



DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION
P.O. Box 942896 • Sacramento, CA 94296-0001
(916) 653-7733

Major General Anthony L. Jackson, USMC (Ret), Director

**ERRATA #1 and QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
to
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
For A
Historic-Style Specialty Restaurant Concession
at
Old Town San Diego State Historic Park**

To All Prospective Bidders:

Attached are Errata #1 and Questions and Answers related to the Request for Proposals (RFP) for a Historic-Style Specialty Restaurant Concession at 2734 Calhoun Street in Old Town San Diego State Historic Park. Errata #1 reflects two deletions to the RFP.

Also attached are the State's answers to the questions submitted by any prospective proposers. The questions are presented exactly as submitted by the identified party.

The errata and other information are available on the website at www.parks.ca.gov/concessions. If you have any questions, please contact Donna Renner at (619) 688-3343 or donna.renner@parks.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Theodore Novak II, Sr. Park and Recreation Specialist
Concessions, Reservations, and Fees Division

Attachments

cc: Clayton Phillips, District Superintendent
Donna Renner, Concession Specialist

State of California – The Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

ERRATA #1
to
Request for Proposal, Sample Contract, and Concession Proposal (DPR 398)
for
Historic-Style Specialty Restaurant Concession
at
Old Town San Diego State Historic Park

Change to the Request for Proposal

1. Section **1.2 General Information**, the list of Food service appropriate to this facility includes, but is not limited to: at the bottom of page 2 has been changed by deleting two items from the list as follows:

Seafood
Mexican (Baja California Region)
Yankee
European
Chop House
Cantina (Spain)
Panaderia/Bakery
~~Off-premise and special event catering~~

DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

SAN DIEGO COAST DISTRICT

THREE HISTORIC-STYLE SPECIALTY RETAIL CONCESSIONS

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

PROPOSER QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

The following are responses from the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) to questions submitted by July 22, 2013, in response to the Historic-Style Specialty Restaurant Concession, at 2734 Calhoun Street, Request for Proposals (RFP).

Questions submitted by RUST General Store:

1. Regarding the section “Food Service appropriate for this facility includes...”
 - a. Cantina (Spain) – There is no ‘Spanish’ interpretive time period within the General Development Plan or the Interpretive Plan; if it is not the mission of OTSHP to interpret the Spanish occupation of Baja California why is a Spanish restaurant an option for this concession location?
 - i. In further research one might also find that, although the word “cantina” originated in Spain in the 1500s, and was used in Italy in the 1700s, the word was not used in the United States to describe drinking establishments until the late 1880s. The terminology is believed to originate (within the US) in lower Texas in 1889 to describe bars with a southwestern/Mexican motif.
 - ii. Cantinas in Mexico were typically drinking establishments (not necessarily serving food) that could be distinguished from ‘dance halls’ because they did not allow women or children to enter the business, common usage of the word ‘cantina’ in Mexico also became more popular after the interpretive time period of the OTSHP.
 - iii. To date there has been no evidence of a Spanish restaurant or bar that operated in the San Diego area during the interpretive time period 1821-1872.
 - b. Mexican (Baja California Region) – Without exception, every operating ‘historic-style specialty restaurant concession’ within the Old Town San Diego State Historic park serves Mexican cuisine. Is it the State’s preference to have Mexican cuisine served at the historic-style specialty restaurant concessions?

RESPONSE: The RFP, Section 1.2 **GENERAL INFORMATION**, under **Facility Description** identifies food service appropriate to the facility, but not limited to a list, which includes Mexican (Baja California Region), the type called Cantina (Spain) has been deleted from the list of appropriate food services. See the attached Errata #1 for modification to this list.

Proposer Q&A

- c. Off-premise special event catering –
 - i. How (in the State’s vision) would an off-site catering business serve to fully realize the listed objectives of this RFP?
 - ii. How does an off-site catering business relate to the vision for interpretation or the mission for interpretation for the OTSHP?
 - iii. In the General Development Plan for OTSHP Design Goals and Objectives it states “Concessions must be sensitively selected for their ability to contribute to the authentic re-creation of Old Town as it was during the years 1821-1872” How would a business dedicated to performing off-site catering contribute to the “authentic re-creation of Old Town?”
 - iv. An off-site catering business has the potential (if it is doing a high volume of business) to create a lot of additional traffic in the immediate area of the catering kitchen; would an off-site catering business in this concession space be required to build/provide a loading area for the catering trucks?
 - 1. If yes; does the State recommend a specific area suitable to accommodate a loading dock for catering trucks?

RESPONSE: The State’s vision for off-premises and special event catering is to enhance the visitors experience and provide for additional sales opportunities that may be proposed in the operator’s business plan. The intent is not to overwhelm the operator from providing first-class services to the park visitor which is first and foremost. Similar to how some of the retail sales concessions provide for internet sales, this opportunity is intended to compliment a food service venue. Catering could be an off-season opportunity when typical foot traffic slows, not a primary service objective. The operator and Park visitors would benefit from catering special events in the park with the historic-style food items served in the restaurant. However in light of the various questions posed, the State is removing this from the list of appropriate food services. See the attached Errata #1 for modification to this list.

- d. Excluded business types – In previous RFPs for the OTSHP there are excluded business types. For example: There are concessions operating inside the state park as a Candy Store, Candle Store, Tobacco Store, etc. Other RFPs specifically excluded these business types Candy Store, Candle Store, Tobacco Store, etc. from the proposal process.
 - i. Why are there no exclusions for this building?
 - 1. Will all business models be accepted for this location?
 - 2. Would a non-restaurant historic style specialty concession be considered?
 - ii. If there are several Mexican cuisine historic-style specialty restaurant concessions operating in the park why is Mexican cuisine not excluded?

Proposer Q&A

RESPONSE: The RFP Section 1.1 **GOALS & OBJECTIVES, Objectives of this RFP**, first bullet item on page 1 lists “create and present through physical facilities, interior furnishings, menu items, and operational style and format, an attractive environment that captures and conveys the historical, cultural, ethnic, and geographic theme of the *building’s interpretive period*”. This statement in itself limits what is appropriate to the premises. Mexican period and American period food being served at other historic-style restaurants in the park is appropriate and therefore not excluded.

2. Regarding the liquor license for the location
 - a. Does the current concessionaire own the liquor license or does the State own it?
 - b. Will the liquor license transfer to the new concessionaire for this location (if they so desire)?
 - i. Please describe any costs associated with the transfer of the license.
 - ii. Please describe operational delays that may be incurred with the transfer.
 - c. If the current concessionaire owns the liquor license; are they planning on selling it to any new businesses in that location?
 - i. Is it the current concessionaire’s discretion of who, when, and how much they sell the license for or is the State involved in that process also?

RESPONSE: The RFP, **Section 3.5 SAMPLE CONCESSION CONTRACT**, page 7, Section 9 titled **ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES** conveys the State Park and Recreation Commissions approval for the restaurant concession to sell beer, wine, and distilled spirits with bona fide meals in the restaurant and bar area for on-premises consumption only and regulations established for the State Park System by the Director of the Department of Parks and Recreation and the regulations established by the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (“ABC”). The State is not involved in the proprietary processes, delays, challenges, or options available to the operator in terms of securing an ABC license, this is the responsibility of the proposer and operator.

Regarding the facilities & facilities improvements

- d. Has there been a building inspection performed by a state licensed building inspector?
 - i. If yes, may we request a copy of the report?
- e. Have there been any structural evaluations performed on the building?
 - i. There is a large crack in the wall facing Calhoun street, is it known if this is structural damage or cosmetic?
 - ii. If the damage is structural; will the State, as the landlord of the premises, provide any assistance (financial or otherwise) to remedy the structural problems of the existing building?

RESPONSE: There is no building inspection report that the State Park is aware of. The large crack in the wall facing Calhoun Street was casually examined by the State’s Engineer and believed to be a faux slab as a façade to the cinder block structure wall; which is not cracked. Structural evaluations were performed on the building in 2007 and are available for review in the District office at 4477 Pacific Highway, San Diego, CA 92110 during the business hours of 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Monday through Friday, excluding Holidays.

Proposer Q&A

The \$100,000.00 minimum required investment into the facilities; is that money required to be spent according to a specific timeline?

- f. For the section of the RFP that states “Listed below are the minimum facility improvements required for this concession....”
 - i. Is there a schedule for completion for all of these bulleted items?

RESPONSE: The RFP, **Section 3 THE PROPOSAL**, sub-section **B. Facility Improvement Plan, Implementation**, page 16 states “specify the timeline for completion of the facility improvements”. The only timeline requirement is listed in the RFP, **Section 3.5 SAMPLE CONCESSION CONTRACT**, page 30, Section **29** titled **DISABILITIES ACCESS LAWS** which requires completion of necessary modifications to premises to meet ADA requirements within the first Contract Year.

- g. The RFP states “repair/replace roof as needed”
 - i. In the opinion of the State officials is the roof in good, fair, or poor condition?
 - ii. Repairing a roof and replacing a roof are two entirely different projects (with drastic cost differences between the two) is it the determination of the State or the Concessionaire whether the roof needs to be replaced or repaired?
 - iii. Is the covered trellis or shade structure that covers the front patio area considered to be part of the “roof” mentioned in the RFP?
 - iv. In the opinion of the State officials is the shade structure in good, fair, or poor condition?
 - v. Is there a specific schedule that has to be met for the roof repairs?

RESPONSE: In the State’s opinion, the roof is in fair condition. The challenge with this roof, which a proposer’s contractor, engineer, or architect may evaluate and discover is there is a mixture of flat and pitch roof design as spaces were constructed over the years. Some of these areas may require repair while others may require replacement. The trellis asked about in item iii was new construction in 2007. Any overhead structure that is affixed to the building may be considered “roof”. There has not been a specific schedule for the roof repairs to date. It is the responsibility of the proposer to determine the scope of repair with the use of consultants as necessary. Please reference the RFP, **Section 3.5 SAMPLE CONCESSION CONTRACT**, page 21, Section **23** titled **CONSTRUCTION AND COMPLETION OF IMPROVEMENTS**, sub-section B. **Use of Consultants**.

- h. The RFP states “correct floor elevations in Cantina, small courtyard, and interior restaurant elevations space(s) to match large courtyard elevations.”
 - i. What does the State mean by “correct”
 1. Is it the State’s desire to have ramps installed?
 2. Is it the State’s desire to have all the different spaces to be at the same elevation?
 3. Is there another “correction” that would be acceptable to the State?
 4. What are the elevation differences between the different spaces?
 5. What is the construction type of the floor (sub floor) of each space?

Proposer Q&A

RESPONSE: The intent of the word “correct” is to have all the floor levels the same height with no threshold outside current accessibility guidelines. The State has no preference other than to meet current accessibility guidelines. Based on previous contractor inspections, of which there is no documentation, only institutional memory, the sub floor spaces vary from open space with dirt ground beneath to concrete foundation in other areas. It is the responsibility of the proposer to determine the scope of repair with the use of consultants as necessary. Please reference the RFP, **Section 3.5 SAMPLE CONCESSION CONTRACT**, page 21, Section **23** titled **CONSTRUCTION AND COMPLETION OF IMPROVEMENTS**, sub-section B. Use of Consultants.

- i. The RFP states “investigate and repair drainage issue”
 - i. What is the drainage issue?
 - ii. Is there a specific licensed tradesperson (concrete, plumbing, landscape) that will be required to perform the investigation mentioned in the RFP? If yes what trade or trades will be required?
 - iii. Has the State performed any investigation of this drainage issue? If yes; what were the results of the investigation and who performed the investigation?
 - iv. What is the State’s cost estimate for the drainage repair that is required by the RFP?

RESPONSE: The RFP, **Section 3 THE PROPOSAL**, sub-section **B. Facility Improvement Plan, Facility Development**, page 16, last bullet specifically lists “inspect and repair drainage issue within the rear employee exit of restaurant/kitchens to the north side (facing Juan Street).” Following the optional pre-proposal meeting there was a site visit in which this area could have been identified as a fully enclosed cinderblock corridor leading from the rear banquet and kitchen exits out to an adjacent walkway to parking lot E off Juan Street. The State has not performed any investigation of the drainage issue; it may be as simple as a roofing repair. The State does not have a cost estimate. In terms of licensed tradespersons, please reference the RFP, **Section 3.5 SAMPLE CONCESSION CONTRACT**, page 21, Section **23** titled **CONSTRUCTION AND COMPLETION OF IMPROVEMENTS**, sub-section B. Use of Consultants. Additional information regarding contractors and trades may be found at the California State License Board here: <http://www.cslb.ca.gov/consumers/HireAContractor/>