

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADLPHIA
SCHOOL REFORM COMMISSION
Office of Capital Programs
440 North Broad Street, 3rd Floor – Suite 371
Philadelphia, PA 19130

TELEPHONE: (215) 400-4730

Addendum No. 1

**Subject: Request for Proposal Professional Architectural Services
New Solomon Solis Cohen Elementary School**

**Location: Solomon Solis Cohen Elementary School
7001 Horrocks Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19149**

This Addendum, dated 16th of March, 2017, shall modify and become part of the Contract Documents for the work of this project. Any items not mentioned herein, or affected by, shall be performed strictly in accordance with the original documents.

1. Proposals are due March 21, 2017 by 2:00 PM.

2. Questions and Clarifications

Q1. Can you clarify how we complete or what do we include for Attachments H and I, “Phase Submission Checklist “ and Phase Deliverables Checklist”, respectively? And how can they be viewed?

A: Both attachments are used during the design phase and must be submitted with every phase submission.

Q2: Please provide the approximate SF for this project.

A: The building shall be a maximum of 110,000 SF

Q3. Who will be responsible for Commissioning Services?

A: The selected firm will be responsible for participating in commissioning, review checklists and results.

Q4. Attachment “A” Professional Service Qualification links to Form 330 on the GSA website. Is this the correct form?

A: Yes.

Q5. There was a reference to grade settlement and sink holes developing on site during the walk through. Are the existing buildings on site provided with traditional footings and foundations or are they supported on special foundations such as piles?

A: Existing building is provided with traditional footings and foundations.

Q6. Under Section 7 “Project Introduction and Scope,” “renderings and models,” please clarify if computer generated models are acceptable?

Addendum No. 1 (cont'd)

A: Artistic renderings, computer generated, are acceptable. Models shall be scaled and physical and shall include surrounding streets, cars, trees, people, etc.

Q7. It was noted that four (4) wings of the existing school are abandoned. Could you identify which wings are abandoned as this will have an impact on the phased design approach?

A: A site plan depicting the closed wings is posted on the school district's website along with the RFP.

Q8. Will you be pursuing LEED certification for this project?

A: The School District of Philadelphia reserves the right to pursue LEED certification anytime during the planning and schematic design phase of the project.

Q9. Is FF & E design/documentation included in the scope?

A: The successful proposer shall provide furniture plans only. The School District of Philadelphia will identify all FF&E and will provide the selected firm, during the schematic design and design development phases, with a list of furniture and equipment to be included in the design.

Q10. Will the Design Professional be responsible to provide services to create documents for the permitting and bidding of the demolition of the existing school?

A: Yes.

Q11. Can the quantity of students occupying each of the four (4) occupied wings of the existing school be provided? Wing A, Wing C, Wing D, Wing H?

A: Refer to the RFP.

Q12. Is there asbestos present in the existing elementary school and if so, where is it located?

A: AIR and AHERA reports will be provided to the successful proposer.

Q13. Does the District recommend that the architect retain the services of an expeditor as part of their project team to facilitate approvals?

A: The School District of Philadelphia does not have any preference and leaves it to the proposer to include such services to meet project schedule.

Q14. On page 1 the RFP calls for a "New Replacement School in the same location as the existing school." On page 3 it says that the selected firm shall provide an "alternate approach to the project during the planning phase of the project, which may include retaining portions of the existing building." Does the SDP currently have a preference for either complete replacement or for keeping portions of the existing elementary school building?

A: No.

Q15. There was an RFP circulated earlier for a construction manager. Has a CM been Chosen?

A: The District has selected Reynolds Construction as the CM and we are waiting for School Reform Commission approval at the March 16, 2017 meeting.

Q16. Does the District have a phasing plan in mind for the students during the project? Do you plan on relocating the students during the project?

Addendum No. 1 (cont'd)

A: The phasing plan shall be developed during the design phase of the project by the CM, the selected firm, and the School District of Philadelphia jointly. As of this RFP, the existing school shall remain in operation during the design and construction phases of the project.

Q17. What wings of the building are currently not occupied?

A: Refer to the site plan posted with the RFP.

Q18. Attachment G Fee Proposal requests a rate for the PA Licensed Plumbing Engineer. Must the plumbing designer be licensed?

A: Yes.

Q19. Attachment B is "Acceptance of the Terms and Conditions of the Contract. Attachment F is acceptance of terms for a sample contract. Neither a specific contract nor a sample contract are provided. Please clarify?

A: Complete Attachment B to accept the Terms and Conditions of the Contract. Attachment F is for the link to the sample contract. The sample contract will be posted on March 14, 2017 under the RFP.

Q20. The contract states that all environmental /hazmat testing and remediation will be provided by the District. Please confirm.

A: Confirmed.

Q21. Regarding Dwg S-1, "Overall Plan" posted to the website: There appeared to be traffic/student activity in wing F, which the plans indicate as being shut down/unoccupied. Please confirm by letter that all wings are shut down/unoccupied and could be demolished (for a phased construction plan)

A: Wings B, E, F, and G are not occupied; the remainder of the school is.

Q22. Regarding Dwg S-1, "Overall Plan" posted to the website: Please confirm the general uses in each of the following spaces, correlated to the letter designation on the referenced plan: Wing A, Wing C, Wing D, Wing H, Area hatched in red lines in front of gym.

A: Classrooms.

Q23. How many students are currently enrolled and are accommodated in the existing Solis Cohen school?

A: Approximately 1,225 students.

Q24. How many teachers and staff are currently working at the school?

A: The total number of staff at Solis Cohen is 116.

Q25. When will the following be made available for viewing /downloading on the website: District Professional Service Contract? Attachment A?

A: The sample contract will be posted on March 14, 2017 under the RFP and Attachment A is the link to the GSA Form 330 Qualifications and should be working.

Q26. Is it permissible to create an Excel formatted document to accommodate additional names/personnel within Disciplines and save to a PDF for final submittal?

A: Yes, as long as all of the information required is included.

Addendum No. 1 (cont'd)

Q27. Please confirm that the maximum of three (3) relevant projects are to be provided by the proposing/primes only and the sub-consultant is not required to provide.

A: Sub-consultants shall provide 3 relevant projects as well as the prime.

Q28. Please confirm that proof of insurance is required by the Proposing firm only.

A: Confirmed.

Q29. Can the Good Standing of Subsistence Certificate Tab 6, be provided through online acknowledgement?

A: Yes, and only the Prime Proposer is required to provide.

Q30. Please confirm that the Tax Clearance Tab 7, is to be provide by the Prime Proposer only.

A: Confirmed.

Q31. Under Tab 3, Project Approach, Item C, is the narrative and bar chart referenced here the same that is to be included under Tab 4-Project Schedule + Plan?

A: Yes.

Q32. Are the sub-consultants to submit Attachment A-D, or just the Prime Proposing?

A: Just the Prime Proposing Firm.

Q33. Are we presuming that the student relocation during construction will be taken care of by the District?

A: There are no plans for the relocation of the students.

Q34. This statement is under the bulleted list on page 2: "Increase lunch seating capacity in the cafeteria and improve kitchen service allowing for freshly prepared meals to be offered to students." Please confirm that this is only if the existing cafeteria/kitchen is retained.

A: Confirmed.

Q35. With the schedule identified in the RFP, do you anticipate expedited SDP plan review of the design phase submissions?

A: SDP requires a minimum of 3 weeks for plan review per design phase.

Q36. It appears that the environmental work that is part of the demolition to be performed is limited to the development of an asbestos abatement design document that would be based upon the asbestos inspection reports that are provided to the successful architectural firm by the School District, perhaps a generic specification that advises the demolition contractor of the potential presence of lead based paint and his obligation to abide by regulation and industry standards. It is our assumption that any hazardous materials removal from the school (cleaning chemicals) would have been taken care of by the School District and that any underground storage tank issues are NOT part of the architectural firms' responsibility. Please confirm whether or not this assumption is true or if it should be part of our scope of services.

A: The assumption is not true. Underground storage tanks are part of the demolition activities documented by the selected firm.

Addendum No. 1 (cont'd)

Q37: Under the Tab 1 Requirements, there is a request for experience with phased projects, but there is no reference in the proposal under the scope of work that the project is to be phased. Please clarify.

A: As of this RFP school will be operational during design and construction phases which will necessitate a phasing approach to the project.

Q38: If the school is to remain operational during the construction, are temporary classrooms something that SDP would consider to free up site area for construction?

A: Yes.

Q39: We are assuming that reimbursable expenses are not to be invoiced separately and we must propose a fee that will cover them. Is that correct?

A: No, refer to the contract for reimbursable expenses.

Q40: Please confirm that the \$50,000,000 number given in the RFP is construction cost, not project cost.

A: Confirmed.

Q41: May we submit the confidential financial statement separately with the fee proposal in lieu of binding it into the proposal?

A: No.

Q42: Is a CPM chart absolutely necessary or can we create a schedule of our own that graphically illustrates the issues described?

A: Graphically illustrated schedules are acceptable.

Q43: Must the three key projects under Tab One meet the requirements to the letter, in particular the \$30 - \$50 million budget range?

A: Yes.

Q44: Is the design team required to provide environmental/hazardous material consultation with respect to demolition and disposal of hazardous materials contained within the existing building?

A: Yes.

Q45: What is the extent of AV for this school? Will there be AV systems in the classrooms that will be in our scope?

A: Yes.

Q46: Please provide a target occupancy for the auditorium.

A: Target Occupancy is 600.

Q47: Is the theatrical lighting required for the stage?

A: Yes.

Q48: Will the gym be used for assembly purposes?

A: No.

Q49: Will the locker rooms require showers?

Addendum No. 1 (cont'd)

A: No.

Q50: Will the school be used year around?

A: The school may serve summer program.

Q51: Will the selected firm be documenting the demolition of the existing structures, services, etc?

A: Yes.

Q52: Please clarify exactly what systems require commissioning services?

A: All major systems including building envelop.

Q53: Please confirm HVAC equipment can be located on the roof of the new building.

A: HVAC equipment must be located in an easily accessible location for ease of service.

Q54: Please confirm that the entire building will be air conditioned.

A: Confirmed.

Q55: Please confirm and provide any documentation that is available on prior soil testing, details of SMP in use on site now and any environmental reports for site.

A: All information will be provided to successful proposer.

Q56: Please elaborate on what is implied by “appropriate recreational space.”

A: A recreational space adequate for the age group, shielded from traffic and parking areas, and capable of supporting students during recess.

Q57: Is there any specific landscape program related to the curriculum?

A: No.

Q58: Will a site survey be required?

A: Yes.

Q59: Please confirm which, if any, classroom wings are not currently occupied. (Reference drawing S-1-some wings note as unsafe) Also, what is the reason they are indicated as unsafe?

A: Wings B, E, F, and G are currently not occupied.

Q60: Will the kitchen serve just the school population or will it be used to prepare meals for neighboring schools?

A: The kitchen will serve just the school population.

Q61: Please provide what percentage completion should the construction documents estimate be provided?

A: Please refer to the contract.

Q62: Does the underground storm-water detention system only serve the PEC and associate site improvements, or does it also serve the existing elementary school?

A: The underground storm-water detention system serves the PEC only.

Addendum No. 1 (cont'd)

Q63: Should the proposal include demolition of existing structures? Environmental consultant? Geotech engineer?

A: Yes to all three questions.

Q64: At the walkthrough, it was mentioned that proposals should include preliminary concept designs, including graphic/illustrative content. Are these to be included in stage 1 of the selection process, or in the shortlist interviews/presentations?

A: Only shortlisted proposers shall prepare presentations.

Q65: Is the required Fee Proposal outlined in Section 10.0 (to be submitted in a separate envelope) of the RFP the same as “Attachment G – Fee Proposal” on Tab 7 under Section 12.0?

A: Yes.

Q66: After determination of the layout for the new and existing structures, there will be many options for the remaining site. Has the School District determined the level of Community Engagement and Process for this project? Will there be full engagements for both the structure and the site with community and stakeholders? Will the design team need to lead this process or will the district?

A: The School District of Philadelphia has not determined yet the level of community engagement, but if it elects to do so, it will lead the process itself with assistance from the selected firm.

Q67: Can the District provide the added details (breakout) of the “preliminary planning and cost estimates performed by OCP”?

A: No.

Q68: Can the District clarify the goals for sustainability and energy efficiency beyond what is provided in the RFP?

A: Sustainability and energy efficiency may include daylighting, LED lighting, geothermal heating and cooling, energy efficient equipment, optimum building orientation, utilizing site contours and landscape in the design of the building, etc. The School District of Philadelphia is open to innovative ideas and approaches.

Q68: Can the District take a guess at what percentage of the children arrive at this school by district school buses? Bikes? Car Drop-off?

A: 49 are transported by bus, 1 by cab and the rest of the population walks or is dropped off by parents

Q69: Has the School District determined whether the project will be subject to Civic Design Review in addition to Art Commission Review?

A: Determination has not been made but most probably Civic Design Review will be required.

Q70: Will the project be required to comply with the Complete Streets requirements?

A: Yes.

Addendum No. 1 (cont'd)

Q71: Please clarify if there are any known environmental issues on the site and whether a Phase 1 has been done?

A: The School District of Philadelphia will provide the selected firm with all environmental documentation and requirements.

Q72: Bustleton Ave and Princeton Ave are state roads. Penndot is not listed on the list of regulatory agencies? Shall we assume that PennDOT review and/or approval is required?

A: Yes.

Q73: Are any of the following sections negotiable for sub-consultants?

Section 3.11.2 requires all terms and conditions under architectural contract shall apply equally to its sub-consultants.

Section 9 Indemnification has language requirements beyond sub-consultant insurance coverage.

Section 10.1 requires all insurance from carriers that are authorized to do business on an admitted basis or otherwise acceptable to SDP.

A: No.

Q74: We note the following program issues may affect early planning area tabulations and might require clarification. Any response deemed pertinent at this point would be appreciated:

Q : Should the program include an instrumental music space in addition to the two the 2 vocal music classrooms?

A: Refer to Appendix A.

Q: Are the special education and ESOL pull out spaces/resource, or self-contained?

A: Self-contained.

Q: Three spaces are identified as Autistic support, should these be clustered together? Or placed with age appropriate classrooms one for 1-2nd graders, one for 3rd-4th graders, and one for 5th graders? (usually, it is k-1, 2-3, and 4-5). Or is this a self-contained center where the students don't interact with the rest of the student population?

A: Location of specific rooms will be discussed and determined during the planning and schematic design phase with input from school administrators.

Q: Should the ESOL (now generally referred to as English Language Learners), spaces be evenly distributed between grades? If so 8 classrooms do not easily split to 5 grade levels. Could this be reconsidered?

A: As of this RFP this cannot be reconsidered.

Q: One science lab is listed but the square footage is for 2 science labs. Should there be one or two science labs?

A: Provide one 1,200 SF science lab.

-END OF ADDENDUM NO. 1-