

RFP VA701-17-R-0009 – LOMA LINDA EXPAND EMERGENCY DEPARTMENT TECHNICAL QUESTIONS AND VA RESPONSE TRACKING SHEET

ITEM NO.	DATE QUESTION RECEIVED	DATE QUESTION ANSWERED	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE
1.	2-3-2017	2-9-2017	Can the font on the Header and Footers be Arial 10 – the rest of content for both volumes will be Arial 12?	No. The Font shall be 12 point Arial for both volumes.
2.	2-3-2017	2-15-2017	In reference to Volume I, Factor 3, Key Personnel Experience: Can the competent person be the Site Safety Health Officer (SSHO)?	Yes. The Competent Person and Safety person should be the same employee. See update in Amendment A00002, ATTACHMENT 1 – SECTION 00 11 21 RFP SPEC – 2-15-2017.
3.	2-3-2017	2-15-2017	In reference to Volume I, Factor 3, Key Personnel Experience: Our Team includes: Project Manager, Site Superintendent, SSHO/Competent Person, and Quality Control Manager – do you need a resume for each or just the Site Superintendent and Site Safety Officer/Competent Person.	Please provide resume for Project Manager, Site Superintendent, SSHO/Competent Person and Quality Control Manager. Section C.4 (3) has been revised in Amendment A00002, ATTACHMENT 1 – SECTION 00 11 21 RFP SPEC – 2-15-2017.
4.	2-3-2017	2-9-2017	E-mail Size: I understand that each Volume must be no more than 5MG be submitted separately; I am concerned that (Volume I – Non-Price) most likely will exceed the 5MG maximum; can we submit this Volume in parts; ex Part 1 of 2, etc.	Please submit one email for Volume I and one email for Volume II.

ITEM NO.	DATE QUESTION RECEIVED	DATE QUESTION ANSWERED	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE
5.	2-7-2017	2-15-2017	<p>In the evaluation factors 00 11 21.C4.A.3, 3. Volume I, Factor 3, Key Personnel Experience:</p> <p>“The Offeror shall provide a resume for each of the following key personnel members to include the designated Competent Person (as defined by OSHA), on site Superintendent, Safety Point of Contact, and all of the identified Major Subcontractors. For each resume, include name of company, name of individual, relevant listing of experience, qualifications for each person such as specialized training, education, experience. Please delineate approximate % of work the prime contractor will perform on this job and the approximate % of work the subcontractors (collectively) will perform on this job”.</p> <p>Is the government wanting us to submit the resumes of our subcontractors or just identify who we anticipate using? If the government wants a resume from each subcontractor, are they wanting the resume of the actual company, the owner, their project manager, foreman or the guy installing the systems? Because of the way estimating works, it is highly unlikely we will know until the last half hour who many of the subcontractors will be, can the resume requirement of the subcontractors be eliminated?</p>	<p>The Governments requests a resume for the subcontractors that have been identified for the project. The Government recognizes that not every subcontractor has been identified or locked into this project, but there are most likely some that are known in advance of the proposal submission date. Information in the resume does not have to be person specific, but should identify the roles and capabilities of the subcontractor.</p> <p>Section C.4 (3) has been revised in Amendment A00002, ATTACHMENT 1 – SECTION 00 11 21 RFP SPEC – 2-15-2017.</p>

ITEM NO.	DATE QUESTION RECEIVED	DATE QUESTION ANSWERED	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE
6.	2-9-2017	2-15-2017	<p>Volume I- Price Proposal Section 00 11 21 – EMR & Attachment 09</p> <p>Paragraph 6. States. “This requirement is applicable to all subcontracting tiers, and prospective contractors...”</p> <p>We plan to submit our EMR rate letter from our Insurance company and complete the Attachment 12 & 09 for each project.</p> <p>Our concern is that not know which subcontractors we will use until possibly the day of or minutes before due date/time; this requirement is extreme.</p> <p>We offer to submit our contracted subcontractors EMR reports along with our start-up submittals (bonds, insurance, etc.) as our part of our Site-Specific Safety Plan.</p>	<p>Please provide EMR for the prime contractor and any subcontractors that can be provided at time of proposal submission. This Paragraph 6 has been revised in Amendment A00002, ATTACHMENT 1 – SECTION 00 11 21 RFP SPEC – 2-15-2017.</p>
7.	2-9-2017	2-15-2017	<p>Volume II: Non-Price Proposal – Section 00 11 21 – Factor 3, Key Personnel Experience</p> <p>Reads: “...and all of the identified Major Subcontractors” – as per questions 01; requiring a resume from our subs is extreme – as they will be selected too close to due date/time.</p> <p>Our firm procures and uses only key subcontractors whom we have had successful joint experience., at least three for each trade.</p>	<p>The Governments requests a resume for the subcontractors that have been identified for the project. The Government recognizes that not every subcontractor has been identified or locked into this project, but there are most likely some that are known in advance of the proposal submission date. Information in the resume does not have to be person specific, but should identify the roles and capabilities of the subcontractor.</p> <p>Section C.4 (3) has been revised in Amendment A00002, ATTACHMENT 1 – SECTION 00 11 21 RFP SPEC – 2-15-2017.</p>

ITEM NO.	DATE QUESTION RECEIVED	DATE QUESTION ANSWERED	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE
8.	2-9-2017	2-22-2017	During pre-bid meeting it was stated that there would be 60 days between phase 1 and phase 2, is that 60 days included in contract duration or will the contract time stop and restart after we get to phase 2? Do we have to keep supervision on site and construction team available during 60 day period?	The 60 days is an estimate time frame in which the move will take. Most likely the transition period will only take 30 to 45 days. However, we have to plan for worst scenario. These 60 days is included in the contract duration. The construction team availability is at your discretion. But I would assume you would need a skeleton crew.
9.	2-14-2017	2-22-2017	How long does the VA have for responding to Submittals?	14 calendar days.
10.	2-14-2017	2-22-2017	How long does the VA have for responding to RFIs?	During Construction it is at discretion of the Contracting Officer Representative. Usually it is between 5 to 10 calendar days.
11.	2-15-2017	2-15-2017	There are currently three larger projects out for bid at Loma Linda and all three are ending within several days of each other. Is there any chance the due dates will be adjusted?	The CO will review with the site to see if any of the due dates can be adjusted. Please monitor FBO for an amendment changing the due dates.
12.	2-15-2017	2-23-2017	01 33 23.10 – A.1 says that “Shop drawing and product data submittals shall be transmitted to Architect in electronic (PDF) format using Submittal Exchange or equal pre-approved website service designed specifically for transmitting submittals between all construction team members. Please confirm.	Yes, the government is requiring the contractor to use Submittal Exchange. Per specs: 1.8 DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT A. General: Document Management will be provided by Submittal Exchange. The General Contractor shall hire Submittal Exchange to manage all documentation during construction. 1. Building documentation service to include: a. Use of Submittal Exchange Website b. Data Storage, Hosting and Security c. Training and Support d. Electronic Archive This has to go thru the submittal process: (Use manual process for this submittal)

ITEM NO.	DATE QUESTION RECEIVED	DATE QUESTION ANSWERED	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE
13.	2-15-2017	2-15-2017	Attachment 1 – Section 00 11 21, Page 9, Item 3, Volume I, Factor 3, Key Personnel Experience states that the Offeror shall provide resumes for “all of the identified Major Subcontractors”. We may not know which subcontractor we are utilizing depending on their scope and price until right before the proposal is submitted. Can the requirement to provide Major Subcontractor resumes in Volume 1, Factor 3 be deleted?	See response to #5.
14.	2-15-2017	2-15-2017	If the answer to Question #1 above is no, please clarify what Major Subcontractors and personnel members (Competent Person, Site Superintendent, Safety Point of Contact) is being required in Volume 1, Factor 3.	See response to #5.
15.	2-15-2017	2-19-2017	Attachment 1 – Section 00 11 21, Page 9, Item 4, Volume 1, Factor 4, Past Performance states that if a completed past performance evaluation is available in PPIRS it shall be submitted under this section. Please confirm that PPIRS also includes the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS).	These are the same.
16.	2-15-2017	2-22-2017	What is the brand and model of the existing fire alarm system shown on the plans?	Notifier. Design Drawings say match existing.
17.	2-15-2017	2-22-2017	Is this a standalone fire alarm panel or is it networked together with other panels?	This would be networked.
18.	2-15-2017	2-17-2017	Requesting consideration to extend the RFI deadline a few more days to allow for a more thorough review of the solicitation by ourselves and potential subcontractors for the purposes of obtaining relevant clarifications to provide as accurate a price proposal as possible?	The deadline has not been extended. However, if there are technical questions that come up, please ask. The VA will review and try to answer them, but makes no guarantee that a response will be provided.

ITEM NO.	DATE QUESTION RECEIVED	DATE QUESTION ANSWERED	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE
19.	2-15-2017	2-19-2017	Volume I, Factor 1, Construction Experience: seeing no prohibition, would consideration be given to a Teaming Partner construction project for which the Teaming Partner performed as the Prime Contractor and meets the other evaluation criteria contained within this factor? Please provide details if consideration would be allowed. In the past, we have participated in VA solicitations in which Teaming Partner experience was considered a responsive inclusion for evaluation.	The projects that are to be provided for this factor must be performed by the Prime Firm. The Teaming Agreement does not apply in the same way a Joint Venture would, where each firm's projects would count as the Prime Firm experience.
20.	2-15-2017	2-19-2017	Volume I, Factor 1, Construction Experience: instruction for submittal of a maximum of three (3) construction projects-is there a minimum number of projects and/or by submitting less than the maximum what effect would that have on the rating/evaluation factor?	Provide up to three projects that meet the criteria listed in the solicitation for Factor 1. The number can vary between 1 and 3, but the importance is on the project or projects meeting the criteria for this factor.
21.	2-15-2017	2-19-2017	Volume I, Factor 1, Construction Experience: would consideration be given to a project in which the Prime Contractor was a Joint Venture in which the Offeror was the managing member with the responsibilities of a Prime Contractor, including managing multiple subcontractors?	If the Offeror is a Joint Venture (JV), relevant project experience should be submitted for projects completed by the Joint Venture entity. If the Joint Venture does not have shared experience, projects shall be submitted for each Joint Venture partner. Offerors who fail to submit experience for all Joint Venture partners may be rated lower.
22.	2-15-2017	2-22-2017	During pre-bid meeting it was stated that there would be 60 days between phase 1 and phase 2, is that 60 days included in contract duration or will the contract time stop and restart after we get to phase 2? Do we have to keep supervision on site and construction team available during 60 day period?	Same as #8.
23.	2-15-2017	2-22-2017	Please provide base plate thickness for all moment frame columns show on S-311; There are no call outs for the thickness of plates.	The full evaluation will be done during the submittal process. 1 ½" thick plates (as called out on S-411 being referred to from S-311 to S-512 to S-411).

ITEM NO.	DATE QUESTION RECEIVED	DATE QUESTION ANSWERED	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE
24.	2-15-2017	2-22-2017	Please clarify the intent to use blast resistant automatic sliding door system. In past projects bid with the VA, this was not required.	This is a design standard for VA emergency depts. This may not have been needed at another non-emergency project but this was the intent during design. (Clarification to the Blast Resistant Glazing on Sheet A-421, door 1A-270.1 will need the “BR” glazing and door A1-270.2 will not need the “BR” glazing so these are flipped with this indication.)
25.	2-15-2017	2-23-2017	The legend on drawing L130 states “CONTRACTOR SHALL RUN NEW VALVE WIRES AND COMMON WIRE FOR VALVES B-1 THROUGH B-11 TO THIS LOCATION”. These valves are not shown on the RFP landscape plans. Please supply a drawing showing these valves to determine the length of runs in the existing conduits.	Not clear as what you are referring to B1 thru B11. (not clear on drawings) However, I attached the As built drawings. See attachment: Attachment - Question #25 included in Amendment A00004. This might help you calculate an estimate distance. The full evaluation will be done during the submittal process.
26.	2-15-2017	2-22-2017	Section 102123 Cubicle Curtains item 2.1.B lists standard track system components with “hooks”. Sheet I-001 item CC1 notes column lists “mesh”, which will be grommited with holes for hooks; What is “Hookless” referring to in the note?	All cubicle curtains will use VA standard barrier free curtain rods by CTRSS. No hooks required.
27.	2-15-2017	2-22-2017	Sheet I-001 item CTRSS names a manufacturer “Barrier Free Lifts”, but the “Specification #” column list section 102123; Should the reference instead be Spec 117300 Ceiling Mounted Patient Lift System?	This is referring to curtain rod system, see item #26.
28.	2-15-2017	2-22-2017	Sheet I-001 lists item WTI for our section 122400 Window Shades – Where do these occur?	At all exterior windows.
29.	2-15-2017	2-22-2017	Room 1A-210 – are the lockers metal or PLAM – and what are the locker dimensions?	The full evaluation will be done during the submittal process. (PLAM lockers – See Sheet I-211 for locker ID then refer to sheet I-001 for locker information.)

ITEM NO.	DATE QUESTION RECEIVED	DATE QUESTION ANSWERED	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE
30.	2-15-2017	2-22-2017	Rooms 1A423A & 1A-425 – what are the locker sizes?	The full evaluation will be done during the submittal process. See Sheet I-211 for locker ID then refer to sheet I-001 for locker information.
31.	2-15-2017	2-22-2017	Room 1A-232 – (6) lockers, are they the same lockers as in Rooms 1A423A & 1A425?	The full evaluation will be done during the submittal process. See Sheet I-211 for locker ID then refer to sheet I-001 for locker information.
32.	2-15-2017	2-22-2017	Locks – the spec indicates both keyed locks & Cam Padlock Hasps but the elevations show recessed padlock hasps. Please clarify which type is desired.	The full evaluation will be done during the submittal process. See Sheet I-211 for locker ID then refer to sheet I-001 for locker information.
33.	2-15-2017	2-22-2017	Please supply more information on the benches. Is there a specification section?	The full evaluation will be done during the submittal process. Provide ADA compliant Benches with dimensions to follow 48”L x 20”D x 17”H from finished floor to top of seated surface. Finish to match lockers.
34.	2-15-2017	2-19-2017	<p>I would like to make a clarification on ER Amendment 02 VA Response Tracking Item No. 2 and 3. In the Eye Clinic RFP, the VA included Spec Section 01 35 26 requesting a designated SSHO. But in the ER RFP, that specification section is not included and a SSHO is not required. I suggest added that section to the ER RFP.</p> <p>Also, on VA Item No. 3, even though someone asked the question, the VA doesn’t have it in either projects RFP that a Quality Control Manager be a requirement of the contract. Again, my suggestion is that if the VA want’s a designed, stand-alone Quality Control Manager, that be added to the requirements of the contract.</p>	<p>*THIS RESPONSE OVERRULES RESPONSE #3. The request for a SSHO for this project is NOT required. Only provide a Competent Person/Project Manager, On-Site Superintendent, Safety Point of Contact and all of the identified or known major subcontractors.</p> <p>Please REMOVE Quality Control Manager from the requirement in Factor 3, Key Personnel Experience. A resume for Quality Control Manager is NOT required for this factor. See A00003 – ATTACHMENT 1 – SECTION 00 11 21 RFP SPEC – 2-19-2017.</p>

ITEM NO.	DATE QUESTION RECEIVED	DATE QUESTION ANSWERED	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE
35.	2-16-2017	2-22-2017	Elevation drawings A311 shows storefront system, but the details on A813 shows curtain wall system. Please advise which one is correct.	Design intent is for a curtain wall.
36.	2-16-2017	2-22-2017	If those are curtain wall system, spec 084413 article 2.1A.8 indicates STC50. Please confirm this is a typo and, if so, please provide an accurate STC rating. Typically it goes from 34 to 39 for this type of building.	STC 50 Rating is correct.
37.	2-17-2017	2-19-2017	Spec Section 00 11 21-5 indicates "All Offerors shall submit information pertaining to their past Safety and Environmental record. The information must contain a certification that the Offeror has no more than three (3) serious, or one (1) repeat or one (1) willful OSHA or any EPA violation(s) in the past three years." After speaking with several EPA representatives it does not appear that the EPA can nor will provide any official documentation stating a company's violations or confirmation that no violations have been received. Can the offeror just provide a statement indicating that they have received no EPA violations? Please provide guidance on what the government will accept for this requirement?	The EMR requirements are clearly stated in Attachment 1. As for the EPA requirements, please provide a letter with a statement indicating that the contractor has not received any EPA violations.

ITEM NO.	DATE QUESTION RECEIVED	DATE QUESTION ANSWERED	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE
38.	2-17-2017	2-22-2017	This project has a Brand Name requirement for Hill Rom Elements Headwall System. After reviewing the requirements, we request that the VA remove the Brand Name requirement and allow for Headwall Systems, Inc. (HSI) to be permitted to submit their headwall system as an alternative to the Hill Rom Headwall System?	<p>The VA has reviewed the HSI system and has determined that it does not meet all of the requirements for the VA. The HSI system does not meet all of the requirements of the Hill-Rom System, as the below requirements are required for this product.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Med gas med gas manifold with flexible hose and check valve system. 2. Power distribution panel with flexible conduit. 3. Post-Construction modularity which is panel by panel as opposed changing the entire headwall. 4. Each headwall has a single point of connection not two points of connection, one preside.
39.	2-21-2017	2-22-2017	Loma Linda VA701-17-R-0009 We had asked some questions and are wondering if the solicitation bid date might be postponed a few days?	The amendment with technical questions will be posted by 2-23-2017. At this time, the due date will not be changed.
40.	2-21-2017	2-22-2017	The specified roofing system for this project in specification section is 075323 - EPDM (rubber) Roofing. We request consideration of an alternate PVC Roofing System. Attached is a cover letter, Substitution Request Form (CSI), Membrane Product Data Sheet, Sample Warranty and UL Class A Fire Resistance confirmation. Please confirm that this alternate roofing system is acceptable.	This appears to be reasonable. This will be fully evaluated during the submittal phase.
41.	2-21-2017	2-22-2017	Spec section "01 10 00 1.7 CONTRACTING OFFICER'S REPRESENTATIVE'S FIELD OFFICE" requires a field office be placed inside the work zone. The work zone is very small for this project. Please clarify if the contracting officer's representatives field office is required for this project.	This is not required.

ITEM NO.	DATE QUESTION RECEIVED	DATE QUESTION ANSWERED	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE
42.	2-22-2017	2-22-2017	Do you plan to extend due date?	Please submit the proposals by the date listed on the SF1442, Marsh 7, 2017.
43.	2-22-2017	2-22-2017	Amendment 1 provides PHASING PLAN in Power Point – can you re-issue again – the notes posted under each phase are hard to read,	This is the only version of the power point available.
44.	2-23-2017	2-23-2017	CPM Schedule: Will these pages count towards max pages?	The schedule counts toward the max page limit.
45.	2-23-2017	2-23-2017	BID BOND: Should we provide a .pdf copy of Bond in Volume II - PRICE, or just reference that original has been sent?	A pdf copy of the bond does not need to be included in Volume II.
46.	2-23-2017	2-23-2017	Can the VA please reconsider the response to Question #38 regarding the Hill-Rom Headwall System Brand Name?	Please disregard the previous answer for Question #38. In the interest of competition, the VA has removed the Brand Name Requirement for the Hill-Rom Headwall Systems. VAAR Clause 852.236-90 “Restriction on Submission and Use of Equal Products (NOV 1986): is hereby removed from the solicitation and Attachment 10 – Brand Name J&A is also removed from the solicitation. The Hill-Rom Headwall System listed in the specs is the Basis of Design and the product currently used by the VA. If a different product is proposed, it is subject to the Brand Name or Equal clauses included in the solicitation and will be thoroughly reviewed during the submittal process.
47.	2-24-2017	2-27-2017	Is this a 2 phase or 4 Phase project?	2 Phase project.
48.	2-24-2017	2-25-2017	Can you please let me know if this is a public bid opening and if so what location?	This is not an IFB, so there will not be a public bid opening.

ITEM NO.	DATE QUESTION RECEIVED	DATE QUESTION ANSWERED	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE
49.	2-24-2017	2-25-2017	PAST PERFORMANCE: We have a PPQ-O already completed; do we e-mail this to you or do we provide in Volume I: NO-PRICE PROPOSAL. If we include our evaluations (PPQ or CCASS) in proposal (VOLUME I) will they count?	<p>Per the instructions listed in Evaluation Factor 4, Past Performance: “If a completed past performance evaluation is available in PPIRS, it shall be submitted with the proposal for each project referenced in Factor 1, Construction Experience. If there is not a completed past performance evaluation available in PPIRS, then the Offeror shall submit Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQ)(reference ATTACHMENT 13) for each project referenced in Factor 1. The Offeror shall notify their client that they PPQ shall be submitted via email to the Government’s point of contact Donald.marsh2@va.gov. If the Offeror is unable to obtain a completed PPQ from a client for a project(s) before proposal closing date, the Offeror shall complete and submit with the proposal the first page of the PPQ, which will provide contract and client information for the respective project(s). project(s) to obtain the PPQ information.”</p> <p>Per the Attachment 1 RFP Spec Section C/2 Proposal Format, C, the page limit does not apply for the PPQ’s submitted by the clients. The CPARS/PPIRS evaluations included in the proposal will count against the limitation.</p>
50.	2-28-2017	3-02-2017	The low-side supply ductwork on both the base bid and alternate bid floor plans is not sized and there are no CFMs provided. Please provide and updated floor plan with the proper duct sizes.	<p>See updated documents posted in Amendment A00005: Updated - MD-201 - 03-01-2017 Updated - MD-202 - 03-01-2017</p>

ITEM NO.	DATE QUESTION RECEIVED	DATE QUESTION ANSWERED	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE
51.	2-28-2017	3-1-2017	Section 01 00 00, Para. 1.4C requires the GC to provide an unarmed guard 24 hours a day, 7 days a week after construction hours as well as visual security equipment to monitor checking of the premises. Are these requirements going to be enforced? If so, how will this requirement work on the 2 nd phase of the project where the work is interior to the hospital?	They have the option to not have a guard but it is at their risk.
52.	3-01-2017	3-2-2017	Is the use of Submittal Exchange part of contract documents for this project ? We see it as proprietary and there is no equal to this which should not be allowed.	A Brand Name J&A has been completed for this item. See the new ATTACHMENT 10 – BRAND NAME J & A. Also VAAR Clause 852.236-90 “Restriction on Submission and Use of Equal Products (NOV 1986)” has been added back to the solicitation.

