

CEQA Consulting Services — RFP #REFM-2016-04-JP
Form for Vendor Submission of Questions

Q #	Questions	RFQ Reference (Document & Page-Section-Item)	Answers
1	Description of services (Section 2) and Table 3 provide different numbering of tasks. Task 4 in Table 3 does not appear to be included in the Section 2 list. Please clarify whether services for Task 4 are required.	RFQ page 3, Section 2 and page 5, Table 3	RFQ has been revised and reposted on the Bidder/Solicitation site.
2	What type of facility projects are expected to require CEQA and related services?	RFQ page 3, Section 2	Historic building studies for compliance with Public Resources Code 5024, analyses for compliance with San Joaquin Valley APCD's Rule 9510, supplements to previously completed traffic studies, and CEQA documents for alternate/contingency courthouse sites
3	What type of studies are anticipated to require peer review?	RFQ page 6, Table 3, Task 7	EC&S hasn't employed any peer reviews, but potential peer review efforts may include reviews of historic building studies for compliance with Public Resources Code 5024 and reviews of submitted biological mitigation proposals
4	Are requested quality control measures to be specified on each project sheet or can one process be described that applies to all projects? How would a separate statement need to comply with page limits?	RFQ page 6, Section 7.2 Prior Projects	For each project, submitters may include a description of the process or processes used for each project. Submitters may also describe the process or processes used for all projects and describe the application of the process or processes to one project as an example.

**CEQA Consulting Services — RFP #REFM-2016-04-JP
Form for Vendor Submission of Questions**

Q #	Questions	RFQ Reference (Document & Page-Section-Item)	Answers
5	Each description of a prior project should be placed on a separate sheet. Is that one single-sided page or can it be double-sided?	RFQ page 6, Section 7.2 Prior Projects	Single Sided
6	Do projects need to be completed in order to qualify for consideration or can they be in-progress?	RFQ page 6, Section 7.2 Prior Projects	Descriptions of in-progress projects is acceptable.
7	Is it sufficient to provide years only for the dates of work?	RFQ page 6, Section 7.2 Prior Projects	Providing only years is acceptable for large projects, but expressing the duration of work in months is better for non-large projects.
8	Clarify the request for “regional services as indicated by resources and staffing.” Is the RFQ asking for staffing levels provided at each regional location?	RFQ page 6, Section 7.3 Regional Scope	EC&S is interested in firms’ ability to provide services throughout regions of the State or a firm’s limitation to only a portion of California. Useful data will include descriptions of a firm’s office locations in California, staffing numbers per office location, and examples of projects that show a state-wide capability or a regional-focused capability.
9	Should CD of price proposal be placed within sealed envelope or be provided outside of sealed envelope along with proposal submittal parts I and II?	RFQ page 8, Section 9.4	Place the CD within the sealed envelope

**CEQA Consulting Services — RFP #REFM-2016-04-JP
Form for Vendor Submission of Questions**

Q #	Questions	RFQ Reference (Document & Page-Section-Item)	Answers
10	What proposal content will be used to assess staff capacity?	RFQ page 9, Table 4 criteria 5	Data showing completion of multiple projects, the associated time schedule for the projects, and descriptions of any confounding schedule details for the projects will be useful.
11	Is the minimum \$5 million Commercial General Liability insurance mandatory? This level of insurance seems more appropriate for construction projects and is, in fact, very unusual for CEQA and environmental study. Firms that do not offer construction management services may not be able to meet this requirement.	Attachment 1. Section 17(B)(i) "Commercial General Liability" (pdf page 12).	Commercial General Liability insurance is mandatory. Although it's been approved to accept \$1M per occurrence and \$2M annual aggregate coverage.
12	The RFQ indicates that "payment is normally made based on completion of tasks" and the Judicial Council "may withhold ten percent of each invoice until receipt and acceptance of the final deliverable." Can we infer that payment will be based on the <i>progress</i> made toward completion of each task on a percent complete basis (rather than full "completion" of a task)?	Attachment 2, page 3. Section 10(B). "THE COURT DOES NOT MAKE ADVANCED PAYMENT FOR SERVICES."	Payment will be processed monthly upon progress completion of tasks.
13			
14			