



ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE
 OF THE COURTS

OFFICE OF COURT CONSTRUCTION
 AND MANAGEMENT

Request for Proposals Form for Submission of Questions
RFQ Number: OCCM—2011-16-JMG

#	Solicitation Reference	Questions	Response
	Organization's Name:	Mace Group (michael.arikat@macegroup.com)	
1	1.0 General Information	Do the 9 appellate locations, 6 courts, co-locate/reside in the mix of the 58 superior courts? What counties?	Each appellate court has a separate court building assigned and does not collocate with a superior court in any county.
2	1.0 General Information	Where is the OCCM based? Branch locations?	The Office of Court Construction and Management (OCCM) is located in 3 primary locations. The OCCM Director, Lee Willoughby and the Design & Construction Unit responsible for the North Central region is based in Sacramento CA. Ernie Swickard, Assistant Director responsible for Design & Construction and the Southern region Design & Construction Unit is based in Burbank CA. The Bay Area Region Design & Construction Unit I located in San Francisco CA.
3	3.1.a Deliverable 1	Consultant to develop list of processes to be examined after conferring with OCCM. There are (10) different and specific processes noted. Is consultant to prepare all (10) processes or some? Who determines criteria and qty.?	The 10 criteria listed in the RFP under section 3.1 represent the primary elements the OCCM includes in the management of each court construction project, and also the elements generally recognized in the industry as critical to a successful project plan. The consultant may adopt the list as presented, or provide a modified list as part of its proposed approach, work plan and methodology as a basis for analyzing the selected projects. The RFP is designed to allow each prospective consultant to provide, and justify, in its proposal the

#	Solicitation Reference	Questions	Response
			approach, work plan and methodology it will use to complete the analysis required under section 3.1.
4	3.1.a Deliverable 1	Who selects the processes? Is OCCM the only entity conferred with regarding the selection?	See answer to item 3 above. The OCCM will be available to provide the consultant with any information as indicated in section 4.0 Process. The Court facilities Working Group will be evaluating each prospective consultant on their response in providing a summary of its approach, work plan and methodology to meet the requirements of section 3.1.
5	3.1 Deliverable 1	Following completion of scope items 3.1a and 3.1b, identify the processes that will, if improved provide the greatest value to the Program and recommend specific improvement goals, objectives and implementation strategies in a report to be provided to the CFWG. Please clarify if CFWG and or OCCM has input in this selection process or is it strictly performed by Consultant?	The report required by Section 3.1.c will be directed to the Court Facility Working Group (CFWG). The OCCM is available to provide information necessary to prepare the report, and also to review a DRAFT report if asked by the CFWG. However, the opinions and recommendations provided in the report are to be those of the consultant.
6	3.6 Deliverable 6	Reference to a report evaluating AOC report, which must be completed in time to be submitted to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee by January 15, 2013. No reference to similar reports to the subsequent extensions thru 5/13/2014, 5/13/2015 and 5/13/2016. Is Deliverable 6 one report or four?	At this time the applicable legislation only requires one report to be issued by January 15, 2013. The report will be prepared by the Administrative office of the Courts, but its content may include significant areas of the consultant's work. Therefore, in order to ensure consistency between the consultant's work and the report, the CFWG will require that the consultant review the report before it is submitted to the Joint legislative Budget Committee.
Organization's Name:		Anchor Engineering, DVBE	

#	Solicitation Reference	Questions	Response
7	E. DVBE Program	In that there will be no pre-proposal conference or outreach events for this RFP, and AOC staff is unavailable to discuss the DVBE program, and the late date of the teleconference provides little time for DVBEs to identify and contact prospective primes, can AOC provide information to DVBEs interested in participation? The current situation presents a barrier to entry for DVBEs not on the current program team, since there is no information or way to contact interested prime consultants or the incumbents.	<p>There is no question here but rather a statement.</p> <p>-In order to address what may be the issue, on November 17 the Administrative Office of the Courts published a list of the attendees to the pre-bid conference for the use of DVBEs. When available, contact information and e-mail addresses of possible primes has also been provided.</p>
Organization's Name:		Casamar Group and Symplex Construction Management.	
8	Deliverable #1	My question is relative to Deliverable #1 and the ten bullets therein. How are we to accurately and competitively provide a Firm Fixed Price for this deliverable, if our selection of the task/bullets to be evaluated is subject to review and possible change by the OCCM?	<p>Each proposal will be evaluated on the approach, work plan and methodology presented by the prospective consultant. The prospective consultant must justify in its proposal the 6 projects selected and how its selection process supports the primary goal for the engagement of a consultant. After reviewing the questions the AOC hereby modifies Scope of Services section 3.1 of the RFP as follows:</p> <p>3.1 Deliverable 1:</p> <p>a. Based on the list of projects listed in Attachment 1 the Consultant shall select six a representative sample of projects, completed and in process, (the minimum sample being six projects), to assess the overall management of the Program and individual project team performance relative to budget, scope, schedule, and</p>

#	Solicitation Reference	Questions	Response
			<p>quality outcomes. In completing its review, the Consultant shall provide objective analysis of the efficiency and effectiveness of the OCCM management of the Program. Of the six projects 3 must be of Completed Capital Projects (one of which must be Contra Costa County—Arnason Justice Center, and the other two can, at the consultant's discretion, be of Fresno County—Sisk Renovation, or Mono County—New mammoth Lakes Courthouse, or Orange County—4th Appellate District Division 3 New Courthouse, or Plumas/Sierra County—New Portala/Loyalton Courthouse); and 3 must be of Active Capital Projects – Funded by SB1732 (one of which must be San Bernardino County—New San Bernardino Courthouse, and the other two can, at the consultant's discretion, be of Galaveras County—New San Andreas Courthouse, or Lassen County—New Susanville Courthouse, or Riverside County—New Mid-County Courthouse, or San Benito County—New Hollister Courthouse, or Tulare County—New Porterville Courthouse). As part of its approved approach, work plan and methodology the conferring with the OCCM, Consultant will develop a list of processes to be examined and determine the breadth of each analysis for each project. The analysis must list may include each of the elements</p>

#	Solicitation Reference	Questions	Response
			<p>indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site acquisition, (selection, site analysis, entitlements, purchase/sale transaction) • Project programming and design, (LEED[®], constructability/coordination/quality assurance reviews, scope refinement, code compliance) • Budget management (preliminary, schematic and design development estimates, value engineering and analysis, life cycle studies, construction phase cost controls, accounting, change orders) • Pre-Construction planning (site logistics, procurement strategy, bid packaging, labor agreements, long-lead purchasing, local and DVBE outreach programs, labor compliance programs, insurance and safety programs, quality assurance programs) • Environmental compliance (CEQA process, mitigation monitoring plan) • Contract solicitation and

#	Solicitation Reference	Questions	Response
			<p>administration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule management (preliminary, schematic, design development, construction, move-in schedules, resource loading forecasting, alternatives, float management, change orders) • Construction administration and management (communication, documentation and document control, insurance and safety, LEED® certification tracking, labor compliance, quality assurance, local and DVBE contracting, project procedures manual, inspection, testing) • Delivery (commissioning, close out, records management, training, technology transfer, move-in) • Warranty and conformance administration. <p>b. Perform an assessment of the structure and composition of the project delivery team, including OCCM organization structure, staff, consultants, architects and engineers, general contractors, and end users.</p>

#	Solicitation Reference	Questions	Response
			<p>c. Following completion of Scope Items 3.1a and 3.1b, identify the processes that will, if improved, provide the greatest value to the Program, and recommend specific improvement goals, objectives, and implementation strategies in a report to be provided to the CFWG</p>
	Organization's Name:	fs3 CM	
9	OCCM-2011-16-JMG	<p>Are the three item (Introductory Letter, Payee Data Form, and Price Proposal Form) required in <i>Section 2-Price Proposal</i> included in the 25 page limit?</p>	NO.
10	OCCM-2011-16-JMG	<p>The scope of Deliverable 2 and 3 appears subject to post-award discussion and definition with CFWG based in part upon the findings in Deliverable 1. For example, Deliverable 2 cites both program <u>and/or</u> project level reviews as a possibility, each requiring a different level of effort.</p> <p>How should the consultant prepare a NTE fee amount based upon this variable scope and in consideration that one third of the evaluation is based upon fee?</p>	<p>The Consultant will have to clearly establish the basis of its Not to Exceed fee as part of its approach, work plan and methodology presented in its proposal. The AOC cannot speculate on all of the work that may be requested of the Consultant, but rather is relying on the experience and knowledge of the prospective consultant to understand the work required for a similar project within the State of California. Further, the contract will be established on a "work order" basis with each work order (except those deliverables compensated on a fixed price basis) having a separate not to exceed basis. Should the CFWG request services from the consultant that exceed the overall contract not to exceed amount, then necessary amendments can be made to the contract to allow for the completion a new work order that when added to all other work orders, completed or in progress, exceed the contract amount. Should there be insufficient funds available in the contract to fund for assignment of new work orders, no new work orders will be issued.</p>

#	Solicitation Reference	Questions	Response
	Organization's Name:	Davis Langdon	
11		<p>Davis Langdon is part of a business line within AECOM, but operates as Davis Langdon. Davis Langdon also has an IDIQ contract with AOC for on-call cost consulting services. Davis Langdon is also working on various AOC courthouse projects in the capacity of cost consultant on the design team.</p> <p>Does any or all of the above conflict Davis Langdon out of responding to this RFP as either a Prime or Subconsultant to a Prime ?</p>	<p>For Business Service Unit response. <u>The intent of the language included in the RFP is to disallow firms that might be placed in a position of doing assessments on their own projects. AECOM currently has an A&E project with AOC in Los Angeles, and it is possible that the selected vendor might end up evaluating that project. The same would apply to work as a Subconsultant.</u></p> <p><u>To clarify the intent of the RFP language, the AOC hereby modifies the last paragraph of Section 2.0 to read as follows:</u></p> <p>Proposals from architectural, construction management, general contractor firms <u>(including their parent organizations, subsidiaries, and other firms in which they have an ownership or control interest)</u> currently under contract with the AOC and doing work on projects within the Program will not be considered or evaluated for ultimate engagement as the Consultant providing the services set forth in this RFP. In addition, the selected Consultant will not be eligible to provide services to the AOC in the design of construction of projects within the Program during the period of time that it is engaged to provide the services set forth in this RFP.</p>