



# OFFICE OF THE CITY ADMINISTRATOR



London N. Breed, Mayor  
Naomi M. Kelly, City Administrator

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

OFFICE OF RESILIENCE AND CAPITAL PLANNING (ORCP) AND EARTHQUAKE SAFETY IMPLEMENTATION  
PROGRAM (ESIP)

RFP # 2020-001

Seismic Safety Engineering and Consulting Services

March 3, 2020

### Question 1

On Page 1, the deadline for written questions is “Wednesday, February 28, 2020, at 4pm. February 28 is a Friday, which is what I think that you intended.

**Answer:** It is correct that the deadline for submission of written questions was intended to be Friday, February 28, 2020. See page 1 of the RFP online for the corrected date in red.

### Question 2

Section VI.C indicates “*Should a proposer object on any ground to any provision or legal requirement set forth in this RFP, the proposer must, not more than ten calendar days after the RFP is issued, provide written notice to the Department setting forth with specificity the grounds for the objection.*” I have three questions in this regard:

1. The objections are to be provided to “the Department.” Is this you, or someone else? If it’s someone else, please indicate to whom we should address our objections.

**Answer:** Objections can be directed to Danielle Mieler at [Danielle.mieler@sfgov.org](mailto:Danielle.mieler@sfgov.org)

2. Is the intent that we identify our objections with an explanation as to the reason (without a proposed solution), or that we propose alternative language.

**Answer:** It is the choice of the proposer what to include in the notification of any objections.

3. We have a current contract with the City for Engineering Design Review services, which took some effort to negotiate. Can we propose that the work be performed under an extension of that contract?

**Answer:** ORCP is a separate department, so we will not be amending existing contract with other departments to fit in this scope of work. However, we will consider final agreement reached with other departments in negotiating with you if you are awarded a contract.

### Question 3

Can further detail on the Scope of Work, including tasks and deliverables, be provided? The RFP is unclear as to what constitutes “technical guidance” and which other entities (if any) are intended to be responsible for items listed under the various tasks in the *Workplan for the CAPSS ESIP*. For example, ESIP Task ID A.3.b, lists a series of items including: Technical Issues, Prior Work Necessary, Costs and Other Impacts, Legislative Action Required and Implementation Cost.

**Answer:** We are most interested in the proposer developing a reasonable scope of work with necessary tasks to support ORCP staff and working group members to achieve the goal of retrofitting concrete and steel buildings. We encourage proposers to identify alternative options within the scope with associated costs. We expect that the proposer will focus on the technical aspects necessary to achieve the policy objective and to work with ORCP, other city staff and the stakeholder working group to inform the development of a technically feasible and acceptable retrofit program. That may also include general cost estimates for proposed retrofit standards.

- a. Which of these items is the proposer expected to respond to?

**Answer:** We are looking for the proposer to respond to technical issues related to these tasks.

- b. If Technical Issues only, please clarify if the proposer is expected to coordinate with the other issues / work of others, including whether this work will occur concurrently or in another sequence.

**Answer:** The proposer will coordinate work concurrently with ORCP and other city staff and the stakeholder working group.

- c. Is the task and deliverable (as part of this RFP) for this specific Task ID to develop / propose seismic evaluation and retrofit criteria (ie seismic hazard and acceptance criteria, or an overall performance objective) for concrete tilt-up buildings in San Francisco?

**Answer:** The task is to perform the technical tasks necessary to support ORCP staff and the stakeholder working group in developing policies to seismically retrofit older concrete and steel buildings. That may include identifying the scope of the program, developing or obtaining an address inventory, identifying appropriate retrofit standards or options to consider, proposing reasonable deadlines to retrofit, and identifying potential costs and benefits of a proposed retrofit scope and standards.

- d. Is the proposer expected to develop the inventory of buildings in this category as part of the Scope of Work?

**Answer:** It may be necessary to develop or enhance existing inventories for the proposed tasks. Inventories exist for concrete buildings and steel buildings over 240ft. Other city databases contain some of the information necessary for developing inventories. We would encourage the proposer to identify the tasks needed to develop needed inventories and propose options, including working with ORCP staff or other organizations, to develop such inventories.

- e. The above questions apply similarly to other ESIP Tasks, including Tasks B.2.a, C.2.a, C.2.e (non-ductile concrete), C.2.b (300+ occupancy buildings) and C.2.d (pre-NR buildings.)

**Answer:** The answers above can be applied generally to the other ESIP tasks. The proposer may wish to propose a modified scope in the proposal. Identification of optional tasks with associated costs are also encouraged.

#### **Question 4**

What metrics/process are being used by ORCP/ESIP to evaluate any proposed seismic evaluation and retrofit criteria? Is the proposer only providing technical (Structural Engineering) guidance on recommended criteria, or is the proposer also expected to provide analysis/evaluation of related issues including: cost-benefit, financing and legal issues, geotechnical hazards, historic preservation, and social equity impacts?

**Answer:** The proposer is expected to provide technical guidance to support the development of a seismic retrofit program. As a part of this guidance, however we do expect that the proposer be able to go beyond technical analysis to identify associated implications of proposed retrofit standards and program scope as they relate to engineering recommendations. At a minimum, some evaluation of costs and benefits will be necessary to inform policy decisions. ORCP staff and working group will also work with proposer to evaluate additional related issues.

#### **Question 5**

Will the project include a project peer review panel?

**Answer:** The project will not include a peer review panel, but a stakeholder group comprised of technical and nontechnical experts and interested parties will guide this project.

#### **Question 6**

Can you clarify your priority tasks for Year 1?

**Answer:** Our priority in Year 1 is to conduct engineering analysis necessary to develop a reasonable concrete and steel retrofit ordinance, including scope, retrofit standard, timeline and any necessary cost/benefit analysis.

#### **Question 7**

RFP Section II refers to certain buildings owned by the City. Is it ORCP's intent that any of the project tasks should treat City-owned buildings exclusively or differently (either by scope or schedule)?

**Answer:** It is not our intention that City buildings be treated any differently than private buildings in this project.

#### **Question 8**

Is the work contingent on passage of Prop A or Prop B on the March 3 ballot, or on other budget proposals not yet approved?

**Answer:** The budget for this project has been secured and is not contingent on passage of Prop A or Prop B.

**Question 9**

Does the work include participation in policy-making processes (hearings, committee meetings)?

**Answer:** It is not generally anticipated that the consultant will be requested to attend policy-making hearings, committee or other meetings. However, as the need arises, the consultant may be requested to attend certain policy-making hearings or other meetings to testify on technical aspects of the policy. Staff will be responsible for crafting policy based on the consultant's recommendations.

**Question 10**

What is status of downtown recovery plan, and will work under this RFP be required to accept its recommendations or coordinate with its findings? This will affect how we schedule and scope our project approach.

**Answer:** The initial phase of the downtown recovery plan is underway. We don't anticipate that this project will depend on the outcomes, recommendations or schedule of the downtown recovery plan.

**Question 11**

Does ORCP anticipate that a main deliverable for some or all tasks will be legislative language, like a draft ordinance?

**Answer:** We do not anticipate that the consultant will be responsible for drafting legislative language. That task will be staff's responsibility based on recommendations from the consultant and stakeholder working group.

**Question 12**

Will the agreement contain an indemnity consistent with 2782.8 California Civil Code?

**Answer:** The ultimate agreement will be consistent with state laws concerning design professionals. We are not asking for design or engineering for a specific building, but rather about the building stock as a whole based on general knowledge of seismic vulnerabilities to certain building types and we may perform analysis of prototype buildings to inform our recommendations, but it won't be plans that would be carried out on a specific building.

**Question 13**

Other than Structural Engineering, are there any other disciplines / expertise / sub-consultants that the City/County would like to see included as part of this project?

**Answer:** It is not anticipated that other disciplines besides structural engineering will be included as part of this proposal. However, other disciplines, such as outreach consulting, may be obtained under separate contract.

**Question 14**

Is the cover letter to be included under a separate tab? (i.e not included as part of Executive Summary and Introduction)

**Answer:** The cover letter may be included separately from the executive summary and introduction. The RFP has been updated to clarify this.

**Question 15**

Does the City/County want to see 4-10 references in total or per person/consultant?

**Answer:** We would like to see 4-10 references total.

**Question 16**

Which comes first in the proposal — Proposal Schedule or the References? There seems to be a discrepancy in the list on pg 5 of the RFP document vs. on pages 6 & 7.

**Answer:** The order should be References and then Proposal Schedule. The RFP has been updated to correct this.

**Question 17**

Do we include our firm's project experience in both the Minimum Qualifications section as well as the Firm Qualifications section? (this would be relating to the prime)

**Answer:** The prime firm may include project experience in both the Minimum Qualifications section and the Firm Qualifications section, as needed to meet the requirements of each section.