

Port of San Francisco

Request for Proposals for

Consultant Services for

Environmental Review for Port of San Francisco

Waterfront Plan Update



Date issued:	Tuesday, September 4, 2018
Pre-proposal conference:	Thursday, September 13, 2018 10:00a.m.
Proposals due:	Thursday, October 18, 2018 5:00p.m.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section 1.	Introduction and Schedule	3
Section 2.	Project Description	4
Section 3.	Scope of Work	9
Section 4.	Submission Requirements	17
Section 5.	Evaluation and Selection Criteria	19
Section 6.	Preproposal Conference and Contract Award	22
Section 7.	Terms and Conditions for Receipt of Proposals	23
Section 8.	Contract Requirements	28
Section 9.	Protest Procedures	29

Appendices:

- A. Standard Forms: Listing and Internet addresses of Forms related to Taxpayer Identification Number and Certification, to Business Tax Declaration, and to Chapters 12B and 12C, and 14B of the S.F. Administrative Code.
- B. Agreement for Professional Services (form p-600)

I. INTRODUCTION AND SCHEDULE

A. General

The Port seeks to promote diversity within its contracting opportunities. We desire to engage contracting teams that reflect the diversity of our City and include participation of both businesses and residents from the City's most disadvantaged communities including, but not limited to, the Bayview/Hunters Point, Chinatown, Mission, South of Market, Tenderloin, Visitacion Valley and Western Addition neighborhoods. As such, the City recommends that bidders consider the composition of their teams in terms of gender, age, ethnicity, and race, and utilize teams that include a diverse mix of staff at all organizational levels.

Through this Request for Proposals (RFP), the Port of San Francisco ("Port") is seeking a qualified consultant to provide environmental review services for proposed amendments to update the Port of San Francisco Waterfront Land Use Plan ("Waterfront Plan Update Project" or "Project") which is currently undergoing review and analysis. The Port is the sponsor of the Waterfront Plan Update Project, and seeks to select a Contractor to satisfy the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the State CEQA Guidelines, San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 31, and the San Francisco Planning Department's Environmental Review Guidelines. The San Francisco Planning Department is the CEQA lead agency responsible for conducting and/or directing consultant work necessary to complete environmental review of projects within the jurisdiction of the City and County of San Francisco.

The Waterfront Plan Update Project will include proposed conforming amendments to the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) San Francisco Waterfront Special Area Plan (BCDC SAP), and San Francisco Planning Code and Zoning Map. Based on the responses to this Request for Proposals, the Port intends to select a consultant to perform the Scope of Work described below. The "Respondent" refers to any entity that submits a response to this RFP. The "Contractor" refers to any Respondent(s) who is selected as a candidate to provide contract services under this RFP.

The Port has determined that an RFP solicitation is the most useful and efficient means of selecting a qualified individual, firm, and/or team for consultant services. Applications will be evaluated based on proposals, including experience of the firm and staff, as described in Section IV of this RFP.

The contract established as a result of this solicitation shall have an original term of 4 years. In addition, the Port shall have the option to extend the term for a period of up to one additional one year term, which the Port may exercise in its sole, absolute discretion.

The total compensation for the initial contract term is not expected to exceed \$1,000,000. Should the City extend the contract term, the annual compensation will increase, if needed, at a rate similar to the annual cost of the initial term. Firms that wish to be respond to this RFP must submit fee proposals for contract services in order to be considered responsive.

B. Schedule

The anticipated schedule for selecting a Contractor is:

<u>Proposal Phase</u>	<u>Date*</u>
Port issues RFP	September 4, 2018

Pre-proposal conference	September 13, 2018 (10:00 a.m.)
Deadline for submittal of written questions or requests for clarification	September 18, 2018 (5:00 p.m.)
Proposals due	October 18, 2018 (5:00 p.m.)

**Dates and times subject to change*

C. Contractors Unable to do Business with the City

1. Generally

Contractors that do not comply with laws set forth in San Francisco’s Municipal Codes may be unable to enter into a contract with the City. Some of the laws are included in this RFP, or in the sample terms and conditions attached.

2. Companies Headquartered in Certain States

This Contract is subject to the requirements of Administrative Code Chapter 12X, which prohibits the City from entering into contracts with companies headquartered in states with laws that perpetuate discrimination against LGBT populations or where any or all of the work on the contract will be performed in any of those states. Proposers are hereby advised that Proposers which have their United States headquarters in a state on the Covered State List, as that term is defined in Administrative Code Section 12X.3, or where any or all of the work on the contract will be performed in a state on the Covered State List may not enter into contracts with the City. A list of states on the Covered State List is available at the website of the City Administrator.

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. Introduction

The Port of San Francisco Waterfront Land Use Plan (Waterfront Plan) sets forth the policies that govern land use and improvements of property under the jurisdiction of the Port of San Francisco. Originally adopted by the Port Commission in 1997, the Waterfront Plan has guided a wide variety of maritime, economic, parks, recreational, historic and cultural improvements across the 7½ miles of property under its jurisdiction, from Fisherman’s Wharf to India Basin. Following a comprehensive review of the Waterfront Plan, completed in 2015, the Port identified policy needs and new challenges to achieving the goals and objectives of the Waterfront Plan, and initiated a public planning process to develop recommendations to amend and update the Plan.¹

¹ The Waterfront Land Use Plan, including the accompanying Waterfront Design & Access Element are available on the Port’s website, along with the report published in 2015 on the Waterfront Plan 1997-2014 Review:

<https://sfport.com/sites/default/files/2016-9-15%20Part%202%20Public%20Process%20and%20Proposed%20Guiding%20Principles.pdf>

To ensure a robust community engagement, the Port created the Waterfront Plan Working Group (Working Group), supported by seven Advisory Teams, which led a 2+ year public meeting and discussion process. The Working Group established Guiding Principles that set a framework of public values to guide public discussions and recommendations.² The policy issues were organized into three categories --Land Use, Transportation, and Resilience—to be reviewed by three subcommittees of the Working Group. The Land Use, Transportation and Resilience Subcommittees each held numerous public meetings to delve into policy questions, analysis and debate, and produced policy guidance recommendations for the Waterfront Plan Update. The collective 161 recommendations were then reviewed and refined by the full Working Group, and ultimately advanced to the Port Commission and staff as direction on issues and public values that should be incorporated in amendments to update the Waterfront Plan. The recommendations, described further below, contain new information, and revised or new goals, policies and procedures. The Port Commission endorsed the Working Group Recommendations on August 14, 2018. Port staff will draft amendments to the Waterfront Plan based on these recommendations and other public comments received during the public process, which will be released for public review and comment in late 2018, prior to starting the CEQA environmental review process.

B. Waterfront Plan Amendments

Figure 1 provides an overview of the existing goals and policies of the Waterfront Plan, and highlights where new goals and major policy updates will be targeted based on the recommendations produced by the Working Group and its Subcommittees. The recommendations continue to support the Waterfront Plan’s existing goals:

- ***A Working Waterfront*** – Reserve lands to meet current and future maritime needs, and protect areas needed exclusively for working waterfront industries.
- ***A Revitalized Port*** – New investment for waterfront revitalization, new jobs, revenues for capital improvements and public amenities benefitting the Port, City and State of California.
- ***Diversity of Activities and People*** – Promote a wide array of maritime, commercial, entertainment, civic, open space, recreational and public-oriented activities that attract San Franciscans and visitors of all ages, cultures, and income levels.
- ***Access To and Along the Waterfront*** – A network of parks, plazas, walkways and open spaces, integrated with transportation improvements to improve public access and public realm.

² Waterfront Plan Working Group Recommendations Report:

<https://sfport.com/sites/default/files/Planning/WLUP%20Documents/9.11.17%20Waterfront%20Update%20Part%20Summary%20Report.pdf>;

Summary overview of Recommendations:

<https://sfport.com/sites/default/files/Part2%20recs%20brochure%20-%208.5%20x%2011%20%281%29.compressed.pdf>

Figure 1

Overview: Waterfront Plan Goals and Relationship with Working Group Subcommittees

This chart provides a high-level overview of the structure of the goals and policies in the current Waterfront Plan, and indicates where new goals or policies will be added or where substantial updates are anticipated. This chart also illustrates how Waterfront Plan content corresponds with the Land Use, Transportation and Resilience Subcommittee meetings in Part 2 of the Waterfront Plan Update public process. It is expected that the Subcommittee meetings will raise crossover issues (e.g. urban design, financial, public engagement) of shared interest between Subcommittees. All Subcommittee meeting information will be shared with the full Waterfront Plan Working Group, Advisory Teams, and the public. Find meeting schedules and information @ SF.PORT.COM/WLUP.

		Subcommittees			Working Group	
		Land Use	Transportation	Resilience	Port Finance, Public Engagement, Urban Design	
GOALS Existing Waterfront Plan Goals	Existing Waterfront Plan Goals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design Worthy of Waterfront Setting Evolving Waterfront, Mindful of Past & Future Access to and Along the Waterfront (Addresses urban design, historic preservation and rehabilitation, and waterfront open space)	Existing Waterfront Plan Goals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design Worthy of Waterfront Setting Evolving Waterfront, Mindful of Past & Future Access to and Along the Waterfront (Addresses urban design, historic preservation and rehabilitation, and waterfront open space)	Existing Waterfront Plan Goals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access to and Along the Waterfront 	Add new Resilience Goal to the Waterfront Plan	Existing Waterfront Plan Goals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Economic Access/Equity Revitalized Port (Addresses jobs, revenue generation, ethnic and gender diversity in contracts and other Port business activities)	Add new Public Engagement Goal to the Waterfront Plan
	Working Port Diversity of Activities (Addresses maritime industries and vibrant mix of other land uses)	Maritime Areas Residential & Commercial General Industry & other uses Waterfront Mixed Use Opportunity Areas Interim Uses Acceptable & Unacceptable Uses per Prop H	Existing & New Public Access and Open Spaces Waterfront Design & Access Element (policies to be reorganized into consolidated Waterfront Plan)	Maritime industrial truck and rail access Promote public transit as a primary mode Efficient parking management Continuous water/waterfront pedestrian access wherever possible Major update needed	Add new Resilience Goal to the Waterfront Plan	Activities for diverse users Description of current funding sources and needs Major update needed
POLICIES Existing Waterfront Plan Policies (high level summary)	Maritime uses, water recreation, berthing and water access needs Public access, public uses and activation of open space Port historic resources and rehabilitation requirements Port leasing and long-term development Public review process for Port leases and development projects Historic preservation and design principles for resilience projects	Goods Movement Water transportation Land Transit and Transportation Pedestrian and Bicycle Parking (Mobility & Access and Transportation Demand Management integrated into all topics)	Climate change, air and water quality, green building and development, biodiversity Sea level rise adaptation, seawall resilience and flood prevention Emergency preparedness and disaster recovery Historic preservation and design principles for resilience projects	Add new Resilience Goal to the Waterfront Plan	Notes: It is anticipated that all three Subcommittees will yield information and recommendations with overlapping implications, including Urban Design, Financial and Public Engagement. These will be documented and reviewed collectively by the full Working Group following the Subcommittee meetings.	
	Land Uses & Neighborhood Waterfront Urban Design Finance & Economy Maritime & MCAC Open Space & Recreation Resilience Resilience	Transportation Open Space & Recreation Maritime & MCAC Waterfront Urban Design	Resilience Waterfront Urban Design Finance & Economy	Land Uses & Neighborhood Waterfront Urban Design Finance & Economy Maritime & MCAC Open Space & Recreation Resilience Resilience Transportation		

I:\Waterfront_Land Use_Plan_Update_2015\WORKING_GROUP_MEETINGS\UPCOMING SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS\WLUPGoalChart&SubcommitteeOrganization.txd

- **An Evolving Waterfront, Mindful of its Past and Future** – Respecting and enhancing the waterfront’s historic character, promoting rehabilitation of Port historic resources, while also creating new opportunities.
- **Urban Design Worthy of the Waterfront Setting** – Highlighting visual and physical access to the Bay, and sensitive developments that respect the waterfront’s historic character and adjacent neighborhoods and districts.
- **Economic Access and Equity that Reflects San Francisco’s Diversity** – Economic opportunities to persons of all genders, ages, cultures and ethnicities.

In large part, the Working Group recommendations reinforce the core goals of the Waterfront Plan, and advance new ideas to facilitate and enrich the mix of maritime, non-maritime, recreational and economic uses along the Port waterfront, most of which are currently allowed in the Plan. The recommendations include new strategies that are intended to address financial feasibility requirements, define and increase certainty of public trust objectives, and improve public engagement and reviews of proposed lease and development projects. The Working Group also identified new topics and recommendations for new information, goals and policies to be added to the Waterfront Plan, described below:^{3 4}

- **Waterfront Resilience** - policies to improve earthquake safety and define a planning framework to reduce potential for seismic damage to Port facilities, transportation infrastructure and the Embarcadero Seawall; new emergency preparedness and disaster recovery policies; climate change, flood protection and sea level rise adaptation policies; and policies to promote social equity and cohesion to withstand and recover from disasters and challenges. (See Working Group Resilience Recommendations)
- **Environmental Sustainability** – to incorporate new climate change, air quality, water quality/conservation and natural resources management policies. (See Working Group Resilience Recommendations which include address of environmental sustainability policy issues)
- **Port Finance and Public Engagement** – to recognize Port capital planning framework and new financial resources for capital improvements; to create new financial and leasing strategies to support Embarcadero Historic District rehabilitation projects; and to improve and strengthen citizen review, comment and transparency in public and regulatory review of Port lease and development projects. (Working Group Land Use Recommendations include the majority of these recommendations; Resilience and Transportation Recommendations also include financial and capital improvement policy guidance.)

³ Waterfront Plan Working Group Guiding Principles: https://sfport.com/sites/default/files/Planning/2016-10-26%20Guiding%20Principles%20-%20Final%20Accepted_0.pdf

⁴ Waterfront Plan Working Group Recommendations Report: <https://sfport.com/sites/default/files/Planning/WLUP%20Documents/9.11.17%20Waterfront%20Update%20Part%202%20Summary%20Report.pdf>;

Summary overview of Recommendations: <https://sfport.com/sites/default/files/Part2%20recs%20brochure%20-%208.5%20x%2011%20%281%29.compressed.pdf>

In addition to the Working Group documents cited above, Port staff published several Port Commission staff reports, which discuss the context for the Land Use, Transportation and Resilience recommendations produced by the Working Group.⁵

Following the Working Group's recommendations, the Port and San Francisco Planning Department hosted walking tours and public workshops during "Part 3" of the public process which focused on proposed updates to policies for urban design, public access and open space, and public realm improvements along The Embarcadero, with the objective of integrating and aligning with City Complete Street, Vision Zero and Transit First policies. These walking tours and workshops also addressed Waterfront Plan update ideas for the Northeast/Ferry Building and South Beach waterfront areas, which will inform amendments to Waterfront Plan policies for these areas. The Port produced a report on the issues, new ideas and public comments addressed during Part 3 of the process, which also will inform the Waterfront Plan amendments.⁶

C. Conforming Amendments to Other Planning Documents

Port projects are subject to review by many planning agencies and regulatory authorities. Key among these agencies and authorities are the San Francisco Planning Department and Commission (SF Planning), San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC), and the California State Lands Commission. The Port works to align and coordinate planning policies and principles among these agencies to support implementation of waterfront improvements. Amendments to update the Waterfront Plan will trigger a need for amendments to the planning documents described below, which will be included in environmental review of the Waterfront Plan Update Project.

1. San Francisco Planning Department Documents

The Waterfront Plan amendments do not require any changes to use districts or building height limits for Port property. However, it is anticipated that there will be amendments to the San Francisco Planning Code and Zoning Map administered by the San Francisco Planning Department (SF Planning). The boundaries of Waterfront Special Use Districts 1 and 3, currently described in Planning Code Section 240, 240.1 and 240.3, will be amended to include additional Port properties to be subject to waterfront design review process and procedures; the expanded Special Use District boundaries also will require an amendment to the City Zoning Map.

Port staff also will work with SF Planning staff to review and determine whether any amendments to the General Plan are needed to align City and Port policies for the Port waterfront.

⁵ Staff reports for Port Commission informational presentations on:

Waterfront Plan Update Part 2 Recommendations, February 2018:

<https://sfport.com/sites/default/files/Documents/Item%2012A%20WLUP%20Part%202%20PC%20Briefing%20FINAL.pdf>

Part 2 Resilience Recommendations, May 2018:

<https://sfport.com/sites/default/files/Commission/Documents/Item%2013A%20Informational%20re%20Resilience%20Recommendation%20s.pdf>

Part 2 Land Use Recommendations, April 2018:

<https://sfport.com/sites/default/files/Commission/Documents/Item%2012A%20WLUPLand%20Use%20Recommendations.3.30.18.pdf>

Part 2 Transportation Recommendations, June 2018:

<https://sfport.com/sites/default/files/Commission/Item%2011A%20Informational%20re%20WLUP-Transportation.pdf>

⁶ Waterfront Plan Update report on Part 3 walking tours and public workshops, June 2018:

https://sfport.com/sites/default/files/Part%203%20FINAL%20REPORT%20%26%20ATTACHMENTS7-17-18_0.pdf

2. San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC)

BCDC's planning policies and regulatory framework are set forth in the San Francisco Bay Plan, which applies to the entire Bay region, and the San Francisco Waterfront Special Area Plan (SAP), which specifically addresses the San Francisco Waterfront, including all Port properties over, or within 100 feet of the shoreline of, San Francisco Bay. The Port has filed a BCDC application to amend the SAP, to align Port and BCDC policies. Given BCDC's authority under the McAteer-Petris Act, key focus areas of the SAP amendments will include:

- Update to recognize Blue Greenway and expanded open space plan across the Port's 7½ mile waterfront
- Policies to increase the diversity of activities allowed in public access areas;
- Updated information and policies to recognize maritime industries and berthing requirements;
- Criteria for shared public access and maritime uses on piers, and circumstances when maritime operations preclude public access;
- Public Trust Objectives and implementation strategy for Embarcadero Historic District rehabilitation leases and developments
- Policies to support public realm improvements that improve public access, safety and mobility along and between the City and the waterfront

D. Possible Implementation Projects

The Waterfront Plan Update Recommendations produced by the Working Group include a defined set of Public Trust Objectives and leasing and development strategies that are intended to promote a broad range of public-oriented uses in Embarcadero Historic District rehabilitation projects that are financially feasible and implementable. In May 2018, the Port Commission authorized Port staff to proceed with a Request for Interest (RFI) to test the market response and opportunity of these Working Group Recommendations, and invite responses from qualified operators and interested developers for public-oriented uses for specified pier facilities within the Embarcadero Historic District. This RFI was issued in July 2018, with receipt and public review of submittals expected to extend into October/November 2018. The RFI process may yield publicly-supported concepts that could lead to Port Commission authorization of a Request for Proposals process for one or more specified pier facilities. The Port may decide to include pier concept ideas from the RFI process in the scope of the Waterfront Plan Update project for CEQA review. More information regarding the objectives and details of the RFI process are provided in the Port Commission staff report and resolution to authorize the RFI.⁷

III. SCOPE OF WORK

A. Scope of Project Description

As described above, the scope of the CEQA analysis has not been finally determined. At its base, the CEQA analysis will cover the planning amendments described above for the Waterfront Plan Update Project. The Port Commission may elect to have Embarcadero Historic District RFI concepts included in the CEQA analysis.

⁷ May 4, 2018 Port Commission staff report on the Embarcadero Historic District RFI: <https://sfport.com/sites/default/files/Commission/Documents/Item%2012A%20RFI%20authorization.pdf>

The SF Planning's Environmental Planning (EP) Division is the City's lead CEQA agency. The Contractor selected through this RFP process will prepare technical and environmental review documents that will be directed, reviewed and ultimately published by the SF Planning EP Division. The Port has not submitted an application for CEQA review yet, and will do so when draft Waterfront Plan amendments are released for public review. Given the content and scope of recommendations produced from the Waterfront Plan Update public process, it is possible that SF Planning may determine that a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) or Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required to comply with CEQA State and City regulations. If the Port elects to include concepts generated from the Embarcadero Historic District RFI process, the scope of CEQA review may be expanded to provide program level environmental impact analysis in a Program EIR.

Respondents to this RFP for CEQA services will be required to include in their proposals a description of proposed approach for environmental review for a MND or an EIR for the following scenarios:

1. A MND for Project scope that consists of Waterfront Plan Amendments and Conforming Amendments to Planning Documents;
2. An EIR for Project scope that consists of Waterfront Plan Amendments and Conforming Amendments to Planning Documents; and
3. A Program EIR for Project scope that consists of Waterfront Plan Amendments, Conforming Amendments to Planning Documents, and Embarcadero Historic District RFI concept(s).

B. Scope of Tasks and Deliverables

Respondent proposals should include a description of tasks and deliverables for the work requirements identified below. They are organized to facilitate description of work and cost estimates for a MND, EIR, and Program EIR which are required to be addressed in Respondent proposals.

Task 1: Project Kick-off Meetings, Information Review and Project Work Plan

Upon receipt of a Notice to Proceed, the Contractor shall review the draft plan amendments proposed in the Waterfront Plan Update Project and any RFI concept(s) if they are included for environmental review. Contractor shall produce a Draft Work Plan describing anticipated major and minor CEQA topics, required studies and analysis, public notice and review procedures and requirements, Project timeline and budget. The Project Work Plan must provide a general approach to the Transportation Impact Study (TIS) that shall be refined and finalized in a TIS Outline and Study Approach, described further in Task 5 below.

Contractor shall conduct a Project Kick-off Meeting in coordination with the SF Planning and Port to discuss project requirements, Draft Work Plan specifics, and strategies to facilitate efficient and thorough environmental review in conformance with CEQA, Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, and the Planning Department's Environmental Review Guidelines. Contractor shall produce a Final Work Plan which shall incorporate conclusions of those discussions and further direction from SF Planning.

If RFI concept(s) are included in the proposed project description, it is anticipated that a Program EIR may be required. The Draft and Final Work Plan will need to identify analysis, public notice and procedural requirements associated with meeting applicable CEQA requirements for Program EIRs.

If the proposed project is limited to the draft plan amendments in the Waterfront Plan Update Project, the Contractor shall review the proposed amendments and produce a preliminary assessment of whether an MND or EIR appears to be appropriate. This assessment will be a focus of discussion in the Project Kick-off Meeting with SF Planning and Port. Based on those discussions, Contractor will prepare a Draft Work Plan and conduct follow up review or meetings as determined necessary, prior to producing the Final Work Plan that identifies the analysis, public notice and procedural requirements associated with meeting applicable CEQA requirements for MND or EIR, as determined and directed by SF Planning.

Task 2: Public Notice of Preparation of Environmental Review

Public notice regarding the preparation of the environmental review document will be published, as required under Chapter 31, as directed by SF Planning. Contractor will provide Project information as directed by SF Planning to accompany the public notice.

If an EIR is required, Contractor shall prepare a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR. After review and authorization by SF Planning to issue the NOP, Contractor will distribute it in conformance with CEQA regulations, and provide notification of a public scoping meeting for the Project. The Notice of Availability of a NOP shall be translated in up to three languages. The Contractor shall organize, manage, set up and facilitate the public scoping meeting, and shall arrange for translation services for up to three languages and court reporter services for the meeting. The Contractor shall be responsible for providing all materials.

Task 3: Preparation of an Initial Study or Mitigated Negative Declaration

The completion of an Initial Study is required to present project information, environmental setting, environmental impacts and mitigation measures to reduce or avoid significant environmental effects. The intent of the Initial Study is to perform a full preliminary analysis of all topics required by CEQA, to determine whether the Project could have a significant impact. The Initial Study shall be written for the purpose of public information and distributed in English.

If the Initial Study determines that the Project does not generate significant environmental effects, a Preliminary Negative Declaration will be prepared. If the Project would generate significant environmental effects that can be avoided or reduced with mitigation measures to a less-than-significant level, a Preliminary Mitigated Negative Declaration will be prepared. If the Initial Study determines that the Project could have significant environmental effects that may not be avoided or reduced with mitigation measures, or requires further analysis, an EIR will be required. The Initial Study shall address the following topic areas, and shall evaluate both the localized and cumulative impacts of the Project:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population & Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural & Paleontological Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation and Circulation | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Wind and Shadow | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities and Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology and Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology and Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards/Hazardous Materials |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral/Energy Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural and Forest Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

The Contractor shall prepare two administrative drafts, a screen check and a Final Initial Study for the Project in conformance with CEQA. The Contractor shall be responsible for distribution of the Initial Study in conformance with CEQA and applicable City regulations, and shall follow the Environmental Review Consultant Guidelines provided by SF Planning as well as any further direction provided by SF Planning.

If the analysis in the Final Initial Study leads to a Preliminary (Mitigated) Negative Declaration, as determined by SF Planning, the Contractor shall be responsible for producing and distributing the Preliminary (Mitigated) Negative Declaration at the direction of SF Planning.

In the event the Preliminary (Mitigated) Negative Declaration is appealed, the Contractor shall be responsible for providing analysis, written responses and documents as directed by SF Planning to address the appeal issues identified, and distribution of documents as required under CEQA and Chapter 31 to complete the appeal process.

If the Final Initial Study leads to a SF Planning determination that an (Program) EIR is required, the Contractor shall be responsible for distributing the Notice of Availability (NOA) and up to 75 hard copies and 200 CDs of the Final Initial Study for each proposed plan. As noted in Task 2 above, the Contractor shall be responsible for preparing and distributing a Notice of Preparation of an EIR, and provide services and support for the EIR public scoping meeting.

Task 4: Graphic Support

The Contractor shall prepare maps, figures, drawings and public oriented graphics to support the analysis of impacts and the public understanding of the impacts and conclusions. It is anticipated that the following types of graphics will be required, which work may be supported by maps and graphics provided by the Port.

- Overhead annotated aerial views of Port jurisdiction, subareas of the Port waterfront (e.g. Embarcadero Historic District boundaries and contributing resources), Citywide context and relationship between the Port and nearby neighborhoods and districts
- Plan view maps that depict land use; waterfront parks system; maritime industry and operations areas; street, pedestrian, bicycle and industrial transportation setting
- Photographs of urban design setting and features
- Photographs and site plans for specific pier facilities proposed for a RFI concept, as applicable
- Photomontage images of existing and potential site changes resulting from the Waterfront Plan amendments and RFI concepts, as applicable, and as directed by SF Planning
- Tables and figures summarizing key analyses.

Task 5: Transportation Impact Study

A Transportation Impact Study (TIS) will be prepared to analyze the impacts of the Waterfront Plan Update Project and RFI concept(s), if included. The TIS will address the traffic, transit, pedestrian, bicycle, truck loading, emergency vehicle access, parking and other transportation impacts. The analyses will be quantitative and qualitative, as directed by SF Planning, and will include evaluations of existing and future localized and cumulative conditions with and without the Project. Under the direction of SF Planning, the TIS will determine the number and location of street intersections, pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicle and public transit impact analysis requirements to be included in the environmental review, including cumulative impact and transportation model requirements and technical details of the analysis.

Contractor shall review the following recent studies to understand their features and associated changes in traffic patterns within the Project Area, including:

- 88 Broadway Affordable Housing Project TIS/MND

- Hotel Teatro Zinzanni TIS/MND
- Alcatraz Landing TIS/MND

All projections, baseline counts, and VMT models for the TIS must be compatible with these adjacent or associated studies. Where baseline counts or future projections are not aligned, this discrepancy must be accounted for qualitatively. In addition to evaluating localized issues associated with the Project, the Contractor shall also evaluate the cumulative 2040 impacts of the Project against baseline conditions. This analysis should consider other reasonably foreseeable projects. Cumulative analysis for the TIS should take into account lane drops, lane changes, traffic flow changes, and any other transportation impacts proposed by the above projects. Contractor should be prepared to produce two administrative drafts of the TIS, leading to a Final TIS.

Task 6: Air Quality Impact Study

At the direction of the Planning Department and in accordance with the applicable Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, the Contractor shall prepare an Air Quality Technical Report to support analysis and presentation of impacts and mitigation measures in the MND or EIR document. The analysis may include short-term construction impacts and long-term operational impacts that would be generated by the Project if it includes RFI concepts; the scope of analysis will be determined by SF Planning. This section should also include a full list of all construction equipment expected to be employed.

Task 7: Greenhouse Gas

The project sponsor or consultant must submit development checklist to the Planning Department along with the project application. Greenhouse Gas cover and checklist are found here: <http://sf-planning.org/consultant-sponsor-resources> under Application.

Task 8: Archaeological and Cultural and Historic Architectural Resources Impacts

The Contractor shall meet with the SF Planning EP archeologist and historic preservation planner and prepare a detailed scope of work to develop a CEQA area of potential effects (APE); conduct background archaeological and historic archival research; assess overall archaeological sensitivity of the Project area; and develop a program- level strategy for archaeological investigations.

The Contractor shall also review individual Historic Resource Evaluations and Historic Resource Evaluation Responses for Port historic resources that may be impacted by Project, including Embarcadero Historic District RFI development concepts.

Task 9: Noise Technical Analysis

As directed by SF Planning, the Contractor will prepare a scope of work for a noise study. The project sponsor must describe location and provide plans of number, size (horsepower), and engine tier level of mechanical equipment (e.g., backup diesel generators, fire pumps) or other noise sources.

Task 10: Wind and Shadow Technical Memorandum

There are no proposed changes to building height limits in the Waterfront Plan Update amendments, and Embarcadero Historic District RFI concepts are focused on historic rehabilitation of existing finger pier and bulkhead structures. It is not anticipated that a Shadow Study and Wind Technical Memorandum to evaluate shadow impacts of SF Recreation and Parks Department parks,

in conformance with Proposition K will be required; however SF Planning shall make this determination.

Task 11: Geotechnical Memorandum

A geotechnical memorandum that describes the geological conditions of the Plan area may be prepared to document potential for hazardous seismic events including liquefaction, and whether special structural techniques should be taken into consideration for future buildings within the area, and mitigation measures to address existing and future potential impacts. The Port has substantial geotechnical analyses and documents which may satisfy some or all of the geotechnical analysis required by SF Planning.

Optional Task 12: Additional Technical Studies

At the direction of SF Planning and in accordance with the findings of the Initial Study, the Contractor shall prepare any additional necessary technical studies to support the Waterfront Plan Update Plan environmental review.

Task 13: Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report

If the results of the Initial Study, as determined by SF Planning, require preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), Contractor shall prepare a Draft EIR. If the Port determines that the Draft EIR Project will include analysis of possible implementation concepts resulting from the Embarcadero Historic District RFI process, the Contractor shall prepare a Draft Program EIR, consistent with CEQA regulations and guidelines, to provide program-level impact analysis which will streamline subsequent project-specific CEQA review of Embarcadero Historic District lease or development proposals. The Draft EIR shall address all the topics that were not scoped out as part of the Initial Study as well as the following which are required by CEQA:

- Discussion of Growth-Inducing and Cumulative Impacts: address growth-inducing and cumulative impacts of the project. Draft EIR shall discuss cumulative impacts when a cumulative impact is identified and shall analyze whether the project's contribution to any such impact is considered cumulatively considerable.
- Discussion of Alternatives: describe a range of reasonable alternatives for the project.

Evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives, including the "No Project" alternative. Alternatives developed to address potentially significant impacts identified through the analysis will be presented here.

The publication of the Draft EIR will be followed by a public review and comment period pursuant to CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines and will include a hearing at the Planning Commission, and, if required, a hearing before the Historic Preservation Commission.

The consultant shall prepare two administrative drafts and a screen check of the Draft EIR, and a Notice of Availability (NOA). The NOA shall be translated in up to three languages. The Draft EIR shall be prepared pursuant to the Consultant Guidelines and reviewed and approved by SF Planning. If significant impacts are identified for any CEQA topic, the consultant shall prepare a draft Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP).

The Contractor shall be responsible for distributing the up to 500 NOAs, and 100 hard copies and 200 CDs of the Draft EIR. The Contractor shall attend and participate in, and shall retain court

reporter services for the Draft EIR hearing at the SF Planning Commission. The Contractor shall also be responsible for ensuring that translation services for up to three languages are available at the Draft EIR hearing, and for assisting SF Planning in preparation of an administrative record for the Draft EIR, which will be transmitted to SF Planning.

Task 14: Response to Comments

Following the public review period for the Draft EIR, the Contractor shall prepare a Response to Comments document. To prepare the first draft Response to Comments, the Contractor shall be responsible for documenting and organizing all comments received in a matrix organized by environmental topic, and grouping of related topics to facilitate preparation of complete responses. The Contractor shall be responsible for directing and managing the gathering of information and development of responses from City staff and all members of the consultant team. The Contractor shall prepare two administrative drafts and a screen check of the Draft Responses to Comments, pursuant to Consultant Guidelines and reviewed and approved by SF Planning.

Prior to finalizing the Response to Comments document, the Contractor shall prepare two drafts and final Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP) for the EIR. The consultant shall distribute the Final Response to Comments document in accordance with CEQA regulations. The Contractor shall be responsible for distributing 50 hard copies and 75 CDs of the Response to Comments document. The Contractor shall also be responsible for attending and participating in each of the two EIR certification hearings.

Task 15: Preparation For and Participation in Hearing of the Final EIR

The Contractor shall attend the public hearing of the Final EIR before the San Francisco Planning Commission.

The Contractor shall be responsible for preparing the first draft of the CEQA approval findings for the proposed plans, which will be finalized by the Port, SF Planning and the Office of the City Attorney.

Task 16: Final EIR Document

The Contractor shall make any final revisions or modifications to the environmental review documents and prepare a camera-ready copy of the Final EIR document. The Consultant shall also coordinate the printing of the documents with City and County staff. This shall include a single Final EIR document that contains the Draft EIR, any amendments to the Draft EIR, Response to Comments, all appropriate Motions and Resolution, and Appendices. The Contractor shall be responsible for distributing up to 50 hard copies and 75 CDs of the Final EIR. The Contractor shall assist the Planning Department in preparing a Final Administrative Record for the EIR.

Task 17: Administration

During the life of the contract, the Consultant should expect to manage the project consistent with SF Planning Environmental Review Guidelines, including these tasks:

- Track and maintain tasks, deadlines and deliverable requirements in regular reports to keep Contractor team, Port and SF Planning current on project work plan and schedule, including flagging issues and potential conflicts, and resolution strategy options;
- Prepare project meeting notices and agendas

For all tasks identified above, all materials intended to be posted on the SF Planning website or provided to the Planning Commission or Board of Supervisors must also be Federal Section 508 compliant (accessible for all users), including but not limited to descriptions of all graphics in text format and all information usable with common screen reading software. The City and County of San Francisco recognizes its obligation under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and other disability civil rights laws to provide equal access to all City and County programs and activities. On January 21st, 2005, the City's Board of Supervisors adopted Resolution #2005-1 in support of a motion passed by the Disability Council in support of the DT Web Site Accessibility standards. This resolution called for the City to adopt the DT Web Site Accessibility recommendations as the single, applicable accessibility standard for all Web sites operated by all Departments and Subdivisions of the City and County. View the enhanced Web Accessibility Standards & Guidelines online at <http://www6.sfgov.org/index.aspx?page=76>. Environmental documents and notices **published for public use** for this project shall follow these standards and guidelines. <https://sfgov.org/web-accessibility-standards-and-guidelines>

Optional Task 18: Preparation For and Participation in Hearings of an Appeal of the Final EIR

If the Final EIR is appealed, the Contractor may be requested to prepare an Appeal Response. The Contractor would attend a public hearing of an appeal of the Final EIR before the San Francisco Board of Supervisors (BOS), if necessary, and would be responsible for distributing up to 50 hard copies and up to 75 CDs of the Final Appeal Response document.

³ San Francisco Planning Department. 2012 Environmental Review Guidelines. Online at <http://sfmea.sfplanning.org/EP%20Environmental%20Review%20Guidelines%2010-5-12.pdf> [Accessed March 19, 2015]

IV. SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

A. Time and Place for Submission of Proposals

Proposals must be received by 5:00 p.m. on Thursday, October 18, 2018. Postmarks will not be considered in judging the timeliness of submissions. Submission may be delivered electronically via the City's PeopleSoft system, or in person and left with the Port of San Francisco receptionist, or mailed to:

Port of San Francisco
c/o Boris Delepine
Contracts Analyst
Pier 1
San Francisco, CA 94111

Proposals that are submitted by fax or email will not be accepted. Late submissions will not be considered.

B. Submittal Packages

Proposers shall submit the following packages:

1. Six (6) copies of the Proposal (or Statement of Qualifications) in a sealed envelope clearly marked "Proposal for Environmental Review for Port of San Francisco Waterfront Plan Update."
 - a. Edge-bound using spiral coil binding (plastic or other wire edge-bindings);
 - b. Do not use 3-ring binders;
 - c. Minimum of 11-point size font, unjustified, one inch margins all sides (excluding headers and footers);
 - d. Printed double-sided on 8.5x11 recycled paper;
 - e. Tabloid (11x17) sheets may be used for tables, organizational charts or other graphical information and will count as one page;
 - f. Use clearly labeled tabs or other separators within the document.
2. One (1) copy of Billing Rates Schedule (refer to Appendix B).
3. One (1) original and one (1) copy of required CMD forms (refer to Appendix D).
4. One (1) USB drive with electronic version of above items 1, 2, and 3 in Adobe PDF format. Include the USB drive in the envelope containing the Proposals.

C. Content

Firms interested in responding to this RFP must submit the following information, in the order specified below.

1. Introduction and Executive Summary (up to 3 pages)

Submit a letter of introduction and executive summary of the proposal and your firm's skills and experience as related to this RFP. The letter must be signed by a person authorized by your firm to obligate your firm to perform the commitments contained in the proposal. Submission of the letter will constitute a representation by your firm that your firm is willing and able to perform the commitments contained in the proposal.

2. Project Approach (up to 5 pages)

Describe the services and activities that your firm proposes to provide to the City. Include the following information:

- a. A description of your overall approach and strategy to complying with all applicable CEQA requirements that also advances public understanding of public sector /community plans and policies.
- b. A description of approach of the three different possible types of CEQA documents (MND, EIR, Program EIR) that may be required for the Project, as described in Scope of Work, Section III A above. The description should demonstrate understanding of the distinctions in purpose, analyses, advantages and disadvantages and viability of approach for each type of CEQA document, and prior experience.
- c. Schedule and ability to complete the project within the City's required time frame; and
- d. Assignment of work within your firm's work team.

3. Firm Qualifications (up to 8 pages)

Provide the following information on your firm's background and qualifications.

- a. Name, address, and telephone number of a contact person
- b. A brief description of your firm, as well as how any joint venture or association would be structured
- c. A description of the experience and qualifications of team members of the firm and joint venture partners, if applicable, including brief resumes, demonstrating clearly that they meet the minimum professional qualifications outlined in Section IV
- d. A description of not more than four projects similar in size and scope prepared by your firm and joint venture partner if applicable, that demonstrate experience and ability in the required skills outlined in Section II of this RFP, including a project summary, client references and telephone numbers, and staff members who worked on each project. For each project, indicate whether your firm was the lead contractor and provide a description of your firm's role on the project, as well as information regarding adherence to project budget and schedule. Descriptions should be limited to one page for each project.

4. Team Qualifications (up to 10 pages)

- a. Provide a list identifying: (1) each key person on the project team, (2) the project manager, (3) the role each will play in the project and (4) a written assurance that the key individuals listed and identified will be performing the work and will not be substituted with other personnel or reassigned to another project without prior approval by the City (including Port).
- b. Provide a description of the experience and qualifications of the project team members, including brief resumes if necessary.

5. References (up to 2 pages)

Provide references for the projects that comprise your minimum qualifications. Proposer's references will be used to confirm and verify that proposer has met the minimum qualifications. Provide references the lead consulting firm, joint venture partners if applicable, lead project manager and key subconsultant team members. The references should include the name, address, telephone number, and e-mail address of at least three recent (last 3 to 5 years) clients (preferably from representatives of public sector agencies). Reference letters, if available but not required, may also be attached as appendices.

By including these references, proposers are representing that the references are familiar with proposer's work and experience, and references will be truthful in any representations.

6. Price Proposal

The City intends to award this contract to the firm that it considers will provide the best overall program services. The City reserves the right to accept other than the lowest priced offer and to reject any proposals that are not responsive to this request.

Please provide a fee proposal in a separate electronic folder or sealed envelope that includes the following:

Total fee for each of the disciplines/deliverables identified in the Scope of Work with a not-to-exceed figure; and hourly rates for all team members. Hourly rates and itemized costs may be used to negotiate changes in the Scope of Work if necessary.

7. Certification of Headquarters in Accordance with Administrative Code Chapter 12X

Proposals should contain the following statement:

"I certify that my company is headquartered at the following address
_____. I will notify the Port if my company's headquarters moves."

V. EVALUATION AND SELECTION CRITERIA

A. Minimum Qualifications

Consultants responding to this RFP should clearly indicate the areas of expertise relevant to the above Scope of Work. Consultants should also clearly indicate how they meet the minimum qualifications below. Recipients of this RFP who have working relationships with other consultants in particular specialty skill areas are encouraged to share this RFP with other consultants.

- Principals and firm can demonstrate four years or more of experience providing environmental review services compliant with CEQA, including at least two projects for a mix of private and public sector clients in densely populated, urban jurisdictions, including San Francisco;
- Project team, including joint venture partners if applicable can demonstrate four years or more of experience providing environmental review services compliant with CEQA, including at least two projects for a mix of private and public sector clients in densely populated, urban jurisdictions;
- Respondent must be a certified vendor with the City and County of San Francisco or submit the necessary documentation within ten (10) days after notice of intent to award (see Appendix A – Standard Forms);

Responses should document the ability to effectively facilitate and lead complex environmental review efforts, identify opportunities to streamline the environmental review process, adhere to fast-paced project schedules, and to produce clear and defensible environmental documents that are readily understood by members of the public. A proven ability to synthesize and see the connectivity among complex data, opinions, and ideas is important. Strong written communication, analytical, schedule management, and organizational skills are also essential. Should you feel that other tasks or experience would also be of value, please describe.

Proposals should clearly demonstrate that the qualifications are met. Insufficient or incomplete information may result in a proposal being considered non-responsive and

may not be eligible for award of the contract. If required information is complete, but the Port determines that the proposal does not meet minimum qualifications, proposal may be deemed non-responsible.

B. Selection Criteria

The proposals will be evaluated by a selection committee comprised of parties with relevant environmental planning expertise. The City (including Port) intends to evaluate the proposals generally in accordance with the criteria itemized below. Up to 4 of the firms with the highest scoring proposals may be interviewed by the committee to make the final selection.

Each RFP response will be evaluated in accordance with the criteria below. A Respondent must receive a score of 35 points or above out of the 50 total possible points on the written portion of the RFP (items 1 through 4 below) to be considered for an Oral Interview (item 5 below). Respondents who score below 35 points will not be considered further for selection.

Overall Evaluation Process

The evaluation process will consist of the phases specified below with the following allocation of points:

Evaluation Phase	Maximum Points
Screening of Minimum Qualifications	Pass/Fail
Written Proposal	50
Oral Interview	50
TOTAL	100

C. Screening of Minimum Qualifications

Each proposal will be reviewed for initial determinations on whether Proposer meets minimum qualifications referenced in Section V.A. of this RFP. Proposals will not be scored during the screening of Minimum Qualifications. This screening is simply a pass or fail determination as to whether the proposer has met the minimum qualifications. A proposal that fails to meet the minimum qualifications will not be eligible for consideration in the evaluation process. The Port reserves the right to request clarifications from proposers prior to rejecting a proposal for failure to meet the minimum qualifications. Clarifications are limited exchanges between the Port/City and Proposer for the purpose of clarifying certain aspects of the proposal and will not provide a proposer the opportunity to revise or modify its proposals. Only proposals that meet the minimum qualifications can proceed to the next evaluation phases.

D. Written Proposal Evaluation

The proposals will be evaluated by a selection committee comprised of parties with expertise in the needed services. The City intends to evaluate the proposals generally in accordance with the criteria itemized below.

1. Relevant Experience (15 points maximum)

Capability and specific relevant experience and qualifications of assigned staff of consultant firm, sub consultant firm(s) in environmental analysis, preparation and publication of environmental studies and reports in accordance with CEQA, as most recently amended. Description of the tasks to be performed by each staff person. Previous experience in, and familiarity with, environmental and transportation impact studies particular to San Francisco and/or comparable jurisdictions (over 250,000 population) within five years of the date of this RFP. The lead staff proposed to be assigned to the City’s project must individually have had a similar lead role in comparable projects within five years from the date of this RFP. Demonstration that assigned staff is available and

accessible to meet the requirements of the project. Reference checks may be performed to evaluate each firm's experience and qualifications.

2. Technical and Management Approach (15 points maximum)

Proposed structure of consultant team demonstrates that Respondent understands the project approach and differentiation between MND, EIR and Program EIR documents, and project management and technical requirements. Demonstration that Respondent has and will commit organizational ability and adequate resources to complete the project in accordance with the City's schedule for completion, and that its methods proposed for completion of tasks and deliverables are realistic. Respondent's understanding of the services for each task; clarity and effectiveness of respondent's plan, program and method of execution; understanding of special issues, problems and constraints, and approach towards mitigating and resolving them. Effectiveness of the consulting team's organizational structure and technical approach in executing and managing the tasks; management approach in providing quality and cost effective services. Relative allocations of resources, staff and skills to respond to the different tasks in the proposal. Ability to fully develop the deliverables requested within the timeline described. Respondent should recommend environmental document types and approaches suited to the proposed project.

3. Project Understanding and Related Project Knowledge (15 points maximum)

Demonstrated understanding of the overall project, as reflected in the proposed approach to analyzing the project scope as described in Section III, and the Port's unique public planning and operating context. Familiarity with the Port's public planning processes, Planning Department's prior Community Plans and EIRs, and comfort and fluency with local community outreach and environmental review processes.

4. Proposal Organization (5 points maximum)

Overall organization and clarity of proposal/presentation; responsiveness to all items requested in the written proposal.

5. Oral Interview (50 points maximum)

Following the evaluation of the written proposals and fee proposals, both scores will then be tabulated and proposers will be ranked starting with the proposer receiving the highest score, then continuing with the proposer receiving the second highest score, and so on. Successful Respondents with a score of 35 points or above may be invited to an oral interview; The Port may invite up to 4 Respondents for interviews, and reserves the right not to conduct oral interviews, or to conduct more than one round of oral interviews.

The Port will determine the format and the scoring criteria to be used during the interview. The interview will consist of either or both standard questions asked of each of the proposers, and may include questions of clarification for specific proposals. The selection panel will evaluate each proposer based on their presentation and/or responses. After the oral interview, the Port will combine all scores, rank the Respondents and select the highest ranked Respondent to enter into agreement with.

The selection panel will consider the Respondent's overall presentation, communication skills and ability to explain and answer questions from the selection panel as to the Respondent's written proposal. The oral interview/presentation will be scored by the selection panel based on the following:

- Responsiveness to the needs of the Project as communicated in questions;
- Completeness of answers; and
- Communication skills and ability to explain details clearly and in depth.

Reference checks may be used to evaluate and rank the Respondent as to its experience relating to the services the Port is requesting and the quality of services and staffing provided to prior clients, as well as adherence to schedules/budgets and Respondent's problem-solving, project management, and communication abilities, as well as performance on deliverables and outcomes, as well as effectiveness in meeting or exceeding project objectives.

VI. PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE AND CONTRACT AWARD

A. Pre-Proposal Conference

Respondents are encouraged, but not required, to attend a pre-proposal conference on the date and time listed in the schedule, to be held at the Ferry Building, 2nd Floor, Port of San Francisco Commission Hearing Room, San Francisco, CA 94111. All questions will be addressed at this conference and any available new information will be provided at that time. If you have further questions regarding the RFP, please contact boris.delepine@sfport.com.

Question and Answer Period

The Pre-Proposal Conference will begin at the time specified, and company representatives are urged to arrive on time. Topics already covered will not be repeated for the benefit of late arrivals. Failure to attend the Pre-bid Conference shall not excuse the successful Proposer from any obligations of the contract. Written Bid Addendum will execute any change or addition to the requirements contained in this RFP, as a result of the Pre-Proposal Conference. It is the responsibility of the Proposer to check for any RFP Addendums, Q&A postings, and other updates which will be posted on the City's Bid and Contracts website: www.sfport.com

Proposers shall submit all questions concerning this Request for Proposal in writing by email only during the Question and Answer Period, ending **Tuesday, September 18, 2018**, no later than **5:00 PM PST** and directed to: **boris.delepine@sfport.com**. Questions and Answers will be posted publically. All questions concerning the RFP or process shall be submitted no later than 72 hours prior to the proposal deadline

B. Contract Award

The Port may select a proposer with whom Port staff shall commence contract negotiations. The selection of any proposal shall not imply acceptance by the Port of all terms of the submitted proposal, which may be subject to further negotiations and approvals before the Port may be legally bound thereby. If a satisfactory contract cannot be negotiated in a reasonable time, the Port, in its sole discretion, may terminate negotiations with the highest ranked proposer and begin contract negotiations with the next highest proposer.

The City retains full discretion to select the best qualified proposer to perform the Scope of Work. Alternatively, the City may exercise its discretion to further solicit additional proposals.

No selected Respondent is guaranteed a contract as a result of participation in this RFP.

VII. TERMS AND CONDITIONS FOR RECEIPT OF PROPOSALS

A. Errors and Omissions in RFP

Proposers are responsible for reviewing all portions of this RFP. Proposers are to promptly notify the Port, in writing, if the Proposer discovers any ambiguity, discrepancy, omission, or other error in the RFP. Any such notification should be directed to the Port promptly after discovery, but in no event later than 72 hours prior to the date that proposals are due. Modifications and clarifications will be made by addenda as provided below.

B. Inquiries Regarding RFP

Proposers shall submit all questions concerning this Contract Proposal, scope of services or requirements in writing by email only during the Question and Answer Period, ending **Tuesday, September 18, 2018** no later than **5:00 PM** PST and directed to: Boris.Delepine@sfport.com. All Proposer questions concerning the process shall be submitted no later than 72 hours prior to the date that proposals are due. Proposers who fail to do so will waive all further rights to protest, based on these specifications and conditions.

C. Objections to RFP Terms

Should a proposer object on any ground to any provision or legal requirement set forth in this RFP, the proposer must, not more than 72 hours prior to RFP deadline, provide written notice to the Port, setting forth with specificity the grounds for the objection. The failure of a proposer to object in the manner set forth in this paragraph shall constitute a complete and irrevocable waiver of any such objection.

D. Change Notices

The Port may modify the RFP, prior to the proposal due date, by issuing an Addendum(s) to the RFP, which will be posted on the website. The proposer shall be responsible for ensuring that its proposal reflects any and all RFP Addendum(s) issued by the Port prior to the proposal due date regardless of when the proposal is submitted. Therefore, the Port recommends that the proposer consult the website frequently, including shortly before the proposal due date, to determine if the proposer has downloaded all RFP Addendum(s). It is the responsibility of the proposer to check for any Addendum, Questions and Answers, and updates, which will be posted on the City's Bid and Contracts website: <http://mission.sfgov.org/OCABidPublication>

E. Term of Proposals

Submission of a proposal signifies that the proposed services and prices are valid for 180 calendar days from the proposal due date and that the quoted prices are genuine and not the result of collusion or any other anti-competitive activity. At Proposer's election, the proposal may remain valid beyond the 180 day period in the circumstance of extended negotiations.

F. Revision of Proposals

A proposer may revise a proposal on the proposer's own initiative at any time before the deadline for submission of proposals. The Proposer must submit the revised proposal in the same manner as the original. A revised proposal must be received on or before, but no later than the proposal due date and time.

In no case will a statement of intent to submit a revised proposal, or commencement of a revision process, extend the proposal due date for any proposer.

At any time during the proposal evaluation process, the Port may require a proposer to provide oral or written clarification of its proposal. The Port reserves the right to make an award without further clarifications of Proposals received.

G. Errors and Omissions in Proposals

Failure by the Port to object to an error, omission, or deviation in a proposal will in no way modify the RFP or excuse the Proposer from full compliance with the specifications of the RFP or any contract awarded pursuant to the RFP.

H. Financial Responsibility

The Port accepts no financial responsibility for any costs incurred by a firm in responding to this RFP. Submissions of the RFP will become the property of the Port and may be used by the Port in any way deemed appropriate.

I. Proposer's Obligations under the Campaign Reform Ordinance

Proposers must comply with Section 1.126 of the S.F. Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code, which states:

No person who contracts with the City and County of San Francisco for the rendition of personal services, for the furnishing of any material, supplies or equipment to the City, or for selling any land or building to the City, whenever such transaction would require approval by a City elective officer, or the board on which that City elective officer serves, shall make any contribution to such an officer, or candidates for such an office, or committee controlled by such officer or candidate at any time between commencement of negotiations and the later of either (1) the termination of negotiations for such contract, or (2) three months have elapsed from the date the contract is approved by the City elective officer or the board on which that City elective officer serves.

If a proposer is negotiating for a contract that must be approved by an elected local officer or the board on which that officer serves, during the negotiation period the proposer is prohibited from making contributions to:

- the officer's re-election campaign
- a candidate for that officer's office
- a committee controlled by the officer or candidate.

The negotiation period begins with the first point of contact, either by telephone, in person, or in writing, when a contractor approaches any city officer or employee about a particular contract, or a city officer or employee initiates communication with a potential contractor about a contract.

The negotiation period ends when a contract is awarded or not awarded to the contractor.

Examples of initial contacts include: (1) a vendor contacts a city officer or employee to promote himself or herself as a candidate for a contract; and (2) a city officer or employee contacts a contractor to propose that the contractor apply for a contract.

Inquiries for information about a particular contract, requests for documents relating to a Request for Proposals, and requests to be placed on a mailing list do not constitute negotiations.

Violation of Section 1.126 may result in the following criminal, civil, or administrative penalties:

1. Criminal. Any person who knowingly or willfully violates section 1.126 is subject to a fine of up to \$5,000 and a jail term of not more than six months, or both.
2. Civil. Any person who intentionally or negligently violates section 1.126 may be held liable in a civil action brought by the civil prosecutor for an amount up to \$5,000.

3. Administrative. Any person who intentionally or negligently violates section 1.126 may be held liable in an administrative proceeding before the Ethics Commission held pursuant to the Charter for an amount up to \$5,000 for each violation.

For further information, proposers should contact the San Francisco Ethics Commission at (415) 581-2300.

J. Sunshine Ordinance

In accordance with S.F. Administrative Code Section 67.24(e), contractors' bids, responses to RFPs and all other records of communications between the City and persons or firms seeking contracts shall be open to inspection immediately after a contract has been awarded. Nothing in this provision requires the disclosure of a private person's or organization's net worth or other proprietary financial data submitted for proposal for a contract or other benefits until and unless that person or organization is awarded the contract or benefit. Information provided which is covered by this paragraph will be made available to the public upon request.

K. Public Access to Meetings and Records

If a proposer is a non-profit entity that receives a cumulative total per year of at least \$250,000 in City funds or City-administered funds and is a non-profit organization as defined in Chapter 12L of the S.F. Administrative Code, the proposer must comply with Chapter 12L. The proposer must include in its Proposal (1) a statement describing its efforts to comply with the Chapter 12L provisions regarding public access to proposer's meetings and records, and (2) a summary of all complaints concerning the proposer's compliance with Chapter 12L that were filed with the City in the last two years and deemed by the City to be substantiated. The summary shall also describe the disposition of each complaint. If no such complaints were filed, the proposer shall include a statement to that effect. Failure to comply with the reporting requirements of Chapter 12L or material misrepresentation in proposer's Chapter 12L submissions shall be grounds for rejection of the proposal and/or termination of any subsequent Agreement reached on the basis of the proposal.

L. Reservations of Rights by the City

The issuance of this RFP does not constitute an agreement by the City that any contract will actually be entered into by the City. The City expressly reserves the right at any time to:

1. Waive or correct any defect or informality in any response, Proposal, or Proposal procedure;
2. Reject any or all Proposals;
3. Reissue a Request for Proposals;
4. Prior to submission deadline for Proposals, modify all or any portion of the selection procedures, including deadlines for accepting responses, the specifications or requirements for any materials, equipment or services to be provided under this RFP, or the requirements for contents or format of the Proposals;
5. Procure any materials, equipment or services specified in this RFP by any other means; or
6. Determine that no project will be pursued.

M. No Waiver

No waiver by the Port of any provision of this RFP shall be implied from any failure by the Port to recognize or take action on account of any failure by a proposer to observe any provision of this RFP.

N. Local Business Enterprise Goals and Outreach

The requirements of the Local Business Enterprise and Non-Discrimination in Contracting Ordinance set forth in Chapter 14B of the San Francisco Administrative Code as it now exists or as it may be amended in the future (collectively the “LBE Ordinance”) may apply to city-sponsored contracts awarded from this RFP.

Each solicitation process requires a **new submittal of CMD Attachment 2 forms** at the following link located under the heading “Attachment 2: Requirements for Architecture, Engineering & Professional Services Contracts”:

<http://www.sfgsa.org/index.aspx?page=6135>

- (1) Form 2A-CMD Contract Participation Form
- (2) Form 2B- CMD “Good Faith Outreach” Requirements Form
- (3) Form 3- CMD Non-Discrimination Affidavit
- (4) Form 4- CMD Joint Venture Form (if applicable), and
- (5) Form 5- CMD Employment Form

Please submit Forms 2A, 2B, 3 and 5 (and Form 4 if Joint Venture response) with your Response Package. The forms should be part of the “Original” of your response. The forms should have original signatures.

If these forms are not returned with the response, the response may be determined to be non-responsive and may be rejected.

1. Local Business Enterprise Goals and Outreach

The requirements of the Local Business Enterprise (LBE) and Non-Discrimination in Contracting Ordinance set forth in Chapter 14B of the S.F. Administrative Code as it now exists or as it may be amended in the future (collectively the “LBE Ordinance”) shall apply to this solicitation. More information regarding these requirements can be found at: <http://www.sfgov.org/cmd>

2. LBE Sub-consultant Participation Requirement

Please refer to San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 14B and *CMD Attachment 2* for information concerning the City's LBE program.

The LBE sub-consulting goal is **18 %** of the total value of the goods and/or services to be procured. Sub-consulting goals can only be met with CMD-certified Small or Micro-LBEs located in San Francisco.

3. Link to LBE Sub-consultant Directory

This link takes you to a directory of current Local Business Enterprises.
http://mission.sfgov.org/hrc_certification/

4. Good Faith Outreach to Select LBE Sub-consultants

Each firm responding to this solicitation shall demonstrate in its response that it has used good-faith outreach to select LBE sub-consultants as set forth in S.F. Administrative Code §§14B.8 and 14B.9, and shall identify the particular LBE sub-consultants solicited and selected to be used in performing the contract. For each LBE identified as a subcontractor, the response must specify the value of the participation as a percentage of the total value of the goods and/or services to be procured, the type of work to be performed, and such information as may reasonably be required to determine the responsiveness of the response. LBEs identified as sub-consultants must be certified with the Contract Monitoring Division at the time the response is due, and must have been contacted by the (prime

contractor) prior to listing them as subcontractors in the response. Any response that does not meet the requirements of this paragraph will be non-responsive.

5. Documentation of Good Faith Outreach Efforts

In addition to demonstrating that it will achieve the level of sub-consulting participation required by the contract, a Respondent shall also undertake and document in its submittal the good faith efforts required by Chapter 14B.8(C) & (D) and CMD Attachment 2, Requirements for Architecture, Engineering and Professional Services Contracts.

Responses which fail to comply with the material requirements of S.F. Administrative Code §§14B.8 and 14B.9, CMD Attachment 2 and this solicitation will be deemed non-responsive and will be rejected. During the term of the contract, any failure to comply with the level of LBE sub-consultant participation specified in the contract shall be deemed a material breach of contract.

Note: If Respondent meets/exceeds LBE participation by 35% (i.e. 31.05% LBE participation for this contract), Good Faith Outreach documentation is not required.

6. LBE Participation and Rating Bonuses

The City strongly encourages responses from qualified LBEs. Pursuant to Chapter 14B, the following rating bonuses will be in effect for the award of this project for any Respondents who are certified as a Small or Micro-LBE, or joint ventures where the joint venture partners are in the same discipline and have the specific levels of participation as identified below. Certification applications may be obtained by calling (415) 581-2310. The rating bonus applies at each phase of the selection process. The application of the rating bonus is as follows:

- a) A 10% bonus to a Small or Micro LBE—including Non-Profit; or a joint venture between or among LBEs; or
- b) A 5% bonus to a joint venture with LBE participation that equals or exceeds 35%, but is under 40%;
- c) A 7.5% bonus to a joint venture with LBE participation that equals or exceeds 40%;

Joint Venture Rating Bonus If applying for a rating bonus as a joint venture, the LBE must be an active partner in the joint venture and perform work, manage the job and take financial risks in proportion to the required level of participation stated in the response, and must be responsible for a clearly defined portion of the work to be performed and share in the ownership, control, management responsibilities, risks, and profits of the joint venture. The portion of the LBE joint venture's work shall be set forth in detail separately from the work to be performed by the non-LBE joint venture partner. The LBE joint venture's portion of the contract must be assigned a commercially useful function.

7. Application of the Rating bonus:

The following rating bonus shall apply at each stage of the selection process, i.e., qualifications, proposals, and interviews:

- a) Contracts with an Estimated Cost in Excess of \$10,000 and Less Than or Equal To \$400,000. A 10% rating bonus will apply to any proposal submitted by a CMD certified Small or Micro LBE. Proposals submitted by SBA-LBEs are not eligible for a rating bonus.
- b) Contracts with an Estimated Cost in Excess of \$400,000 and Less Than or Equal To \$10,000,000. A 10% rating bonus will apply to any proposal submitted by a CMD certified Small or Micro-LBE. Pursuant to Section 14B.7(E), a 5% rating bonus will be applied to any proposal from an SBA-LBE, except that the 5% rating bonus shall not be applied at any stage if it would adversely affect a Small or Micro-LBE proposer or a JV with LBE participation.

- c) Contracts with an Estimated Cost In Excess of \$10,000,000 and Less Than or Equal To \$20,000,000. A 2% rating bonus will apply to any proposal submitted by a Small LBE, Micro LBE and SBA-LBE.
- d) The rating bonus for a Joint Venture (“JV”) with LBE participation that meets the requirements of Section 2.02 below is as follows for contracts with an estimated cost of in excess of \$10,000 and Less Than or Equal to \$10,000,000:
 - i. 10% for each JV among Small and/or Micro LBE prime proposers.
 - ii. 5% for each JV which includes at least 35% (but less than 40%) participation by Small and/or Micro-LBE prime proposers.
 - iii. 7.5% for each JV that includes 40% or more in participation by Small and/or Micro-LBE prime proposers.
 - iv. The rating bonus will be applied by adding 5%, 7.5%, or 10% (as applicable) to the score of each firm eligible for a bonus for purposes of determining the highest ranked firm. Pursuant to Chapter 14B.7(F), SBA-LBEs are not eligible for the rating bonus when joint venturing with a non LBE firm. However, if the SBA-LBE joint ventures with a Micro-LBE or a Small-LBE, the joint venture will be entitled to the joint venture rating bonus only to the extent of the Micro-LBE or Small-LBE participation described in Section 2.01B.4b. and c. above.
- e) The rating bonus does not apply for contracts estimated by the Contract Awarding Authority to exceed \$20 million.

The rating bonus/bid discount does not apply for contracts estimated by the Contract Awarding Authority to exceed \$20 million.

8. CMD Contact

If you have any questions concerning the CMD Forms and to ensure that your response is not rejected for failing to comply with S.F. Administrative Code Chapter 14B requirements, please call Finbarr Jewell, the CMD Contract Compliance Officer for this solicitation at 415-274-0511 or by e-mail at Finbarr.Jewell@sfgov.org or the main CMD phone number (415) 581-2310. The forms will be reviewed prior to the evaluation process.

VIII. CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS FOR PUBLIC PROJECTS

A. Standard Contract Provisions [for Public Projects]

The successful proposer will be required to enter into a contract substantially in the form of the Agreement for Professional Services, attached hereto as Appendix B. Failure to timely execute the contract, or to furnish any and all insurance certificates and policy endorsement, surety bonds or other materials required in the contract, shall be deemed an abandonment of a contract offer. The City, in its sole discretion, may select another firm and may proceed against the original selectee for damages.

B. Nondiscrimination in Contracts and Benefits [for Public Projects]

The successful proposer will be required to agree to comply fully with and be bound by the provisions of Chapters 12B and 12C of the San Francisco Administrative Code. Generally, Chapter 12B prohibits the City and County of San Francisco from entering into contracts or leases with any entity that discriminates in the provision of benefits between employees with domestic partners and employees with spouses, and/or between the domestic partners and spouses of employees. The Chapter 12C requires nondiscrimination in contracts in public accommodation. Additional information on Chapters 12B and 12C is available on the CMD’s website at <http://sfgov.org/CMD>.

C. Minimum Compensation Ordinance (MCO) [for Public Projects]

The successful proposer will be required to agree to comply fully with and be bound by the provisions of the Minimum Compensation Ordinance (MCO), as set forth in S.F. Administrative Code

Chapter 12P. Generally, this Ordinance requires contractors to provide employees covered by the Ordinance who do work funded under the contract with hourly gross compensation and paid and unpaid time off that meet certain minimum requirements. For the contractual requirements of the MCO, see www.sfgov.org/olse/mco. Note that this hourly rate may increase on January 1 of each year and that contractors will be required to pay any such increases to covered employees during the term of the contract.

Additional information regarding the MCO is available on the web at www.sfgov.org/olse/mco.

D. Health Care Accountability Ordinance (HCAO) [for Public Projects]

The successful proposer will be required to agree to comply fully with and be bound by the provisions of the Health Care Accountability Ordinance (HCAO), as set forth in S.F. Administrative Code Chapter 12Q. Contractors should consult the San Francisco Administrative Code to determine their compliance obligations under this chapter. Additional information regarding the HCAO is available on the web at www.sfgov.org/olse/hcao.

E. First Source Hiring Program (FSHP) [for Public Projects]

If the contract is for more than \$50,000, then the First Source Hiring Program (Admin. Code Chapter 83) may apply. Generally, this ordinance requires contractors to notify the First Source Hiring Program of available entry-level jobs and provide the Workforce Development System with the first opportunity to refer qualified individuals for employment.

Contractors should consult the San Francisco Administrative Code to determine their compliance obligations under this chapter. Additional information regarding the FSHP is available on the web at <http://www.workforcedevelopmentsf.org/> and from the First Source Hiring Administrator, (415) 701-4848.

F. Conflicts of Interest

The successful proposer will be required to agree to comply fully with and be bound by the applicable provisions of state and local laws related to conflicts of interest, including Section 15.103 of the City's Charter, Article III, Chapter 2 of City's Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code, and Section 87100 et seq. and Section 1090 et seq. of the Government Code of the State of California. The successful proposer will be required to acknowledge that it is familiar with these laws; certify that it does not know of any facts that constitute a violation of said provisions; and agree to immediately notify the City if it becomes aware of any such fact during the term of the Agreement.

Individuals who will perform work for the City on behalf of the successful proposer might be deemed consultants under state and local conflict of interest laws. If so, such individuals will be required to submit a Statement of Economic Interests, California Fair Political Practices Commission Form 700, to the City within ten calendar days of the City notifying the successful proposer that the City has selected the proposer.

IX. PROTEST PROCEDURES

A. Protest of Non-Responsiveness Determination

Within five working days of the City's issuance of a notice of non-responsiveness, any firm that has submitted a proposal and believes that the City has incorrectly determined that its proposal is non-responsive may submit a written notice of protest. Such notice of protest must be received by the City on or before the fifth working day following the City's issuance of the notice of non-responsiveness. The notice of protest must include a written statement specifying in detail each and every one of the grounds asserted for the protest. The protest must be signed by an individual authorized to represent the proposer, and must cite the law, rule, local ordinance, procedure or RFP provision on which the protest is based. In addition, the protestor must specify facts and evidence sufficient for the City to determine the validity of the protest.

B. Protest of Non-Responsible Determination

Within five working days of the City's issuance of a notice of a determination of non-responsibility, a vendor that would otherwise be the lowest responsive proposer may submit a written notice of protest. The vendor will be notified of any evidence reflecting upon their responsibility received from others or adduced as a result of independent investigation. The vendor will be afforded an opportunity to rebut such adverse evidence, and will be permitted to present evidence that they are qualified to perform the contract. Such notice of protest must be received by the City on or before the fifth working day following the City's issuance of the notice of non-responsibility. The notice of protest must include a written statement specifying in detail each and every one of the grounds asserted for the protest. The protest must be signed by an individual authorized to represent the proposer, and must cite the law, rule, local ordinance, procedure or RFP provision on which the protest is based. In addition, the protestor must specify facts and evidence sufficient for the City to determine the validity of the protest.

C. Protest of Contract Award

Within five working days of the City's issuance of a notice of intent to award the contract, any firm that has submitted a responsive proposal and believes that the City has incorrectly selected another proposer for award may submit a written notice of protest. Such notice of protest must be received by the City on or before the fifth working day after the City's issuance of the notice of intent to award.

The notice of protest must include a written statement specifying in detail each and every one of the grounds asserted for the protest. The protest must be signed by an individual authorized to represent the proposer, and must cite the law, rule, local ordinance, procedure or RFP provision on which the protest is based. In addition, the protestor must specify facts and evidence sufficient for the City to determine the validity of the protest.

D. Delivery of Protests

All protests must be received by the due date. If a protest is mailed, the protestor bears the risk of non-delivery within the deadlines specified herein. Protests should be transmitted by a means that will objectively establish the date the City received the protest. Protests or notice of protests made orally (e.g., by telephone) will not be considered. Protests must be delivered to:

Boris Delepine
Port of San Francisco
Pier 1, San Francisco, CA 94111

Appendix A

Standard Forms

A. How to become Eligible to Do Business with the City:

Before the City can award any award any contract to a contractor, all vendors must meet the minimum requirements described below. There may be additional requirements placed upon a vendor depending on the type of good or service to be purchased.

B. Mandatory Forms:

At a minimum, in order to become eligible to do business with the City, a vendor must submit the following documents to the Vendor Support Division via the City's supplier portal located at <https://sfcitypartner.sfgov.org/> :

1. [Vendor Application Packet](#) (includes *New Vendor Number Request Form* and *IRS Form W-9*)
2. [CCSF Vendor - Business Registration \(Electronic Submission - you must have a vendor number to complete\)](#)
3. [CMD 12B-101 Declaration](#) of Nondiscrimination in Contracts and Benefits

C. Vendor Eligibility and Invoice Payment:



Vendors must have a City-issued vendor number, have all compliance paperwork submitted and approved by the City, and have an executed contract or purchase order before payments can be made. Once a vendor number has been assigned, an email notification will be provided by the City's Vendor File Support Division. This notification will include instructions on how to sign up to receive payments through the City's supplier portal located at <https://sfcitypartner.sfgov.org/> .

D. Vendor Eligibility Forms:

<u>Form</u>	<u>Purpose/Info</u>	<u>Routing</u>
CCSF Vendor - Business Registration (Electronic Submission - you must have a vendor number to complete)	This declaration is required for city vendors to determine if you are required to obtain a Business Registration Certificate.	https://sfcitypartner.sfgov.org/
Declaration of Nondiscrimination in Contracts and Benefits with supporting documentation (Form CMD-12B-101)	This Declaration is used by the City's Contract Monitoring Division to determine if a vendor offers benefits to employees. When a vendor offers benefits, it must be verified that all benefits, including insurance plans and leaves, are offered equally to employees with spouses and employees with domestic partners. For more information and assistance, please visit the City Administrator's Contract Monitoring Division Equal Benefits web	https://sfcitypartner.sfgov.org/

	page.	
Vendor Profile Application	Includes New Vendor Number Request Form and IRS Form W-9.	https://sfcitypartner.sfgov.org/

E. Supplemental Forms:

Form:	Required If:
Minimum Compensation Ordinance (MCO) Declaration ( pdf)	You have at least \$25,000 (\$50,000 for non-profit organizations) in cumulative annual business with a City department or departments and have more than 5 employees, including employees of any parent, subsidiaries and subcontractors.
Health Care Accountability Ordinance (HCAO) Declaration ( pdf)	You have at least \$25,000 (\$50,000 for non-profit organizations) in cumulative annual business with a City department or departments and have more than 20 employees (more than 50 employees for nonprofit organizations), including employees of any parent, subsidiaries or subcontractors.
Insurance Requirements (pdf)	The solicitation requires the successful proposer to demonstrate proof of insurance.
Payment (Labor and Material) Bond (pdf)	The solicitation requires the awarded vendor to post a Payment (Labor and Material) bond.
Local Business Enterprise Program Application (Contract Monitoring Division)	You desire to participate in the City’s Local Business Enterprise Program which helps certain financially disadvantaged businesses increase their ability to compete effectively for City contracts

For further guidance, refer to the City’s supplier training videos that are located online at: <https://sfcitypartner.sfgov.org/> .