



Judicial Council of California
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688
Telephone 415-865-4200 • Fax 415-865-4205 • TDD 415-865-4272

ADDENDUM 1

Date	Action Requested
May 8, 2008	Please review the attached Q & A for the RFP.
To	Contact
Interested Proposers	george.santore@jud.ca.gov
From	
Judicial Council of California	
Administrative Office of the Courts,	
Office of Court Construction and	
Management	
Subject	
Addendum No. 1 – Q & A	
Request for Proposals for FIRE PROTECTION	
AND LIFE SAFETY CONSULTING SERVICES	

Solicitation Number: OCCM-FY2007-10

Fire Protection and Life Safety Consulting Services

Solicitation Number: OCCM-FY2007-10

Addendum No. 1

#	Question	Response
1	Although Section 2 - Purpose of this RFP, indicates it seeks a consultant with expertise in many areas surrounding fire, life safety, including occupational health and safety concepts, based upon Section 3 - Scope of Services the focus of work for the term of June 1, 2008 to June 30, 2008, seems to be limited to the inspection and analysis of the specified facility fire detection and control systems. Please clarify whether there is any expectation that inspections will be expanded beyond this specific area; if so, how much more extensive an inspection is anticipated?	Scope of Services, paragraph 3.1 reads, "Services are expected to be performed by the consultant between June 1, 2008 and June 30, 2009." Inspections will be expanded beyond June 30, 2008.
2	Section 6.0 Fee Proposal limits the overall amount as a "not to exceed" of \$48,000. Please explain how this overall number was determined. Is there a specific number of facilities that are included for inspection during the contract term? If so, are those specific locations already identified and can a list be provided?	Within the \$48,000 there would be no more than 4 facilities to be inspected plus some limited plan design work.

Fire Protection and Life Safety Consulting Services

Solicitation Number: OCCM-FY2007-10

Addendum No. 1

#	Question	Response
3	If there is not a predetermined list of facilities, either by number and/or location, will a proposal in excess of \$48,000 be rejected outright, regardless of the level of detail and justification with respect to the "not to exceed" amount?	There is not a predetermined list of facilities. The proposal should be either on a time and material basis, or a cost per inspection within range of sq ft. For example: up to 25,000 sq ft \$ _____ from 25,000 to 50,000 sq ft \$ _____ from 50,000 to 100,000 sq ft \$ _____ above 100,000 sq ft \$ _____ plan review without site visit \$ _____ plan review with site visit \$ _____ The dollars for this service fee will be refreshed each year of the contract so this is not a take it or leave it bid, but rather one based on hourly costs, or unit costs as above.
4	What is the number of court facilities that need to be surveyed? The Judicial Council website mentions 450 sites throughout the State.	There would be no more than 4 court facilities that would be inspected within this budget, plus some plan review work that may come up from time to time.
5	What is the estimated number of court houses or facilities that need to be inspected for fire safety?	The AOC has not yet established the total number of court buildings that will require inspections. Inspections will be scheduled following an initial site assessment, and will be based on existing fire life safety system condition and age. At this time four buildings have been determined to require a system inspection. As court buildings continue to transfer additional inspections will be scheduled and funded on a fiscal year basis.
	Is the budget of \$48,000 all of part of the funds available (over some period of time) for this effort?	We would expect the contract funding to be refreshed in the 2008/2009 fiscal year to a similar or greater amount depending on transfers. Our Fiscal year 2009/2009 runs from July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2009