

Bid B20/21-15 DSA Inspector of Record - Comparison Table LPC - PSC/AMT Facilities		
C. Proposal Format	ITS Enterprise	Durbrow Consulting
C.1 - LPC Project Title	Yes	Yes
C.2 - Applicant/Firm Name	ITS Enterprise	Thomas Durbrow
C.3 - Firm Qualifications		
C.3.A - Type of Organization, Size, Professional Registration, Certifications, and Affiliations	Incomplete	Complete
C.3.B - Recent Related Projects	<p>* ITS listed 5 projects, 3 of the 5 are education projects (2 of the 3 education projects are higher ed).</p> <p>* The 2 higher ed project listed are stated to complete in 2019 and 2020. The current year is 2021 and this project list has not been updated. This does not demonstrate good use of technology, keeping records up to date, or attention to detail which is not conducive to executing a successful project</p> <p>*In the RFP Response, there is no connection between the projects listed as reference and the projects listed as completed by Bradley. Meaning that the project presented as reference project, Bradley was not involved with.</p>	<p>* Project list is compiled of 7 projects, all with some aspects of the PSC/AMT Project</p> <p>* An example of how value was added to a project through the IOR was also demonstrated.</p>
C.3.C - Name, Exp, Quals, and Classifications of IOR's	<p>* Resume and work experience for Bradley Williamson was provided, however there seems to be gap in recent work history as of Jan 2020 and the resume does not appear up to date.</p> <p>* Qualifications that apply to the PSC/AMT project are not listed.</p> <p>*No list of Certification or affiliations was provided in the proposal for Bradley Williamson.</p>	* A detailed list of experience, qualifications, and classifications was provided.
C.3.D - 2 Client References (within 5 years and similar projects)	Yes	Yes
C.3.E - Additional Applicable Certs	No	Yes
C.3.F - Current Project Workload & Availability	No	Yes
C.4 - Philosophy and Approach to Inspections		
C.4.A - Summary of Philosophy and Approach	Very light and generic with no specifics to how it would apply to the PSC/AMT project.	A detailed approach was provided, however the details of this approach are concerning. The approach is to review all contract docs, outline inspection requirements, plan for inspections, and then incorporate these inspections into the contractor schedule. This may create more burden on the contractor and may be an indicator (along with the lack of a monthly fee) that the IOR is only planning to visit the site when pre-planned inspections are required and not on a continuous basis as may be required by the scale of the project. It is understood that the IOR lives in the Sacramento Area and may be commuting to perform inspections. All these factors are indicators that fulltime onsite support may not viable which the project will surely require in some regard throughout the duration of work.
C.4.B - Identify Specific Individual that Will Be District P.O.C.	No	Yes
C.5 - Fee, Insurance, and Indemnification		
C.5.A - Fees		
C.5.A.1 - Hourly and Monthly Rates	Yes	No - Missing Monthly Rate
C.5.A.2 - Itemized Fee Schedule for Extra Services	No	No
C.5.A.3 - Comply with Labor Code Section 1720	No Statement Included in RFP Response	No Statement Included in RFP Response
C.5.A.4 - Contractor Supplied Field Office	N/A	N/A
C.5.B - Insurance & Indemnification		
C.5.B.1 - Execute Hold Harmless - Liability and Insurance	Yes	Yes
Additional Comments	<p>* The RFP Response that was submitted is very light in information and does not demonstrate how past project experience would provide benefit for the PSC/AMT Project.</p> <p>*The RFP Response is generic and out of date. Projects that were noted to be completed in 2019 and 2020 have not been update.</p> <p>*There is no correlation between past work that was included in the RFP Response to the upcoming PSC/AMT Project.</p>	<p>* Discussions with references listed were positive and concerning in some regard. The references did attest that Thomas was very knowledgeable and willing to work towards completion of the project, but the endurance of Thomas was mentioned during 2 of the 3 follow-ups. It was mentioned that Thomas appeared to struggle with workloads at times for projects completed in years back.</p> <p>*There is concern that Thomas did not list a monthly fee and is located in the Sacramento Area. This will lead to commuting and potentially not being onsite when required and/or create additional burden on Thomas that would hinder performance on the project that has a duration of more than 1 year.</p>