

**SAN RAFAEL CITY SCHOOLS
MEASURES A & B CAPITAL FACILITIES PROGRAM
310 Nova Albion Way
San Rafael, CA 94903
ADDENDUM NO. 1**

**TO
Request for Qualifications and Proposals
Professional Commissioning Services
(RFQ/P No. PM-007)
Addendum Date: April 12, 2018**

This Addendum provides for:

1. CHANGE OF DUE DATE FOR SUBMITTALS.

The deadline for submittal of all submissions in response the RFQ/P No. PM-007 is changed, the new date and time are: **April 24, 2018 at 4:00pm.**

2. REVISE SECTION G. DISTRICT'S EVALUATION PROCESS, Evaluation Criteria Table. See below.

G. DISTRICT'S EVALUATION PROCESS

Evaluation Criteria:

CxA and Cx Team qualifications	35 points
Project Experience	35 points
Project Approach	20 points
Preliminary Fee Proposal Phase 1 Projects	10 points

3. CLARIFICATIONS AND RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS FROM PROPOSERS RECEIVED.

The San Rafael City Schools has received the following questions, with responses provided in the body of the text for each **in blue**. In addition, where a clarification is provided that will be included below.

Question Group #1. General Project Information:

- **Project Phasing** – You mentioned that there are going to be additional phases later on, will any of the phases be in parallel with one another? **Future phases are scheduled after all of the projects for Ph. 1 listed in the RFP. The Ph. 2 projects are anticipated at both high schools, Davidson Middle School and Venetia Valley K-8 and will run concurrently. Projects at the High schools will continue beyond the middle school projects. Work will continue until 2022.** I ask because this will change our approach to staffing for this project since you mentioned there will be a pool of qualified candidates / teams.

- **Construction Budget** – Has the money been secured for the school districts projects at this time? **Yes.** Will the subsequent phases be dependent funding from this year or will additional funding requests be submitted for each phase? **The District has funding for current and future projects through the Measure A and Measure B Bonds.**
- **Project Teams** – You mentioned that the projects have already or in the process of pre-construction activities, are the commissioning requirements identified for the 6 projects consistent with the district standards or is each project team implementing their own Cx requirements / standards? **The requirements identified for the projects are consistent with District standards and no the teams are not implementing their own requirements.**
- **District Cx Standards** – Are the Cx deliverables provided within this RFP in line with the district standards? If not, can the district standards for Cx be provided? **The District’s standards for commissioning services to be as consistent as possible with CBC, Title 24 and CHPS.**

Question Group 2. Scope of Services:

- **Systems to be Commissioned** – During our discussion you mentioned that the systems to be commissioned are the typical equipment that is installed on projects but may not be representative of each separate project. **Yes, we tried to prepare a comprehensive list of systems to commission and typical equipment. If there are changes in those requirements on specific projects we can review with the assigned firm.**
- **Future Expansion** – Does the school district have plans to implement renewable energy sources later on? **Yes, we have a Renewal Energy Feasibility Study and Prop. 39 funding for two renewable projects.** If so, would you want the Cx Agent to make sure these items are accounted for within the identified projects? **Since the Board has not approved the projects yet, no. We can account for those at a later time.**
- **Project DWGs** - Can the district provide DWGs so we can adequately assess and develop a fee that is in line with the equipment to actually be installed for each of the 6 projects? Having an accurate equipment count will help our firm provide a more accurate fee instead of assuming what is to be installed for each project. **Short answer is no. The District anticipates that the Fee proposals are preliminary, based upon the information provided. The District anticipates that selected firms will negotiate a final fee with drawings provided for review for each project.**
- **CHPS Acoustical Requirements** – There is no mention of acoustical testing but in the CHPS 2014 guide, it calls for verification, is this something that the district wants to be verified during functional performance testing? In my past experience with Oakland Unified and other school districts they’ve wanted the acoustical systems in place to be verified and tested. Please see the attachment above for clarification. **For now, do not include.**
- **Sampling Rates** – What is an acceptable sampling rate for the School District? Typically we sample between 10-20% for all like systems. If certain equipment is deemed “critical” by a client then we will test 100% of those pieces. Please provide clarification. **Each proposer should provide for their typical sampling rate and that should be noted in the preliminary fee proposals.**
- **District-Wide EMS** – Do you want the Cx agent to test the control functionality of the equipment systems from a central facility? Sometimes districts have a central area where the facilities staff

can control equipment offsite, is this what meant by the statement within the RFP? **Yes, we are in the process of procuring a District-wide EMS.**

- **Building Enclosure** – Is to be excluded from the project. **Yes.**
- **Title 24 CXR Forms** – There is only mention of one CXR form within the RFP but there a total of 5 that typically get completed with a project, does the district have a party taking care of the remaining forms (CXR-02 through CXR-05) or will the remaining forms be the responsibility of the Cx Agent and the engineer of record (EOR). **If there are forms required by Title 24 they will need to be provided by the commissioning agent.**
- **Operations Consultant Coordination** – Who is the owner’s operations consultant and what are their responsibilities for the project(s)? **The District has a Director of Maintenance and a Sr. Director of Facilities.**
- **Check-out Plan** – Is this basically asking the Cx Agent to witness certain start-up activities in addition to those items mentioned in the Pre-functional Start-Up? **Preliminary plan for selected equipment start-up.**

Question #3. Qualifications:

- **Cx Qualifications** – The RFP mentions that the Cx Authority should satisfy the qualifications in accordance with Building Commissioning Associations (BCA), will a CCP, CxA or other certifications satisfy the requirement? **Certified Commissioning Professional or other certifications are acceptable assuming education requirements are met.**

Question Group #4. Proposal Requirements:

- **Technical Expertise** – Will a project / management approach and / or staffing plan work for this? I ask because these items are also asked for later on in another section. **Yes.**
- **Evaluation Process** – Can you clarify what the district means by “reasonableness of fee”? **See revised Evaluation Criteria in Addendum item #2 above.**

Question Group #5. Multiple Questions These are contract questions related to the Agreement attached to the RFQP.

- A mutual waiver of consequential damages along with a reasonable cap on each other’s liability. We would also like to discuss a mutual indemnity provision. **The District cannot accept mutual indemnity as a public agency.**
- The extent to which there is responsibility for items we cannot control like existing conditions, erroneous information provided by others, existing hazardous materials, or the design and construction efforts of others. **I don’t see anything here stating that Consultants are responsible for these things.**
- We ask for clarity regarding section 8.1 where it states we are to carefully study and compare all “documents, findings and other instructions.” We see no language about what we’re supposed to compare in order to meet our reporting requirement. **This is a statement regarding standard of care that Consultant should compare “documents, findings, and other instructions” to the conditions at sites, to other documents related to the work, and to requirements of the owner, the project, codes, etc.**
- We would like to discuss standard clarifying edits to the work product ownership, intellectual property and confidentiality provisions. **Ok**
- We would like some discussion about increasing the insurance limits under the contract so that they become “stated” limits and not “minimum” limits. As to professional liability insurance, we would like clarity as to whether it is required. In one place it is called for and in another it states it is not

required. **Professional Liability insurance is required. See the revised insurance table \$2,000,000 Professional Liability and \$1,000,000 Employer’s Liability. Sections 14.1.2 and 14.1.3 are revised as included below.**

Type of Coverage	Minimum Requirement
Commercial General Liability Insurance , including Bodily Injury, Personal Injury, Property Damage, Advertising Injury, and Medical Payments Each Occurrence General Aggregate	 \$ 1,000,000 \$ 2,000,000
Automobile Liability Insurance - Any Auto Each Occurrence General Aggregate	 \$ 1,000,000 \$ 1,000,000
Professional Liability	\$ 2,000,000
Workers Compensation	Statutory Limits
Employer’s Liability	\$ 1,000,000

14.1.2. Workers’ Compensation and Employers’ Liability Insurance. Workers’ Compensation Insurance and Employers’ Liability Insurance for all of its employees performing any portion of the Services. In accordance with provisions of section 3700 of the California Labor Code, the Consultant shall be required to secure workers’ compensation coverage for its employees. If any class of employee or employees engaged in performing any portion of the Services under this Agreement are not protected under the Workers’ Compensation Statute, adequate insurance coverage for the protection of any employee(s) not otherwise protected must be obtained before any of those employee(s) commence performing any portion of the Services.

14.1.3 Professional Liability (Errors and Omissions). Professional Liability Insurance as appropriate to the Consultant’s profession, coverage to continue through completion of construction plus two (2) years thereafter.

Question Group #6. After careful review of the RFQ we have the following questions:

- Can you provide preliminary schedules (or milestones) for the projects? **All projects are currently in design.**
 - Davidson Building Construction Starts Winter 2018
 - Laurel Dell Building Construction Starts Winter 2018
 - Venetia Valley Building Construction Starts Winter 2018
 - San Pedro Building Construction Starts Winter 2018
 - SRHS Ph. 1 Building Construction Starts Spring 2019
 - Terra Linda HS Ph. 1 Building Construction Starts Spring 2019
- Are you intending to award to one firm or multiple firms? **More than one firm.**

Question Group #7. Thank you for the proposal opportunity. We have the following questions concerning San Rafael’s RFP:

1. The RFP states - kitchen systems to be included in the Cx scope.
 - a. Is this kitchen equipment (Stove exhaust, Ansul System, etc.) or general HVAC for the kitchens? **General HVAC including make-up air, exhaust fans.**

2. Have Owner Project Requirements (OPR) documents been issued for each site? If so, can they please be provided? **No.**

3. Are there any preliminary design documents that list specific equipment type and quantities at each site? Typically, the price for commissioning services is highly dependent on exact quantities of equipment and systems. In absence of this information, if bidders make their own assumptions we expect the District will receive prices for work scopes that may not be comparable. **Provide preliminary fee assumptions based upon the information provided. The District understands that the fee proposals might be based on previous projects completed by the respondents with similar scope of work, costs of construction, size of buildings. In consideration of preliminary nature of project descriptions, the District has revised the Evaluation Criteria under District's Evaluation Process as noted above in Addendum Item #2.**

4. Is district pursuing additional CHPS Energy credits such as:
 - a. EE 5.2 – Advanced Energy Management System and Sub-metering **Not clear at this time.**If so, has the district purchased fault detection software (Skypark, BuildPulse, etc)? **No, not at this time.**

5. Is district pursuing irrigation commissioning and green energy credits? **The District is not considering irrigation commissioning. The District will be installing renewable energy systems at sites, however, at this time, do not include any cost allowances for commissioning of renewable systems.**

6. Who will be conducting T24 acceptance testing? Will this be by the contractor or third party? **The District is assuming that this would be a part of the commissioning agent's responsibility.**

Question Group #8. On the General Project Information section, the RFQ/P states that the District is seeking a Professional Commissioning Service Firms to perform comprehensive commissioning services however on Section B. Scope of Services (Systems to be commissioned) there is no mention on the Low voltage systems (communication systems, security systems, etc.). Are we to assume that the Low voltage systems will not be commissioned? **Yes, however, energy management systems are required to be commissioned.**

[END OF ADDENDUM]