

# Request for Proposal

## **CRITERIA ARCHITECT SERVICES**

---

**LOS ANGELES MASTER PLAN**

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA**

**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

**The Judicial Council of California seeks Proposals from qualified firms to provide professional services for a long-range strategic plan for improving and modernizing superior court facilities of Los Angeles County.**



**JUDICIAL COUNCIL  
OF CALIFORNIA**

---

**Facilities Services  
Capital Outlay Program**



# JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688

Telephone 415-865-4200 • Fax 415-865-4205 • TDD 415-865-4272

## REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

<b>Date</b> September 30, 2021	<b>Action Requested</b> Send To: Temporarily via email as described in item 5 of RFP Schedule of Events: Judicial Council of California, BAP Attn: Sheryl Berry 455 Golden Gate Avenue, 6 <sup>th</sup> Floor San Francisco, CA 94102
<b>To</b> Architectural/Planning Firms	
<b>From</b> Judicial Council of California, Facilities Services	
<b>Subject</b> RFP number: RFP-FS-2021-13-AL Criteria Architect Services-Los Angeles Master Plan	<b>Deadline</b> Friday, November 12, 2021 by 5:00 PM Pacific Time <b>Contact</b> <a href="mailto:solicitations@jud.ca.gov">solicitations@jud.ca.gov</a>

RFP SCHEDULE OF EVENTS (Subject to change at the Judicial Council's discretion)		DATES / TIMES, Pacific Time
1	Branch Accounting & Procurement to advertise RFP.	Thursday, September 30, 2021
2	Pre-proposal meeting via video meeting platform Microsoft Teams: <b>Join on your computer or mobile app</b> <a href="#">Click here to join the meeting</a> <b>Join with a video conferencing device</b> <a href="mailto:178332609@teams.bjn.vc">178332609@teams.bjn.vc</a> Video Conference ID: 113 101 822 6 <a href="#">Alternate VTC instructions</a> <b>Or call in (audio only)</b> <a href="tel:+14159060569687503834">+1 415-906-0569,687503834#</a> United States, San Francisco Phone Conference ID: 687 503 834# Host/Moderator – Alice Lee / Srini Rao	Thursday, October 14, 2021 at 10:30 AM
3	Deadline for submittal of Firm's requests for clarifications or questions regarding the RFP. Send to: <a href="mailto:Solicitations@jud.ca.gov">Solicitations@jud.ca.gov</a> . Refer to Attachment 10.	Thursday, October 21, 2021 by 5:00 PM
4	Modifications and/or responses to questions posted on the Judicial Council website: <a href="http://www.courts.ca.gov/rfps.htm">http://www.courts.ca.gov/rfps.htm</a>	Thursday, October 28, 2021
5	<b>Submittal Deadline for Proposals</b> Email Statement of Qualifications to: <a href="mailto:fs202113al.soq@jud.ca.gov">fs202113al.soq@jud.ca.gov</a> Email Cost Proposal to: <a href="mailto:fs202113al.fee@jud.ca.gov">fs202113al.fee@jud.ca.gov</a>	Friday, November 12, 2021 by 5:00 PM
6	Notification of Interviews date and time – Interviews will be held remotely via a collaboration meeting platform (i.e., Web-ex, Teams, etc.). Notifications will be made via email ( <i>estimate only</i> )	Monday, November 22, 2021
7	Interviews of Firms - Times to be determined ( <i>estimate only</i> )	Week of December 3, 2021
8	Notice of Intent to Award ( <i>estimate only</i> )	Monday, December 13, 2021
9	Execute Agreement ( <i>estimate only</i> )	Monday, January 24, 2022
10	Contract start date ( <i>estimate only</i> )	Tuesday, January 25, 2022

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**1. INTRODUCTION..... 1**  
**2. LABOR COMPLIANCE..... 2**  
**3. PROJECT INFORMATION ..... 2**  
**4. RESPONDING TO THE RFP ..... 4**  
**5. STANDARD AGREEMENT AND SCOPE OF SERVICES..... 7**  
**6. EVALUATION AND SELECTION PROCESS ..... 8**  
**7. ADMINISTRATIVE RULES GOVERNING RFPs ..... 10**  
**8. PROTESTS..... 10**

**ATTACHMENT 1, Administrative Rules Governing RFPs (Non-IT Services)**

**ATTACHMENT 2, Standard Agreement (for Criteria Architect Services)**

**ATTACHMENT 3, Fee Proposal – Consultant Personnel Billing Rates**

**ATTACHMENT 4, Proposer’s Acceptance of Terms and Conditions**

**ATTACHMENT 5, General Certifications Form**

**ATTACHMENT 6, Darfur Certification Form**

**ATTACHMENT 7, Standard Form 330**

**ATTACHMENT 8A, Payee Data Record Form**

**ATTACHMENT 8B, Payee Data Record Supplement**

**ATTACHMENT 9, DVBE Participation Form**

**ATTACHMENT 10, Form for Submission of Questions**

**ATTACHMENT 11, Iran Contracting Certification [for solicitations of \$1,000,000 or more]**

**ATTACHMENT 12, Unruh Civil Rights Act and California Fair Employment and Housing Act Certification  
[for solicitations of \$100,000 or more]**

**EXHIBIT A, Districts Map**

**EXHIBIT B, 2019 Prioritization for Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects**

## 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. **Introduction.** The Judicial Council of California (“Judicial Council”), chaired by the Chief Justice of California, is the primary policy making body of the California judicial system. The Judicial Council is responsible for the planning, design, and construction of court facilities for the Superior and Appellate Courts of California (“Capital Outlay Program”).
- 1.2. **Purpose of Request for Proposal.** The Judicial Council, through this Request for Proposal (“RFP”) is soliciting Proposals from Firms (“Firm(s)”) to provide Criteria Architect services necessary to develop a long-range strategic plan for improving and modernizing superior court facilities of Los Angeles County (“Project”). The responsible party shall be an architect licensed to practice in California, a registered professional engineer to practice in California, or a Certified Planner. Firm team shall comprise of all disciplines necessary to effectively perform the required services. The selected team shall be experienced with designs of similar size, complexity, and nature.
- 1.3. **Background Information.** The Superior Court of Los Angeles County occupies forty-three (43) buildings with approximately 8 million square feet of facilities spread across thirty (30) cities. Based on the 2020 Judicial Needs Assessment, the superior court does not have a need for additional judgeships at this time. However, many of the facilities are at or nearing the end of useful life. Additionally, there is a need for balancing supply with demand of case types by district.

The superior court is divided into twelve (12) geographic districts: Central, East, West, North, North Central, North Valley, Northeast, Northwest, South, South Central, South East, and Southwest (see the districts map included as Exhibit A). The court uses a decentralized model for service, with full-service operations in each district. With the exception of the Juvenile Dependency and Delinquency, Probate, and Mental Health courts—whose service area is not limited to any particular district—all caseload types are processed in each district. Caseload originating within each district is assigned to one or more courthouses in the district. Each district should have the capacity to address the caseload that originates in that district. The court’s main administrative functions are headquartered at the Stanley Mosk Courthouse (the largest of all courthouses) in the Central District in downtown Los Angeles, the county seat.

- 1.3.1. The *2019 Prioritization for Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects* (included as Exhibit B) identified 17 capital-outlay projects for the superior court, 11 of which are in the Immediate or Critical Need groups. These projects were developed using a detailed and systematic analysis of the following criteria:
  - 1.3.1.1 The general physical condition of the building;
  - 1.3.1.2 Needed improvement to the physical condition of buildings to alleviate the totality of risks associated with seismic conditions, fire and life safety conditions, Americans with Disabilities Act requirements, and environmental hazards;
  - 1.3.1.3 Court security features within buildings;
  - 1.3.1.4 Access to court services;
  - 1.3.1.5 Overcrowding; and
  - 1.3.1.6 Projects that replace or renovate courtrooms in court buildings where there is a risk to court users due to potential catastrophic events.
- 1.3.2. The combined estimated cost of the 17 courthouse projects identified for the superior court from the reassessment is over \$6.0 billion. The two largest courthouses in California include the Stanley Mosk Courthouse which needs replacement and the Clara Shortridge Foltz Courthouse which needs renovation.

The prioritization report has identified the following operational priorities:

- 1.3.2.1 Ensure parity of access among districts;
- 1.3.2.2 Improve facilities;
- 1.3.2.3 Re-allocate centralized civil/small claims caseload outward;
- 1.3.2.4 Establish a regional approach to juvenile delinquency and dependency;
- 1.3.2.5 Employ a multipurpose neighborhood courthouse model; and
- 1.3.2.6 Construct a new centralized mental health facility.

## 2. LABOR COMPLIANCE

- 2.1. **Prevailing Wage.** The Criteria Architect and all Subconsultants under the Criteria Architect shall pay all workers on Work performed pursuant to this Agreement not less than the general prevailing rate of per diem wages and the general prevailing rate for holiday and overtime work as determined by the Director of the Department of Industrial Relations, State of California, for the type of work performed and the locality in which the work is to be performed, pursuant to sections 1770 et seq. of the California Labor Code. Copies of the general prevailing rates of per diem wages for each craft, classification, or type of worker needed to execute the Agreement, as determined by Director of the State of California Department of Industrial Relations, are on file at the Court’s principal office. Prevailing wage rates are also available from the Court or on the internet at <http://www.dir.ca.gov>.
- 2.2. **Prevailing Wage Compliance Monitoring.** The Project is subject to compliance monitoring and enforcement by the Department of Industrial Relations. Criteria Architect shall post job site notices, as prescribed by regulation. Contractor shall comply with all requirements of Labor Code section 1771.4, except the requirements that are exempted by the Labor Commissioner for the Project.
- 2.3. **Contractor Registration.** Criteria Architect shall comply with the registration and compliance monitoring provisions of Labor Code section 1771.4, including furnishing its certified payroll records (“CPR(s)”) to the Labor Commissioner of California and complying with any applicable enforcement by the Department of Industrial Relations (“DIR”). Labor Code section 1771.1(a) states the following:

“A contractor or subcontractor shall not be qualified to bid on, be listed in a bid proposal, subject to the requirements of Section 4104 of the Public Contract Code or engage in the performance of any contract for public work, as defined in this chapter, unless currently registered and qualified to perform public work pursuant to Section 1725.5. It is not a violation of this section for an unregistered contractor to submit a bid that is authorized by Section 7029.1 of the Business and Professions Code or by Section 10164 or 20103.5 of the Public Contract Code, provided the contractor is registered to perform public work pursuant to Section 1725.5 at the time the contract is awarded.”

## 3. PROJECT INFORMATION

- 3.1. **Project Description.** Consistent with the operational priorities of the prioritization report, the Los Angeles Master Plan will reconfirm the need to replace existing courtrooms in the facilities affected by the capital-outlay projects identified in the report and for consolidation of caseload based on service demand. Its main focus will be on the following two major projects located in the downtown Los Angeles area and their impact on the development of the projects that precede them: the New Downtown Los Angeles Courthouse (replaces the Stanley Mosk Courthouse through possible funding in FY 2028–29); and the Foltz Courthouse Renovation (renovates the Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center through possible funding in FY 2035–36).

As the Mosk and Foltz courthouses are integrated with the county's infrastructure, county representatives should be engaged during the development of the master plan.

The study should include the phased demolition of the Mosk Courthouse to confirm that the building can be operational at half capacity while the replacement courthouse is being built on the demolished portion of the site. The sizes of the projects that precede the phased demolition of the Mosk Courthouse will be sized for an appropriate number of courtrooms to be reduced from the Mosk Courthouse. Consultant should focus on the strategies that could help expedite the Mosk Courthouse replacement and preceding projects for the Mosk Courthouse.

For the Foltz courthouse, the study should include how many courtrooms can be removed from operation during the renovation and the final number of courtrooms after renovation.

For ease of reference, a summary of the prioritization report strategy for capital-outlay projects is provided as follows:

- 3.1.1. Two new *Immediate Need* projects (56 New Courtrooms (CRs):
  - 3.1.1.1 New Santa Clarita Courthouse (24 CRs) – possible funding in FY 2023–24 and provides partial replacement of courtrooms in the Mosk Courthouse.
  - 3.1.1.2 New West Los Angeles Courthouse (32 CRs) – possible funding in FY 2024–25 and provides partial replacement of courtrooms in the Mosk Courthouse.
- 3.1.2. Four new *Critical Need* projects (139 New CRs):
  - 3.1.2.1 New Inglewood Courthouse (30 CRs) – possible funding in FY 2026–27 and provides partial replacement of courtrooms in the Mosk Courthouse.
  - 3.1.2.2 New Van Nuys Courthouse: New East Courthouse and Renovation of West Courthouse (55 CRs (increased from 44)) – possible funding in FY 2024–25 and provides partial replacement of courtrooms in the Mosk Courthouse.
  - 3.1.2.3 New Downtown Los Angeles Courthouse (Mosk Replacement) (47 CRs) possible funding in FY 2029–30.
  - 3.1.2.4 Chatsworth Courthouse Renovation (includes 7 CRs build out) –possible funding in FY 2031–32 and provides partial replacement of courtrooms in the Mosk Courthouse.
- 3.1.3. The following 11 Critical and Medium Need projects are beyond a 10-year funding horizon and are only provided for information, and do not need to be a focus of the study with the exception of existing Los Angeles Metropolitan Courthouse Renovation and existing Foltz Courthouse Renovation:
  - 3.1.3.1 New West Covina Courthouse (15 CRs)
  - 3.1.3.2 New Eastlake Courthouse (6 CRs)
  - 3.1.3.3 Existing Los Angeles Metropolitan Courthouse Renovation (Existing 14 CRs)
  - 3.1.3.4 New North Central Courthouse (12 CRs)
  - 3.1.3.5 Existing Foltz Courthouse Renovation (Renovation of the existing Courthouse) (60 CRs)
  - 3.1.3.6 New Pasadena Courthouse (17 CRs)
  - 3.1.3.7 Edelman Courthouse Renovation (6 CRs)
  - 3.1.3.8 New Los Angeles Mental Health Courthouse (4 CRs)
  - 3.1.3.9 New Lancaster Dependency Courthouse (6 CRs)

3.1.3.10 New Torrance Dependency Courthouse and Traffic Annex (7 CRs)

3.1.3.11 Compton Courthouse Renovation (31 CRs)

The master plan will be developed using the phases and milestones identified below in section 3.0 Timeline for Services.

3.2. **Project Schedule.** The duration to develop the master plan will be fifteen (15) months to focus on the following:

3.2.1. Provide the strategy and phasing for the Stanley Mosk Courthouse;

3.2.2. Provide the strategy and phasing for the Foltz Courthouse;

3.2.3. Describe the impact of the caseload shifting from the aforementioned projects to the projects that precede them;

3.2.4. Focus on the cost of projects; and

3.2.5. Narrow the geographic location of the sites for New Santa Clarita Courthouse and New West Los Angeles Courthouse projects.

Consultant should anticipate meeting every three weeks for the duration of the study and include at least three presentations to the executive team. Consultant is also encouraged to recommend optional schedule be completed in 12 months.

3.3. **Project Milestones**

<b>Estimated Overall Schedule</b>	<b>Completion Milestone</b>
Procurement of <b>Criteria Architect</b>	August 2021- September 2021
Contract Execution	October 2021
NTP	November 1, 2021
Work completion	November 1, <b>2022</b>
Time for additional revisions and approval	January 31, 2023
Final publication of the report	February 1, 2023
New Santa Clarita Courthouse funding	July 1, 2023

#### 4. RESPONDING TO THE RFP

4.1 **Pre-Proposal Actions and Events.** All Firms interested in submitting a Proposal are requested to attend a pre-proposal meeting at the date and time indicated in the RFP Schedule of Events on page 2. Attendance at the pre-proposal meeting is not mandatory to submit a Proposal.

\*The pre-proposal meeting cannot be used as a substitute for written questions. Questions must be submitted in writing per the RFP Schedule of Events. Any verbal responses provided during the pre-proposal meeting will not be considered binding.

4.2 **Questions.** Firms may submit requests for clarifications or questions to the Judicial Council via e-mail to [Solicitations@jud.ca.gov](mailto:Solicitations@jud.ca.gov) no later than the date specified in the RFP Schedule of Events. Please indicate the RFP number and title in the subject line. Contact with the Judicial Council shall be made only through email; telephone calls will not be accepted.

**4.3 Errors in the RFP.** If Firm(s) discovers any ambiguity, conflict, discrepancy, omission, or other error in this RFP, Firm(s) shall provide the Judicial Council with written notice at least two (2) full Judicial Council business days' before the due date for Proposals, and request that the RFP be clarified or modified. Without disclosing the source of the request, the Judicial Council may modify the RFP prior to the date fixed for submission of Proposals by issuing an addendum.

4.3.1 If prior to the date fixed for submission of Proposals Firm(s) knows of or should have known of an error in the RFP, and fails to notify the Judicial Council of the error, Firm(s) shall submit its Proposal at its own risk, and if Firm(s) is awarded the contract, it shall not be entitled to additional compensation or time by reason of the error or its later correction.

#### **4.4 Submitting Proposals.**

4.4.1 **Offer Period.** All submitted Proposals shall constitute and be an irrevocable offer by the Consultant that is valid for ninety (90) days following the Proposal due date. In the event a final contract has not been awarded within this ninety (90) day period, the Judicial Council reserves the right to negotiate extensions to this period with Proposers. The Judicial Council may release all offers not selected under this RFP upon award and execution of the Agreement.

4.4.2 **Proposal Elements.** Responsive proposals shall consist of all the following items:

4.4.2.1 Firms Statement of Qualifications (SOQ) as outlined in section 4.4.3, including the following attachments:

- Proposer's Acceptance of Terms and Conditions, Attachment 4
- General Certifications Form, Attachment 5
- Darfur Contracting Act Certification, Attachment 6
- Standard Form 330, Attachment 7
- Payee Data Record Form, Attachment 8A
- Payee Data Record Supplement, Attachment 8B
- Iran Contracting Act Certification, Attachment 11
- Unruh Civil Rights Act and California Fair Employment and Housing Act Certification, Attachment 12

4.4.2.2 Fee Proposal, Consultant Personnel Billing Rates, Attachment 3

4.4.3 **Statement of Qualifications (SOQ).** Each Firm shall provide the following in its written Statement of Qualifications:

4.4.3.1 **Letter of Interest.** A dated Letter of Interest must be submitted, including the legal name of the Firm, address, telephone and fax numbers, and the name, title, and signature of the person(s) authorized to submit the Proposal on behalf of the Firm

4.4.3.2 **Table of Contents.** A table of contents of the material contained in the RFP shall follow the Letter of Interest.

4.4.3.3 **Executive Summary.** The executive summary should contain an outline of Firm's approach to defining performance criteria and verifying compliance with the criteria requirements, along with a brief summary of Firm's qualifications and experience.

4.4.3.4 **Licensure.** Provide documentation demonstrating that Firm is a currently licensed architect or a registered professional engineer in the State of California. Architects and Civil Engineering



Licensure will be verified by accessing California Department of Consumer Affairs at: <https://search.dca.ca.gov>.

- 4.4.3.5 **Public Works Contractor Registration Number.** Provide the Firm's contractor registration number issued by the California Department of Industrial Relations. Contractor registration numbers will be verified by accessing California Department of Industrial Relations at: <https://cadir.secure.force.com/ContractorSearch>.
- 4.4.3.6 **Criteria Design Experience within the Team.** Provide specific experience of the proposed team including any subconsultants and its key individuals in the criteria development of high quality courthouse buildings or other similar complex public/institutional buildings of similar size, complexity, and cost, during the past ten years, as evidenced by awards from third party organizations for completed projects; teams with long-term experience together; documented and proven successful design solutions, etc.
- 4.4.3.7 **Planning and Programming Expertise.** Provide specific experience of the proposed criteria architect and/or planner in preparing architectural programs for individual public/institutional projects of similar size and complexity. Prospective Consultant's record and systems for providing and maintaining high quality consulting services programming documents to its clients, including any specialized documentation of successes in preparation of scope, cost, and time parameters for completed projects, etc.
- 4.4.3.8 **Key Personnel/Team.** Outline the experience, expertise, and demonstrated knowledge of the key team personnel providing management, programming, planning, and design review services throughout the phases of the project. Provide comment on the ability of the firm to provide the resources required to respond in a timely manner and/or provide services remotely or in the geographical location of the project given the firm's proposed resources, offices, and teams.
- 4.4.3.9 **Technical Expertise.** Illustrate the experience and expertise of the proposed team to deliver specialized services such as design and compliance review specific to aspects of institutional buildings, including, but not necessarily limited to, building Mechanical/Electrical/Plumbing (MEP) systems, structural engineering design, interior design including FF&E coordination, site design, and LEED TM standards, and/or Fire & Life Safety systems as evidenced by documentation of completed projects which accomplished specific technical goals, or otherwise unique and particular mechanical, electrical, structural and other systems, etc.
- 4.4.3.10 **Management Approach.** Describe Firm's philosophy and how Firm intends to work with the Judicial Council's administration officials including Project Managers and Court staff, to perform the Services. Provide a clear, articulated narrative addressing the division of work, coordination within the consultant team and with the selected DBE, performance of design reviews, performance of code and exiting reviews, quality control, and adherence to required timelines.
- 4.4.3.11 **Claims.** Provide a statement of ALL claim(s) filed against Firm in the past five (5) years. Briefly indicate the nature of the claim and the resolution, if any, of the claim(s). Such listing shall not include any claims that are strictly personnel claims.
- 4.4.3.12 **References.** Include a list of references with contact information (email and phone number). Firms should limit references to no more than five (5). Firms shall not submit individuals working for the Judicial Council as references.
- 4.4.4 **Format of Proposals.** Firms shall compile the elements of the proposal as follows:

4.4.1.1 The Firm(s)'s written SOQ in pdf format. The SOQ must be digitally signed by an authorized representative of the company. The proposing Firm must include the RFP number and "SOQ" in the name of the electronic file.

4.4.1.2 The Firm(s)'s Fee Proposal, Attachment 3, Consultant Personnel Billing Rates in pdf format. The Fee Proposal must be digitally signed by an authorized representative of the company. The proposing Firm must include the RFP number and "Fee Proposal" in the name of the electronic file.

The Fee Proposal shall not be combined or incorporated in any way with the SOQ.

4.4.5 **Method of Submission.** Due to the current COVID-19 crisis, the Judicial Council will temporarily accept proposals in an electronic format. Firms must submit proposals in two separate files: (1) the SOQ and accompanying administrative documents and required attachments; and (2) the Fee Proposal (Attachment 3, Consultant Personnel Billing Rates). These files shall be emailed to separate email addresses as outlined in the RFP Schedule of Events to ensure separation throughout the submission and evaluation process.

Only electronic proposals will be accepted.

4.4.5.1 For electronic submission of proposals, email your proposal no more than three (3) days in advance of the due date to the designated email addresses. A confirmation that a proposal has been received will be provided.

4.4.6 **Submission Timeliness.** Firm(s) assume all risk for ensuring receipt no later than the date and time specified in the RFP Schedule of Events. Late proposals will not be accepted.

## 5. STANDARD AGREEMENT AND SCOPE OF SERVICES

5.1 **Agreement.** Attached hereto as Attachment 2 is the Judicial Council's Standard Agreement for Criteria Architect Services, including the indemnification provision that the Judicial Council will include in that Agreement. The Judicial Council reserves the right to modify or update the Agreement at any time until an award and execution of the Agreement with the successful Firm.

By submitting its Proposal, the Firm(s) acknowledges that it has no objection to the form of Agreement unless exceptions are identified. In such instances, the proposer must submit (i) red-lined version of the Terms and Conditions that implements all proposed changes; (ii) a written explanation or rationale for each exception and/or proposed change.

5.2 **Services.** In general, the services that shall be required by the Criteria Architect include strategy and phasing for the Stanley Mosk Courthouse; strategy and phasing for the Foltz Courthouse; describe the impact of the caseload shifting from the aforementioned projects to the projects that precede them; focus on the cost of projects; and narrow the geographic location of the sites for New Santa Clarita Courthouse and New West Los Angeles Courthouse projects.

5.3 **Scope of Services.** The detailed scope of services, tasks, and work ("Services") that the selected Firm will be required to perform are set forth in Exhibit B to the Standard Agreement. Firm must be technically and financially capable of providing all the Services identified for the Project. Firm shall be the Judicial Council's representative and shall work under the direction of a Judicial Council Project Manager.

5.4 **Extra Services.** Note that the rates for Extra Services will be good for three years and update every two years thereafter based on Bureau of Labor Statistics CPI for Urban Wage Earners and Clerical Workers (CPI-W).

**5.5 DVBE.** The Judicial Council has a contract participation goal of a minimum of three percent (3%) for disabled veteran business enterprises (DVBEs). Information about DVBE resources can be found on the Department of General Services’ website at <http://www.dgs.ca.gov>, or by emailing [OSDSHelp@dgs.ca.gov](mailto:OSDSHelp@dgs.ca.gov) or calling the Office of Small Business and DVBE Services at 916-375-4940. Please note that DVBE documentation is not required to be submitted with the Proposal but is to be submitted only by the Firm selected for Services.

**6. EVALUATION AND SELECTION PROCESS**

**6.1 Evaluation Process.** The basis for selection of a Firm to provide Services in response to this RFP consists of a two-step evaluation. Step 1 – Qualifications, is an evaluation of the firm’s qualifications based on the firm’s written SOQ and interview. Step 1 scores will be finalized prior to commencement of Step 2 - Fee Proposal evaluation. Step 2 - Fee Proposal evaluation, is the scoring of the Firm’s Attachment 3, Consultant Personnel Billing Rates. Step 1 and Step 2 scores will be added together to establish the Firm’s total score.

The Firms will then be ranked in numerical order from the most points to least points received. The Firm receiving the highest combined total score will be ranked the number one Firm. In the event of ties within the ranking list, the Firm with the higher Step 1 score will be advanced one place holding in the ranking list. The Judicial Council reserves the right to reject any Firm’s Proposal due to non-responsiveness to the selection criteria or that fails to demonstrate the Firm has qualifications and expertise delivering projects of similar size, complexity and nature.

**6.2 Step 1a – Evaluation of Qualifications.** The Judicial Council will evaluate Proposals and award points within the individual categories below. After evaluating and scoring qualification Proposals, interviews will be held which may result in adjustment of points awarded to specific categories of the Proposal.

WEIGHT	QUALIFICATIONS TO BE EVALUATED
15 points	<p><b>Criteria Design Experience Within Team</b>  The Judicial Council will evaluate the organization of the team and the ability of the Firm and any subconsultants to develop, compile, and evaluate compliance with the performance criteria for the project.</p>
15 points	<p><b>Planning &amp; Programming Expertise</b>  The Judicial Council will evaluate the planning and architectural programming expertise within the Firm and any subconsultants, and the ability of the team to develop the architectural program working in conjunction with the Court.</p>
15 points	<p><b>Key Personnel</b>  The Judicial Council will evaluate the expertise and demonstrated knowledge of the prospective Firm’s key team personnel to provide management, programming, planning, and design review services, as well as the ability to provide all the requisite resources needed.</p>
15 points	<p><b>Technical Expertise of the Team</b>  The Judicial Council will evaluate the technical expertise of the proposed Firm and its subconsultants providing specialty reviews, technical or engineering services such as those needed for site investigations or code evaluations, and design reviews. Technical expertise shall be evidenced by a list of supporting consultants who will be utilized on the proposed project.</p>

WEIGHT	QUALIFICATIONS TO BE EVALUATED
15 points	<p><b>Management Approach</b>  The Judicial Council will evaluate the Team’s approach to providing services, strategy to manage compliance, and the commitment to adhere to required timelines.</p>
N/A	<p><b>Interview</b>  The Judicial Council shall award no points directly for interview performance; however, the interview process will be used to confirm the Firm’s qualifications and the Judicial Council may adjust the points afforded to the Firm in the above categories as a result of the interview.</p>
N/A	<p><b>References.</b> The Judicial Council may contact any reference listed by a Firm to verify the experience and performance of the Firm, key personnel, and subconsultants. The Judicial Council shall award no points directly for reference responses; however, the reference process will be used to confirm the Firm’s qualifications and the Judicial Council may adjust the points afforded to the Firm in the above categories as a result of reference input.</p>

**6.3 Step 1b - Qualifications Interview:**

- 6.3.1 Each Firm shall prepare a presentation of no more than 45 minutes that communicates the Firm’s and key personnel’s qualifications and relevant experience in criteria development, programming, and design review of projects of similar size, complexity, and nature. The presentation will be followed by a question and answer session of approximately twenty (20) minutes. The interview panel will consist of three to five (5) persons.
- 6.3.2 The Firm’s presentation shall demonstrate its communication skills and explain how the individual team members will interact with the Judicial Council, the local court, and other stakeholders on the Project and reinforce the areas being scored.
- 6.3.3 Firms will be notified of their interview date, time, and location per the RFP Schedule of Events.
- 6.3.4 After all interviews are complete, and references have been checked, qualification scores will be tallied to identify the points awarded for each Firm in Step 1a.

**6.4 Step 2 - Evaluation of the Fee Proposals:**

- 6.4.1 A maximum of 25 points will be awarded for the fee proposal.
- 6.4.2 The basis of the evaluation and subsequent award of points for the Fee Proposal shall be the blended hourly rate of the key personnel positions listed. The blended hourly rate will be determined by multiplying the proposed hourly rate for each position by the designated weight factor, then adding all the weighted rates to determine the blended hourly rate.
- 6.4.3 The firm’s hourly rates shall include, without limitation, all costs for overhead, personnel, administration, profit, costs for travel, per diem expenses, and all deliverables, printing, and shipping, under the Agreement. The submitted rates will be held in confidence until such time as a contract is executed.

6.4.4 The fee proposal points awarded for each firm will be calculated by identifying the amount of the lowest fee proposal submitted divided by the amount of the fee proposal being evaluated and multiplying that ratio by the maximum number of points that can be awarded.

**6.5 Determining Total Score.** The scores determined in Step 1 and Step 2 of the Proposal evaluations shall be added to determine the total score for each Firm. The maximum combined Qualification and Fee Proposal score (Total Score) is 100 points. The Firm will be selected on a “highest scored bid” basis in accordance with the Judicial Branch Contracting Manual, Chapter 4B which can be accessed at: <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jbcl-manual.pdf>.

**6.6 Preclusion.** A Firm and any subconsultants selected as the Criteria Architect on this Project are precluded from being the architect or subconsultant, architect of record, or member of the Design-Build Entity or its team on future Projects that were analyzed as part of this study. Successful Firm(s) will not be precluded from consideration nor given special status in any future Judicial Council solicitations. Successful Firm(s) on a specific Project may still propose to be a consultant on a different Project.

**6.7 Selection of Firm and Calculation of Fixed Fee.** After determining the total score for all Firms, the Judicial Council will identify the highest ranked Firm. The Judicial Council will commence negotiations with the highest ranked Firm regarding the necessary hours and personnel for each phase of the Project and may also address any identified variances in the Terms and Conditions. The negotiation period is anticipated to be 30 calendar days. Once the necessary hours and personnel for each phase of the Project are agreed upon, the parties shall apply the hourly rates set forth in that Firm’s Fee Proposal to the agreed upon hours and personnel. This method shall be used to calculate the fixed fee amount for each phase of the Project.

If a satisfactory contractual agreement on services and compensation cannot be reached between the Judicial Council and a selected Contractor within 30 calendar days of notification of selection, the Judicial Council reserves the right to terminate negotiations with that Firm and attempt to reach satisfactory contractual agreement with the next qualified Proposer. If the Judicial Council and the second highest ranked Firm are unable to agree upon services and compensation for the Project, the Judicial Council may commence negotiations with the third highest ranked Firm.

## 7. ADMINISTRATIVE RULES GOVERNING RFPs

**7.1** The Judicial Council’s Administrative Rules governing this RFP can be found in Attachment 1. By virtue of submission of a Proposal, the Proposer agrees to be bound by said Administrative Rules.

**7.2** The Judicial Council reserves the right to reject any and all proposals, in whole or in part, as well as the right to issue similar requests for proposals in the future. This RFP is in no way an agreement, obligation, or contract and in no way is the Judicial Council or the State of California responsible for the cost of preparation or any expenses incurred in responding to this RFP. One copy of a submitted proposal will be retained for official files and will become a public record.

## 8. PROTESTS

**8.1** Protests will be handled in accordance with Chapter 7 of the Judicial Branch Contracting Manual (see <http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jbcl-manual.pdf>). Failure of a Proposer to comply with the protest procedures set forth in Chapter 7 will result in rejection of the protest. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Judicial Council will accept electronically submitted protests as an accommodation in response to the Covid-19 pandemic. The deadline for a Proposer to submit a protest challenging this RFP, including any attachments, or portions thereof, is two days before the proposal due date. Protests must be sent electronically to: [Solicitations@jud.ca.gov](mailto:Solicitations@jud.ca.gov).