GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES







Addendum No. 4 To

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS NO. DCAM-19-AE-RFP-0017 ARCHITECTURAL/ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR STEAD PARK RECREATION CENTER

Issued: November 5, 2019

This Addendum No. 4 is issued and effective as of the date shown above. Except as modified hereby, the Request for Proposals ("RFP"), proposal due date is extended to November 12, 2019@ 2:00 pm.

Item No. 1: Answers to questions are attached to this addendum as Exhibit 1.

Franklin Austin
Contracting Officer

- End of Addendum No. 4 -

Date: 11/5/2019

Architectural/Engineering Services for Stead Park Recreation Center

DCAM-19-AE-RFP-0017

Questions	Answers
Is the architect who produced the current design for Friends of Stead Park precluded from this solicitation?	Yes
Is the selected team beholden to the design that has been produced?	No, but keep in mind the scope and general program in the RFP were developed based on the previously completed design work which has been presented to the community.
3. Can the [2014] archaeology study be shared prior to proposal submission?	2008 Archaeology Report can be found at the following link: https://dpr.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/dpr/publica tion/attachments/dpr_stead_park_arch_report_oct_200 8.pdf
4. What is DPRs criteria for the sensory garden? What activities should be provided?	No defined criteria at this time. The original intent of the Sensory Garden was to serve as a garden in memory of Henry and Annie Hurt who built the carriage house on the site. Annie Hurt helped establish the Hurt Home for the Blind in Georgetown and the idea is that a "sensory garden" will provide interest to all, especially individuals who are blind or visually impaired, children, and adults alike. It is intended to beautify and animate the P Street Sidewalk in front of the park.
5. What is the desired new square footage?	Total square footage of around 12,000 is currently envisioned for the new/renovated facility. However this will be determined as program and design evolves.
6. Is aerial photography required as a deliverable [B.2.1a]?	No
7. Is the requested 40 year life cycle analysis for MEP systems or all components within the project?	All components

8. Is a formal phasing plan required as part of the design deliverable or does this fall under the purview of the CMAR?	Phasing plan will be required if necessary depending on the design and desire of DPR to operate the site. At this time, primary focus of phasing plan is to keep the field component of the facility available for community using during construction. AE team should work in conjunction with selected CMAR to develop best plan for this.
9. Based on the language in A.1, will this be a design-bid-build delivery project?	Section A.1 states that the project will be a Construction Manager at Risk (CMAR) delivery method.
10. Will a swing space (building) need to be accommodated on the site during construction?	No
11. Can you clarify historic status? a. Is the building on the historic registry or is it a contributing structure within the Dupont Historic overlay?	Contributing Structure. Please see additional historic information via link provided in Question #3.
12. Can you please clarify I the previous design proposals should be incorporated in this next design effort?	Previously designs can be incorporated into or influence the design effort but are not required to.
13. Can you confirm that we will be getting existing building drawings?	Existing building drawings can be found on the DGS project website: https://dgs.dc.gov/page/stead-park-recreation-center-project
14. Can you identify who uses the fields?	The fields are currently used by various organized sports/recreation groups and community members.
15. Can you confirm what / who of the team constitutes "offeror" when it comes to DSLBD / CBE scoring?	Lead Architect firm?
16. Can you provide an example of operational issues encountered in	It is expected Net zero feasibility will be informed by life cycle cost requirements

previous attempts to achieve net zero in other facilities?	included in the RFP which will identify costs and difficulties in operating a Net Zero facility.
17. Who currently manages the building and do you anticipate the same team will be managing new building? b. Hours of operation are posted as 3-9pm – will these remain?	DPR manages the building and DGS maintains it – Yes same team is anticipated to manage the new building as of right now.
18. It appears that there is an Architect that has worked rather extensively on the Center with Friends of Snead Park (FoSP). Will that Architect be permitted to bid on this project, or is there a conflict of interest or unfair advantage there?	NO - previous Architect is precluded