

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Safety and Security Consulting Solicitation No. 5988

ADDENDUM NO. #2
Issue Date 10/28/2024

This Addendum containing the following revisions, additions, deletions and/or clarifications, is hereby made a part of this solicitation and Contract Documents for the above-named project. Proposers shall take this Addendum into consideration when preparing and submitting their response to this solicitation.

This Addendum answers questions submitted for this RFP (see Item 1).

Item 1.

Question #1: If available, please provide the list of the Pre-Submission Conference attendees.

Answer #1: The Pre-Submission Conference attendees list has been posted on our website under solicitation #5988.

Question #2: Please provide the list of RFP registrants.

Answer #2: To date, the following companies have registered as an interested vendor for this RFP: Eye Q Surveillance, Security Risk Management Consultants LLC, and Fortified International.

Question #3: What are the project's anticipated award and desired completion dates?

Answer #3: The anticipated award and start of work will occur after evaluations have been completed for this solicitation. We anticipate finalizing evaluation and award within four weeks of RFP submission deadline. The desired completion date is one year from the signing of the contract, although this could be adjusted during contract negotiations.

Question #4: What is the project's expected budget?

Answer #4: The estimated budget for this RFP is \$250,000.00.

Question #5: Do prior security assessments exist? Who conducted them?

Answer #5: There may be limited internal security assessments that were recently completed, which the selected vendor may review as part of the project. Additionally, the Seattle Housing Authority has data from critical incident reports and other relevant data that will be made available to the selected vendor for review and analysis during the assessment process.

Question #6: Page 1, Section A.1 General: The RFP states the Seattle Housing Authority (SHA) is seeking a qualified professional firm of consultants. Is SHA looking for an independent, vendor-agnostic firm or is it also accepting proposals from

companies that sell, install, and/or service security systems hardware and/or software?

Answer #6: SHA is seeking qualified subject matter experts to help form a comprehensive security plan. There are no restrictions on who may apply or for which area of the RFP they may submit a proposal. However, it is important to note that this RFP is focused on assessment and recommendations, rather than implementation or installation of security systems.

Question #7: Page 1, Section A.1 & 2 General & SHA Background: The RFP indicates SHA desires the consultant to identify strategies by community for increased security. It also states that SHA owns and operates over 8,500 housing units at nearly 400 sites. Does SHA expect the consultant to visit all sites, or will a representative sampling suffice? Please provide the number of site visits and the square footage and acreage of the communities involved to support the determination of pricing for this project.

Answer #7: SHA will work with the selected consultant to select a varied and diverse representation of SHA properties that meet the needs of the agency and the guidelines of the RFP. Proposals should include a method for determining costs associated with site visits in their budgets and proposals, as the number and scope of site visits will be finalized in collaboration with the selected vendor.

Question #8: Page 7, Section C.4 Deliverables: Does SHA want an in-person or virtual presentation(s) to review the deliverables?

Answer #8: There is no preference as to whether the deliverables are reviewed in person or virtually. However, any major components that SHA believes require or requests to be done in person should be presented accordingly.

Question #9: Page 8, Section D.2 WMBE Inclusion Plan: Can a firm self-fulfill the SHA's 14% aspirational WMBE goal?

Answer #9: The aspirational WMBE goal of 14% cannot be self-fulfilled. The inclusion plan is based on providing meaningful opportunities to WMBE sub-consultants.

Question #10: Page 8, Section D.2 Project Team's Experience & Qualifications: The RFP states, "Explain how the project team would approach the referral process of individuals, from start to finish." Please clarify the meaning of "the referral process of individuals." What is SHA expecting to see in our response?

Answer #10: The "referral process of individuals" refers to the involvement of all stakeholders, staff, residents, partners, and others who may be referred to participate in the process to collect quantitative data and contribute to the assessment, as reflected in the RFP. SHA expects the project team to explain how they would engage these stakeholders, gather necessary information, and integrate their input into the security plan, ensuring a comprehensive approach to addressing the needs of all involved.

Question #11: Page 8, Section D.2 Project Team's Experience & Qualifications & Reporting & Processes: Two of the bullet points ("Explain how the project team would approach..." and "Provide an in-depth explanation on your processes...") listed under Project Team's Experience & Qualifications are also listed under Reporting & Processes. Are they to be answered for both?

Answer #11: The duplication of bullet points suggests that these areas should be addressed thoroughly in both sections. It is best to provide distinct answers in both sections, focusing on the relevant context for each.

Question #12: Page 8, Section D.2 Reporting & Processes: The RFP asks us to provide sample reports pertaining to the Scope of Work (SOW). Because we protect the confidential information of our clients, we cannot supply whole examples of our previously completed work, and because our work product relies heavily on digital images, graphs, and references, providing redacted examples does not effectively convey its quality. Will SHA accept a Table of Contents from a past safety & security assessment report instead?

Answer #12: The evaluation of proposals does include a review of past work and reports. It is recommended that applicants provide a comprehensive submission that allows evaluators to fully assess each component of the response and demonstrates the applicant's full capabilities to meet the deliverables. If applicants are unable to provide full reports due to confidentiality concerns, alternative submissions are acceptable so long as they still meet the requirements of the RFP. The choice of what the alternative submission looks like is left to the applicant's discretion.

Question #13: Page 9, Section D.2 Fee Schedule: The RFP states the fee schedule should include a breakdown that provides all-inclusive rates pertaining to the SOW. Does this mean SHA is looking for hourly rates that include reimbursable expenses?

Answer #13: SHA is asking for an all-inclusive fee schedule that includes rates related to the scope of work. This means that hourly rates should include reimbursable expenses, and the proposal should provide a clear breakdown of costs to avoid ambiguity.

END OF ADDENDUM NO. #2