
**LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE
DISTRICT Contracts Office
770 Wilshire Boulevard, 6th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90017**

**RFP Number: REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP) NO. 24-03
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT SERVICES**

Addendum Number: 3

Date: March 27, 2024

NOTICE TO PROPOSERS: THIS ADDENDUM SHALL BECOME PART OF THE RFQ, AND PROPOSERS SHALL ACKNOWLEDGE, IN WRITING, RECEIPT AND INCORPORATION OF ALL ADDENDA AND CLARIFICATIONS IN THEIR RESPONSE. FAILURE OF THE BIDDER TO RECEIVE ADDENDA SHALL NOT RELIEVE THE **BIDDER FROM ANY OBLIGATION UNDER ITS BID AS SUBMITTED. THE BIDDER SHALL IDENTIFY AND LIST IN ITS BID ALL ADDENDA RECEIVED AND INCLUDED IN ITS BID; FAILURE TO DO SO MAY BE ASSERTED BY THE DISTRICT AS A BASIS FOR DETERMINING THE BID NON-RESPONSIVE. MANDATORY PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE**

CLARIFICATION(S) REQUESTED BY POTENTIAL PROPOSERS:

NUMBER	QUESTION	EDUCATIONAL SERVICES CENTER RESPONSE
<p>1</p>	<p>What would happen to a subconsultant currently serving on the MATOC and/or BTOC, should their current Prime be on the team (either as a Prime or Sub) selected for the new PM Services contract?</p> <p>Example: Prime A on either the MATOC or BTOC has Subconsultant A on it's current team. Prime A pursues the new PM Services contract (either as a Prime or Sub) with a "New Team" that Subconsultant A is NOT a part of.</p> <p>Assuming the "New Team" wins and is awarded the new PM Services contract, what happens to subconsultant A who now no longer has a Prime firm on the MATOC and/or BTOC?</p>	<p>The District understands this question to focus on the potential impact of a PMO contract award on a subconsultant currently under contract to a MATOC or BTOC prime where the subconsultant is not part of the successful PMO proposer's team. As current District subconsultants are likely aware, the District already regularly refreshes its approved subconsultants and MATOC/BTOC task orders and contracts in what the bond program refers to as an "open season" process which allows qualified and experienced subconsultants opportunities to propose partner with different MATOC/BTOC prime contractors and/or subcontractors for the benefit of the program. Accordingly, the District will work to ensure an "open season" proposal process is timely made available if the District, in its sole discretion, determines such a process will benefit the program following completion of the PMO RFP process.</p>
<p>2</p>	<p>Is the Director of Quality Assurance/Quality Control/Risk Management required to be an employee of the Program Manager (and not a subconsultant)? Attachment No. 4, Page 6 of 20 does indicate that the Director of Quality Assurance/Quality Control/Risk Management must be an employee, however, Attachment No. 1, Page 15 of</p>	<p>Yes, the Director of Quality Assurance/Quality Control/Risk Management is required to be an employee of the Program Manager. The cross-reference in the draft form of the Program Management Agreement in Attachment 1 will be corrected prior to any potential execution by a successful proposer.</p>

	<p>125 states: <i>The following Key Personnel positions shall be performed only by employees of Program Manager (and not by Subconsultants or independent contractors retained by Program Manager): (1) Program Director; (2) BOT Communications Construction; and (5) Director of Design.</i> – and does not mention the Director of Quality Assurance/Quality Control/Risk Management.</p>	
3	<p>We respectfully request a 30-day extension to respond to the RFP in order to adequately address all of the District’s requirements.</p>	<p>The District is unable to honor your request. Any proposal, modification, or revision received after Tuesday, April 10, 2024 at 2:00 p.m., will be considered “late”. Late proposals will not be considered.</p>
4	<p>Can a District reference be utilized for the key personnel, firm, and subconsultant’s reference sections?</p> <p>REFERENCE: 1.2.1.3.4 and 1.2.2.3 on page 7-8 of 20 and 1.8.1 on page 14 of 20 of Attachment No.</p>	<p>Proposers are encouraged to provide references other than District projects/personnel. As further described in the RFP, proposers are reminded that Key Personnel and Firm submissions will be evaluated on the overall strength of the submissions and the demonstrated qualifications, experience, and capabilities of the proposed teams.</p>
5	<p>Can we reference the project featured in Section 1.3 (and the specific page number) on the key personnel resume instead of fully duplicating the project description to be compliant with item 1.2.1.3.4 to accommodate the 100-page count?</p>	<p>Proposers are directed to carefully follow and meet all requirements for the information for references requested for each listed member of proposers’ Key Personnel as described in Section 1.2.1.3 on pages 7 and 8 of Attachment 4. If needed/appropriate, proposers may submit duplicate information, but the</p>

	<p>REFERENCE: 1.2.1.3.4 on page 8 of 20 of Attachment No. 4</p>	<p>references information provided for each individual must meet all specified requirements set forth in Section 1.2.1.3 of Attachment 4, which includes all of the information set forth in Sections 1.3.2.1-10.</p>
6	<p>Can you please confirm that you would only like services provided by the subconsultant firm and not an individual performing services for item 1.2.2.2?</p> <p>REFERENCE: 1.2.2.2 on page 8 of 20 of Attachment No. 4</p>	<p>Proposers are directed to carefully follow and meet all requirements for Subconsultants as explicitly detailed in Attachment 4, Section 1.2.2.1 – 1.2.2.4, including the requirements of 1.2.2.1, which states that Subconsultants should be identified by firm name <i>only</i>.</p>
7	<p>Can you please confirm if you would like three (3) building project or program references for the subconsultant as a firm and not for a specific individual on our team? Or no references for subconsultants at all?</p> <p>REFERENCE: 1.2.2.3 on page 8 of 20 of Attachment No. 4</p>	<p>Proposers are directed to carefully follow and meet all requirements for Subconsultants as explicitly detailed in Attachment 4, Section 1.2.2.1 – 1.2.2.4, including the requirements of 1.2.2.1, which states that Subconsultants should be identified by firm name <i>only</i>.</p>
8	<p>If using a Proposer firm project as a reference for the subconsultant, can we reference the project featured in Section 1.3 (and the specific page number) for the subconsultant firm if they worked on that project with the Proposer firm instead of fully duplicating the project description to be compliant with item 1.2.2.3 to accommodate the 100-page count?</p>	<p>Please see the Response to Numbers 5 and 6 above. With regard to the page count requirements all Proposers are reminded to comply with the provisions of Attachment 4, Section 1.0.4.</p>

	<p>REFERENCE: 1.2.2.3 on page 8 of 20 of Attachment No. 4</p>	
9	<p>If the entire project description to answer 1.2.1.3.4 for the key personnel references on the resumes and 1.2.2.3 for the subconsultant firms' references is required to be duplicated, please confirm they will not be included in the page count.</p> <p>REFERENCE: 1.0.4 on page 2 of 20 & 1.2.1.3.4 and 1.2.2.3 on page 8 of 20 of Attachment No. 4</p>	<p>Please see the Response to Numbers 5 and 6 above. With regard to the page count requirements all Proposers are reminded to comply with the provisions of Attachment 4, Section 1.0.4.</p>
10	<p>Please confirm if the District would like one (1) separately sealed financial package including Attachment No. 6 and all financial information requested within the Technical Proposal boxed package OR eight (8) total separately sealed financial packages within each Technical Proposal binder provided within the boxed package</p> <p>REFERENCE: 1.4.1 on page 9 of 20 of Attachment No. 4 and 5.1.3.1.3 on page 20 of 26 of the Instructions to Proposers</p>	<p>One separately sealed financial package is sufficient.</p>
11	<p>Please confirm the complete table of contents and the back side to the TOC page is not included in the 100-page limit.</p> <p>REFERENCE: 1.0.4 on page 2 of 20 of Attachment No. 4</p>	<p>Please see the Response to Numbers 5 and 6 above. With regard to the page count requirements all Proposers are reminded to comply with the provisions of Attachment 4, Section 1.0.4.</p>

<p>12</p>	<p>Please confirm the page for 1.4 Proposer's Financial Capacity to direct the District to the separately sealed envelope within our Technical Proposal and the back side to the page is not included in the 100- page limit.</p> <p>REFERENCE: 1.0.4 on page 2 of 20 of Attachment No. 4 and 1.4 on page 9 of 20 of Attachment No. 4</p>	<p>Please see the Response to Numbers 5 and 6 above. With regard to the page count requirements all Proposers are reminded to comply with the provisions of Attachment 4, Section 1.0.4.</p>
<p>13</p>	<p>Now that there are eleven (11) required elements of the Program Management Plan, can you please confirm the scoring of the technical approach to meet the 300 points?</p> <p>REFERENCE: 2.1.2.1 on page 16 of 20 of Attachment No. 4</p>	<p>As thoroughly described in Attachment 2 and Attachment 4 each PMP will be evaluated in whole, based on the overall strength of the proposer's narrative response and technical approach. Individual items/sections of the PMP will not be broken out or weighted within the overall maximum possible points available for the strength of each proposer's complete PMP.</p>
<p>14</p>	<p>Are we allowed to bring an interactive PowerPoint or some form of technology/visual for the 15-minute opening presentation and 10-minute closing statement in addition to the 11x17 single-sided placemat for the interview?</p> <p>REFERENCE: 3.0.2 on page 17 of 20 of Attachment No. 4</p>	<p>No, proposers will be required to carefully review and meet the express requirements set forth in Attachment 4, Section 3.0.2(a), pg. 17.</p>

Please be reminded: UNAUTHORIZED COMMUNICATIONS

Proposers shall not, prior to Award, contact or communicate, either verbally or in writing, with any of the following persons (other than the person named above) for the purpose of discussing the requirements of the RFP Documents or the RFP process: (1) any trustee, officer, employee, or representative of the District; or (2) any consultant, or employee of a consultant, providing the District with assistance, advice, or professional services relating to the matters covered by the RFP Documents or who is involved in any aspect of the RFP evaluation or scoring processes. Unauthorized communication by a Proposer in violation of the foregoing may result in disqualification.

CONTACT FOR ALL COMMUNICATIONS IS:

Ms. Dorothea Mc Farline
District Procurement Manager
mcfarld@laccd.edu