



**South Orange County Community College District**

RFQ&P 385D

Student Housing Feasibility Study for Saddleback College, Irvine Valley College and the Advanced Technology & Education Park

Addendum No. Two (2)

March 16, 2020

**Nick Newkirk**

Purchasing and Contracts Manager

**Note:**

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

1. **Due to the ongoing and changing health related concerns, the Due Date for proposals has been moved to Monday, April 27, 2020 at 12:00 PM.**

**Hard copies will no longer be required.**

The dates for interviews, contract negotiations and Board approval have modified to accommodate the revised proposal due date. The revised schedule for the RFQ&P is shown below:

<b>Proposal Due Date</b>	<b>April 27, 2020</b>
Interview/Presentations (if needed)	May 15, 2020 Saddleback College President’s Conference Room AGB 106 28000 Marguerite Parkway Mission Viejo, CA 92692
Contract Negotiations (if needed)	May 18-22, 2020
Anticipated Governing Board Approval	June 22, 2020

2. The responses to the Requests for Information submitted by March 2, 2020 and the questions asked during the mandatory pre-proposal meeting on March 4, 2020 are shown below:

Q1: Are there current sites under consideration? If so, are they all on the campuses?

A1: The District has not identified any specific locations on any of the campuses at this time, but requires that any future locations will be placed on campus property. The feasibility study should be making the necessary recommendation.

Q2: While the RFQ does not imply, we wanted to double check to see if this study should entail any study of faculty/staff demand?

A2: The intent of the District is for the study to focus on student housing. The inclusion of Faculty/staff housing has yet to be determined.

Q3: Given the timeline of selection towards the beginning of the Summer Session, what is the

anticipated delivery of Phase I and Phase II?

A3: The District's intent is for the project to be completed in about a year's time. The decision on phases and schedules shall be made based on the firm that provides the most practical and feasible response to Proposal Form D Project Schedule.

Q4: In Proposal Form A: Proposer Firm Information, RFQ&P page 20, the second bullet asks for Business License Number. Can the District confirm which business license number(s) is / are acceptable here?

A4: Firms shall submit a general business license number for the city in which they are located. A federal tax ID number in lieu of the business license number will also suffice.

Q5: In Proposal Form C: Related Experience and Methodology, item #10 asks for electronic copies of complete examples of similar studies; do these examples count against the 10-page limit for this section? May proposers provide these in an appendix, outside of the page limit?

A5: Firms shall provide a digital link to the complete examples of similar studies or provide them in a folder on the required USB flash drive. Firms shall not provide the examples in a hard copy format. The examples do not count against the page count.

Q6: There is a slight discrepancy in the titles of Proposal Forms between the list on RFQ&P page 9 and the actual forms on RFQ&P pages 27–30 (Form E is duplicated, affecting the naming of the subsequent forms); please confirm the Proposal Form naming on page 9 prevails and should be followed in proposers' responses.

A6: The Proposal Form naming on page 9 prevails and should be followed in proposers' responses. Revised Proposal forms shall be included with Addendum No. 2.

Q7: Please confirm that it is acceptable for proposers to re-create the Proposal Forms (e.g. in MS Word or Excel) as appropriate to accommodate response items in our proposals. As an example, Proposal Form B requires long-form responses to some items—is it acceptable to re-create Form B, inserting items such as the organizational chart in sequence below each numbered prompt? (as opposed to including Proposal Form B verbatim as provided in the RFQ&P and providing response items on subsequent pages)

A7: This is acceptable so long as the information required is exactly as it is shown in the RFQ&P.

Q8: What are the exact statistics for the past five years, for each of the campuses, of students enrolled in Distance Education?

A8: This information will be provided via a future Addendum.

Q9: What is the trend, over the past five years, for each of the campuses, of students that are housing insecure?

A9: Saddleback College: Housing Insecurities based off total head count for the last 5 years are as follows:

2015-2016 4%  
2016-2017 4.3%  
2017-2018. 4.6%  
2018-2019 6%  
2019-2020 6.2%

IVC: information will be provided via a future Addendum.

Q10: What is the enrollment, over the past five years, of international students at each of the campuses?

A10: Saddleback College:  
2015-16: around 150  
2016-17: around 200  
2017-18: around 280  
2018-19: around 250  
2019-20: around 250

IVC: information will be provided via a future Addendum.

Q11: The RFQP provides a limited amount of information regarding housing near the campuses. Will we be provided with the source data?

A11: The District will share all available relevant data with the awarded firm.

Q12: Is preference given to a firm that can provide all of the required services “in-house” or will equal consideration be given to firms that are a joint-venture between several firms?

A12: The District’s intent is to award the contract to one firm. All joint-ventures, subcontractors, subconsultants, etc. shall be under the firm submitting the proposal (as a proposing firm’s subcontractors/subconsultants).

Q13: Is the awarded firm and any of its identified subconsultants, subcontractors, etc. precluded from providing architectural, development, or any other associated services for the student housing facilities should they be built?

A13: Yes.

Q14: Will firms be providing, within the scope of services, any advice on financial structure and funding development?

A14: Yes.

Q15: Was the primary proposing firm’s presence required at the mandatory pre-proposal meeting?

A15: Yes. The firms that participated via the Zoom conference call are shown below:

- BDO
- Berliner Architects
- Brailsford & Dunlavey
- Brookhurst Development
- Carrier Johnson + CULTURE
- Concourse Group, LLC
- HED
- IBI Group
- Jones Lang LaSalle Americas, Inc.(JLL)
- ONYX Architects
- PFIC
- Project Management Advisors, Inc.
- Scion Group
- Taylor Design
- Torti Gallas + Partners