GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES







Addendum No. 3

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL NO. DCAM-24-CS-RFP-0004 DESIGN-BUILD SERVICES FOR MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. ELEMENTARY SCHOOL MODERNIZATION Issued: December 1, 2023

This Addendum No. 3 is issued and hereby published on the DGS website and is effective as of the date shown above. Except as modified hereby, the Request for Proposals ("RFP") remains unmodified.

Item No. 1: The questions and answers sheet about the RFP is hereby attached as **Exhibit 1**.

Item No. 2: The proposal due date is hereby extended to December 22, 2023, at 2:00 P.M.

By: Peter Lyonga Ghogomu
Peter Ghogomu
Contracting Officer

- End of Addendum No. 3 -

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES







Exhibit 1

Questions and Answers about the RFP

[EXHIBIT WILL APPEAR ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE]

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

DCAM-24-CS-RFP-0004

DB SERVICES FOR MLK ES MODERNIZATION

No.	Questions	Answers
1	Please provide a design for student capacity	Refer to attachment A2 (MLK Elementary School Educational Specifications) of the RFP.
2	RFP 1.1.1.4 mentions the solar-readiness requirement. Currently solar is installed on the building roof. Is the intent to salvage and reuse existing solar?	The existing system will likely be replaced.
3	Currently solar is installed on the building, at the time of installation was the building	Refer to the response to question NO.2.
4	Will the building remain occupied during construction?	No, the school will swing out for 2 years as noted in the RFP.
5	Will the Design-Build team be responsible for a swing plan?	No.
6	Will the adjacent Congress Heights Recreation Center be utilized as shared outdoor program space, to include parking?	The Congress Heights Rec Center is currently undergoing modernization and should not be expected to be utilized for a shared program.
7	The current RFP proposal due date is 12/15/2023. With recent and pending Holidays, will this due date be extended?	Refer to Item No. 2 of this addendum.
8	Please confirm the goal of EUI 20kbtu/SF/yr requirement outlined in the RFP only applies to the new addition and not the existing building. It's understood that the existing building includes air-cooled VRF and new unit ventilators, which are not aligned with an EUI 20 solution.	The new EUI is for the whole project and the mechanical system is expected to be replaced as part of the modernization.
9	Please confirm intent to reuse existing building MEP systems.	Reuse of the existing mechanical system is not expected. Electrical and plumbing will require evaluation by the Design-Builder.

10	Addendum 2 deleted Section 3.4.8 (Certified Mentor-Protégé Partnership). Will the submission date be extended? The deletion of this section will affect prepared documents and teaming arrangements.	Refer to the response to question NO.7.
11	The RFP states a requirement of EUI of 20. Given the limited site area for geothermal wells, achieving this may not be possible unless the school is willing to work within strict usage and occupation guidelines, such as no summer school, and or plug-load restrictions. Please advise on the flexibility of this requirement.	The Design-Builder shall work to achieve the EUI 20 or provide reasoning for being unable to reach this goal.
12	Please confirm if the EUI of 20 is only intended for the addition. The existing building includes air-cooled VRF and new unit ventilators which are not aligned with an EUI 20 solution.	Refer to the response to question NO.8.
13	The playground equipment appears to be relatively new. Is new equipment required or can the existing equipment be reused?	This will be determined during the project, however, by the delivery date of the project the existing equipment will be much older and therefore it should be assumed it will be replaced.
14	The RFP states that the Design Development drawings are to be used as the basis for the GMP. Because the design period is longer than previous DCPS projects, we anticipate that we may be able to use a more advanced set such as 50% CDs as the basis for GMP. Is there flexibility in this requirement?	Yes.
15	The existing windows appear to have been recently replaced. Please advise on the need to replace these windows.	This shall be determined during the project based on need and meeting sustainability goals.
16	Is there a zoning report available for this project?	No.
17	Will DGS engage a land-use attorney for this project?	No, if a land use attorney is expected to be needed, the Design-Builder is responsible for their scope.
18	The rec center appears to be accessed through the school site. Please advise on any easements or agreements in place to maintain this access.	The rec center is currently accessed through the site but is currently in design for a modernization. Access will be coordinated with DPR during construction.

19	Are there any special after-school or third-party community organizations that use the building?	Further information on school programs will be determined during the project.
20	Will the site be occupied during construction?	Refer to the response to question NO. 4.
21	Please confirm Tri-Joint Venture or Quad-Joint Venture is allowed for this project?	Refer to the last paragraph of Section 3.4.1 (Past Performance, Relevant Experience & Capabilities on the Design-Builder) of the RFP.
22	Is it possible If a firm is involved in multiple joint ventures, and can submit multiple bids for this project?	Refer to the response to question NO. 21.
23	Please confirm Net Zero is not required for this project.	Confirmed.
24	The provided HAZMAT report covers a page dated 2020 however the selected data record in 2006, please confirm this is valid to use.	The Design-Builder will be responsible for verifying the provided report and executing any required abatement.
25	If provide HAZMAT expires, will DGS provide the HAZMAT allowance in the bid form, or it should be covered in the GMP phase?	Refer to the response to question NO.24.
26	Please confirm solar panels are to be removed by DGS & provide the expected timeline.	The panels will be removed by DGS and will work with the Design-Builder to confirm the required date during the project.
27	Are the original structural drawings available and able to be provided?	All existing documentation has been provided along with the RFP.
28	Are there plans for a Child Development Center at this location? One is not shown in the Ed Spec, however, M.L. King has been publicly discussed as housing one of these programs in the future.	No.
29	To what extent can co-location and coordination happen between this project and the Congress Heights Recreation Center? As the design of this project develops there may emerge opportunities to take a holistic view of the site that better supports both programs.	The rec center will go under construction during the early design phases of this project and there will likely be little opportunity to make adjustments to the project.
30	Please confirm that the parking requirements for this site will be aligned to Zoning minimums as is typical for DCPS facilities undergoing Modernization.	Yes.

31	The ed specs in Attachment A3 identify space requirements based on 4 ranges of student populations. What is the projected student enrollment that this project should be designed for?	Refer to the response to question NO.1.
32	What is anticipated for any zoning issues or entitlements in this project?	This is to be determined by the Design-Builder.
33	Is there anticipated regular occupancy of the building beyond the typical school schedule? For example, any community meetings or use by other groups?	There is a standard schedule provided in the ed specs, further information will be provided during the project.
34	What areas of the site are available for consideration for geothermal? Parking and playground areas? Is there interest in investigating sewer heat exchange?	The parking and playground area can be considered but the overall design will be determined as part of the project. Sewer Heat Exchange is not being considered for this project.
35	Are original drawings, including structural drawings, available?	Refer to the response to question NO.27.
36	How do the majority of students arrive at school? Walking, biking, bus, drop off?	This information will be determined during the project.
37	Is there an agreement that allows the school to use the alleyway for parking? Will this remain?	There is no known agreement and will need to be determined as part of the survey performed by the Design-Builder.
38	What is the history of the alleyway easement? It appears to be an odd shape that was removed from the school property.	Refer to the response to question NO.37.
39	What is the accurate property line?	Refer to the response to question NO.37.
40	Are the elevators hydraulic?	Refer to Attachment B (MLK Existing Drawings) of the RFP.