

## EXHIBIT D—

### Additional Services for San Mateo Government Center Site with new jail component

#### **1. Additional Services:**

In addition to the services described in Exhibit A, HOK will provide the following services regarding evaluation of new Jail and Sheriff Administration space needs in Government Center, as more particularly described in the following “Scope of Work.”

The purpose of this additional service is to confirm the recommended site and concept for the new Jail in Government Center. HOK will serve as an impartial party to assist the County in documenting this recommended site and the reasons it is preferred, based on comprehensive County needs and objectives. Results of this study will be integrated into the overall County Facility Master Plan.

- Evaluation of jail siting/massing options that address growth capacity and efficiency
- Preliminary budget analysis of these options
- Preliminary parking analysis
- Preliminary building blocking/massing and shadow analysis, drawing upon the conceptual jail block diagrams being prepared by Liebert & Associates
- Conduct research to determine if there are regulations restricting jail location near Child Care Center
- Evaluate potential of Hall of Justice (HOJ) to accommodate County support for community-based organizations
- Opportunities to improve the circulation and aesthetic appearance of the campus
- Incorporate consideration of the County’s fiscal constraints (as they are likely to impact phasing and timing of development)
- Recommend strategies that should be considered by CMO, Board of Supervisors and the Sheriff’s Office
- Recommendation for relocation of the Motor Pool

#### **SCOPE OF WORK**

##### **Phase I. Confirm Sheriff/Jail Needs, Goals and Site Evaluation Criteria**

Jail Needs and Site Evaluation Criteria have already been identified by earlier studies (DMJM 2008 and Liebert & Associates 2009). HOK will base its analysis on the Pre-architectural Program issued by Liebert & Associates in September 2009. Contractor will meet with the Sheriff’s Office and Public Works, and a teleconference with Liebert & Associates to clarify the parameters and program/functional assumptions for the study:

##### **Topics and Target Outcomes from Coordination Meetings:**

1. Summarize Jail-related needs for site testing purposes:

*#/Type of beds, initial and growth potential (tentatively 768 initial plus additional shelled in floor)*

*Assumptions re: support and ancillary—kitchen, laundry, booking, visitation, health, vehicular access and parking (if Sheriff's Office has changes from September 2009 Liebert report)*

2. Agree on approach to planning for improvements to Sheriff Headquarters (HQ), OES and training functions in the Government Center vicinity.

*(Note: we assume that Sheriff Office will provide an inventory of amount/location and type of existing parking needs, as well as assumptions regarding requirements for possible future replacement of Sheriff HQ, OES and associated parking.)*

3. Confirm other County and justice facility needs and parameters in Government Center area:

*What are potential alternative locations for Motor Pool, whether on-site or off site?*

*What must remain at the Government Center even if Motor Pool is relocated (e.g. minimum number of pool cars)*

*What are the requirements for Judge and Jury parking in Transfer Agreement with State?*

4. Discuss Site Evaluation Criteria and evaluation method to be used for comparing alternative strategies (criteria will build upon previously established Jail site selection criteria).

## **Phase II. Jail Site Alternatives Development and Assessment**

The Sheriff's Office has recommended the Motor Pool vicinity as their preferred site for the new jail. During Facility Master Plan interviews, the Sheriff's Office has also expressed their desire to look into combining jail improvements with other County public safety facilities in the Government Center (Sheriff HQ and OES, possibly in combination with Public Safety Communications).

### **Determine Alternatives to be Analyzed and Illustrated:**

To address these needs, HOK will analyze and diagram up to three alternatives, including:

1. Locate Jail on Motor Pool site – relocate Motor Pool:
  - *What functions if any now at Motor Pool site need to remain somewhere in the County Government Center?*
  - *What are potential locations for these displaced functions? (include at least one potential location outside County Government Center for these displaced functions)*
  - *Can, or should the Motor Pool be accommodated on the ground floor of a new parking structure?*
  - *What is the feasibility of bridge and/or tunnel links from Jail to courthouse and Maguire to achieve desired functional/operational connections?*
  - *What is the minimum amount of structured parking needed, how would it best be located and configured?*
2. Same as #1 but renovate 455 building

- *How does renovation of 455 County Center compare with replacement cost on a per SF basis*
3. Locate Jail on Motor Pool site; demo and replace 455 County Center building (the starting point for jail concepts will be the functional program prepared by Liebert & Associates):
    - *What are the benefits/advantages re: Jail and Sheriff development potential and operational connections if the 455 building is removed?*
    - *How can jail-related Sheriff's Office functions be located in best proximity to jail?*
    - *What is the potential development capacity gained by this additional site area*
    - *How does this strategy change potential phasing and development increments?*
  4. An alternative or variation on the above (to be determined in discussion with County)
    - *Is there any significant advantage gained by relocating the child care center? What if any restrictions affect locating the proposed jail adjacent to the child care center?*
    - *What are the comparative pros/cons of siting the jail on the First American Title Company (FATCO) block?*

### **Phase III. Evaluate Site and Development Alternatives**

The Contractor will analyze and diagram alternative facility strategies in order to compare their rough order of magnitude (ROM) costs and benefits. Working with County staff, HOK will develop an evaluation method that addresses clear and defensible Site Evaluation Criteria and compares the overall costs and benefits of various location options. Evaluation will include development of a 2-D site development strategy and a 3-D massing diagram for each alternative (an example from HOK's San Francisco Jail site evaluation study was shown at the scoping meeting).

A high-level comparison matrix will summarize the major differences in costs and benefits of the alternatives, for example:

- Construction costs
- Cost to relocate/replace existing functions
- Ability to accommodate both current program and future growth potential
- Major operational benefits and advantages
- Potential to achieve Goals for Civic Center aesthetic improvement
- Likelihood of support by City
- Control of Risk e.g. County owned property, minimizing required approvals, ability to influence timing and funding for improvements etc.

Issues that will be evaluated during this stage in cooperation with the Steering Group include:

- *What alternative provides the best and most cost-effective transport of inmates and integration with the overall Jail support/ancillary services? (per input from Sheriff's Office)*
- *For functions such as vehicle maintenance, radio shop and pool car parking that must be displaced to create development site(s), what are possible options for their replacement, and what are the rough order of magnitude (ROM) costs of this replacement? (Assume*

*coordination with County to determine if they can be accommodated on existing County sites or whether additional land acquisition is likely to be required)*

- *What case studies can be identified and photos gathered to illustrate specific examples and principles of how a jail can be a “good neighbor” in an urban setting?*

Findings will be presented to the key stakeholders at this point (representatives from Sheriff’s Office, Public Works, and County Manager’s Office). HOK assumes that the County’s project manager will convey consolidated comments and direction from the stakeholder group, in order to proceed to the documentation of findings and recommendations. If the County opts to authorize the Optional task of concept sketches, the stakeholder group should designate the preferred strategy to be illustrated.

#### **Phase IV. Document Findings and Recommendations**

Findings and recommendations will be documented in a brief summary of diagrams and supporting text and tables. The evaluation of alternatives will be summarized in the form of conclusions and recommendations. The form of deliverable is assumed to be a concise Recommendations summary in PowerPoint format (suitable for slide presentation or hard copy printout), supported by a Technical Appendix containing the relevant analytical materials.

#### **Optional Task IV A—Concept Sketches of Jail in Government Center Context:**

After the preferred site and development strategy is agreed, at the County’s request HOK could prepare concept sketches of how the proposed Jail could be a “good neighbor” in the larger Government Center area, and the types of circulation, parking and open space improvement opportunities that could enhance the entire area. The purpose of these sketches would be to illustrate planning principles and desired quality/character of development, for example:

1. Jail and Sheriff space massing, height and circulation/parking
  - *How many floors should/can be assumed (base case is Liebert & Associates illustrations)*
  - *How much parking should be provided compared with existing, and where?*
  - *What total amount of additional space and parking could be accommodated on the site?*
2. Integration with overall County and Court needs at the Government Center
  - *How can circulation, parking and pedestrian access be organized to prevent conflicts, maximize safety, support best utilization (e.g. shared parking) and create a good environment?*
  - *What are desirable shared amenities for the Government Center, and where would they best be located (e.g. food service, coffee kiosk, public service counters, short-term client parking and passenger dropoff, public plaza, landscaped mall and/or open space)*
  - *How could the County establish performance criteria and “good neighbor” design principles that could enhance compatibility of the Jail and Sheriff functions with the Government Center and surrounding neighborhood (e.g. ground level façade and landscape treatment, “user-friendly” public entry to Sheriff HQ, high-quality materials, screening and sound isolation of jail recreation yards)*
  - *How can the new development enhance and improve the Government Center and be compatible with the plans for downtown Redwood City?*

## **Optional Task IV B— Participation in Public Presentations and Community Outreach**

A modest additional contingency allowance is recommended to make HOK available on a time and materials basis to attend presentations to the CMO, Board, or public to explain the findings of the study.

### **2. Additional Payments.**

In consideration of the additional services described herein, County will pay Contractor an amount not to exceed \$80,500, which shall include expenses fees, expenses and contingencies, and which shall be paid as follows:

#### Payment for Phases I, II, III and IV.

\$14,625 upon completion of the Phase I tasks

\$14,625 upon completion of the Phase II tasks

\$14,625 upon completion of the Phase III tasks

\$14,625 upon completion of the Phase IV tasks

#### Payment for Optional Tasks.

\$12,000 is reserved for “Optional Tasks IV A and IV B”.

Payment for those tasks shall be made only if either or both of them are requested by the Director of Public Works, in which case, they shall be paid at the rate of \$6,000 per task, upon the completion of the task.

#### Contingencies.

\$10,000 has been included for contingencies and unforeseen items and can only be used to compensate Contractor for expenses or if a specific service and cost is identified and presented to the Public Works Director for approval prior to proceeding of work.