

ANSWERS TO SUBMITTED QUESTIONS

Q #	Questions	RFP Reference (Document & Page-Section-Item)	Answers
1	At this time, is an estimated project cost/budget available?	[none provided]	Please refer to the RFP for all available information.
2	There are two varying deadlines noted in the RFP. The proposal deadline is noted as September 27 by 5 PM on the inside cover and on the same page in the RFP Schedule of Events below it, part 5 lists the due date as October 6 by 5 PM. Can the JCC confirm what the proposal deadline is?	Page 2 of the RFP	The deadline (due date and time) for submitting proposals is Wednesday, October 6, 2021 by 5:00 PM Pacific Time.
3	Page 5 states “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.” For any objections to the form of Agreement. Would it be acceptable to include any exceptions under a separately marked tab within the Statement of Qualifications?	RFP Page 5, item 5.1.1	Yes, explanation or rationale for each exception taken may be included under a separately marked tab within the Statement of Qualifications; however, a red-lined version of the Terms and Conditions must also be included or attached as a separate file. The red-lined version is preferred to be submitted in Microsoft Word format.
4	Page 3 States “4.4.2.1 Firms Statement of Qualifications (SOQ) as outlined in section 4.4.3, including the following attachments.” Would it be acceptable to include these attachments under a separately marked tab within the Statement of Qualifications?	RFP Page 3, item 4.4.2.1	Yes, attachment forms may be included under a separately marked tab within the Statement of Qualifications.
5	Is the Courthouse a registered historic building and if so should we include Historic Consulting Services as part of the fee proposal or has the JCC already retained such services?	3.2 Project Description Page 2 of 9	The courthouse and Annex are listed in the ‘Registered Historic District’. The courthouse and annex are listed in the National Register of Historic Places-U.S. Department of the Interior.
6	Please confirm certified payroll requirements are not required for professional architectural and consulting engineering services, and only typically required if the Architect commissions a survey on the JCCs behalf.	2. Labor Compliance Page 1 of 9	Certified payroll requirements are required for any work performed that is subject to prevailing wage requirements for the type of work performed and the locality in which the work is performed, under the appropriate craft prevailing wage determination(s).
7	Please indicate how many alternate sites should be studied as part of the new building option, and whether the JCC has selected potential sites.	3.2 Project Description Page 2 of 9	The study should look at the size of the building and space needed as stated in the RFP in order to construct in a new location and determine the cost of land based on market values.
8	The table header lists 9/27 as deadline and the table lists 10/6 and submittal due date. Please confirm the submittal due date as either 9/27 or 10/6.	Page 2 of RFP	See answer to Question 2.
9	Please clarify what the deadline of 5 p.m. Sept. 27, 2021, refers to, (which is printed above the table that shows that submittals are due by 5 p.m. Oct. 6, 2021). Also, please confirm what the actual deadline for submittals of the Statement of Qualifications and the Cost Proposal is.	RFP - Page 2 of the pdf document containing the RFP (between the cover and Table of Contents) in the “memo” printed on your letterhead. (No page number printed.)	See answer to Question 2.

ANSWERS TO SUBMITTED QUESTIONS

Q #	Questions	RFP Reference (Document & Page-Section-Item)	Answers
10	Billing rates are to include all expenses, including travel. To determine this, we need to know the following: Is the hourly rate for the entire contract which could extend into monitoring the design/build criteria compliance over an extended timeframe of possibly five years, or is it only applicable to the initial contract from 2021 to completion of the "feasibility analysis" (not site selection) in May 2022 per your schedule?	RFP Page 8 of 9: Section 6.4.3 (page 11 of the pdf)	Refer to the standard agreement Article 7-Payment for Extra Services. The fee quoted should be good for three years along with the extra services clause.
11	If the billing rate is to go beyond May 2022, how do we incorporate adjustment for inflation for an unknown schedule for future phases?	RFP Page 8 of 9: Section 6.4.3 (page 11 of the pdf)	Refer to the standard agreement Article 7-Payment for Extra Services. The fee quoted should be good for three years along with the extra services clause.
12	Where will review meetings be conducted if they are not directed to be virtual? In San Francisco at the Judicial Council offices or in Nevada City to include the local judges?	RFP Page 8 of 9: Section 6.4.3 (page 11 of the pdf) To determine expenses to include in billing rates	There will be 5 in person meetings in Nevada City and 2 in person meetings in Sacramento. There will be 2 in person presentation meetings in San Francisco. All other meetings will be virtual. There will be a reimburseable line item that the firm can bill against with back up receipts and following the State's reimbursable fee schedule.
13	Can we assume the same number of face-to-face review meetings for the phase (or phases) to be required by the Judicial Council, so all teams are burdening their billing rates by the same number of trips to the same place?	RFP Page 8 of 9: Section 6.4.3 (page 11 of the pdf) To determine expenses to include in billing rates	There will be 5 in person meetings in Nevada City and 2 in person meetings in Sacramento. There will be 2 in person presentation meetings in San Francisco. All other meetings will be virtual. There will be a reimburseable line item that the firm can bill against with back up receipts and following the State's reimbursable fee schedule.
14	We do not think that conducting all review meetings and planning workshops by virtual methods is the best way to communicate space planning, design, and complicated economic issues so we would not want to burden our labor rates for attending team members for travel to a location to be determined by the Judicial Council if other teams assume all meeting are virtual and incur no travel costs. We need direction from the Judicial Council.	RFP Page 8 of 9: Section 6.4.3 (page 11 of the pdf) To determine expenses to include in billing rates	There will be 5 in person meetings in Nevada City and 2 in person meetings in Sacramento. There will be 2 in person presentation meetings in San Francisco. All other meetings will be virtual. There will be a reimburseable line item that the firm can bill against with back up receipts and following the State's reimbursable fee schedule.
15	If the labor rates also apply to future phases, we need to define, or exclude, the meetings to select the D/B team and the subsequent review meetings to assure compliance with the design criteria. It cannot be done virtually or only by review of documents.	RFP Page 8 of 9: Section 6.4.3 (page 11 of the pdf) To determine expenses to include in billing rates	There will be 5 in person meetings in Nevada City and 2 in person meetings in Sacramento. There will be 2 in person presentation meetings in San Francisco. All other meetings will be virtual. There will be a reimburseable line item that the firm can bill against with back up receipts and following the State's reimbursable fee schedule.

ANSWERS TO SUBMITTED QUESTIONS

Q #	Questions	RFP Reference (Document & Page-Section-Item)	Answers
16	Is it correct to assume the scope of work, or work plan you want us to submit, is only for the feasibility study and to include a “conceptual” analysis of a new building on a new site and does not include site evaluations or site selection? If this is correct, we would assume a two-level building as you have directed, surface parking, and a relatively level site for purposes of calculating the cost of constructing this option.	RFP Page 5 of 9: Section 4.4.3.10 (page 8 of the pdf)	This is correct.
17	The RFQ identifies a requirement for 80,000 gross square feet in a two-level building for six (6) courts (we assume courtrooms). Is it correct that the space program will include six (6) courtrooms and no further expansion or analysis is required?	RFP Page 2 of 9: Section 3.2 (page 5 of the pdf)	The gross square footage has been vetted by our planning group and will be sufficient for the space requirements for the 6 courtroom building and all associated spaces.
18	Can we assume for purposes of determining the number of specialized Court Planning Consultants we need to include on the team, that the number of judicial positions and Court Clerk, District Attorney, Public Defender, Probation, Court Services, and other support staff that will need to be included in the space program will be identified by the Judicial Council and that the Criteria Architect will not have to project or negotiate the number of support staff required?	RFP Page 2 of 9: Section 3.2 (page 5 of the pdf)	This is correct.
19	We recognize that the space accommodations for Court and support staff are prescribed in the State Court Planning standards which were developed prior to COVID and the new “office of the future” transition of the work environment. For purposes of composing our team, developing a research methodology to develop a space program and the architectural criteria for the new facility, should we assume “business as usual” regarding the office environment, or are we to incorporate adjustments for COVID, working remotely, virtual presentations, for court appearances, testimony, and reduced office and workstation sizes?	RFP Page 8 of 9: Section 6.4.3 (page 11 of the pdf)	The space accommodations will be set and provided to the selected team. Space requirements have been determined by the Judicial Council's planning team.

ANSWERS TO SUBMITTED QUESTIONS

Q #	Questions	RFP Reference (Document & Page-Section-Item)	Answers
20	<p>The RFQ seems to emphasize site evaluation, environmental analysis, traffic, and parking for the new building option and provides very little direction regarding the reuse, remodeling, demolition, replacement or transfer to alternative use of the current “historic” courthouse and/or the modern design annex. Thus, the following follow-up questions whose answers may impact the schedule and sequence of our initial study and thus our team structure and need for special consultants.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the original courthouse of potential historical designation or do we need to be sensitive to community interests and the attendant costs of reuse? 	Attach-2-Standard-Agreement, Exhibit B, Page 1 of 3, Section 2.1 (page 27 of the Word document)	The courthouse and Annex are listed in the ‘Registered Historic District’. The courthouse and annex are listed in the National Register of Historic Places-U.S. Department of the Interior.
21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there ADA, seismic studies, and as-built plans for the original courthouse or the annex that we can count on, or do we need to create these existing-condition documents? 	Attach-2-Standard-Agreement, Exhibit B, Page 1 of 3, Section 2.1 (page 27 of the Word document)	There are some existing as-builts. Due diligence will be required as part of the study.
22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the Judicial Council want a detailed study and design-sensitive structural analysis for the cost of remodeling all or a portion of the existing structure under the alternatives to be evaluated? 	Attach-2-Standard-Agreement, Exhibit B, Page 1 of 3, Section 2.1 (page 27 of the Word document)	For the renovate or rebuild options, ADA and seismic as well as all other deficiencies must be addressed in order to determine which option is most cost effective, while providing the court with a safe, compliant facility, and while considering the impact to the community and City.
23	Will the space program need to be reviewed with the Nevada County judges and/or Nevada County or only with the Judicial Council?	RFP Page 8 of 9: Section 6.4.3 (page 11 of the pdf)	All facets of the Planning Study will be reviewed by the Superior Court and Judicial Council.
24	Will the space block-outs, space plans, and budget for the three options need to be reviewed with the Nevada County judges, or Nevada County, first, or only with the Judicial Council?	RFP Page 8 of 9: Section 6.4.3 (page 11 of the pdf)	All facets of the Planning Study will be reviewed by the Superior Court and Judicial Council.
25	Since the initial feasibility study requires a cost analysis of options that may not require use of the existing courthouse or annex, the new facility development cost should be partially offset by the sale or leasing of the existing courthouse. Will the criteria architect be required to determine this potential income, or will the Judicial Council or General Services provide this input so the team we propose does not need to include the expertise to determine this important economic data?	RFP Page 2 of 9: Section 3.2 (page 5 of the pdf), Paragraph 3, line 4, which requires cost estimates	Costs associated with the sale or lease of the existing courthouse will not be taken into consideration or applied to any costs for the option of a new facility.

ANSWERS TO SUBMITTED QUESTIONS

Q #	Questions	RFP Reference (Document & Page-Section-Item)	Answers
26	<p>The consultant will generally need to provide services over an undefined timeframe that could extend to at least five if not seven years depending on Judicial Council and legislative budgeting actions. The phases are, broadly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feasibility study and selection of the preferred option, • Site selection if new construction is selected, • Design Criteria and Design/Build selection process, • Design Criteria Compliance Review. <p>RFP Section 4.4.3 requests a number of statements related to experience, staff, qualifications, approach, and references. Are these statements to address all four phases in equal depth or should they concentrate on the first task order – the feasibility study?</p>	RFP Page 4 of 9: Section 4.4.3 (page 7 of the pdf)	Address Section 4.4.3 for all phases.
27	<p>Because you have asked the proposing teams to present their approach and work plan for the study, we need for the Judicial Council to answer the following questions regarding the scope of the feasibility phase: Define the agencies/departments that are considered “courts” in the current building. During the pre-bid meeting on 9/10/2021, it was stated that “only the courts and the sheriff” are included in the 85,000-sf new building estimate. What is included in the “Courts” family other than Judges, Courtrooms, Jury, Court Security, Judicial Council representative, and Court Clerks?</p>	RFP Page 5 of 9: Section 4.4.3.10 (page 8 of the pdf)	<p>The Courthouse will only include space for Judicial Officers, Court staff and County sheriff. All other Justice partner agencies will not have permanent space in the Courthouse. The Courthouse typically includes, Courtsets (Courtrooms and associated spaces), administrative areas, clerk office, jury assembly, screening and lobby area, holding facilities, sherrif's office space and other public areas such as self help.</p>
28	<p>Confirm that the District Attorney, Public Defender, and other “County” departments that may now be located in the Courthouse or Annex are not to be included in the new building option.</p>	RFP Page 5 of 9: Section 4.4.3.10 (page 8 of the pdf)	<p>The Courthouse will only include space for Judicial Officers, Court staff and County sheriff. All other Justice partner agencies will not have permanent space in the Courthouse.</p>
29	<p>If the courts move out of the current courthouse, will the space vacated be available to lease out by the state to others and is that a potential income stream to be included in the life-cycle cost of the new building option?</p>	RFP Page 5 of 9: Section 4.4.3.10 (page 8 of the pdf)	The state does not own the current courthouse.
30	<p>If the Courts remain in the current courthouse, will the State be able to take over any County-occupied spaces to support Court requirements?</p>	RFP Page 5 of 9: Section 4.4.3.10 (page 8 of the pdf)	<p>These are part of the planning study that will need to be determined, but are not currently approved.</p>
31	<p>If County departments have to move out of the current courthouse if the courts take over their space, is that cost to be considered in the analysis?</p>	RFP Page 5 of 9: Section 4.4.3.10 (page 8 of the pdf)	<p>These are part of the planning study that will need to be determined, but are not currently approved.</p>

ANSWERS TO SUBMITTED QUESTIONS

Q #	Questions	RFP Reference (Document & Page-Section-Item)	Answers
32	The feasibility phase requires development of a comparative life-cycle cost estimate which includes land acquisition and development and future operating costs which would include the cost of transportation and supervision of persons in custody. Site selection is included in Phase 2, so we will need to assume a location and cost of a new site. This will be dramatically different if the site is in downtown Nevada City versus a large, level suburban site such as available property adjacent to the Nevada County Government Center and jail. Will the State tell the selected consultant what site to assume for purposes of developing cost estimates or will the Criteria Architect need to develop multiple cost estimates?	RFP Page 2 of 9: Section 3.2 (page 5 of the pdf), paragraph 3, line 4, which requires cost estimates And RFP Page 5 of 9: Section 4.4.3.10 (page 8 of the pdf)	The availability of potential sites at market rate is to be analyzed as part of the option to build new courthouse in a new location.
33	To develop the option to retain and remodel all or a portion of the “historic” courthouse and to “consider” community interests, we will need to know if the courthouse is, or is not, to be considered for historic designation. This will impact space utilization, functionality, ADA, and security, and of course construction and operating costs. Will the State clearly identify the “historic” preservation interests at the beginning of the feasibility phase, or do we need to engage specialists and “negotiate” with the State or the Nevada County/City regarding this issue?	RFP Page 5 of 9: Section 4.4.3.10 (page 8 of the pdf)	The courthouse and Annex are listed in the ‘Registered Historic District’. The courthouse and annex are listed in the National Register of Historic Places-U.S. Department of the Interior.
34	Will the State identify which, if any, County agencies must, should, can, or cannot, be accommodated in the same State Court building security envelope with the Courts at the beginning of the feasibility phase?	RFP Page 5 of 9: Section 4.4.3.10 (page 8 of the pdf)	Yes.
35	At the conclusion of the feasibility phase, and later after the site selection phase if a new building option is selected, there is very likely to be controversial public hearings. Will the Criteria Architect be asked to be the presenter of findings at these hearing, or a co-presenter with the Judicial Council, or only to attend to answer questions?	RFP Page 8 of 9: Section 6.4.3 (page 11 of the pdf), related to cost of expenses And RFP Page 5 of 9: Section 4.4.3.10 (page 8 of the pdf)	The Criteria Architect will be asked to attend, answer questions and possibly present at public meetings or events.
36	Because our billing rates must include expenses for travel and testimony, can the Judicial Council identify the number of these “hearings” to include in the billing rate analysis?	RFP Page 8 of 9: Section 6.4.3 (page 11 of the pdf)	A reimbursable line item should be included for travel and presentations to public meetings and events.

ANSWERS TO SUBMITTED QUESTIONS

Q #	Questions	RFP Reference (Document & Page-Section-Item)	Answers
37	The schedule presented indicates 4-1/2 months to complete the “high level” feasibility study to conclude in May 2022. This will require the State to establish firm limits on space program requirements and operations input and to provide timely decisions after each review meeting to stay on schedule. Should the methodology we develop in our proposal/qualifications address this ambitious schedule, or can a more relaxed and less demanding methodology be proposed?	RFP Page 5 of 9: Section 4.4.3.10 (page 8 of the pdf)	The Planning Study must be concluded by May 1, 2022.
38	At what juncture in the feasibility study will the City and/or the County be included in workshops or presentations? Or will we limit interaction to only the Courts/State/Judicial Council?	RFP Page 5 of 9: Section 4.4.3.10 (page 8 of the pdf)	A Project Advisory Group made up of the court, Judicial Council staff, City, County, Community will be a part of the Planning Study process.
39	Exhibit B attached to the RFP requires stacking and blocking plan for the prospective sites. This type of representation is also needed, but not stated, for the Project Study Phase to confirm how space can be provided in the options to revise or replace the current courthouse on the current site. Certainly, the blockouts and building configurations required in the Performance Criteria Phase will be required to document adjacency and configuration criteria. Are these blockouts and plans then considered to be prescriptive or only illustrative of one acceptable space arrangement?	RFP Page 5 of 9: Section 4.4.3.10 (page 8 of the pdf) Exhibit B	This is only for the planning study phase. If blocking/stacking is how you would achieve the goal for the phase, then include in your proposal.
40	For option two mentioned in part 1 general description, will replacing with new courthouse building anticipated to have similar size/ sq ft as the existing?	Attach-2-Standard-Agreement – Exhibit B	Yes.
41	For option three mentioned in part 1 general description, will analysis of new building on new location require early iterative energy modelling/ parametric design to help inform building massing/ orientation and such?	Attach-2-Standard-Agreement – Exhibit B	This RFP is only for the Planning Study phase.
42	Professional services for site acquisition phase mention CEQA consultants, will this specialist be brought in by JCC, or should be included as part of the criteria architect team?	Attach-2-Standard-Agreement – Exhibit B	The Judicial Council will provide this if needed.
43	Are there aspirations for on-site renewable energy/ solar PV to be part of the three different options? Or only if it’s a new building in new location?	Attach-2-Standard-Agreement – Exhibit B	This is to be determined.
44	Are there sustainability goals envisioned to be part of the three different options? Or only if it’s a new building in new location? Intend to pursue LEED certification? WELL certification?	Attach-2-Standard-Agreement – Exhibit B	This is to be determined.

ANSWERS TO SUBMITTED QUESTIONS

Q #	Questions	RFP Reference (Document & Page-Section-Item)	Answers
45	Professional services for performance criteria phase mention Design-build entity selection, is the intent to pursue an Integrated Project Delivery IPD or Progressive Design Build approach?	Attach-2-Standard-Agreement – Exhibit B	This RFP is only for the Planning Study phase.
46	If a team submitting qualifications to this RFP solicitation has sub-consultants which include programmers or planners from the prior iteration of the Nevada City Courthouse project, will the JCC disqualify that team for a potential conflict of interest?	Page 8-Section 6.6 (Preclusion)	Please note that the Judicial Council does not provide legal advice to consultants. Prospective consultant architects are directed to consult with their legal counsel regarding conflict of interest and bear the risk of any actions taken as a result of their legal counsel’s advice or failure to seek as much.
47	The Judicial Council have previously advertised for and taken on the responsibility of determining what land is available for a new site in the Nevada City area. Should the Criteria Architect include a consultant to find available sites and costs for the new Courthouse or will the JCC provide this information?	3. Project Information. 3.2 Project Description, paragraph 4.	The study should look at the size of the building and space needed as stated in the RFP in order to construct in a new location and determine the cost of land based on market values.
48	This section notes that the project is currently authorized for the Criteria Architect Planning Study Phase. And that the JCC may negotiate with the Criteria Architect for future phases. Could you clarify what the phases may be between the scope under this RFP and the future DBE Scope?	3. Project Information. 3.3	This RFP is only for the Planning Study phase only. Any future project or scope will be determined based on the findings of this study.
49	There have been multiple reports and studies prepared for the AOC/JCC in the past. These include a Feasibility Study and perhaps Geotechnical investigations with reports. Could you clarify if these past studies will be shared with the selected Criteria Architect upon award of the contract?	[none provided]	Past studies may not be relevant to the current existing conditions or applicable to the current stakeholder.
50	Attachment 3 to the RFP “Consultant Personnel Billing Rates” includes a list of disciplines including Security/Low Voltage Services. In the pre-submittal conference, it was mentioned that a Security/AV was not needed to be included as part of the scope for the Planning Study. Does our response to the RFP need to provide rates for all listed disciplines on Attachment 3, or should proposers only include rates for the consultants that the proposers require for the scope of the Planning Study? Can Service Types be added or deleted from the Attachment 3?	Attachment 3	Respondent should include all rates for all disciplines.
51	With the assumption that existing documents will eventually be available to the selected team, could the teams be provided a list of available documents for the existing site and buildings as part of the addendum?	[none provided]	There are some existing as-builts, but due diligence will be required as part of the Planning Study.

ANSWERS TO SUBMITTED QUESTIONS

Q #	Questions	RFP Reference (Document & Page-Section-Item)	Answers
52	Will it be possible for the proposing teams to tour the existing site and buildings prior to submitting a final fee proposal?	[none provided]	A tour of the existing site is not part of the RFP process.
53	Will reviews by the Office of the State Fire Marshall or DSA be required as part of the scope of the Planning Study?	[none provided]	We do not need reviews from OSFM or DSA during the Planning Study, but fire life safety codes and building codes must be considered in the analysis of the three options.
54	If there are no Geotechnical Reports available for the existing site, will the Criteria Architect team need to obtain a report as part of their scope for the Planning Study.	[none provided]	There is an existing 2003 seismic assesment.
55	Will Geotechnical testing and the production of a reports be required as part of the scopes for the alternative sites?	[none provided]	The study should look at the size of the building and space needed as stated in the RFP in order to construct in a new location and determine the cost of land based on market values. If geotechnical testing is determined by the respondent to be required in order to make this determination then it should be included.
56	Previous studies for the Nevada City Courthouse have included a detailed building program for the Courthouse. Will a detailed building program be provided to the selected Criteria Architect team upon award of the contract?	[none provided]	A detailed program will be provided for different options.
57	If a program is provided, will the scope of the Planning Study include the validation of the program?	[none provided]	No validation is needed in the planning study phase.
58	Does a revit model or other electronic drawing files exist of the existing site and buildings, and if so will they be made available to the selected Criteria Architect, or should the proposers consider that the scope of the development of existing conditions drawings will be part of the scope of the planning study?	3. Project Information. 3.2 Project Description, paragraph 4.	There are some existing as-builts, but due diligence will be required as part of the Planning Study.
59	Should the scope of the evaluation of new sites include a detailed analysis of available utilities and the cost of providing utilities to the alternative sites?	[none provided]	The availability of potential viable sites at market rate is to be analyzed as part of the option to build new Courthouse in a new location. The cost of providing utilities to a potential site should be considered in the cost of building a new facility in a new location.
60	Will CEQA related consulting be required of the scope of the Planning Study and if so would this need to be required by the Criteria Architect team?	[none provided]	Respondent should include all rates for all disciplines.
61	Should the scope of the evaluation of new sites include a detailed analysis of available utilities and the cost of providing utilities to the alternative sites?	[none provided]	This is answered in #59 above. The availability of potential viable sites at market rate is to be analyzed as part of the option to build new in a new location. The cost of providing utilities to a potential site should be considered in the cost of building a new facility in a new location.

ANSWERS TO SUBMITTED QUESTIONS

Q #	Questions	RFP Reference (Document & Page-Section-Item)	Answers
62	Will CEQA related consulting be required of the scope of the Planning Study and if so would this need to be required by the Criteria Architect team?	[none provided]	This is answered in #60 above. The availability of potential viable sites at market rate is to be analyzed as part of the option to build new in a new location.
63	Can you clarify the submittal deadline? Page 2 of the RFP states September 27 and the Schedule of Events chart states October 6.	RFP, Page 2	See answer to Question 2.
64	As the Attachment 3 Consultant Personnel Billing Rates consists number of service types that are not necessarily required at this stage based on the scope of services described in the RFP. Please confirm if you'd still like to get a fee estimate of all services listed in the form (attachment 3)? if not, how shall we approach the form?	Fee Proposal, Consultant Personnel Billing Rates, Attachment 3	All billing rates should be filled in on the Fee Proposal form.
65	<p>The Judicial Council's 2019 Update of the Judicial Needs Assessment to the Legislature provided under Government Code Section 69614(C)(1) & (3) quantified the "Need for New Judgeships in the Superior Courts". Page 8 of the document indicates that Nevada County Superior Court had 7.6 authorized and funded Judicial Positions. However, per the 2019 Update of Judicial Needs, Nevada County Superior Court has a judicial need of 4.8 Judicial Positions.</p> <p>Does the 84,000 square feet, two (2) stories and six (6) courtrooms scope for analysis of the construction of a new full-service courthouse take into account the JCC 2019 Judicial Position need assessment of approximately five (5) officers for Nevada County Superior Court? If this RFP's new full-service courthouse scope does not take into account this potential for a reduction in Judicial Officer positions and associated courtroom sets, to what extent will this study address space planning/programming for changing Superior Court staffing, operational patterns, technology implementation and service delivery to court consumers?</p>	[none provided]	The study is to evaluate for a six (6) courtroom courthouse. The Judicial Council will provide more detailed program to the selected firm.
66	Does the JCC want this "fair market value" of potential adjacent sites evaluated as part of the A+E Team scope?	Page 2-Section 3.2	The availability of potential sites at market rate is to be analyzed as part of the option to build a new courthouse in a new location.
67	Has the CEQA process been started on the historic portion of the facility?	Page 2-Section 3.2	No. Until the project scope is developed, CEQA will not be started.
68	Will the A+E Team have scope in a CEQA process during this study?	Page 2-Section 3.2	There is no CEQA scope in the study.
END OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS			