

Cheryl R. Bailey, Ph.D. Acting Executive Officer

Herbert Rouson, Jr., J.D. Acting Deputy Executive Officer DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTS

Administrative Services Division *Office:* Gallery Place 616 H Street NW, 6th Floor Washington, DC 20001 *Mailing Address:* 500 Indiana Avenue NW Washington, DC 20001-2131



Geoffrey A. Mack Acting Administrative Officer

AMENDMENT NO. 01

TO:

ALL PROSPECTIVE BIDDERS

AMENDMENT ISSUE DATE:

January 05, 2023

SUBJECT:

Solicitation No. DCSC-23-RFP-28 DC Courts Commissioning Services

PROPOSAL SUBMISSION DATE:

Tuesday 17, 2023, by 3:00 pm, Eastern Standard Time

This addendum answers submitted questions, and provides updated link to attachments

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED

One (1) copy of this amendment is being sent to all prospective Offerors. The prospective Offeror shall sign below and attach a signed copy of this amendment to each proposal to be submitted to the Courts in response to the subject solicitation or otherwise acknowledge this amendment with the signed offer as stated in the original solicitation documents. Proposals shall be delivered in accordance with the instructions provided in the original solicitation documents.

Geoffrey A. Mack

Geoffrey Mack Contracting Officer

Acknowledgement of this Amendment, together with the Offeror's proposal, must be received by the District of Columbia Courts as stated in the solicitation no later than the closing date and time specified above for the receipt of proposals.

Failure by the Offeror to properly acknowledge receipt of this Amendment Number 01 may be cause for rejection of the proposal submitted by the Offeror in response to the subject solicitation. **This Amendment Number 01 is acknowledged and is considered a part of the proposal for Solicitation Number DCSC-23-RFP-28 DC Courts Commissioning Services.** Signature of Authorized Representative

Date

Name of Authorized Representative

Title of Authorized Representative

Name of Offeror

From:	Kenneth L. Evans	Q & A	
		Round:	1
Company:	Administrative Service Division, Contracts and	Date:	January 05, 2023
	Procurement		
Email:	Kenneth.Evans@dccsystem.gov	Pages:	4

This Document includes the following:

- -Corrective Information
- -Solicitation Questions & Answers Round: 02
- -New Attachment K. Rev#1

cc:	Brett Johnson	DC Courts
cc:	Richard Moore	
cc:	<u>Clay McKenna</u>	
cc:		

A. SOLICITTION CHANGES

B. SOLICITATION QUESTIONS & ANSWERS: ROUND 01

- Question 1 (pg. 9) Section E (and elsewhere in the RFP) refers to "inspection system" or "inspection work", and this section appears to require certain punitive requirements for this provider, referred to as "contractor" in this section to re-perform work if not acceptable to the owner. Cx services, typically, are 3rd party services provided on behalf of the owner. Cx providers do not assume responsibility for design or installation of systems or materials and would not be subject to re-work requirements as a result of "inspections". Please provide some clarity as to the intent of this page (section E).
- Answer 1 Commissioning services contractor is not responsible for General Contractors' Services and are not required to assume responsibility for work done by the General contractor.
- Question 2 (pg. 17) G.3.8 specifies retainage rates of 10%. Retainage typically would not be applied to non-professional or professional services contracts that do not include materials provided. Please consider that services may not be subject to retainage requirements. These amounts are better suited to construction materials and services contracts where workmanship and final acceptance are material to final payment.
- Answer 2 The process of holding retainage will not apply to the commission services required under this solicitation.
- Question 3 (pg. 17) G.3.11 specifies an overall retainage of 10%. Consider that retainage is not typical for non-professional or professional services contracts that do not include materials provided. These amounts are better suited to construction materials and services contracts where workmanship and final acceptance are material to final payment.
- Answer 3 The process of holding retainage will not apply to the commission services required under this solicitation.
- Question 4 (pg. 29) H.12 and H.13- sub-contracting: We intend to provide our proposal without sub-contractors at this point because we are able to provide commissioning services without subcontract for the systems or specialties listed in the RFP (M/E/ P/Fire Protection/Low Voltage/Comm). However, the RFP is not specific to the type of services to be provided and we may supplement our workforce with required specialties if needed in the future unless you choose to specify these requirements at this time. If necessary, please specify the type of systems to be commissioned, services to be provided, or specialties to be considered in addition to the engineering specialists required within the RFP (short list of examples below):
 - Building Envelope or Enclosure specialist
 - Testing, Adjusting, and Balancing specialist (primarily if retrocommissioning is considered)
- Answer 4 The Court will allow proposals to be submitted without subcontractors. The Courts reserve the right to review and approve subs before any work is done.
- Question 5 Section J attachments, as listed on page 35 of the RFP, are not included. Please provide applicable attachments.
- Answer 5 Updated links have been included for all attachments

Question 6	stion 6 Section K (beginning page 36) is listed on page 35 as the "Pricing" attachment; however, it does not include the information that is to be priced. As a recommendation, since this is an IDIQ solicitation, we would suggest that DC C would require hourly rates for consideration (in addition to experience, etc. require lesewhere). If you are requiring a sample project to be priced out completely, pl provide that information. As written, we do not have the information necessary t provide pricing.	
Answer 6	Attachment K.1 reflects the pricing schedule: please ATTACHMENT K.1	
Question 7	As a result of the questions noted above and the dual holiday period in which this solicitation was received, please consider delaying the required response by 7 days to January 17, 2023.	
Answer 7	Yes, the Due date has been extended to January 17, 2023.	
Question 8	Also, just to clarify- the professional liability insurance limits for this contract will be \$2,000,000?	
A	the survey of the set of the billion to serve any distribution of the set of the server set of the second set of	

Answer 8 the professional liability insurance limits will not apply to the commission services required under this solicitation.

C. <u>ATTACHMENTS</u>

Updated links are provided