



Addendum No. 03

Request for Proposal and Prequalification Application No: B19/20-14

Lease-Leaseback Project Delivery Service

To: All Prospective Proposers

This addendum No: 03 is issued to clarify, add, delete, correct and/or change the RFP B19/20-14 documents to the extent indicated and is hereby made a part of the above noted RFP documents on which the contract will be based. Any modifications/changes made by this addendum affect only the portions or paragraphs specifically identified herein: all remaining portions of the proposal to remain in force. It is the responsibility of all proposers to conform to this addendum. Acknowledge receipt of this addendum in the space provided on the Prequalification Form, and in submitted Proposal(S). Failure to do so may subject the bidder to disqualification.

A. Revisions to Prequalification Forms:

None at this time

B. Revisions to Request For Proposal Document:

- a. Page 6, #5. Relevant Experience revise to read **#14 Relevant Experience.**
- b. Page 6, #5 (14) Relevant Experience revise dollar amount to **\$21,500,000.00** from \$30,000,000.00 in second paragraph.
- c. Page 6, #13, Project Specific Proposals: Omit the third bullet point which reads **~~"Describe your experience with projects similar to those being considered by the District."~~**
- d. Page 6, #5 (14) Relevant Experience revise second open bullet point per the following: **"Provide a contact name, email and phone number for the owners and indicate key firm personnel who worked on each project. List those areas where sub consultants were required and where the firm had in house expertise."**
- e. Page 1, paragraph 2, revise to read as follows: **"Questions regarding this Request for Proposal ("RFP") must be directed to Owen Letcher, Vice Chancellor Facilities/Bond Program & Operations at the email address below by March 4, 2020. Interested firms or persons must submit their proposals, which shall not exceed Forty (40) single sided pages, as described below, with one (1) electronic copy and three (3) hard copies of requested materials to:"**

None at this time

C. Revisions to Specifications:

None at this time

D. Response to Bidders Questions:

RFP Q-1: On page 6 of the RFP, "5. Relevant Experience" seems to be misnumbered. Is this meant to be section "14 Relevant Experience"?

District Response: Refer to Revision to Request for Proposal Document above item B.a above, revise numbering from #5 to #14.

RFP Q-2: Please clarify what should be submitted for each job (A1, A2 & A3) we are proposing on? Is it full qualifications and fee proposal: items 1-13 + relevant experience (currently numbered "5") or are there common sections and only #13 is different for each job?

District Response: Individual packages shall be submitted for each project; information may be duplicated in relevant experience response to items 1-14.

RFP Q-3: Last bullet under item 13 (page 6) is relevant project experience, which seems like a duplication of the following section which goes into greater detail regarding project experience. Would the District consider deleting this bullet?

District Response: Refer to item B.c above for omission of language.

RFP Q-4: Item 5 on page 6 states:

- i. Provide a contact name, email and phone number for the owners and indicate which key firm personnel worked on each project. List those areas where sub-consultants **will be** required and where the firm **has** in-house expertise. **Provide resumes** of persons providing each of these services and for key personnel assigned to the Project.

District Response: No response required

- ii. Regarding the first sentence: should this be worded in the past tense "List those areas where sub consultants **were** required and where the firm **had** in-house expertise" since it's referencing past projects?

District Response: Refer to item B.d above.

- iii. Regarding the second sentence: resumes of key personnel assigned to the Project will already be provided under a previous section (section 4). Would the District consider removing this duplicate language?

District Response: Refer to item B.d above.

RFP Q-5: The page limit of 30 single sided pages seems to be quite limiting considering there are 14 sections of questions, including team resumes and project experience which will take up quite a few of those pages. Would the District consider excluding resumes and project experience from the page count?

District Response: refer to item B.e above

RFP Q-6: On page 6 of the RFP, "relevant experience" is asking for projects over \$30 mil in the past 5 years. Would the District consider revising project requirements to greater than \$21.5 million in the past seven (7) years to match the prequalification requirement?

District Response: Dollar value of required projects revised per Revisions to Request for Proposal Document item B.b above.

RFP Q-7: Currently the interview due date is set for Friday 3/27, however, there was some discussion at the pre-proposal meeting of re-examining this date due to the potential need to interview (9) teams. We therefore wanted to confirm the district's intent for the interview, however, there are a few potential challenges for teams for the weeks in question we wanted to bring forward. The first would be the possibility of pulling the interview up prior to the 3/27 date which may cause challenges with team's ability to prepare after a shortlist notification on 3/24. The other would be the potential

challenges with respective team members being out with children out for spring break that week of 3/30. We will be prepared to address any schedule your team feels most appropriate; we just need to confirm so we can plan accordingly with our team members.

District Response: Refer to Addendum #02 Item B. Revision to Request for Proposal Document for changes to the interview dates for each project.

RFP Q-8: Please advise when prequalified firms will be notified based on the prequalification that was submitted last Wednesday 2/12.

District Response: Notifications were mailed via US Postal service on Wednesday, February 19th and sent via email on Friday, February 20th.

RFP Q-9: Could you please provide copies/drafts of the contract and PLA?

District Response: Refer to original documents posted on the District Purchasing Department website for copies on all draft contracts and Project Labor Agreements.

http://www.clpccd.org/business/documents/RFPB1920-14_Lease-LeasebackProjectDeliveryFINAL.pdf

RFP Q-10: The last bullet point under the "Project Specific Proposals" on Page 6 of the RFP notes "Describe your experience with projects similar to those being considered by the District". Please advise if this bullet should be a part of the "Relevant Experience" section.

District Response: Refer to item B.c above for omission of language.

RFP Q-11: The "Relevant Experience" section on Page 6 of the RFP notes to provide experience for the past five (5) years with value exceeding \$30,000,000, but the prequalification was changed in Addendum 1 to provide experience for the past seven (7) years with value exceeding \$21,500,000. Please advise if this change is to be made for the RFP response as well.

District Response: Dollar value of required projects revised per Revisions to Request for Proposal Document item B.b above.

RFP Q-12: Will the District be posting a list of firms prequalified based upon the submittal made on February 12, 2020.

District Response: Refer to attached memo regarding prequalified firms.

End of Addendum

All other terms and conditions of Bid No. B19/20-14 are to remain the same or as modified by Addendum #01 and #02