

## ADDENDUM

covering

### CLARIFICATIONS, CHANGE IN SPECIFICATIONS AND/OR SCOPE OF SERVICES

Date Issued: April 4, 2011

Addendum No.: 1

RFP Number: 11-15-067-00 (Graphic Design and Communications Services)

Procurement Officer: Gregory Moore

#### INTENT

1. This addendum is issued in order to provide for clarifications and/or modifications to the above referenced RFP, or provide additional information intended to clarify the procurement process. Acknowledgment of this addendum shall be made in the Proposal Letter (see Appendix 'D') required as a part of each proposer's submittal. ***A proposer's failure to acknowledge all addenda to the subject RFP issued by the Commission may render that offeror's proposal non-responsive.***
2. The Commission does hereby modify RFP cover page, Key RFP Dates, as follows:  
Change From:  
Interviews May 8, 2011  
  
Change To:  
Interviews May 10, 2011
3. The Commission does hereby modify RFP Section 8.0 Evaluation of Proposals, paragraph 8.3.1, Experience and Qualifications of Key Staff, page 12, as follows (~~striketrough~~ denotes a deletion):
  - Proposed team/personnel's experience appropriate for technical and management requirements of the project, ~~including economic analysis and environmental impacts.~~
4. The Commission does hereby modify the RFP to reflect its intention to award a contract to one or more consulting firms to perform the required services.
  - a. Modify RFP Section 1.0 Introduction, paragraph 1.2 Project Description, as follows (~~striketrough~~ denotes a deletion and underline denotes an addition):

The intent of this RFP is to award a contract to ~~the~~ one or more responsible proposer(s) whose proposal, conforming to this RFP is most advantageous to the Commission, price and other factors considered.

- b. Modify RFP Appendix ‘A’ Statement of Work, page 16, as follows (~~strikethrough~~ denotes a deletion and underline denotes an addition):

The Riverside County Transportation Commission (hereinafter “Commission” or “RCTC”) is seeking the services of a one or more qualified consultant(s) to provide graphic design and communications services.

- c. Modify RFP Appendix ‘G’ Proposal Pricing Form, page 53, as follows:

Add:

The Commission reserves the right to award a contract to one more firms to perform the subject services based upon the relative scores earned by the proposers in their respective area(s) of expertise, and as is otherwise deemed in the best interests of the Commission.

- 5. The meeting minutes/summary for the pre-proposal conference held on March 24, 2011 in support of Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 11-15-067-00 (Graphic Design and Communications Services) are included herein as Attachment “A”.
- 6. The Commission’s formal responses to questions and requests for clarifications received from prospective proposers are included herein as Attachment “B”.
- 7. The proposal deadline remains April 11, 2011 at 2:00 p.m. Proposals received after the specified date and time may be considered non-responsive and returned to senders unopened.
- 8. All other terms and conditions of the RFP will remain the same.



Issued by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gregory Moore  
Procurement and Assets Manager

**ATTACHMENT “A”****Pre-Proposal Conference Meeting Minutes/Summary****March 24, 2011****Commission Offices, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Conference Room “A” at 2:00 p.m.**

The following is a summary of the issues and topics that were discussed at the above referenced pre-proposal conference in support of RFP No. 11-15-067-00 for the provision of graphic design and communications services. The meeting was called to order at approximately 2:03 P.M. by Gregory Moore, the designated procurement officer, who welcomed the prospective proposers and described the format and objective of the meeting. [A copy of the meeting agenda and a list of attendees are provided as exhibits to this item.]

The purpose of the pre-proposal meeting is to introduce the project manager/team, provide potential proposers with an overview of the procurement process, and to offer clarifications and/or explanations regarding any issues that may have arisen during the procurement process. Formal written responses to all questions submitted by potential proposers during the procurement process may be issued by Commission staff under an addendum to the RFP. Similarly, any amendments to the RFP package will be effected with the issuance of formal addenda.

**Meeting Minutes/Summary****1. Prohibited Communications**

The procurement officer informed the meeting attendees that potential proposers are to refrain from any and all communications with Commissioners, Commission staff or its management. Any questions regarding the RFP package or the responsibilities of the successful proposer(s) must be directed to Gregory Moore, Procurement and Assets Manager, and a formal response will be developed with the assistance of appropriate Commission staff. Requests for clarification, including any exceptions taken to the Sample Contract Form (see Appendix ‘B’) must be submitted in accordance with RFP Section 3.0 Instructions to Offerors, paragraph 3.7, Requests for Clarification.

**2. Project Manager Summary**

It is the Commission’s intention to award a contract to one or more qualified consultants to provide as-needed graphic design and communications services. A detailed description of the required services is included in the Statement of Work (see RFP Appendix ‘A’). Tanya Love, RCTC Goods Movement Manager, presented a brief overview of the Statement of Work. Tanya indicated that the Riverside County Transportation Commission (hereinafter “Commission” or “RCTC”) is seeking the services of a qualified consultant or consultants to provide graphic design and communications services.

The successful consultant will, among other duties, provide photographic services, maintain and enhance the Commission website, coordinate advertisements, design marketing materials that comport with RCTC’s aesthetic and communication standards, and work with RCTC staff and management to develop public information strategies. Consultant will also continue and update RCTC’s messaging through innovative graphic design and communication tools, including brochures, informational materials, e-marketing, and print advertising.

### 3. Procurement Department – RFP Summary

Please be advised that, as the Commission's designated Project Manager, Tanya Love, will be the primary interface between the successful proposers and the Commission *AFTER* the contract(s) are awarded; however, *DURING* the procurement phase all communications must be directed to and through the designated procurement officer. The Commission's formal responses to questions received either during the pre-proposal meeting or at some point thereafter are included herein under Attachment 'B', Answers to Proposers' Questions: Set No. 1.

The Procurement Officer, Gregory Moore, provided an overview of the RFP package. He emphasized that proposers must review the entire RFP document in detail, including the Sample Contract Form, and provide all of the information requested in the RFP in order to be considered responsive.

Gregory highlighted the following RFP topics:

- Minimum Qualifications. At a minimum, proposers must have specialized experience or knowledge regarding graphic design and communications services and have provided comparable and continuous services for at least five (5) years. Proposals that do not evidence the minimum required experience may be eliminated from further consideration in the competitive process.
- Contract Type. The agency will award fixed unit rate, labor hour contract(s) for a three-year base period with two single year options to extend the agreement for a total period of performance of up to five years.
- Addenda. Any revisions to the RFP will be made by written addenda issued by the Commission. All addenda issued by the Commission for this RFP will be posted on the Commission website at <http://www.rctc.org/rfps.asp>. All addenda must be acknowledged in each offeror's Proposal Letter (Appendix 'D') as part of its submittal. Failure to acknowledge receipt of all addenda for this RFP may render an offeror's proposal non-responsive.
- Subcontractors. Proposers may partner with subcontractors to provide some element of the required services; however, the partnering arrangement must be made clear, pursuant to RFP Section 3.0 Instructions to offerors, paragraph 3.15, Use of Subcontractors.
- Submittal Requirements. The Submittal Requirements listing in paragraph 6.0 (beginning on page 8) of the RFP provide a useful summary and checklist of the proposal preparation and submission requirements. Please reference this section when assembling your respective proposals.
- Evaluation Criteria. The respective offeror's proposals will be evaluated based upon the evaluation criteria set forth in paragraph 8.0. All sub-criteria shall be equally weighted by the evaluation committee.
- Proposal Letter, Forms and Certifications. A fully executed Proposal Letter (Appendix 'D', page 42) and all other required forms and certifications (see paragraph 7.0 Submittal Requirements) must be completed and submitted with the respective offerors' proposals.
- Requests for Clarification. All questions must be submitted in writing to the designated procurement officer, Gregory Moore, as described in paragraph 3.7, Requests for Clarification. Any exceptions to the Sample Contract Form (Appendix 'B') must be included as part of a proposer's the Proposal Letter. The Commission will assume that each proposer

agrees to the terms of that contract form, including insurance requirements, if it does not take exception in its Proposal Letter.

**Question/Answer**

No written questions were presented to staff during the pre-proposal conference. Commission responses to oral inquiries and questions received after the pre-proposal meeting from proposers, and the Commission's formal responses, are provided herein as Attachment "B".

Any questions regarding the procurement process shall be directed to Gregory Moore, Procurement and Assets Manager via e-mail at [gmoore@rctc.org](mailto:gmoore@rctc.org) or via fax at (951) 787-7906.

- Exhibit(s)      (1) Agenda  
                      (2) Attendance List



4080 Lemon Street, 3rd Floor • Riverside, CA  
Mailing Address: P. O. Box 12008 • Riverside, CA 92502-2208  
(951) 787-7141 • Fax (951) 787-7920 • www.rctc.org

## AGENDA

### PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE

#### REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) NO. 11-15-067-00 GRAPHIC DESIGN AND COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES

March 24, 2011 at 2:00 P.M. \* RCTC 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Conference Room 'A'

Welcome/Introductions

Greg Moore  
Procurement and Assets Manager  
RCTC Contact Person

Communications Requirements

Greg Moore  
Procurement and Assets Manager

Statement of Work Overview

Tanya Love  
RCTC Goods Movement Manager

RFP Summary/Highlights

Greg Moore  
Procurement and Assets Manager

Question & Answer Session

Open Forum

Proposers are invited to submit questions on the forms provided. All questions will be received by the Procurement and Assets Manager who will redirect the questions to the representative best qualified to answer. All proposers are advised that any exchange between RCTC in response to the proposers' questions are for clarification purposes only and does not qualify or amend the solicitation document. The RFP document shall govern if there are any conflicts between the information provided at the Pre-Proposal Conference and the RFP documents.

RIVERSIDE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

PRE-PROPOSAL MEETING

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 11-67-047-00 (Graphic Design and Communications Services)

Thursday, March 24, 2011 @ 2:00 p.m.

3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Conference Room 'A', Commission Offices

	Name	Company	Phone	Fax	E-Mail	Certified DBE? (Y/N)
1	Patricia Lurin	Lista Design	909 238 5516	909 899-6411	patricia@listadesign.com	Y
2	Danielle Areola	Lista Design	909 238 5516	"	danielle@listadesign.com	Y
3	Michelle Paus	Michelle Paus	949 677 9452		micheleraus@cox.net	
4	Gwen Lloyd	The Dot Printer	949 474 1100	949 474 1263	glloyd@dotprinter.com	N
5	Katelynn Ingraham	RW Creative	310-310-8161		kingraham@rwccreative.com	N
6	Donna Summers	Summers By Design	949-724-1423		donna@summersbydesign.com	N
7	GRACE LEE	Ideapolis	714 309-0472		grace@sunshine trade.inc.com	N
8	LINDA CARLBERG	IDEAPOLIS	714/809-0307		linda@ideapolis.com	N
9	John Robles	Robles Media	909 645 1363		john@roblesmedia.com	N
10	NOELIE AFUALO	SIMON WONG ENGINEERING	(951) 972-2501		NAFUALO@simonwongeng.com	N
11	Evelyn French	Simon Wong Engineering	951-972-2591		efrench@simonwongeng.com	N
12	STAVIS	Hogler-Reano, Inc	951-787-9222		STAVIS@HoglerReano.com	N
14	Jen Labrado	Consensus Inc.	949.252.1755		jlabrado @consensusinc.com	N

Jennifer Labrado  
@consensusinc.com

	Name	Company	Phone	Fax	E-Mail	Certified DBE? (Y/N)
15	Brad Jensen	NBI	626-967-1510		Brad@nbicons.com	Y
16	Stephanie Sweeny	CalTrop	714-251-6810		ssweeny@caltrop.com	N
17	Dawn Hassett	Geographics	951 369-1564		inbox@geomail.info	Y
18	ROBERT CHEVEZ	WESTBOUND COMMUNICATIONS	909-886-8188		rchevez@westboundcommunications.com	N
19	Vanessa Barrientos	TCM Group	909 202 3752		vbarrientos@tcgroup.us	N
20	John Carley	Trinet	949 442 8900		John@trinet-solutions.com	
21	Michael Schaffer	ECHO-FACTORY	909-758-5171		MIKE@ECHO-FACTORY.COM	
22	Chanel Woods-Joe	COOK+SCHMID	619-914-2370		cwoods@cookandschmid.com	Y
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						
29						
30						

## ATTACHMENT "B"

April 4, 2011

Subject: **REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS NO. 11-15-067-00  
GRAPHIC DESIGN AND COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES  
ANSWERS TO PROPOSERS' QUESTIONS, SET NO. 1**

To: All Proposers

Reference: (a) Pre-Proposal Conference held on March 24, 2011, in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor RCTC  
Conference Room 'A'  
(b) Subject RFP issued March 17, 2011

The following questions and associated responses were either submitted to the procurement officer by potential proposers during and after the above-referenced pre-proposers meeting, or are being offered by Commission staff to clarify the requirements set forth in the RFP package.

### Set No. 1

- Q1. In terms of website enhancements, is the Commission looking for a total cost for any specific project or task at this point?
- A1. No. The Commission's intent in issuing the RFP was to establish labor hour agreements with one or more firms with expertise in the various specializations identified in the RFP- including web development. The cost for any specific project or task will be developed by and between the successful consultant(s) and Commission staff based on the proposed level of effort for a particular project and the successful consultant's fixed unit rates. That said, the evaluation committee will look favorably on those proposals providing a proposed work plan or suggested modifications to the Commission website, insofar as they reflect a unique understanding and approach to the requested services.**
- Q2. Would the Commission prefer that a large consulting firm with a broad and varied skill sets and resources propose, or would the Commission rather receive proposals from several small firms with a specific niche or technical focus?
- A2. The Commission has no preference in terms of the firm size and/or type, as long as the requirements set forth in the Statement of Work are met. The Commission reserves the right to select the appropriate number and types of firms necessary to satisfy those requirements.**
- Q3. In RFP Appendix 'A' Statement of Work under paragraph 2.1.2, does "[p]lanning, facilitating, and documenting public information meetings at workshops" include videotaping or some other means of documentation?
- A3. The documentation requirement could take the form of any number of methodologies including writing on a whiteboard, wallpaper graphic or videotaping. Each of the Commission's projects is a bit different from one other, so this requirement could vary among projects. The Commission would expect a proposer to evidence it's understanding of this general requirement by including a suggested approaches to satisfying this requirement.**

Q4. When does the Commission anticipate an award of the contracts associated with this RFP?

**A4. The evaluation committee's recommendation for award is tentatively scheduled to be taken to the Commission's regular monthly meeting on June 8, 2011.**

Q5. What types of projects is the Commission currently involved with or planning that may contain public outreach requirement?

**A5. Any of the Commission's projects could require some level of public outreach services. A comprehensive listing of active and planned projects are listed on the Commission's website. A few of those projects include the SR-91 Corridor Improvement Project, the Mid-County Parkway project, and the Metrolink Perris Valley Line extension. For some of these projects a primary outreach services firm is already under contract, therefore, only supplemental outreach services may be required.**

Q6. How/where is the Commission website hosted?

**A6. Dedicated managed hosting is currently at Rackspace.**

Q7. What platform is the current site built on, e.g., Windows or Linux?

**A7. Linux.**

Q8. Is there any content management software used currently by the Commission to develop its site, e.g., Drupal, Joomla or Wordpress?

**A8. A custom administrative console plus Contribute Publishing Server.**

Q9. Is there any application service software used currently, e.g., Tomcat or GlassFish?

**A9. No.**

Q10. What kind of database is currently used?

**A10. MySQL.**

Q11. Would copies of a proposer's samples or work product be required as part of its submittal?

**A11. Yes. An original sample set AND four copies of each proposer's sample set/work product must be provided with its submittal. Copies of a proposer's samples set/work product must be included in addition to the originals in order to ensure that each evaluation committee member has a complete submittal package.**

Q12. Are the fully burdened labor rates for each labor classification proposed by an offeror under Appendix 'G' fixed for the term of the agreement?

**A12. Yes. The fully burdened labor rates are fixed, as proposed, for the term of the agreement.**

Q13. If a proposer is only providing rates for selected labor classifications under Appendix 'G', should those labor classifications not used by that proposer be deleted from the form?

**A13. Proposers need not modify the form in order to eliminate labor classifications not being proposed; however, if a labor classification is not included in Appendix 'G' then a proposer may add that missing classification to the form under the "Other" category.**

Q14. Will a proposer's subconsultant(s) be required to carry the same types and limits of insurance set forth in the Sample Contract Form (Appendix 'B')?

**A14. Yes, unless the successful consultant secures a written waiver of this requirements from the Commission. Any potential issues identified by a proposer regarding coverages should be flagged in that proposer's Proposal Letter submittal (see "Exceptions" under Appendix 'D').**

Q15. Is it permissible for a joint venture or partnership to submit a proposal?

**A15. Yes. Proposers may form a joint venture or partnership in response to the RFP, as long as its work plan is clearly defined and its key personnel identified in its proposal. Further, the qualifications and experience of the various personnel included as part of the proposing team must be detailed in its proposal.**

Q16. In the Statement of Work under paragraph 2.1.6, what does "[c]oordinating and securing the placement of advertisements including RCTC's annual report mean? Is that ads for the report or the actual report?

**A16. It could be either, but that language refers to the annual report that RCTC provides to the public, which is a report card describing the progress made by RCTC in expending Measure 'A' funds to advance various projects in Riverside County.**

Q17. If my firm has not contributed any campaign contributions does a proposer still need to submit Appendix 'C' Disclosure of Campaign Contributions to Commissioners?

**A17. Yes. Even if no contributions were made by your firm, please indicate "\$0" or "N/A", sign and submit.**

Q18. How much has the Commission spent on these types of services in the recent past?

**A18. During the last three full fiscal years the Commission has expended between \$185,000 to \$300,000 per year for the subject graphic design and communications services. Projected expenditures for the current fiscal year are approximately \$300,000.**

Q19. What firm is the Commission currently using to provide these services?

**A19. The incumbent team is Geographics located in Riverside, CA, and Moore, Iacofano & Goltsman (MIG) of Pasadena, CA.**

Q20. If a subconsultant is used, will that subconsultant have to possess the minimum five years of experience?

**A20. Not necessarily. The minimum qualifications requirement applies to "key staff/project manager". So, the minimum experience requirement applies to subconsultants only insofar as a subconsultant is determined to be key staff or a project manager.**

Q21. How many copies of the proposal are required, and where should they be delivered?

**A21. An original, four (4) copies [including samples], and one (1) CD of each firm's proposal must be delivered by hand or mail to the address below, not later than 2:00 p.m. on April 11, 2011. Proposals received after that time may not be considered. The only acceptable evidence to establish the time of receipt is the date/time stamp imprinted on the proposal package by the date/time recorder at the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor Commission reception desk located at:**

**Riverside County Transportation Commission  
4080 Lemon Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Riverside, CA 92501**