

**DEPARTMENT OF RECREATION  
AND PARKS**

**BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**

**SYLVIA PATSAOURAS**  
PRESIDENT

**LYNN ALVAREZ**  
VICE PRESIDENT

**MELBA CULPEPPER**  
**PILAR DIAZ**

**IRIS L. DAVIS**  
BOARD SECRETARY (213) 202-2640

**CITY OF LOS ANGELES**  
CALIFORNIA



**ERIC GARCETTI**  
MAYOR

**MICHAEL A. SHULL**  
GENERAL MANAGER

**ANTHONY-PAUL (AP) DIAZ, ESQ.**  
EXECUTIVE OFFICER &  
CHIEF OF STAFF

**RAMON BARAJAS**  
ASSISTANT GENERAL MANAGER

**VICKI ISRAEL**  
ASSISTANT GENERAL MANAGER

**SOPHIA PIÑA-CORTEZ**  
ASSISTANT GENERAL MANAGER  
(213) 202-2633 FAX (213) 202-2614

March 21, 2018

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL  
RANCHO PARK GOLF COURSE FOOD AND BEVERAGE CONCESSION  
(CON-G18-002)**

**QUESTIONS & ANSWERS**

- 1) Question: Is the BIP outreach that was performed for Package #1 Rancho Park under RFP (CON-G17-007) acceptable for this RFP (CON-G18-002)?

Answer: All prime proposers must perform a full BIP outreach and must meet all of the BIP requirements as they pertain to this opportunity. A BIP outreach performed with respect to an earlier opportunity cannot be used to meet the BIP requirements of any subsequent opportunity.

- 2) Question: Are the old forms filled out for the rejected rancho RFP acceptable for the new one?

Answer: Submitted compliance documents have not been processed. Proposers may submit the same documents as long as all information is accurate and current (i.e. must use the new RFP reference/bid/contract number CON-G18-002).

- 3) Question: Are all the questions asked in RFP CON-G17-007, as they relate to the new RFP CON-G18-002, have the same answers?

Answer: Yes.

- 4) Question: Is the form that was notarized for the cancelled Package No. 1 of RFP CON-G17-007 acceptable for the new RFP?

Answer: Yes.



- 5) Question: On what grounds was the RFP CON-G17-007, Package #1 Rancho Park rejected?

Answer: It was determined that cancellation of Package #1 for Rancho Park was in the best interest of the City.

- 6) Question: What is the difference between the rejected Package #1 RFP and the new RFP?

Answer: Minor technical changes were made to the RFP.

- 7) Question: Are new entities that did not submit a proposal for the cancelled Package No. 1 of RFP CON-G17-007 allowed to Bid on the new RFP?

Answer: Yes, any entity who sees the new RFP (CON-G18-002) on LABAVN may participate in the RFP process.

- 8) Question: Which city official decided to cancel Package No. 1 of RFP CON-G17-007?

Answer: The Department of Recreation and Parks.

- 9) Question: Is the \$25,000 Proposal Deposit that was submitted with the cancelled Package No. 1 of RFP CON-G17-007 acceptable for the new RFP?

Answer: Please see the Addendum for RFP CON-G18-002.

- 10) Question: Has a panel been formed to review the golf restaurant RFPs? If yes, who is on the panel?

Answer: No panel has been formed at this time, but will consist of persons knowledgeable in golf operations, contract administration, and RAP planning to form a well-rounded panel.

- 11) Question: The new RFP (CON-G18-002) states that the Halfway House needs to be open until 9:00 PM or later, is this correct?

Answer: Please see the Addendum for RFP CON-G18-002.