

ADDENDUM NO.: 1

RFP NO: 24-020BC

ISSUE DATE: MARCH 12, 2024



Snohomish County

Purchasing Services

(425) 388-3344

purchasing@snoco.org

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP) TITLE:

Security Assessments, County Buildings

This addendum is issued to revise the original RFP as follows:

- A. Remove Section 5E of the original RFP in its entirety.
- B. Delete Attachment A-1 Cost Proposal in its entirety and replace with Attachment A-1R Cost Proposal.
- C. The following responses are provided to questions received:
 - 1. Question: Has Snohomish County (SC) worked with any Security Consulting firm to develop this RFP? If so, will this firm be allowed to bid on this project?
Answer: No.
 - 2. Question: Has SC had any physical security evaluations/assessments performed at any of it's facilities within the last 1 – 3 years? If so, will the consulting firm who provided the services be allowed to compete for this project? Can the names of these vendors be provided?
Answer: Yes, Snohomish County conducted RFP-23-034BC Security Assessments – Courthouses. A contract was awarded to National Center for State Courts. Yes, National Center for State Courts may submit a proposal.
 - 3. Question: Has SC had any major security projects completed within the last 1 – 3 years at its facilities? If so, will the associated vendor(s) be able to bid on this project? Can the names of these vendors be provided?
Answer: No.
 - 4. Question: Are there any Security System Operations and Maintenance (O&M) contractor(s) that provide security maintenance services to the facilities associated with this project? If so, will this contractor be allowed to bid on this project? Can the names of these vendors be provided?
Answer: No. Currently, the County does not have any active contracts with Security System Operations and Maintenance contractors at the locations covered by this RFP.

5. Question: Can a proposal submitted by individual consultant firm (in whole or part) be used to support this project even if the consulting firm is not awarded the project?

Answer: Yes, all documents submitted to the County in response to the RFP will become public record and may be used by the selected firm. Refer to Section 20 of the RFP to identify any specific information that can be claimed as confidential or proprietary.

6. Question: Has any form of Risk Assessments or Threat Assessments been conducted on any of the facilities associated with the RFP in the past?

Answer: No.

7. Question: What type of Electronic Security System(s) (Intrusion Detection, Access Control, CCTV, Duress, etc.) are in place at each of the facilities associated with this RFP? When were these systems installed? Where are they located?

Answer: The successful proposer is responsible for collecting and confirming this information during mandatory site visits and department interviews. Refer to RFP Section 5, page 7, "The County will provide" for additional information.

8. Question: Has a full functional test ever been conducted on the Electronic Security System Components (CCTV, Access Control, Intrusion Detection, Duress) that are in place at the facilities?

Answer: No.

9. Question: Are the existing Electronic Security System Components (CCTV, Access Control, Intrusion Detection) in a standalone configuration, or, are they part of a Wide Area Computer Network or Local Area Computer Network?

Answer: Refer to the answer to Question #7.

10. Question: Is there a commercial or proprietary Monitoring Station/Security Operations Center associated with the Electronic Security Systems? If the Commercial Monitoring Station/Security Operations Center is contracted, should it be associated with this project?

Answer: Refer to the answer to Question #7.

11. Question: Are CAD/Bluebeam Revit/PDF Drawings available for each facility associated with this project to aid project efforts?

Answer: Yes. CAD/PDF architectural backgrounds are available for each facility. Refer to RFP Section 5, page 7, "The County will provide" for additional information.

12. Question: Does SC have a dedicated (contract or proprietary) Security Staff that oversees security operations for all of the facilities associated with this project?

Answer: Snohomish County Sheriff's Office is responsible for providing security oversight for County buildings. Some locations have onsite sheriff staff (i.e., marshal) and additional contract security officers. The successful proposer is responsible for collecting and confirming this information during mandatory interviews and site visits. See RFP Sections 2, 3 and 5 for additional information.

13. Question: Is some form of contracted (non-proprietary) or proprietary Security Officers/Sheriff Officers used to support security efforts at each facility?
Answer: Refer to the answer to question #12.
14. Question: Can an organizational chart for SC be provided that outlines where Security Operations falls within the organizational model?
Answer: No. Refer to the answer to question #12.
15. Question: Are any of the facilities related to this project designated as Historical Landmarks which could affect security upgrade efforts?
Answer: Yes, the Carnegie Building is designated as a Historic Landmark.
16. Question: Page 5, 2A District Court – South Division, states that the building is a two-story building with basement. Is this building a 1 story building with a basement; or, a true two-story building with a basement?
Answer: District Court has one level above ground and one level below ground.
17. Question: Page 3, E. Security Training, 'Provide Owner training on new and revised recommendations. This training shall be in-person and include hardcopy documents for reference.'
- a. Can this training be in the form of a power point presentation that outlines the recommendation(s) (and illustrations if the recommendation is a physical security improvement)?
 - b. Who is the anticipated audience associated with this training?
 - c. Can this training be part of the official out-brief?
- Answer:*
- a. Please See Revision A above. **Section 5E is deleted from the RFP.** Training may occur in a later phase and may be addressed as an additional service.
 - b. Please see answer to Question # 17.a.
 - c. Please see answer to Question # 17.a.
18. Question: What is prompting this assessment? Was this not covered by a previous request for proposal? This seems repetitive to work that has been done or previously bid.
Answer: Please refer to RFP Section 3, Background.
19. Question: We note courts are to be assessed. Does this assessment involve courthouse/adjudication processes?
Answer: Yes.
20. Question: Can more definition be provided on the areas and building be assessed (aerial photo with lines of demarcation). We see multiple buildings from our cursory review. Something that defines the areas to be assessed:
- a. Parking areas (are there garages? Are they on-site?) How big?
 - b. To properly scope this project, we must know all departments, or minimally identify interviews that are planned at each building. "shall include, but are not limited to" is concerning.
 - c. Where can we find the exhibits that are associated to the project?

Answer:

- a. There is one parking garage on the main campus. It is 7 floors deep below ground with approximately 58,000 SF per level. The garage is open to the public and proposers are encouraged to visit the garage in order to accurately scope the proposal. All other parking areas are above grade and visible from the satellite photographs.*
- b. Departments and functions for each location are included in the RFP, Section 5.F. Each department listed needs to be interviewed per location including ancillary functions and shared resources. See RFP, Section 5.D for additional information.*
- c. The exhibits are posted on the Snohomish County Purchasing Portal. Under the RFP number (RFP-24-020BC) within the Bid Documents Tab.*

21. Question: How many interviews are desired for each building?

Answer: Refer to the answer to question #20.b.

22. Question: Is a lighting/light metered assessment required? Is a qualitative lighting assessment acceptable?

Answer: The County does not have a requirement for light metering associated with this project. Lighting levels should be assessed as indicated in Sections 2 and 5.A. of the RFP including mandatory after-hours site visits.

23. Question: Are there any relevant accreditations and or standards that need to be followed?

Answer: Refer to Sections 5.A. and 5.B. of the RFP.

24. Question: Is there a subterranean component to this assessment – interconnecting tunnels/corridors?

Answer: Yes. The buildings and underground parking garage on the main campus are connected to one another via a tunnel system and elevators. Several of the buildings have basements as noted in the RFP Section 5.F.

25. Question: What systems are in place? How many cameras, how many access control readers, how many intercoms, duress, etc. per assessment location? Generally.

Answer: Refer to the answer to Question #7.

26. Question: Does systems maintenance documentation exist?

Answer: Computerized maintenance management system (CMMS) records regarding security systems are likely not available. The successful proposer is responsible for researching and confirming details during mandatory interviews and site visits.

27. Question: Does the county have an incumbent consultant now?

Answer: No.

28. Question: Do prior internal/external assessments exist? Will we be able to obtain access?

Answer: No.

29. Question: Will an on-site presentation of findings be required, or will a teleconference presentation be acceptable?

Answer: Refer to Section 5.D of the RFP.

30. Question: Will/can a pre-bid meeting be offered to review submittal requirements and provide an overview of the buildings? Virtually?

Answer: No.

31. Question: Will the lowest bidder have preference?

Answer: Refer to Section 13. Evaluation Criteria. Cost Proposal is weighted at 20% of the proposal.

32. Question: Will local bidder have preference.

Answer: No.

33. Question: Will there be a preference to WBW/DBE/VOB/SBE disadvantaged firms?

Answer: No. That information is requested for data collection.

34. Question: Are there participation goals?

Answer: No.

35. Question: The FFE Requirements are unclear, can more detail be provided?

Answer: The County is looking for a security assessment with recommendations, prioritization and ROM estimates including potential FF&E improvements. The successful proposer will gather additional FF&E information during mandatory interviews and site visits. Assistance regarding future ff&e work could be addressed as an additional service.

36. Question: The budgeted amount is significant concern. What is the upper limit for this engagement? Is this to include expenses?

Answer: Refer to Section 4. Specific Project Information. The final budget will be largely determined by the result of this RFP.

37. Question: The delivery by "fall" is subjective, can we assume November 30th, 2024?

Answer: The County desires assessments for site labeled 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, and 2C in Section 5.F of the RFP are to be completed by 1 September 2024. The County desires all other locations are to be completed by 11/1/24.

38. Question: Can more details around signage be provided? This typically is addressed by legal. How many types of signage wording are expected for this engagement?

Answer: The County is looking for a security assessment with recommendations, prioritization and ROM estimates as indicated in Section 2 of the RFP. The design, purchase and installation of any signage to complete those recommendations would be part of a future project which could be addressed as an additional service.

39. Question: Security training is subjective; can we provide an allowance to address this?

Answer: Refer to the answer to Question #17.

40. Question: Are we to document as-built conditions?

Answer: Refer to the answer to question #11. Proposers are not required to document as-built conditions for current or future County use, but this information may be needed to address the required Scope of Services in RFP Section 5. Formal documentation of existing, revised or final as-built conditions would be extra work and could be addressed as an additional service.

41. Question: Does the County have an already completed security risk assessment for its facilities that informs priorities for existing security measures and procedures? a. Does the County desire the successful proposer to complete a new security risk assessment or update the current one as part of the scope for this project?

Answer: No and Yes (a.) a new assessment which is the primary reason for this RFP.

42. Question: Does the Security Training identified in Paragraph 5E, Page 3 of the RFP part of the initial scope of work, or will it be executed in option years, as new or revised recommendations are implemented?

Answer: Refer to the answer to question #17.

43. Question: Since as-built plans for each security system are not available, will the County provide up-to-date floor plans for each facility for use in marking up/confirming security details at each facility?

Answer: Please see answer to question #11.

44. Question: Does the County have a security asset inventory of systems in place and their specifications?

Answer: Refer to the answer to Question #7.

45. Question: Does the County provide its own system monitoring, or does it use a third-party monitoring service? If third-party, who provides your monitoring services?

Answer: Refer to the answer to Question #12.

46. Question: Does the County provide its own security system maintenance, or does it use a third-party? If third-party, who provides your security system maintenance?

Answer: Refer to the answers to Questions #4, #7 and #26.

47. Question: Paragraph 4, page 2 states that the County desires recommendations completed by Fall 2024. Does the County have a specific date or month in the Fall of 2024 that it desires for the recommendations to be completed?

Answer: Refer to the answer to Question #37.

48. Question: Does the County ONLY want the submittal form returned and no additional documentation?

Answer: Proposals shall include a completed Attachment A, Submittal Packet and a completed Attachment A-1, Cost Proposal.

49. Question: Please define the role of the “Marshalls” and are they county employees?

Answer: The role of the Marshalls will need to be obtained as part of the discovery of the existing systems in place during the scope of the work. In addition, refer to the answer to Question #12.

50. Question: Please clarify what the expectations are for security measures regarding “restroom usage.”

Answer: We expect the successful provider to address illicit activities and safety concerns in restrooms as a part of the security risk assessment. The successful proposer will gather additional restroom concerns during mandatory interviews and site visits.

51. Question: Does the County Desire its Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) assessed? Does each defined facility have its own EOP, if so, are they to be assessed as well?

Answer: No. EOPs are not anticipated to be reviewed or revised by this assessment, but this could be addressed as an additional service.

52. Question: How many Emergency Management Centers exist within the identified facilities, and does the County expect them to be assessed for compliance with FEMA/Homeland security standards?

Answer: One (1) per RFP Section F, 5. We are looking for a security assessment with recommendations, prioritization, and ROM estimates as indicated in Section 2 of the RFP. As indicated in Section 5, A ii, the County will not be providing standards to meet since we are not security consultants. However, for DEM’s assessment, FEMA/Homeland security standards are relevant.

53. Question: Can you please elaborate on the County’s anticipated \$75,000 budget. Is that the entire project budget, or are there “additional funds” available as described in the RFP from locations identified in the scope of work?

Answer: Refer to the answer to Question #36.

54. Question: Does the County desire the in-person training regarding the awarded firm's recommendations to be in larger group sessions inclusive of all nine sites, or is the expectation that they occur in individual sessions for each of the 9 sites, or more granularly, one for each individual business unit at each of the 9 sites?

Answer: Refer to the answer to Question #17.

55. Question: What are the County’s expectations regarding the evaluation of the roles and responsibilities of the local Sheriff’s office pertaining to physical security?

Answer: Refer to the answer to Question #12.

56. Question: Does the County desire the evaluation of parking procedures and capacity at the identified facilities?

Answer: Yes, in so far as these policies and capacities relate to security.

57. Question: Does the County desire the selected firm to meet with representatives of each individual department within the identified facilities separately, or can the interviews be grouped by building?

Answer: Separately. For additional information, refer to the answer to Question #20 b.

58. Question: Is the anticipated budget all-inclusive, or are travel expenses billed separately?

Answer: The Lump Sum totals by location are all-inclusive for phase 1 assessment work including travel expenses if applicable. Proposers may provide pricing for additional services for future work including separate fees for travel expenses.

59. Question: Referencing Section 1: Due to questions being submitted and allowing Snohomish County time to provide answers, will there be a submittal extension to allow interested firms to review answers and adjust their proposals accordingly?

Answer: No, not at this time. The due date and time remain 3/21/2024, no later than 11:00am Pacific Time.

60. Question: Referencing Section 3: Other than the county departments and elected officials requesting assessments be conducted, is there any other reason or specific event that can be disclosed that has prompted this project at this time?

Answer: No.

61. Question: Has an assessment (similar in scope) been conducted in the past for any of the listed facilities? If yes, would the reports from those assessments be made available to the selected vendor?

Answer: Refer to the answer to Question #6.

62. Question: Referencing Section 4: In addition to the \$75,000 dedicated Facilities funds, is there an estimated budget limit for this project?

Answer: Refer to the answer to Question #36.

63. Question: Is the desired completion date of Fall 2024 flexible dependent on the outcome of the assessments if additional time is necessary based on initial findings? This would be for the initial contract time, not the potential extension.

Answer: Refer to the answer to Question #37.

64. Question: Referencing Section 5: Does Snohomish County currently have preferred/contracted vendors that the assessing firm will have to collaborate with for the design and integration of recommendations, or will Snohomish County prohibit the assessing firm from proposing and/or providing these services?

Answer: Refer to the answer to Question #4. The scope of work is for a security risk assessment with recommendations, prioritizations, and ROM estimates for future improvements. The implementation of recommendations will be future projects. The successful vendor would not be barred from future projects involving the implementation of the recommendations.

65. Question: Referencing Section 5.E.i: Can you clarify what is being requested regarding training on new and revised recommendations?

Answer: Refer to the answer to Question #17.

66. Question: Is there a requirement by Snohomish County that this project be conducted under the supervision of a Certified Protection Professional (CPP) or Certified Security Consultant (CSC) to minimize liability to Snohomish County?
Answer: No.
67. Question: We have a question regarding automobile insurance. We do not carry Symbol 1 coverage. We do have Symbol 8 & 9, Hired and Non-Owned. Is that sufficient for this contract?
Answer: Yes. Symbol 8 & 9 coverage is acceptable.
68. Question: Section 4 notes the project has \$75,000 in funds plus additional funds from other departments/locations. Can it be clarified what is the total budget expected to be available to support the scope of services outlined in this RFP?
Answer: Refer to the answer to Question #36.
69. Question: In regard to section 5.B.: The title is called "Development of Security Policies and Procedures". Tasks i-iv listed indicate the scope is limited to advisory/recommendations, as opposed to explicitly writing out policies and procedures (ie. SOPs). Can this be confirmed?
Answer: The scope is correct. The RFP is for recommendations. Writing policies and procedures may be a future project.
70. Question: In regard to section 5.B.i.: What is the total number of written policies and procedures that would need to be reviewed for this scope?
Answer: It is currently unknown which departments have written Security Policies and Procedures. The successful proposer is responsible for collecting this information during mandatory interviews and site visits.
71. Question: In regard to Section 5.B.E: Can it be clarified what is envisioned for the Owner Training? Is this a single presentation of the report and findings to the Owner (1 entity), or is it multiple workshops/sessions with each department in each building? In addition, is the training hands-on with specific staff, e.g. receptionist, guards?
Answer: Refer to the answer to Question #17.
72. Question: Regarding Attachment B: Will a limit of professional liability commensurate with the scope and type of services be considered?
Answer: Professional Liability insurance is not required.
73. Question: Does the County desire a single report that compiles the information for all sites, or a separate report for each location?
Answer: Separate reports for each location.
74. Question: Page 1/Section 2 Can the County provide more specificity regarding the level of detail expected in the way of rough-order-of-magnitude (ROM) estimates?

Answer: ROM estimates are required for every security enhancement recommended for each facility including ancillary spaces and shared resources. See Section 5. Scope of Services, A., vi. for additional information. Accurate estimates for budgeting are expected based on proposer expertise, experience and local working conditions including reasonable turnkey ranges (low/high).

75. Question: Page 2/Section 4 Can you quantify, at least to some extent, the amount of “additional funds” that will be available?

Answer: No.

76. Question: What degree of flexibility does the County have with respect to the stated desire that the project be completed by fall 2024?

Answer: Refer to the answer to Question #37.

77. Question: Page 3/Section 5F • Will any additions to the list of locations come as a written Addendum to the RFP per Section 9? If additional locations are added after the contract is issued, does the County expect that the proposer cover those additional location(s) within the proposed budget?

Answer: No additional locations were added to the original scope of work. If more locations require assessments after the contract is issued, this work could be addressed as an additional service.

78. Question: Paragraph 6 states the contract term is one year with an option to extend for two additional one-year terms. When does the county expect these initial assessments to be complete? Is it expected that there will be additional assessments in the future?

Answer: Refer to the answers to Questions #37 and #77.

79. Question: Paragraph 4 says the project has \$75,000 in dedicated Facilities funds for 2024, plus additional funds from departments/locations. What is the total expected budget for this project?

Answer: Refer to the answer to Question #36.

80. Question: In Paragraph 5C Security Design Standards, bullet i discusses signage requirements and bullet ii states, “Provide reference standards, specifications, and samples with verbiage for owner fabrication and/or implementation.” Is bullet ii referring to the fabrication of signs?

Answer: Refer to the answer to Question #38.

81. Question: In Paragraph 14 Evaluation Process, it says the County may conduct demonstrations. What sort of demonstration would be expected?

Answer: Refer to item 14. Evaluation Process, Section A, Subsections i-iv. “The County reserves the right to conduct one or more of the additional phases described below:”

82. Question: RFP Section 4 indicates \$75,000 of dedicated funds “plus additional funds from departments/locations included in the Scope of Services”. Please provide the approximate amount of total additional funds available for this effort so we may tailor our approach to fit within the funding available.

Answer: Please see answer to Question #36.

83. Question: RFP Section 6 indicates the contract may be extended for two options years; however Section 4 indicates a desire to have recommendations complete by fall 2024. Please describe the possible scope that is envisioned beyond fall 2024.

Answer: Refer to the answer to Question #37.

84. Question: Attachment A-1 requests pricing for each facility separately. Is there the potential that a bidder would only be awarded some buildings, but not the full scope of work?

Answer: Yes. Refer to Section 15. Award Process of the RFP.

85. Question: Attachment A-1 requests pricing for each building separately, however some SOW items (e.g. 5B, 5D, 5E) seem to be for countywide policy and standard development. Should the costs for these items be spread across all sites or should they be priced as a separate item?

Answer: Everything is to be priced per site in the Lump Sum totals by location.

All other RFP terms and conditions and information remains unchanged.