

**GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES**

**CONSTRUCTION SERVICES FOR THE BEAUTIFICATION OF
ST. ELIZABETHS BUILDINGS 89, 94, 95, AND 100**

Solicitation #: DCAM-15-CS-0143

Addendum No. 6

Issued: October 16, 2015, 2015

This Addendum Number 06 is issued by e-mail on October 16, 2015. Except as modified hereby, the Request for Proposals (“RFP”) remains unmodified.

Item #1

Scope of Work/Pricing Documents: Available for download at <https://leftwichlaw.box.com/s/bekdv2vw1gnywlx3savnldjda36u6n4w> is the roofing scope of work.

Item #2

Requests for Information: Below is a list of questions received and the Department’s responses.

1. Should the exterior metal stairs be painted? **Response: Yes.**
2. Does HPRB have a preference on how we should attach the plywood to the windows? **Response: See Attachment No. 1.**
3. Has the building been abated? **Response: LBP Remediation will need to be performed; see Attachment No. 3 (to be uploaded to the link above no later than October 21, 2015).**
4. If the windows are boarded up, how do we allow them to breathe? **Response: See Attachment No. 1.**
5. B.1.8; campus currently has security services, please define security requirements. **Response: DGS will inform Security once construction has begun. The selected Contractor will be required to provide a weekly list of contractors that will be visiting the site.**
6. Painting; please specify items to be repainted along with a finish schedule. **Response: All exposed wood and painted steel is required to be painted on the exterior. A finish schedule will be required by the Contractor as part of your submittals, in accordance with the specifications in Division 09.**
7. Limits of disturbance; please specify limits of disturbance of area(s) of work. **Response: Buildings 89, 94, 95 and 100.**
8. Façade; excluding paint, is any other façade work anticipated as part of this scope? **Response: Deteriorated or un-sound wood fascia, soffit, rafter tails, gutter, downspout work is included.**
9. Exterior cleaning; will cleaning be part of the scope, if so, please specify? **Response: Cleaning will be limited to preparation to the surfaces being remediated or painted**

and the surrounding grounds. This is an open site, so daily grounds clean-up is required for all debris, especially nails and sharp objects.

10. Structures; is repair and/or re-painting of structures, such as walkways, stairways, porches, columns, louvers, screen, grates, and grills part of the scope? **Response: Yes, limited to steel and wood items.**
11. Porches; screening at some sections are missing and/or in-filled with plywood, what is the anticipated scope for these conditions? **Response: The Department has not yet determined the scope for that portion of the work. An allowance will be carried in the contract for such work.**
12. Trees/vegetation/overgrowth; please specify the extent of removal for each building. **Response: See Section 01 56 39.**
13. Maintenance; will maintenance of landscaping within limits of disturbance be required during the 90-day period of performance? **Response: Yes.**
14. Cleaning; will cleaning of sidewalks, stairs, and/or patios, be part of the scope, if so, please specify? **Response: See response to question no. 9 above.**
15. LSDBE Utilization counts for 10% of the bid evaluation. Is there any incentive to do better than the stated goals? (Ref. A.6, pg 4 of 26) **Response: Offerors must demonstrate in their proposals that they are able to meet the Department's minimum LSDBE goals as explained in the RFP. Offerors who can demonstrate higher levels of LSDBE participation will receive more favorable evaluations with respect to their proposed LSDBE plans.**
16. The words 'spruce up,' 'beautification,' and 'watertight' are used throughout the document, however their meanings may be subjective. Are we to qualify the extent of each that is included in our bid? For example, repairing the roof and leaving the wooden soffit sagging would not qualify as watertight. **Response: Please review the added specifications and guidelines for this project available for download in Item #1.**
17. Is the quantity of terra cotta tile stored on site sufficient for the repairs? If not, what is the anticipated amount that needs to be fabricated, and do you have a source for this material? **Response: Please review Attachment Nos. 8 and 9 for verification of stored tile.**
18. We intend to construct safety barricades for the use of our work only. Is it your intent to construct permanent safety rails/barriers in and on the buildings? (Ref. B.1.5, pg 6 of 26) **Response: No.**
19. Please clarify whether the plywood window coverings are to be painted the color of the bricks, or do they need to be painted to look like the brick with mortar joints. **Response: Exterior plywood covering color to be approved at time of submittal. For bidding purposes, the plywood paint is to match the brick.**
20. What permits will be required for this project? Is the contractor responsible for putting together the drawings and obtaining the building permit? **Response: The Contractor will be responsible for all permits.**
21. Is the contractor responsible for putting together the presentation package to obtain approval from Washington, DC State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO)? **Response: Yes.**
22. Has a hazardous materials report been completed on the exterior of the four buildings? If so, can we get a copy? **Response: See Attachment No. 3.**
23. Will the general contractor be responsible for any lead or asbestos abatement under this RFP? **Response: Yes, see response to question no. 3 above.**

24. Is there any structural damages to the roof rafters and structural walls that will need to be addressed? **Response: See WPM St. Elizabeths East Campus Roof Structural Condition Assessment, available at the link specified above.**
25. Does these buildings have a Historic Structures Report? If so, can we get a copy? **Response: Not available.**
26. Does this RFP cover work to stabilize and repair the existing soffits? **Response: Yes.**
27. Does this RFP cover work to stabilize and repair the existing gutters and down spouts? **Response: Yes.**
28. Do the existing entrances need to be covered with Brick Colored Plywood as well? **Response: Doors and Windows should be covered.**
29. If the existing entrances are to be covered like the windows, are we to provide a secure entrance for each building? **Response: Yes.**
30. When were the last repairs to the roof completed? **Response: Completed in 2013.**
31. Installing the plywood on the walls might result in an airtight environment that will be damaging to the historic elements of the building. What building ventilation system will be required for this project? **Response: See Attachment No. 1- Passive Ventilation.**
32. Do we need to provide a maintenance plan for a period after the completion of this work? **Response: Not at this time.**
33. Will we be required to perform historical repairs of materials currently covered by temporary plywood before the installation of the new plywood? **Response: Yes.**
34. Will we be required to remove the existing window AC units, and other existing metal elements around the windows (AC unit supports, security screens, etc.)? **Response: Yes.**
35. Are any sample tiles available in order to obtain color and profile? **Response: Yes, as is currently being stored in the buildings.**
36. Because of Fences, Building(s) Configuration and access in general, we are unable to get to the north end of Building 89 in order to perform our take off. It appear that we need to enter the building in order to assess the situation. Being unable to see that end affects our ability to bid both the carpentry and landscape components of this bid. The Rise Center Facilities Manager believes she has a key but she is awaiting some direction from DGS in order to allow anyone access. Can this access be facilitated? **Response: Yes. If interested, please reach out to the Project Manager Vanessa Simmons at vanassa.simmons@dc.gov.**
37. **Scope of Roof Repair.** Clarification is needed on roof assessment recommendations. For example the report state that Bldg. 89, Roof Section A is 73% “Degraded.” Bldg. 94, Roof Section A is 78% “Degraded.” Bldg. 95, Roof Section A is 51% “Unsatisfactory,” Roof Section B is 73% “Degraded.” And Roof Section C is 71% “Degraded.” Bldg. 100, Roof Section A is 68% “Degraded,” and Roof Section B is 41% “Unsatisfactory.” The standard recommendation noted at all “Degraded areas reads “Area is currently water tight, however, underlayment is not a permanent solution to guard against roof leaks. Bluefin recommends monitoring area for roof leaks on a monthly basis, until roofing can be properly reinstalled.” While the 2 “Unsatisfactory” Roof Sections noted on Bldgs. 95 and 100, the Bldg. 95 recommendation reads the same as above for the standard “Degraded” recommendation and the Bldg. 100 recommendation calls for repairing and sealing holes in membrane caused by falling bricks. Our question is to what extent is the desired repair? Are we to strip the roof of the remaining tile shakes, felt underlayment, inspect and repair roof deck and then install new 15# felt underlayment, roof penetration and roof/wall junction flashing and new tile shakes at all “Degraded” and “Unsatisfactory” roof sections? Or are we just to install tile shakes where they are missing? Please advise. We are presuming that the roof sections marked “Adequate”

require no work. **Response: The base scope of work is to fill in the areas that do not have tile, make necessary repairs to the ridge, hip and any broken pieces to place the roof pack into a watertight condition.**

38. **Clarification on project scope.** In light of the noted “falling bricks” and after viewing the pictures of the buildings brick chimneys, will any brick re-pointing be required or desired at any of the buildings? Falling bricks would compromise any new roof surface, especially clay/concrete tile shakes. Please advise. **Response: The Bluefin report was completed 2 years ago and some repointing has been completed. Additional investigation may be needed.**

Item #3

The bid date is hereby changed. Proposals are due by **November 2, 2015 at 2:00 pm EST.** Proposals that are hand-delivered should be delivered to the attention of: Courtney Washington Contract Specialist, at **Frank D. Reeves Center, 2000 14th Street, NW, 8th floor, Washington, DC 20009.**

- End of Addendum No. 6 -