



South Orange County Community College District
RFQ&P 376D: Facilities Master Plan Development Services

Addendum No. One (1)
June 27, 2019

Nick Newkirk
Purchasing and Contracts Manager

Note:

All documents remain unchanged except section or parts added to, revised, deleted and/or clarified by this Addendum.

1. The responses to the Request for Information submitted by the deadline of 5:00PM on June 21, 2019, as well as the responses to the questions asked during the mandatory pre-proposal meeting at 10:30 AM on June 26, 2019 are shown below:

Q1: Is the selected firm for the Master Plan Development Services precluded from projects that arise out of the master plan or from any of the upcoming 3 separate and independent projects?

A1: The District is seeking legal counsel on this matter and will issue a response to this question as part of a future addendum.

Q2: The RFQ&P states on page 26 of 47, item 5, that the Firm will provide a website to host the FMP and the site will be hosted by the Firm's cost during the contract term. We have provided websites for similar project in the past but have never seen a request to host the site during the contract term. Would the District reconsider this requirement?

A2: Firms are required to assume this responsibility and this requirement will remain as written. It is fine to offer an alternative to the requirement in your proposal identifying the cost variance and we could consider this during contract negotiations.

Q3: Since the deadline for questions falls before the Mandatory Meeting on June 26th, would the District consider extending the Request for Information period?

A3: No, questions and answers from the mandatory meeting are included in Addendum No. 1.

Q4: What is the shared governance process for the District and colleges? Outside of engagement, is there a process for shared governance for approvals?

A4: California Community Colleges reach many decisions using a participatory governance process. As such, representatives from all constituencies will be represented including students, staff, faculty, and executive administration. The shared governance sign-off (approval) process means you will provide us with draft reports that will be reviewed from many perspectives and you can expect that no less

than two draft versions will be required.

Q5: What is the expectation for the detailed scoping process for the implementation plan?

A5: Projects will be defined, estimated and calendared to align with District resources. Funding will be distributed across fiscal year periods.

Q6: How is the project budget allocation determined?

A6: Project budget allocation shall be discussed during the FMP process.

Q7: Will the firms scoping the projects for the RFP be precluded from providing proposals for future projects?

A7: The District is seeking legal counsel on this matter and will issue a response to this question as part of a future addendum.

Q8: Can the District share a link to the draft format of the district wide Education Master Strategic Plan (EMSP)? What is the status of the districtwide EMSP? What level of detail will be provided? What date will it go to board?

A8: The draft of the EMSP is not ready for distribution. The EMSP is currently under development and no details are available at this time. It is anticipated that the EMSP will be approved at the December 2019 Board meeting.

Q9: Can the District provide the composition of the committee?

A9: The District cannot state exact names or positions, but the committee will consist of a cross-section of the District and College staff and faculty.

Q10: Is the selection committee for this RFP going to be jointly responsible for proposal evaluation and interviews? Please clarify the criteria for evaluation.

A10: The District is currently re-evaluating its selection criteria and approach. A detailed response to this question will be issued via a separate addendum.

Q11: The District has previously conducted various studies such as the parking study, accessibility & sustainability, underground utilities and mapping, etc. Is it the intent of the District that the FMP will include updates to those documents? Are these documents to be treated as static or will they evolve and be incorporated into the FMP?

A11: The reports are living documents and may evolve during the course of the FMP process, however the successful Firm is not expected to update these reports. The reports shall be used for reference purposes only in the development of the FMP.

Q12: Is the firm doing the EMSP precluded from submitting a response to the FMP RFQ&P?

A12: No.

Q13: What firm is developing the EMSP?

A13: MIG, Inc.

Q14: Does the District have a space inventory database? Has an assessment of physical condition been conducted? Are the spaces “fit for programming”?

A14: Yes, as with all California Community Colleges, our space inventory database information is in FUSION and this District’s information is believed to be no less than 90-95% accurate. Additionally, two separate condition assessments have been performed. The first assessment conducted evaluated the buildings and their systems. The second assessment conducted was a mapping and condition assessment report on the utility infrastructure. The aforementioned documents will be available for reference throughout the development of the FMP. The EMSP is determining whether spaces are “fit for programming” and this effort will continue with the FMP.

Q15: How detailed of a utility infrastructure analysis are you expecting for the FMP? If the District is putting a new building on top of existing infrastructure, would it be expected for the firm to provide a plan? Which firm provided the utility mapping report?

A15: The District will require the analysis to understand the cost of the infrastructure renovation necessary for every proposed project. The FMP shall incorporate all project costs when developing the implementation plan, including the infrastructure costs. The mapping and condition assessment report prepared by McCarthy Building Companies on the utility infrastructure provides necessary information for this effort and will be made available for reference throughout the development of the FMP.

Q16: Question 8 of Proposal Form C requires firms to submit one complete example of a similar FMP developed within the last 5 years. Do firms have to provide a hard copy?

A16: No, an electronic copy or a link to an electronic copy is sufficient.