REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS/REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
#1314-53

PROGRAM PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT SERVICES

Addendum #1

The following changes, additions, deletions or corrections shall become part of the Request for Qualifications/Request for Proposal for Program Planning and Management Services

The following are responses to questions received from various firms.

1. What are the type of projects and their timeline?

   Information regarding current and future projects can be found at the RSCCD website. You may find information in the Physical Resources Committee (Departments/Business Operations & Fiscal Services/Committees) and Bond Projects.

2. What is the value of remaining construction bond?

   Information regarding the construction bond can be found at the RSCCD website. The District has two Bond programs, Measure E and Measure Q ($198 million).

3. Is there a current program management firm on board?

   No.

4. If we hold an on-call construction management service contract, are we precluded from proposing this RFQ?

   The District will review all respondents that are interested and would encourage any interested firms to respond. The District has the discretion to select and determine which respondents are appropriate and if any conflicts that may exist.

5. Page 2 of the RFQ/RFP, states that the District does not have the resources in-house to fulfill the needs related to program planning and management. Understanding that FFPS is currently a consultant to the District, is this RFQ/RFP considered outside of the scope of services that Facilities Planning & Programming Services, Inc. (FPPS) is currently providing to Rancho Santiago? If yes, is FPPS allowed to submit a response to this RFQ/RFP or are they conflicted out of the process?

   This RFQ/RFP is a proposal for staff augmentation services as described in the Scope of Services section of the RFQ/RFP. The District is not looking for a Bond Program Management firm to manage a specific bond program. See also response to question number 4 above.
6. Can you expand on the difference between the requested Submittal Cover versus Firm Information on page 10 and 11 of the RFQ/RFP. Both reference the cover letter.

_The cover letter is an introductory letter versus the Firm Information is a form._

7. We understand that the District has an approved list of 8 CM’s firms. Are the firms listed below conflicted out of submitting on the program planning and management RFQ/RFP?

1. APSI Construction Management, Irvine, CA, Atul Apte
2. Balfour Beatty Construction, Irvine, CA, John Bernardy
3. Bernards Builders and Management Services, Irvine, CA, Kelvin Okino
4. Cumming Construction Management, Inc, Aliso Viejo, CA, Anthony Sanchez
5. gkkworks, Irvine, CA, Charlie Merrick
7. McCarthy Building Companies, Inc., Newport Beach, CA, Mark Mardock
8. O’Connor Construction Management, Inc., Irvine, CA, Ciaran O’Connor

_The District will review all respondents that are interested and would encourage any interested firms to respond. The District has the discretion to select and determine which respondents are appropriate and if any conflicts that may exist._

8. Refer to Section 3.3 – With respect to description of projects, reference is made to “relevant surveying work”.

_This is a typing error. Please read as “relevant program planning and management work”._

9. Refer to Section 4. – With respect to billing rates, reference is made to “land surveying consulting services”.

_This is a typing error. Please read as “program planning and management work”._

10. Refer to Exhibit F – With respect to the Certification Form, reference is made to “Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan Consulting Services”.

_This is a typing error. Please read as “program planning and management work”._

11. Refer to Exhibit D – With respect to the Project Narrative dialog box, reference is made to “knowledge of Commissioning requirements”.

_This is a typing error. Please read as “knowledge program planning and management work”._

12. Refer to Exhibit D – The form states “List of Community College Districts Consultant Has Worked For”. It appears that the responder can complete this exhibit only if it has Community College experience. For consistency purposes, can the responder highlight its Team Member Experience with “Similar Work” project experience, as Exhibit A allows for on page 2?

_Yes, respondents may highlight your Team Member Experience with “similar work” project experience. The District has the discretion to review and consider such experience as it deems appropriate._
13. Our firm responded to RSCCD RFQ 1314-02 for Construction Management Services last year. We were short-listed, interviewed and selected along with 7 other firms for this list which included descriptions of specific projects. How does the new RFP relate to the prior process?

*The new RFP does not relate to the RFP you mentioned. These are two separate RFP’s.*

14. What is the difference in the two? The scope of services appears to be very similar.

*The new RFP is for Program Planning and Management services. This RFQ/RFP is a proposal for staff augmentation services as described in the Scope of Services section of the RFQ/RFP.*

15. Does the District intend to hire a single firm, or create a list of pre-qualified firms?

*It is the desire of the District to hire staff augmentation services through one firm but this has yet to be decided. The District may create a pre-qualified list.*

16. Will each list serve the same or different projects?

*This is yet to be determined.*

17. Is a list of projects or project types for the new list available?

*Information regarding current and future projects can be found at the RSCCD website. You may find information in the Physical Resources Committee (Departments/Business Operations & Fiscal Services/Committees) and Bond Projects.*

18. Are firms on the first list precluded from the new list or vice versa?

*The District will review all respondents that are interested and would encourage any interested firms to respond. The District has the discretion to select and determine which respondents are appropriate and if any conflicts that may exist.*

*End of Addendum #1*