



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688
Telephone 415-865-4200 • Fax 415-865-4205 • TDD 415-865-4272

ADDENDUM NO. 3

Date Issued: **March 22, 2016**
RFQ Number: **RFP #REFM-2016-02-JT**
RFQ/Project Title: **ID/IQ ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING SERVICES**
Contact: **CapitalProgramSolicitations@jud.ca.gov**
Action Requested: **Data below is in response to Vendor questions**

#	RFP Reference (Page-Section)	Question	Response
1	REFM-2016-02-JT, Page 6	For the Required SF 330 Form, is there a page limit? For Section H, is there a page limitation?	This has been clarified in Addendum 4.
2	REFM-2016-02-JT, Page 6	For the Payee Date Form, is this just for the Prime to submit or do all team members need to submit?	This has been clarified in Addendum 4.
3	REFM-2016-02-JT, Page 29	For Attachment D, Can those Job Titles be changed, or do you want us to use your job titles? If we have multiple Job Titles that are the same, can we duplicate them?	Do not change or edit Attachment D. Job Titles must remain consistent among Proposers. The Judicial Council is looking for a blended rate in cases where duplication might occur. This form must be filled out in its entirety.
4	REFM-2016-02-JT, Page 6	For SF 330, Part I, Section F, can we list a project that is under one contract, but has several projects under that contract and still be counted as one project?	This is up to the Proposer. The Judicial Council will be looking for breadth of services provided. Projects may be listed by master contract or separate sub contracts, so long as all information requested is provided.

#	RFP Reference (Page-Section)	Question	Response
5	REFM-2016-02-JT, Page 6	For the Cover letter, you state to only include one, however, if we submit five copies of the SF 330 Form, shouldn't we have a complete package, inclusive of 5 SF 330 Forms with each having a Cover Letter, Hourly rates and Payee Data Forms?	This has been clarified in Addendum 4.
6	REFM-2016-02-JT, Page 6	For the SF 330 Forms, it states to include Part I (F) and Part I (H), but I assume that you also want Part A-D, E, G and then Part II, as well.	Form SF330 must be completed in its entirety. This has been clarified in Addendum 4.
7	REFM-2016-02-JT, Page 7	Delinquent Taxpayer Status. It states to list if you are on one of these lists? If you are not, do you want a statement included in one of the tabs outside of the SF 330 Form?	This has been clarified in Addendum 4.
8	REFM-2016-02-JT, Page 6	Do you have a set format that you want our sections to be tabbed? (i.e., 1. Cover Letter, 2. Payee Data Record, 3. SF 330 Form, 4. Hourly Billing Rates)	This has been clarified in Addendum 4.
9	REFM-2016-02-JT, Page 5	When and where is the pre-proposal meeting in San Francisco	See the solicitation website for the most up-to-date information: http://www.courts.ca.gov/34317.htm
10	29 of 29: Hourly Rates	Are we to quote the hourly rates as "fully loaded" (incl. profit and overhead)?	Yes. This has been clarified in Addendum 4.
11	3. Scope of Services, Page 4	Does a successful proposer need to provide a team capable of delivering the complete scope of services or would the Council be open to selecting a team that for example specializes solely in the design of parking structures?	All Proposals will be considered and evaluated in accordance with Section 6 - EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS. Proposers that perform specialized services may want to consider a Joint Venture with other firms to increase breadth of services, however, this is not required for consideration. A specialized firm could be the lead and contract out other service to others but all services will be needed. As a reminder, all Proposals must include Attachment D – Hourly Rates completed in its entirety.

#	RFP Reference (Page-Section)	Question	Response
12-20		Questions #12 – 20 were duplicates of previous questions and have been removed.	
21	On Page 6 of the RFP," it states a requirement for "Five (5) printed copies of the hourly rates you propose to charge for all services utilizing Attachment D- Hourly Rate. On page 8, Item No. 3 of the evaluation criteria is listed as "3. Hourly Rates – Hourly rates for general Architectural Services, as provided in Exhibit D." This evaluation criteria has a point value of 20 points, which is equal to the highest point total for any other individual criteria.	My question is this; how is this criteria allowable under the Brooks act, which requires architecture and engineering firms be selected based on their competency, qualification, and experience, rather than by price?	The Brooks Act is a federal statute and is not applicable to the Judicial Council of California. California law (Gov. Code § 4525, et seq.) includes some restrictions with respect to "state agency" personnel in the use of rates or price in selecting architects, however, those provisions are only applicable to the executive branch. Even if those Government Code sections were applicable to the Judicial Council, there is no prohibition under those provisions to consider "prices" along with "competence" and "qualifications." (Gov. Code § 4526). In fact, Government Code § 4526 states that state agency heads may adopt "procedures that assure that ... services are engaged on the basis of demonstrated competence and qualifications ... <u>and at fair and reasonable prices.</u> " The Judicial Council believes that price information will be helpful in evaluating potential architect firms and it is within its right to request that information from respondents.
22	Page 6 – Part 1 F – Examples of Projects	Page 8 states to include "at least 10 projects" under Part 1F however the SF330 is formatted for 10 projects. Do you prefer we limit it to 10 relevant projects?	This has been clarified in Addendum 4.
23	Page 8 – 6. Evaluation of Proposals– 1. Relevant Experience	Will only projects completed within the past 5 years be considered in the relevant experience?	This has been clarified in Addendum 4. Priority is given to projects completed or started within the time frame listed.

#	RFP Reference (Page-Section)	Question	Response
24	Page 8 – 6. Evaluation of Proposals - 3. Hourly Rates	Can you elaborate on the basis of evaluating the hourly rates with a maximum of 20 points? Will all 20 points be awarded if the Attachment D is filled out completely or will there be a grading scale based on the rates listed?	This has been clarified in Addendum 4.
25	Page 6-bullet point 3, regarding Standard Form 330	Can you please clarify if we need to only submit forms Part 1 (F) and (H) or do we need to submit all of the forms for SF330, i.e. ABCD, E, F, G, H and Part II?	See Question #6.
26	Page 6, bullet point 4, Attachment D- Hourly Rates	Can you please clarify if we need to submit resumes (Part I, SF330 E form) for every person listed on Attachment D- Hourly Rates form or if we only need to submit resumes (Part I, SF330 E form) for the proposed core team as listed on page 5 paragraph 3.3 of the RFP?	Key Personnel only.
27	Page 6, Section 4.1 Your proposal must include:	Do we have a page limit and what forms/sections count towards that limit if there is one? How many copies of our proposal do we need to submit and in what format? Bound or unbound in a three-ring binder? Do we still need to submit a USB of our proposal as well?	This has been clarified in Addendum 4.
28	Please verify 4.4.2 of the submittal requirements on pg. 6 of the above RFP.	Does the Council mean “Submit one (1) CD or flash drive”? Currently, it states “Submit one (2) CD or flash drive...”	This has been clarified in Addendum 4.
29	Sign in sheet for the pre-bid meeting.	Would it be possible to get a copy of the sign in sheet for the pre-bid meeting which was held last week for this solicitation? MTGL is a small business looking to team with the Prime firms on this solicitation.	This has been posted on the website. See question #9 for link.
30	Length – Section H	Length: How many pages are preferred for Section H?	This has been clarified in Addendum 4.

#	RFP Reference (Page-Section)	Question	Response
31	Form G	How many key staff would you prefer on Form G, ideally?	Resumes of Key Personnel are requested in Form 330, Part I, Section E. The number of staff is up to the Proposer provided page limits are followed. This has been clarified in Addendum 4.
32	In RFP Section 6 "Evaluation of Proposals," Criteria #1.	Relevant Experience, it reads, "or similar program-intensive, public-agency, institutional buildings." If we have private projects that similarly convey capabilities that the JCC wants us to show, will these projects be worth fewer evaluation points than comparable public projects?	Similar building types and functions are helpful in evaluation, however, emphasis will be given to project scope.
33	SF330 Section H, will only include the RFP Section 6 Parts #2 "Quality Improvement," #4 Budget/Schedule, #5 Problem Solving, and #6 Regional Capacity. Part #1 Relevant Experience will be evaluated from SF330 Section F and #3 Hourly Rates will be evaluated from the RFP's Attachment D.	Is this true?	This has been clarified in Addendum 4.
34	DVBE form	DVBE form is not required and not to be included in the RFP submission. Is this true?	DVBE form is not to be submitted at this time. See RFP Section 4.2.
35	Section 6 #2 Quality Improvement	What kind of documentation would the JCC prefer in order to convey that our firm can provide quality contract documents?	For the purposes of this RFP, "documentation" refers to the Proposal submitted.

#	RFP Reference (Page-Section)	Question	Response
36	Page 3 (Standard 330 Form), Section F	Under Section F (Example Projects). Can we include project images? If so should they follow each form or should they be added to an appendix at the end of the proposal.	Project images may be submitted but will count towards the page limit specified in Addendum 4.
37	Page 13, Section C; Attachment A	Will they be providing the responses to questions asked by each region to proposers in all regions?	Yes, all questions/answers pertaining to this RFP are being posted, regardless of region.
38	Page 5, Section 3; 3.7	For the contractors for the deconstruction testing and investigation, do we have to include that firm now, as the type of firm required may differ depending upon the type of work being investigated?	It would be beneficial to show capability in breadth of services.
39	Page 5, Section 3; 3.5	For some of the specialty services listed - vibration control, parking structure design, parking lot planning and control- do we need to select and list those now?	Please see Question #38.
40	Page 4, Section 2	Does the prevailing wage requirement only relate to the contractors performing on site investigation and testing, since architects and engineers typically are not part of prevailing wage requirements?	Please see Question #41.
41	Standard Agreement article 42.12	Lionakis is seeking the Judicial Council's interpretation of the Public Works Provision as stated in article 42.12 (Prevailing Wage Laws) of the Standard Agreement. We have reviewed the multiple codes associated with the provision and are unclear if they apply to professional services firms. The language that is stated in all codes pertaining to this requirement are very specific to general contractor and subcontractor works. If we could obtain the Judicial Council's input on their interpretation of this newly adopted code, and if this would be a requirement for a professional services firm, that would assist us with timely registration with the Department of Industrial Relations if needed.	The Judicial Council cannot provide legal advice to any potential respondent as to whether their potential work under the agreement will be subject to the Prevailing Wage Laws. Suffice it to say that there are potential scopes of work that are often performed by architects and their consultants that the DIR may consider a classified craft and for which the Prevailing Wage Laws could be applicable (e.g. engineering, drafting, surveying, etc.) It is the responsibility for each architect to make the necessary determinations and to comply with the Prevailing Wage Laws to the extent that those laws may be applicable to them.

#	RFP Reference (Page-Section)	Question	Response
42	Standard Form 330, Part 1 Form H, page 5	Is this to be a narrative that answers the 6 items (evaluation criteria) on page 8 of RFP?	This has been clarified in Addendum 4.
43	RFP page 6	Please clarify that the only items included in our proposal are: cover letter, Payee Data Record, Part 1- F (10 examples), Part 1- H, Attachment D-Hourly Rates. Do we include Attachment C (certification) or any resumes (Part 1 Form E)?	This has been clarified in Addendum 4.
44	Pre-proposal meeting teleconference	Do you need to rsvp for the pre-bid meeting tomorrow?	No.
45	REFM-2016-02-JT Page 6 of 29	If a Provider is proposing for multiple regions is a separate proposal required for each region?	Yes. Five (5) copies of a Proposal is required for each region. This has been clarified in Addendum 4.
46	REFM-2016-02-JT Page 6 of 29	Please clarify the preferred format for the five printed copies. 3 ring binder, spiral bound or loose leaf?	This has been clarified in Addendum 4.
47	Page 4 of 29	Please confirm that a general contractor is required on each team. Typically, general contractors are contracted directly with the client and not with the architectural lead.	Please see Question #38.
48	Page 8 of 29	Given the limited amount of judicial work performed in California in the last 5 years, is it possible to extend the experience limitations to the last 10 years?	Please see Question #23. This has been revised in Addendum 4.
49	Mentioned at 3/11 Proposal meeting	Please confirm that a geotechnical consultant is required on each team. Typically, geotechnical subconsultants are contracted directly with the client and not with the architectural lead.	Please see Question #38.
50	Mentioned at 3/11 Proposal meeting	Please confirm that a hazmat consultant is required on each team. Typically, hazmat/environmental subconsultants are contracted directly with the client and not with the architectural lead.	Please see Question #38.

- - - - - *End of Addendum #3* - - - - -