



Judicial Council of California
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

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

ADDENDUM

Date	Action Requested
January 18, 2007	Please review the attached changes and clarifications to the RFP.
To	Deadline
Design and Construction Quality Assurance Firms	N.A.
From	Contact
Judicial Council of California Administrative Office of the Courts, Office of Court Construction and Management	solicitations@jud.ca.gov
Subject	
Addendum No. 2 Request for Qualifications for ID/IQ D & C QA Services RFP OCCM-FY2006-04	

1. See attached answers to questions.

Item	RFQ Reference	Firm Name and Question	Answer
1.	-3.0 – -4.3-	<p>Harris Engineering</p> <p>1. In the "Request for Proposal" under section 3.0 SCOPE OF SERVICES item 3.1 Plan Checking it refers to Access Compliance, Fire and Life Safety and Corrections Standards Authority for Holding Cells to be reviewed by State agency. It was not clear what is included in the scope of services required by the RFP. Does the scope of services required include Access Compliance, Fire and Life Safety and Corrections Standards Authority for Holding Cells? Or is it just Structural Plan Checking similar to a Division of the State Architect (DSA) project? Or all of the above?</p> <p>2. In the "Request for Proposal" under section 4.0 RESPONDING TO THIS RFP item 4.3 provides a link to the Standard Form 330 however the form states in the upper right hand corner that it expires 12/31/2006. Since it is now past the expiration date is there another form that we should use? Or should we just use the old form?</p>	<p>1. Successful Service Providers may be selected to provide Plan Checking services in any or all of the areas in question. It is contemplated that such Plan Checking services could facilitate more rapid and successful plan checking by the named State agencies.</p> <p>2. The form with the 12/31/2006 expiration is fine to use.</p>
2.	-4.0-	<p>Salas O'Brien Engineers, Inc.</p> <p>If a prime is going to include a sub consultant, do you require the SF 330 forms (both part 1 and 2) for the proposed sub consultant as well?</p>	<p>Yes, but be careful to package it with the prime SOQ package for each Quality Assurance service the prime firm is proposing on.</p>

Item	RFQ Reference	Firm Name and Question	Answer
3.	-4.4- -6.0-	<p>Kitchell</p> <p>Section 4.4 of the RFQ asks for a price proposal (hourly rates) for services to be submitted in a separate sealed envelope. Section 6.0 indicates that hourly rates are a weighted item in the evaluation of proposals which would imply that they should be included in the body of the SOQ.</p> <p>Should hourly rates for professional services be submitted in a separate sealed envelope or in the body of the SOQ?"</p>	<p>As instructed, hourly rates for professional services should be submitted in a separate sealed envelope. As indicated in 6.0, these will be evaluated as part of the entire proposal for each Quality Assurance service proposed on. (Please remember that separate SOQ documents are required for each Quality Assurance service being proposed on. These will be evaluated separately and it is possible that a firm is successful in proposing on one Quality Assurance service and unsuccessful in proposing on another.) As indicated in 4.4, please clearly indicate with the rates the category of Quality Assurance service those job titles would be providing.</p>
4.	-3.2-	<p>CYS Structural Engineers, Inc.</p> <p>Please clarify: Are the Construction Inspection services intended to be by a full-time on-site "Inspector-of-Record" or an "oversight"-type of service involving frequent job-site visits?</p>	<p>Construction inspection, as described in 3.2, requires competent and adequate inspection necessary for adherence to contract documents during the performance of the work. Larger projects will require full-time on-site inspection. Competent and adequate inspection for smaller projects may be through called inspections or periodic inspection.</p>
5.	-4.0-	<p>Facility Engineering Associates</p> <p>Are CMAS rates required for this contract?</p>	<p>No</p>

Item	RFQ Reference	Firm Name and Question	Answer
6.	-3.1- -4.0-	<p>Integrated Design Services, Inc.</p> <p>Our firm is specialized in “structural” plan check and we are considering proposing to provide Plan Checking services (Scope of Services Item 3.1). Can we propose and get contract with AOC for “structural only” plan check (as typically contracted with OSHPD and DSA) or do we have to also include in our team qualifications/capabilities to perform “access compliance and fire/life safety” plan check? Our understanding is that the “access compliance and fire/life safety” plan check will be performed by DSA.</p>	<p>Plan checking services as described in 3.1 require a review of documents for conformance to minimum applicable codes (Title 24, including building, mechanical, plumbing and electrical codes) for State owned or occupied non-essential services buildings. Proposers will be evaluated on their ability to perform plan checking to minimum applicable codes.</p>
7.	-3.4- -4.0-	<p>Quantum Energy Services & Technologies</p> <p>1. Our firms' primary area expertise is in commissioning of existing buildings (as opposed to commissioning new buildings). Is this service within the scope of this RFQ (such as under "Total Building Commissioning?")</p> <p>2. Does the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) desire that firms have expertise in each of the four workscope areas: i) plan checking, ii) construction inspection, iii) materials inspections and special testing, and iv) total building commissioning, or is the AOC accepting firms with qualifications in only one or two areas?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Total Building Commissioning as described in 3.4 requires services for selected projects whether the projects are for new buildings or existing buildings. 2. Firms may submit for any or all of the four services. Evaluation and selection will be independent for each of the four services. Successful selection in one service does not influence the selection in another.

Firms emailing intent to respond, through January 18, 2007 (please see Addendum 1 for remainder of list):

American Commissioning Group LLC
 Kitchell
 Facility Engineering Associates
 TYR, Inc.
 Carlton Engineering Inc.
 CYS Structural Engineers, Inc.
 Nabih Youssef & Associates
 WorkingBuildings

The Owen Group
 ABS Consulting
 Precision Inspection Inc.
 Ballard & Watkins
 Henrikson Owen
 MTGL, Inc.
 Testmarcx Commissioning Solutions
 Enovity, Inc.

PC Associates
 Welsh Commissioning Group, Inc
 JCE Structural Engineering Group, Inc.
 Public Works Services
 Soil Engineering & Testing