

Additional Information
October 10, 2023 Board Meeting

The following additional information was provided regarding the October 10 Board meeting agenda:

Item 3.f, Geotechnical Services Agreement with RMA Group for the Fine Arts Renovation Project at Cypress College:

1. Four prequalified firms submitted proposals. The most expensive firm is being recommended. Their hourly rate is competitive to two of the three competitors, but they propose to use 102% to 455% more technician hours to do the work. The project scope seems to be for standard geotechnical tests and inspections that presumably every proposer is qualified to do. Specifically, why are any of the other firms not being recommended instead? **When evaluating proposals for this particular scope of services, several critical factors take precedence, namely the hourly rates, specific project experience, and the capacity to conduct the necessary tests through a DSA certified laboratory of record (“LEA”). It's essential to emphasize that the number of hours and the extent of required tests remain constant for any selected geotechnical engineering firm, as these parameters are 1) prescribed by the relevant code, specifying when and what tests are obligatory, and 2) depend on the contractor's performance (i.e. failed testing means more testing; slow construction progress means the inspection period will be prolonged; etc.). Further, this project will require the installation of new piles and caissons, which are anticipated to take at least six months for the contractor to install. During this time period, the geotechnical engineer will be required to be onsite for continuous inspection, as well as complete all required material testing for rebar and concrete. It is worth noting that despite the RFP specifying this obligation by the geotechnical engineer of record, all four firms initially overlooked the material testing component specific to piles and caissons. The screening panel, after review of all proposals, concluded that RMA best met the needs of the scope of work, held competitive hourly rates, and can complete all testing requirements within their own laboratory in lieu of requiring any subconsultants. Therefore, the screening panel requested for only RMA to revise their proposal to meet the required oversight and testing obligations. If all other firms were also asked to revise their proposal each would subsequently increase.**

Item 3.g, Architectural Services Agreement with SGH Architects for the Cypress College Softball Renovation Project:

1. Seven prequalified firms submitted proposals. Why weren't they all interviewed? **The selection panel agreed during the paper screening that two of the firms lacked similar project specific experience and therefore they were not selected to move forward to the interview phase.**
2. Specifically, why is the lowest cost firm not the recommended one? **The selection of professional services is not required to be selected solely by cost and instead based on “demonstrated competence and on the professional qualifications necessary for the satisfactory performance of the services required” [Government Code Section 4526]. In addition, not all firms included the same consultant services within their proposal; therefore, while their fee appears “cheaper”, it would need to be revised (i.e., increased) to include all required consultant services if the panel found the firm to have demonstrated the most competence.**