



C o u n t y o f S a n L u i s O b i s p o

GENERAL SERVICES AGENCY

Janette D. Pell, Director

Helen McCann, Department Administrator

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS PS- #1062 ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR PROBATION - JUVENILE HALL EXPANSION, Project #320032

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS PRESENTATION AT THE
COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO MEDIA CENTER ON NOVEMBER 15, 2010

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

December 8, 2010

Q1. Where is the location of the proposed gymnasium?

A1. There is no specific location for the proposed gymnasium except that it must be located on Lease Parcel 1 or Lease Parcel 2.

Q2. Will boundary/survey information be provided?

A2. Yes, at the appropriate time.

Q3. Has the boundary been approved by the State?

A3. The State has acknowledged Lease Parcel 1 and Lease Parcel 2 as the proposed building sites for the Juvenile Hall expansion project.

Q4. Any thought of expanding to the easterly side of the facility?

A4. No, the eastern side of the existing building consists of Courts and Administrative offices.

Q5. Does the utility easement shown on the Lease Boundary & Fire Access Exhibit have an impact on the location of new construction?

A5. We are not certain at this time. The utility easement that is located in the middle of Lease Parcel is in favor of the State of California. A substantial portion of the existing facility is constructed over the same utility easement. This item will be resolved as the project evolves.

Q6. What is the County looking for in the SOQ submittal response?

A6. See the SOQ request for details.

Q7. Will a copy of today's presentation be made available?

A7. Yes, it will be put on-line.

Q8. Is the County's 25% share towards the project costs fully funded?

County of San Luis Obispo RSOQ PS- #1062 November 4, 2010 Page 2
Probation – COC – Juvenile Hall Expansion, Project #320032
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

A8. No, only partial County funding of \$750K has been approved by the Board of Supervisors for the project. Additional funding must be approved by the Board of Supervisors as the project evolves.

Q9. Was the conceptual preliminary design prepared for the State grant application prepared by the County or by an outside consulting firm?

A9. The work was prepared by a consulting firm familiar with the existing facility. The conceptual preliminary design was used only as a tool to create a rough cost estimate of the proposed project for purposes of the State grant application. The merits of the design were not considered or critiqued by the project Steering Committee.

Q10. Will the conceptual preliminary design be made available?

A10. The County will make the document available under a Public Records Act request to the extent not exempt from disclosure.

Q11. Is there a schedule concerning the Statement of Qualification process?

A11. There is no established formal schedule for the process. It is estimated a “short-list” of architectural design consultants will be determined by the end of January, 2011. It is estimated that interviews with consulting firms on the “short-list” may occur in February/March, 2011. A professional services contract may be awarded by the County Board of Supervisors in April, 2011.

Q12. Are we looking for LEED certification?

A12. No, the County is interested in including as many energy efficient measures in the project that the project budget can afford. A list of alternate energy efficiency bid items will be included in the bid documents.

Q13. What is the facility operational philosophy?

A13. Physical barriers must not hinder response times in the facility by County staff. Visual observation of the juvenile offenders is imperative. Yard areas should have few or no “blind” spots. The new expansion area should not be crowded with barriers that keep County staff from effectively doing their job.

Q14. Will the addition be a “hardened area”?

A14. Yes, the new addition will house offenders that require the most effective security features in the facility.

Q15. Will the expansion be primarily constructed on one side of the existing facility?

A15. The project may be constructed on Lease Parcel 1 and Lease Parcel 2. See the Lease Boundary & Fire Access Exhibit for the extent of each parcel.

Q16. Will the new project include any renovation of the existing facility?

A16. No.

Q17. Will the juvenile offenders be transferred from the new facility expansion to the existing exterior yards?

A17. Yes, for recreation purposes, Court appearances, or other operational purposes.

Q18. *Who does the Chief Probation Officer report to?*

A18. The Chief Probation Officer reports to the San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors.

Q19. *Will there be a need to add parking spaces on the west side?*

A19. Yes, approximately three to four spaces.

Q20. *Where does one park to enter the existing facility?*

A20. Visitors park in the east side parking lot as well as on the sides of the existing access road in front of the facility, parallel to Highway 1. People entering the Courts also park in the east side parking lot.

Q21. *What is the extent of "in-home" services?*

A21. There are three satellite offices that support "in-home" services for the County. The offices are located in Atascadero in the North County, Arroyo Grande in the South County, and San Luis Obispo at the Department of Social Services.

Q22. *Will the County retain a cost estimating consultant for the project?*

A22. The County may retain a cost estimating consultant for the project. The project Steering Committee will make that determination at a later date.

Q23. *The original 2007 schedule lists a mid-point of construction that is several years earlier than what will be the actual mid-point of construction. This relates to the 2008 Needs Assessment cost estimate. How are you going to handle that discrepancy?*

A23. The budget will not be increased. The project budget is locked into the State Grant funding. Since there will be no increase in project funding, all possible cost saving options will be considered and determined as the project develops.

Q24. *Are construction management services planned for the facility expansion project?*

A24. Construction management services will be determined by the project Steering Committee at a later date.

Q25. *Can you describe the western extent of the property?*

A25. The property consists of undeveloped property and an access road in very poor condition. The actual site for the proposed project is illustrated on the Lease Boundary & Fire Access Exhibit.

Q26. *Are there any drainage issues concerning the proposed project?*

A26. Drainage from the new facility expansion cannot drain directly into the riparian area. A drainage plan will be required for the project.

Q27. *Is there any tree removal proposed for the project?*

A27. The County is constantly trimming the boundary of the riparian habitat so that it does not encroach closer to the double security fences. Two large trees, near the detached modular unit and the

drainage channel are likely to be removed to allow for creation of the emergency vehicle access road.

Q28. There does not appear to be room to construct a fire access road between the outer fence and the riparian habitat. Will the outer fence be moved so that the access road will be between fences?

A28. Relocating the outer security fence will be considered by the project Steering Committee. The existing willow trees in the area require regular trimming and will be a factor in the decision.

Q29. What is the timing of the Mitigated Negative Declaration?

A29. The Mitigated Negative Declaration may occur by the end of January, 2011. However, the County may wait until a preliminary design has been approved by the project Steering Committee prior to processing the Mitigated Negative Declaration.