SAN BERNARDINO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

ADDENDUM 2

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS AND PROPOSALS
RFQ/P 2019-02

FOR

SBCCD MEASURE CC BOND PROGRAM
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT SERVICES

Issued: February 20, 2019
Addendum 2 includes the following revisions to RFQP document:

1. **Request for Clarifications:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RFC</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RFC-1</td>
<td>Regarding the Proposer’s following question: “Section 5.A. on page 10 of 19 of the RFP addresses font size. Is a smaller font size allowed for text on tables, graphics, captions, or page headers and footers?”</td>
<td>It is acceptable to use a smaller font size for text on tables, graphics, captions, or page headers and footers as long as it is clear, legible and readable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFC-2</td>
<td>Regarding the Proposer’s following question: “Would pursuing the program management services RFQP as a prime preclude us from pursuing future RFQ/Ps to be issued by the District under the CC Bond Program / any other District programs?”</td>
<td>The Program Management firm selected via this RFQP process and its sub-consultants will be precluded from pursuing any future Bond Program RFQs and/or RFPs issued to engage consultants and contractors to provide other various Bond Program services that the Program Management firm is not providing. However, if the Proposer pursues the program management services as a Prime Consultant and did NOT win the contract with SBCCD, then the Prime Consultant will NOT be precluded from pursuing future RFQ/P’s for the SBCCD Measure CC Bond Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFC-3</td>
<td>Regarding the Proposer’s following question: “Would pursuing the program management services RFQP as a subconsultant to a prime preclude us from pursuing future RFQ/Ps to be issued by the District under the CC Bond Program / any other District programs?”</td>
<td>The Program Management firm selected via this RFQP process and its sub-consultants will be precluded from pursuing any future Bond Program RFQs and/or RFPs issued to engage consultants and contractors to provide other various Bond Program services that the Program Management firm is not providing. However, if the Proposer pursues the program management services as a Sub-Consultant to a Prime Consultant, and the Prime Consultant did NOT win the contract with SBCCD, then the Sub-Consultant will NOT be precluded from pursuing future RFQ/P’s for the SBCCD Measure CC Bond Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFC-4</td>
<td>Regarding the Proposer’s following question: “Does the District have a list of consultants who have downloaded the RFQ/P that we can obtain?”</td>
<td>NO. The District does not have a list of consultants who have downloaded the RFQ/P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFC-5</td>
<td>Regarding the Proposer's following question: “On page 9, section J. of the RFQ/P the District refers to Board Policy 6610. Additionally 10% of the scoring is allocated to the policy. In response to Section J. is the district requesting that the program management firm staff meet the goals, provide a narrative approach explaining how the goals will be achieved for contractors, or both? Also, please clarify whether/how “3. Bidding” of the policy applies to the RFQ/P response, as it is understood to refer only to contractors.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Answer RFC-5 | The District’s Board Local Policy 6610 is very important for Measure CC Bond Program and a goal-oriented policy. This clarification has two sub-parts to address both components of Proposer’s question:  

i) “On page 9, section J. of the RFQ/P the District refers to Board Policy 6610. Additionally 10% of the scoring is allocated to the policy. In response to Section J. is the district requesting that the program management firm staff meet the goals, provide a narrative approach explaining how the goals will be achieved for contractors, or both?  

Response (i): In its Proposal, Proposer needs to demonstrate their approach to achieving the goals set forth in Board Policy 6610 as part of Proposer’s technical qualifications and proposed plan.  

ii) Also, please clarify whether/how “3. Bidding” of the policy applies to the RFQ/P response, as it is understood to refer only to contractors.”  

Response to (ii): The “3. Bidding” of the local policy 6610 applies to this RFQ/P and applies to the Proposer and any subconsultants Proposer may have that make up Proposer’s team being proposed in response to this RFQP. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RFC-6</td>
<td>Regarding the Proposer’s following question: “1A – Prime Firm Postposed Personnel, I. Part 1, and II. Part 2 request that the program management firm “Identify if you company and/or the individuals identified above work or live in the District by attaching hereto an additional page or pages.” Please confirm that “District” refers to SBCCD district boundaries or San Bernardino and Riverside Counties. Please also indicate what type of information qualifies for the “additional page or pages.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer RFC-6</td>
<td>The San Bernardino Community College District’s boundaries are the Inland Empire “IE” geographical area: San Bernardino County and Riverside County. Additional page or pages are requested for Proposers to identify in writing if a Proposer’s company and/or the individuals identified in its Proposal, pursuant to RFQP Attachment 1 A Part 1 and Part 2, work or live in the District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFC-7</td>
<td>Regarding the Proposer’s following question: “1A – Prime Firm Postposed Personnel, I. Part 1 states that “all personnel proposed under Part 1 must be prime firm employees, not contracted workers or consultants,” and lists 5 key positions. However, 10 – Technical Proposal Staffing and Program Management Plan, Section 2., Page 8 states “*must be employees of proposer and not team members,” and only indicates that the Bond Program Manager and Design and Planning Manager are required to be employees of the proposer. Please confirm which key positions are required to be prime firm employees.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Answer RFC-7 | Attachment 1A Part 1 merely requires Proposers to only include the required information for Prime Firm Employees (versus employees of a sub-consultant to the Prime Firm) in Proposers’ response to this section of the RFQP.  

As issued, the RFQP required the Bond Program Manager, Design and Planning Manager and Financial and Contract Manager to be employees of the Proposer/Prime Firm.  

The District hereby clarifies that it prefers the (5) five proposed positions be employed by the Prime Firm; however, the District will accept proposals that include “at least”
the Bond Program Manager, Design and Planning Manager, and Program Admin Assistant being employed by the Prime Firm with the rest of the proposed team being employed by a sub-consultant to the Prime Firm.

RFC-8 Regarding the Proposer’s following question: “Section 5.A on page 10 of 19 states, “Proposals shall be prepared on standard letter size (8 ½” x 11”) paper.” Are any 11” x 17” fold-out pages permissible for some larger charts and graphics, in light of the font size requirement?”

Answer RFC-8 11” x 17” fold-out pages are permissible for special larger charts and graphics for demonstration and presentations.

RFC-9 Regarding the Proposer’s following question: “In Section 5.A on page 10 of 19, regarding the 11-point font requirement, is a smaller font permissible for occasional graphics, captions, etc.?”

Answer RFC-9 Similar to answer of RFC-1: It is permissible to use a smaller font size for occasional graphics, captions, etc. as long as it is clear, legible and readable.

RFC-10 Regarding the Proposer’s following question: “Per the Part 1 − Technical Proposal Requirements in Attachment 10 “Technical Proposal Staffing and Program Management Plan,” please confirm that respondents are to organize their responses to the categories of “A. History, Organization, and Key Personnel,” “C. Proposer’s Experience,” “D. Proposer’s Financial Strength,” “E. Claims History,” “F. Technical Approach,” and “G. References,” and that there is no category “B.”

Answer RFC-10 This is correct. There is no category “B”, due to a typographical error. Proposers are to organize their responses to the technical qualification requirements for the RFQ/P as requested in paragraphs A, C, D, E, F, and G of Attachment 10 Part 1 − Technical Proposal Requirements.

RFC-11 Regarding the Proposer’s following question: “10 – Technical Proposal Staffing and Program Management Plan, Section G., Pages 16-17 request “(3) references of a public agency, department, district, or other political subdivision…” Any public agency is very broad, are the references required to be California, public, K-14 agencies? Do the references need to be clients from the project experience examples also provided in the RFQ/P response?”

Answer RFC-11 The references can be from the types of public entities described in the RFQ documents; however K-12, K-14 and other educational public entities are preferred. Yes, the references must be from the public entities identified by the Proposer.

RFC-12 Regarding the Proposer’s following question: “Also, we did not receive notification regarding Addendum 1 and it was posted to a different page than the RFQ/P. Is there some way of knowing when/where future addenda can be located?”

Answer RFC-12 As illustrated in the newspaper advertisement:

“The RFQP document can be found at http://www.sbccd.org/bids, the week of January 28th, 2019. All addenda will be posted on the same website, and PROPOSER is solely responsible for obtaining any and all original documents and submitting its qualification and proposal according to the specifications within the RFQP documents and any
addenda.” Additionally, per the RFQP, “RFC’s that are responded to will be issued via Addendum via email or posted only on the District’s Website. It is each Proposer’s sole obligation to regularly check their email/that website for any and all Addendums to the RFQP.”

Please be advised that all RFQ/P addendums will and have been posted to the above referenced websites: www.sbcdd.org/bfs/constructionbids and http://www.sbcdd.org/bids, and have the same procurement number, which is 2019-02 and addendums will be posted beneath the RFQ/P 2019-02 document.

END OF ADDENDUM 2