

Addendum No. 3
To
DCAM-21-AE-0009 Wilson Building Upgrades
Issued: July 6, 2021

This Addendum No. 1 is hereby issued on July 6, 2021. Except as modified hereby, the Request for Proposal (“RFP”) remains unmodified.

Item # 1: Bid Due Date Changed from July 9, 2021 at 4:00pm EST to July 16, 2021 at 4:00pm EST.

Item # 2: Final Condition Assessment Report - Wilson Building HAZMAT

Item # 3: RFI Responses

Item # 4: The following section of the scope of work under section 5, page 3 shall be removed:

“5. C-Level Water Leaks

D Street. – 10” Storm Water Pipe is expected to be the culprit in leaks in the adjacent office. An investigation needs to identify the exact source and cause of the leak, then a design will address the appropriate solution.”

By: Pamela Ford Dickerson
Pamela Ford Dickerson
Contracting Officer

Date: 07/06/2021

- End of Addendum No. 3

10.0 Hazardous Materials

10.1 BUILDING MATERIALS

Description

The Wilson building underwent major renovations in 2001 including a gut/rehab of the original building and constructing an addition. The majority of interior finishes were demolished with the exception of historically significant finishes or areas.

The floor coverings generally consist of carpet with areas of vinyl floor tile in special use areas. Walls are painted plaster and drywall. Ceilings typically consist of acoustical ceiling tiles and painted wallboard within special use areas.

Item	Friable	Description	Location
Suspect ACM	No	Vinyl floor tile	Various
Suspect ACM	No	Original fire doors	Various
Suspect Lead Paint	N/A	All original painted surfaces	Throughout building

Condition

Given the timeframe of the renovation activities, it is unlikely that friable asbestos-containing materials were used or remain on-site. Finish materials such as vinyl floor tile and mastic are suspect non-friable asbestos-containing material (ACM). Original painted surfaces are considered to be lead-based paint (LBP) or lead-containing paint. Observed insulation on ductwork and equipment in mechanical spaces appeared to be glass fiber.

The condition of the suspect ACM and LBP were good.

10.2 FUEL & CHEMICAL STORAGE

Description

A 600-gallon diesel aboveground storage tank is located in the C-level mechanical room. The diesel tank serves the emergency generator onsite. No paperwork for the tank was available to FEA.

Item	Description	Location
Diesel AST	600-gallon AST	C-Level Mechanical Room

Water treatment chemicals are stored in the C-level mechanical room. Cleaning chemicals are stored in a storage room on the C-level. Other chemicals and flammable materials are stored in the Hazardous Materials Room on the C-level. MSDS sheets for the chemicals in the building were observed in the engineering office.

Item	Description	Location
Water Treatment Chemicals	11 5-gallon buckets of water treatment chemicals 13 boxes of microbiocide	C-Level Mechanical Room
Cleaning Chemicals	Small amounts of windex, floor cleaner, and disinfectants	Housekeeping Storage Room
Flammable Materials	Various chemicals stored in a flammable cabinet Paints, degreaser, waterproofer	C-Level Hazardous Materials Room

Condition

The AST was in good condition and was equipped with secondary containment.

No floor drains or sumps were observed in the vicinity of the chemical storage areas and housekeeping was considered satisfactory. These chemicals, which are stored in their original containers, do not appear to represent an impact to the environmental quality of the site provided that they are used as intended, properly handled, and the regulations pertaining to their usage are followed.

Recommendations

The MSDS sheets should be moved to the physical location of the chemicals they pertain to.

DCAM-21-AE-0009 - Wilson Building Upgrades Questions Response

1. The contract requires the A/E team to design to budget; has a budget been established for this project? **Yes, the budget is \$8.5M**
2. Environmental Liability/Contractor's Pollution Liability – Please confirm that the A/E team is not required to provide this insurance since this does not apply to Professional Service contracts. Typically, this is a contractor insurance requirement. **A/E team is not required to provide Environmental Liability/Contractor's Pollution Liability insurance.**
3. Please confirm that the A/E is not required to submit a Payment Bond, Performance Bond, Bid Bond or Irrevocable Letter of Credit in lieu of the bonds. These bonds are typically associated with contractors and are not applicable to Professional Service contracts. **Correct**
4. How recent must the Certificate of Clean Hands be? Is a certificate completed in 2021 acceptable, or does the A/E team need to submit a more current certificate? **The Clean Hands Certificate must be current within the same month as bid submission.**
5. The RFP indicates that the final submission of required drawings will be on Computerized Graphic Software (AutoCAD) and PDF. Are Revit-format drawings acceptable in lieu of AutoCAD drawings, or does the final submission have to be in AutoCAD format? **Revit-format drawings is not acceptable.**
6. What existing documentation is available of the building in general (architectural, civil, MEP, structural)? Is it available electronically, and if so, in what form? PDF's? CAD? **DGS will provide the available drawings in PDF format.**
7. What existing documentation is available (e.g. building and site drawings, photos, condition assessment reports, maintenance repairs, previous repair records) regarding the 14th street window well leakage or the D street suspected storm water pipe leakage that can be provided for review? **This section will be removed in subsequent addendum.**
8. Attachment A, Section 5 of the RFP includes investigation of leaks at the C-level, including at window wells on 14th Street and along D Street. Please confirm the following:
 - a. The locations of the reported leaks in an office along D street (preferably on a plan drawing). This item was not reviewed during the earlier site walk. **Not included.**
 - b. On the site walk, the building engineer showed us areas of leakage at the basement level below the C-level, including near the northeast corner of the building and at the Switch Gear Room along the D Street (south) elevation. Please confirm whether investigation and repair of leaks at these areas are included in the scope. **Included.**
 - c. We understand from the site walk that previous leakage in the Elevator Machine Room (basement level) has been repaired. Please confirm that this is not included in the scope. **Not included.**
9. Attachment A, Section 6 of the RFP states “replace all windows with a new system that matches the existing look, but provides a much higher efficiency in regard to water leaks, air drafts, heat

insulation.” Please confirm whether the intended scope includes only windows on the building exterior (north, south, east, west elevations), and does not include interior curtain walls (between original building and enclosed atrium), or other glazing systems. **The intended scope includes only windows on the building exterior (north, south, east, west elevations)** Are there any special design requirements for the windows, such as Forced Entry Protection or Blast Resistance (FEBR)? **AE to work with PSD and Mayor’s security on which windows will be FEBR. Replacement windows must meet HPRB requirement being a historic building.**

10. Section A.5 of the RFP and Page 5 of Attachment A includes requirements for the A/E to engage a qualified commissioning authority for the project. The RFP is not specific about which systems are to be commissioned. Our understanding from the RFP is that commissioning services for this project to be provided by the design team are limited to the mechanical system work, and do not include commissioning of the building envelope (window replacement). Please confirm that our understanding is correct. **Yes. Special Commissioning services for other system will be provided by DGS contracted third party agents**
11. If Building Envelope Commissioning is required, based on the information listed below, should the design team still include the Project Commissioning Authority (CxA), as well as any other necessary technical commissioning providers, as part of their team submission? Or will DGS be engaging these entities for this project as implied by the documentation note below?
- a. Based on comments by representatives of the Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs (DCRA) and the National Capital Region Building Code Academy (NCRBCA) in response to a question following the 3 June 2021 seminar “2017 District of Columbia Commercial Energy Code Training” we understand it is currently DCRA’s expectation that the building enclosure commissioning provider (BECxP) would be **contracted by the project Owner directly** but could participate as part of the design team. DCRA also expects the “**Project Commissioning Authority**” (CxA) also must be engaged by ownership but they cannot participate with any role in design or construction and must only be performing commissioning services for the owner on the project. Guidance under the “Approved Commissioning Authority & Minimum Qualifications” subheading in the DCRA’s Green Building: Compliance requirements (linked here: [Green Building: Compliance | dcra](#)) confirms the same:
 - i. The commissioning authority shall not be a member of any construction or design firm involved in the design or construction of the project.
 - ii. The commissioning authority shall contract with the project owner or owner representative, but not a design firm or construction firm involved in the design or construction of the project.
 - iii. Qualified commissioning authorities must acknowledge the above two requirements when submitting to be an approved commissioning authority.
- See response to #10**
12. If the A/E is required to engage a building enclosure commissioning provider (BECxP) should the A/E also include an enclosure testing agency to perform testing on the new windows included in the project scope or can the A/E specify in the design that the contractor will engage a qualified enclosure testing agency? **See response to #10**

13. If the A/E is required to engage a building enclosure commissioning provider (BECxP) and enclosure testing agency, can the BECxP perform as the enclosure testing agency if so qualified?
See response to #10
14. Is there an estimated construction budget for the project? **Yes, the budget is \$8.5M**
15. Will the project include the production and submission of a full BIM (Building Information Modeling)/Revit model of the property? **Yes, but no Revit.**
16. Will the drawings of the existing facility be provided as an Addendum? **Yes, and in PDF format**
17. Is there any existing documentation available (e.g. building and site drawings, photos, condition assessment reports, maintenance repairs, previous repair records) regarding the 14th street window well leakage or the D street suspected storm water pipe leakage that can be provided for review? **See response to #16**
18. Please confirm that the A/E team will NOT be responsible for hazardous materials Abatement and only be there to monitor the completion of this work by a contractor under a separate contract. **Based on the Final Condition Assessment Report dated 8/10/2005, section 10 there is no hazardous materials Abatement needed (see attached document)**
19. Please confirm that Hazardous Materials Reports are to be included in the scope of work per Attachment A – Scope of Work. Under Section B.1.1.2 Hazardous Materials Report, it is noted “Not required”. **Yes**
20. The property is unzone based on its location in the city but is an 800 lot, will it require a subdivision for the permit? **No.**
21. Noted in Section B Scope of Work “B.1 Title I: Title I Services shall include Pre-Preliminary Design (including existing conditions and program)” however in Attachment A - Scope of Work there is no indication that there will be any programming involved in this project. Please clarify if there will be a Predevelopment Phase and what all will be required during that phase including deliverables. **There is no programming involved but consultation with facility department is required. Survey and validation of provided as built documentations is necessary for development of new base plans under this solicitation.**
22. In Section B.1.1.3 Deliverables under B.1.3 Design Development it notes “Fully developed plans, interior elevations, and all pertinent spatial and structural cross sections at appropriate architectural scales,” however, in Attachment A - Scope of Work there is no scope of work listed that would require this level of drawing or a structural engineer. Please clarify if drawings of the building in its entirety will be required even if not part of the Attachment A - Scope of Work. **Required Drawings and Specifications is determined by responders to the RFP and based on their understanding and proffered solution of the RFP requirements.**
23. During the building tour the window replacement scope of work was discussed. It was noted that all windows on the historic structure but on the exterior of the building and on the interior courtyard are too be replaced, additionally all the curtainwall/storefront on the exterior of the

building is to have the Glazing replaced. Please confirm the full scope of work for the windows and glazing throughout the building. **No replacement on the interior courtyard. Only the exterior façade. The scope is to provide a watertight building envelope and improve the energy efficiency, insulation.**

- a. Are there any special design requirements for the windows, such as Forced Entry Protection or Blast Resistance (FEBR). **See response to #9**

24. Please confirm if civil engineering design including a civil survey is required as part of the scope of work. **Responders to determine if and scope required in line with their proffered solution.**

25. Please confirm that the A/E team is to provide the excavation and associated permits required to investigate the scope of worked for “D St – 10” Storm Water Pipe.” **See response to #24**

26. Attachment A, Section 5 of the RFP includes investigation of leaks at the C-level, including at window wells on 14th Street and along D Street. Please confirm the following:

- a. The locations of the reported leaks in an office along D street (preferably on a plan drawing). This item was not reviewed during the earlier site walk. **Not included.**
- b. On the site walk, the building engineer showed us areas of leakage at the basement level below the C-level, including near the northeast corner of the building and at the Switch Gear Room along the D Street (south) elevation. Please confirm whether investigation and repair of leaks at these areas are included in the scope. **Included.**
- c. We understand from the site walk that previous leakage in the Elevator Machine Room (basement level) has been repaired. Please confirm that this is not included in the scope. **Yes, not included.**

27. Section A.5 of the RFP and Page 5 of Attachment A includes requirements for the A/E to engage a qualified commissioning authority for the project. The RFP is not specific about which systems are to be commissioned: mechanical, building enclosure, or both. Please confirm which systems will be commissioned as part of this RFP. If the scope includes building enclosure, then we have the following questions:

Based on comments by representatives of the Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs (DCRA) and the National Capital Region Building Code Academy (NCRBCA) in response to a question following the 3 June 2021 seminar “2017 District of Columbia Commercial Energy Code Training” we understand it is currently DCRA’s expectation that the building enclosure commissioning provider (BECxP) would be contracted by the project Owner directly but could participate as part of the design team. DCRA also expects the “Project Commissioning Authority” (CxA) also must be engaged by ownership but they cannot participate with any role in design or construction and must only be performing commissioning services for the owner on the project. Guidance under the “Approved Commissioning Authority & Minimum Qualifications” subheading in the DCRA’s Green Building: Compliance requirements (linked here: [Green Building: Compliance | dcra](#)) confirms the same:

- a. The commissioning authority shall not be a member of any construction or design firm involved in the design or construction of the project.
- b. The commissioning authority shall contract with the project owner or owner representative, but not a design firm or construction firm involved in the design or construction of the project.

- c. Qualified commissioning authorities must acknowledge the above two requirements when submitting to be an approved commissioning authority. New York Avenue Terminal (1345 New York Avenue, NE)

Based on the above, should the design team still include the Project Commissioning Authority (CxA), as well as any other necessary technical commissioning providers, as part of their team submission? Or will DGS be engaging these entities for this project? New York Avenue Terminal (1345 New York Avenue, NE) **See response to #10**

If the A/E is required to engage a building enclosure commissioning provider (BECxP) should the A/E also include an enclosure testing agency to perform testing on the new windows included in the project scope or can the A/E specify in the design that the contractor will engage a qualified enclosure testing agency? **See response to #10**

If the A/E is required to engage a building enclosure commissioning provider (BECxP) and enclosure testing agency, can the BECxP perform as the enclosure testing agency if so qualified? **See response to #10**

28.

Section A.2 of the RFP mentions “structural engineering services”, but Attachment A (scope of work) does not contain details for such scope. Please clarify if structural engineering services will be required. **See response to #24**

Paragraph A.5 requires commissioning as part of the project. Can the commissioning authority be an independent team that is part of the architectural or engineering firm or does the commissioning authority have to be from a separate firm?
See response to #10

29. Is it possible to get a copy of the latest hazardous materials report for the facility? **Based on the Final Cond Assessment Report dated 8/10/2005, section 10 there is no hazardous materials Abatement needed (see attached document)**

30. Please confirm that no hazardous material remediation is required as part of the scope of this project. **Base on the Final Cond Assessment Report dated 8/10/2005, section 10 there is no hazardous materials Abatement needed (see attached document)**

31. Due to the importance of the facility, is it possible to conduct field surveys and non-destructive investigative work during normal business hours? **Yes, this This has to be coordinated with facility engineer and other stakeholders.**

32. Please provide the project construction budget estimate. **The budget is \$8.5M**

33. Will the district require a study and/up design upgrades to have the facility capable of operating in an “Epidemic Mode”? **This is not in the current scope and requirements.**

34. Is there an estimated construction budget for the project? **The budget is \$8.5M**
35. Will the project include the production and submission of a full BIM (Building Information Modeling)/Revit model of the property? **BIMS**
36. Will the drawings of the existing facility be provided as an Addendum? **DGS will provide the available drawings.**
37. Is there any existing documentation available (e.g. building and site drawings, photos, condition assessment reports, maintenance repairs, previous repair records) regarding the 14th street window well leakage or the D street suspected storm water pipe leakage that can be provided for review? **This section will be removed through an addendum.**
38. Please confirm that the A/E team will NOT be responsible for hazardous materials Abatement and only be there to monitor the completion of this work by a contractor under a separate contract. **Base on the Final Cond Assessment Report dated 8/10/2005, section 10 there is no hazardous materials Abatement needed (see attached document)**
39. Please confirm that Hazardous Materials Reports are to be included in the scope of work per Attachment A – Scope of Work. Under Section B.1.1.2 Hazardous Materials Report, it is noted “Not required”. **Yes, not required.**
40. The property is unzone based on its location in the city but is an 800 lot, will it require a subdivision for the permit? **No.**
- 41.** Noted in Section B Scope of Work “B.1 Title I: Title I Services shall include Pre-Preliminary Design (including existing conditions and program)” however in Attachment A - Scope of Work there is no indication that there will be any programming involved in this project. Please clarify if there will be a Predevelopment Phase and what all will be required during that phase including deliverables. **There is no programming involved but consultation with facility department is required. See response to #21**
- In Section B.1.1.3 Deliverables under B.1.3 Design Development it notes “Fully developed plans, interior elevations, and all pertinent spatial and structural cross sections at appropriate architectural scales,” however, in Attachment A - Scope of Work there is no scope of work listed that would require this level of drawing or a structural engineer. Please clarify if drawings of the building in its entirety will be required even if not part of the Attachment A - Scope of Work. **See response to #22**
42. During the building tour the window replacement scope of work was discussed. It was noted that all windows on the historic structure but on the exterior of the building and on the interior courtyard are to be replaced, additionally all the curtainwall/storefront on the exterior of the building is to have the Glazing replaced. Please confirm the full scope of work for the windows and glazing throughout the building. **No replacement on the interior courtyard. Only the exterior façade. The scope is to provide a watertight building envelope and improve the energy efficiency, insulation.**

- a. Are there any special design requirements for the windows, such as Forced Entry Protection or Blast Resistance (FEBR)? **See response to #9**
43. Please confirm if civil engineering design including a civil survey is required as part of the scope of work. **See response to #24**
44. Please confirm that the A/E team is to provide the excavation and associated permits required to investigate the scope of worked for “D St – 10” Storm Water Pipe.” **Not required.**
45. Attachment A, Section 5 of the RFP includes investigation of leaks at the C-level, including at window wells on 14th Street and along D Street. Please confirm the following:
 - a. The locations of the reported leaks in an office along D street (preferably on a plan drawing). This item was not reviewed during the earlier site walk. **Not included.**
 - b. On the site walk, the building engineer showed us areas of leakage at the basement level below the C-level, including near the northeast corner of the building and at the Switch Gear Room along the D Street (south) elevation. Please confirm whether investigation and repair of leaks at these areas are included in the scope. **Included.**
 - c. We understand from the site walk that previous leakage in the Elevator Machine Room (basement level) has been repaired. Please confirm that this is not included in the scope. **Not included.**
46. Section A.5 of the RFP and Page 5 of Attachment A includes requirements for the A/E to engage a qualified commissioning authority for the project. The RFP is not specific about which systems are to be commissioned: mechanical, building enclosure, or both. Please confirm which systems will be commissioned as part of this RFP. If the scope includes building enclosure, then we have the following questions:

Based on comments by representatives of the Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs (DCRA) and the National Capital Region Building Code Academy (NCRBCA) in response to a question following the 3 June 2021 seminar “2017 District of Columbia Commercial Energy Code Training” we understand it is currently DCRA’s expectation that the building enclosure commissioning provider (BECxP) would be contracted by the project Owner directly but could participate as part of the design team. DCRA also expects the “Project Commissioning Authority” (CxA) also must be engaged by ownership but they cannot participate with any role in design or construction and must only be performing commissioning services for the owner on the project. Guidance under the “Approved Commissioning Authority & Minimum Qualifications” subheading in the DCRA’s Green Building: Compliance requirements (linked here: [Green Building: Compliance | dcra](#)) confirms the same:

- a. The commissioning authority shall not be a member of any construction or design firm involved in the design or construction of the project.
- b. The commissioning authority shall contract with the project owner or owner representative, but not a design firm or construction firm involved in the design or construction of the project.
- c. Qualified commissioning authorities must acknowledge the above two requirements when submitting to be an approved commissioning authority.

Based on the above, should the design team still include the Project Commissioning Authority (CxA), as well as any other necessary technical commissioning providers, as part of their team submission? Or will DGS be engaging these entities for this project?

If the A/E is required to engage a building enclosure commissioning provider (BE

See response to #10

CxP) should the A/E also include an enclosure testing agency to perform testing on the new windows included in the project scope or can the A/E specify in the design that the contractor will engage a qualified enclosure testing agency?

If the A/E is required to engage a building enclosure commissioning provider

See response to #10

(BECxP) and enclosure testing agency, can the BECxP perform as the enclosure testing agency if so qualified? See response to #10

47. Section A.2 of the RFP mentions “structural engineering services”, but Attachment A (scope of work) does not contain details for such scope. Please clarify if structural engineering services will be required. **This will be at discretion of the A/E.**
48. Please provide previous reports related to hazardous materials surveys, abatement activities, and/or operation and maintenance plans. **Base on the Final Cond Assessment Report dated 8/10/2005, section 10 there is no hazardous materials Abatement needed (see attached document)**
49. Section B.1.1 describes how hazmat surveys should be performed. Section B.1.1.2 indicates hazardous materials report is not required. These two statements are in conflict. Please clarify what Industrial Hygienist services are included in the scope of work and what phases of the project those services are expected to be included in. **Base on the Final Cond Assessment Report dated 8/10/2005, section 10 there is no hazardous materials Abatement needed (see attached document)**