

Addendum No. 1

Subject: Commissioning Agent Services on an As-Needed Basis
RFP-121820

Location: N/A

This Addendum No 1, dated 20th of January, 2021, shall modify and become part of the Request for Proposal. Any items not mentioned herein, or affected by, shall be performed strictly in accordance with the original documents.

Questions

Question 1: What design services are expected as a part of the Commissioning Services?

Answer 1: There will not be design activities associated with commissioning services but rather a review of design documents.

Question 2: Familiarity of permitting with the City of Philadelphia is an experience requirement. What permits are anticipated as a part of the Commissioning services?

Answer 2: Proposers shall be familiar with the requirements of the Authorities Having Jurisdiction and shall be prepared to meet the requirements whether permits are required or not.

Question 3: The license for e-Builder is a reimbursed expense. How will fees from commissioning software used on project be processed as reimbursable expenses?

Answer 3: Commissioning software is a tool of the trade that proposers must possess in order to conduct business and therefore shall not be reimbursed by the School District of Philadelphia.

Question 4: Our firm anticipates self-performing the scope of services. Concerning MWBE subconsultant participation, is the 15-20% goal a requirement or a good faith effort for this project?

Answer 4: Meeting the M/WBE requirements is a goal of this RFP.

Question 5: What is the School District allowances for sub-contractor mark-up?

Answer 5: The School District of Philadelphia does not define allowances for sub-contractors.

Question 6: Will the district be awarding more than one firm for this contract?

Answer 6: Yes.

Question 7: How has the District handled third party commissioning in the past? Does the District currently have a current list of prequalified consultants or are commissioning agents hired on a case-by-case/project-by-project basis?

Answer 7: Third party commissioning agents were retained by our consulting design firms. With the 2018 building codes' requirements, the District is looking to retain multiple commissioning agents under contract, through this RFP, to be assigned projects as they become available.

Question 8: Can the District provide a list of the incumbent firms who have held this contract previously?

Answer 8: There are no incumbent firms under contract for commissioning.

Question 9: The district asks for a complete Standard Form 330 as well as tabbed qualifications information under 7.0 Proposal Requirements. Some of the information requested in the SF 330 and under section 7.0 Proposal Requirements are repetitive (ie. Proposed team, resumes, project experience, etc.) Does the District require the consultant to complete both Part 1 and Part II of the SF 330 form in addition to providing qualifications information organized as requested under 7.0 Proposal Requirements? Can the District please clarify how the consultant should present our qualifications information to avoid redundancy?

Answer 9: Proposers shall provide the information as noted in the RFP in both Proposal Requirements and Form SF330. We expect redundancy in the responses.

-END OF ADDENDUM NO. 1-