

Addendum 1

1. Page 13 & 27 – Section 6-Forms

Q --A “Service Category Form” was referenced in the text, but no form was provided. Please clarify.

A----RFQ to be revised to reflected removal of Service Category form and other Service Category

2. Can you please correct (on page 30) Reference document Firm name to:

Thomas Architecture Studios & HOK in 2015 (instead of Ron Thomas Architects)

Response – Verbiage will be revised.

3. Page 13 – Section 4.2 Evaluation Criteria references five criteria and point values listed below however only 4 criteria are actually listed. Please confirm only 4 criteria totaling 100 points is correct.

Response – RFQ to be revised to reflect 4 criteria totaling 100 points.

Page 2 – Revised date from 1/3/21 to 1/3/22

Replacement pages have been provided

- D. Coordination with regulatory agencies, other County departments, consultants, and contractors.
- E. Other types of professional services requested by the County that are consistent with the intent of this RFQ.

1.3 RFQ SCHEDULE

Following is the schedule for this RFQ. The dates shown below that are preceded by an asterisk are tentative, provided for information only, and subject to change at the sole discretion of the County.

<u>12/01/2021</u>	Date issued
<u>12/20/2021</u>	Questions due, in writing (via email), not later than 2:00 p.m. PST
<u>1/03/2022</u>	Submittals due not later than 2:00 p.m. PST
<u>1/03/2022</u>	Begin evaluation of submittals
<u>1/17/2022- 1/21/2022</u>	Interviews, if deemed necessary
<u>1/26/2022</u>	Consultant selected
<u>2/15/2022</u>	Contract award

1.4 BUDGET AND CONTRACT PERIOD

The value of this task order is anticipated to be in the range of \$180,000 \$250,000. There is no guarantee of work under this contract. In addition, the County reserves the right to solicit separate contracts with other consultants at its sole discretion.

1.5 PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE

The County does not intend to hold a pre-proposal conference for this RFQ.

1.6 MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS

Following are the minimum qualifications that proposing firms must meet in order to submit a response to this RFQ. Submittals must clearly show compliance to these minimum qualifications. Submittals that are not clearly responsive to these minimum qualifications shall be rejected by the County without further consideration.

- A. The proposing firm shall have been in business for a minimum of five years from the date of issuance of this RFQ.
- B. The proposing firm must have a minimum of five years' experience with judicial projects which include reconfiguration of space, tenant improvements, facility design and construction in addition to courtroom design and construction.

SECTION 4 – EVALUATION AND SELECTION

This Section describes the method the County will use to evaluate submittals received in response to this solicitation.

4.1 INITIAL SCREENING OF SUBMITTALS

All submittals will be initially screened for responsiveness and the minimum qualifications outlined in this solicitation. Those submittals that do not clearly meet the minimum qualifications will be considered nonresponsive and will not be further evaluated.

4.2 EVALUATION CRITERIA

The County will evaluate and score the SOQs using the four criteria and point values listed below.

- (1) The qualifications, experience, and ability of the firm to provide the services requested in this solicitation. – 20 points
- (2) The qualifications, experience, and ability of the Project Manager and other key personnel to provide the services requested in this solicitation. – 25 points
- (3) The capability, integrity, and reliability of the firm, Project Manager, and key personnel, as verified by references and/or as already known to the County. – 10 points
- (4) Approach to Task 1 – Comprehensive Project Development and Feasibility Study – 45 points

4.3 EVALUATION PROCESS

The County will evaluate the SOQs according to the evaluation criteria in Section 4.2 and will rank the SOQs for each category. At the County's discretion, the top-ranked proposers may be contacted and asked to submit more detailed or supplementary information and/or invited to participate in interviews. If interviews are held, then the County will conduct a final evaluation of the proposers based on the criteria listed in Section 4.2 above. Interviews will have a maximum of 100 points. The initial evaluation scores combined with the interview scores will be used to determine the final ranking.

4.4 SELECTION AND NEGOTIATION

The County shall select the highest-ranked proposer for each category based on the criteria and evaluation process outlined above. In the event that two or more proposers have the same final score, the County will initiate negotiations with the proposer who, in the sole opinion of the County, best meets the County's needs as outlined in this solicitation.

The County will ask the selected highest-ranked proposer to submit a fee schedule. The County will then enter into negotiations with that firm to finalize the contract and the fee schedule. The County reserves the right to negotiate any aspect of the contract and/or fee schedule for purposes of executing a contract.

Although the County may open discussions with the highest-ranked proposer, consideration or negotiations resulting in a contract are not guaranteed. If the County is unsuccessful in negotiating with the selected proposer or if negotiations do not proceed in a timely fashion, the County reserves the option to terminate negotiations and proceed with the next-highest ranked proposer, and so on until an agreement is reached with one of the proposers or the process is terminated.

SECTION 6– FORMS

The Submittal Form must be completed by the proposer for inclusion in the submittal, are presented in this section on the following pages.

- **Submittal Form** – The one-page Submittal Form must be completed in entirety and executed by a person authorized to legally and contractually bind the proposer, or the submittal may be rejected by the County. The executed Submittal Form must be included in the submission as directed in Section 3.3 of this solicitation.
- **Task 1** – Comprehensive Project Development Study Scope of Work

The study will need to address project options with the following budget scenarios: (1) full space program projected through 2045 as outlined in 2015 Comparable Feasible Study for and (2) maximum space utilizing space planning best practices criteria with a project budget ceiling of \$120M assuming a Design and/or Construction contract is awarded in the summer of 2022.

Existing County Courthouse campus (2000 Lakeridge Drive, Olympia, WA)

Hilltop Plaza Reconstruction

Using the “Hilltop Existing Campus” option from the 2015 Comparative Feasibility Study as a point of departure along with the 2016 Condition Assessment Report of the existing Courthouse complex, develop a feasibility option for potential reconstruction of Buildings 1 – 3 while expanding existing building(s) upward to provide Superior and District Court space with proper security and personnel circulation. Consider relocating all the functions from Buildings 4 – 6 into the renovated space in Buildings 1 & 3 making it possible to provide additional parking where Buildings 4 & 6 are presently located.

Cost Estimates

Provide two (2) cost estimates for each of the options. The first estimate will address the 2045 Space requirements as shown in the “Programming Summary” section of the 2015 Comparative Feasibility Study and the second estimate will address the maximum space, utilizing space planning best practices criteria, with a project budget ceiling of \$120M. The construction portion of the estimates shall be Uniformat II. Costs shall include design, construction, construction administration, permits, taxes, furnishings, equipment, moving, etc. Assume construction starts in the Summer of 2022. Estimates shall not include purchase of property.

Final Report

The Final Report will be presented to the Thurston County Board of County Commissioners by the selected proposer in coordination with County Project Manager. Additional presentation(s) to other elected officials, department directors, and stakeholders may be required.

Reference Documents:

Hilltop Campus Expansion Site

- Comparative Feasibility Study by Thomas Architecture Studios & HOK in 2015
- Facility Condition Assessment Final Report by MENG ANALYSIS in 2016