

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

**DESIGN-BUILD SERVICES
MURCH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

Solicitation #: DCAM-15-CS-0166

**Addendum No. 2
Issued: September 22, 2015**

This Addendum Number 02 is issued by e-mail on September 22, 2015. Except as modified hereby, the Request for Proposals (“RFP”) remains unmodified.

Item #1

Preproposal Conference Meeting Minutes: Minutes from the September 17, 2015 preproposal conference are attached.

Item #2

Hazardous Material and Geotechnical Reports: Information regarding the presence of hazardous materials and the geotechnical report are available through the links below.

- Hazardous Materials: <https://leftwichlaw.box.com/s/v3bio73h61qftvokkf5q2gr07fp6bk9z>
- Geotechnical Report: <https://leftwichlaw.box.com/s/e1ktzniqai10uqo1avy8xd0nolcc6g82>

Item #3

The bid date remains unchanged. Proposals are due by **October 6, 2015 at 2:00 pm EDT.** Proposals that are hand-delivered should be delivered to the attention of: Alicia Norris, Contract Specialist, at **Frank D. Reeves Center, 2000 14th Street, NW, 8th floor, Washington, DC 20009.**

- End of Addendum No. 2 -

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



**PREPROPOSAL CONFERENCE MEETING MINUTES
RFP FOR DESIGN-BUILD SERVICES
MURCH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

**Solicitation #: DCAM-15-CS-0166
September 17, 2015 at 1:30 p.m.**

1. A preproposal conference for the above-referenced solicitation was held on Thursday, September 17, 2015 at 1:30 p.m.
2. The preproposal conference began with introductions of the following individuals:
 - a. Jeff Bonvechio – Deputy Director of Capital Construction, DGS
 - b. Thomas Bridenbaugh & Kavita Aildasani – Leftwich, LLC (Procurement and Real Estate Development Consultant)
 - c. Mike Quadrino & Sarah Hasselmann – DCPEP (Program Manager)
3. Details of the project were discussed:
 - a. Murch is an elementary school located in Ward 3.
 - b. It has exceeded its current capacity. A complete renovation of the building is anticipated.
 - i. The existing building is about 45,000 sqft and was built in the 1920s. The building is historic.
 1. The addition of 50,000 sqft is anticipated as part of the project. The additional space would be built along Davenport Street. Below the addition, parking for approximately 25 cars is anticipated.
 - ii. Renovation of playgrounds, softscape, and hardscape are also contemplated.
 - c. The site is very compact and part of the land is owned by the National Park Service (“NPS”).
4. The delivery method of the project was discussed:
 - a. DGS has already engaged R. McGhee & Associates (“RMC”) to serve as the Architect for the Project. DGS is only seeking to engage a builder through this solicitation. DGS will assign its agreement with RMC to the builder to create a design-build team. Assignment will take place at the time the GMP is established, around late spring of 2016.
5. The fee structure was discussed. Offerors are to bid the following three numbers in addition to providing their qualifications:

- a. Preconstruction Fee – This fee should be bid as a number, not as a percentage. This fee should cover all costs for design reviews, schedule, estimating, trade bidding, GMP preparations, and helping to manage the project during preconstruction—essentially all costs from award through the commencement of construction.
- b. Design-Build Fee – This fee should cover overhead and profit. It does not include insurance and bonds or general conditions costs.
- c. General Conditions Budget – This is a not-to-exceed number for general conditions cost—project Managers, field office, etc. It should also include staff on the site that is above the level of a foreman.

Offerors were specifically advised that their bid should not be submitted relative to the budget. Offerors were advised that their bids should be relative to the concept design issued with the RFP and the schedule. Fees and general conditions will not be increased if the project budget increases. Fees will only be increased if (i) the concept design changes radically and results in an increase to the cost of performance; or (ii) the schedule changes and results in an increase to the cost of performance.

6. It was again noted that the site is very compact and that a portion of the site is National Park Service land which can only be used for recreation purposes. From the Department’s perspective, one of the challenges of the project will be how to construct the project while the school is swung on site and without it adversely affecting school operations. Offerors were encouraged to address this in the management plan, including specific details on how it would be accomplished. Offerors were reminded that essentially, the construction would be over 2 years, and although there would be work during 3 summers, for the majority of the construction phase, the school would be in session. It was noted, that there may be some swinging inside the building, and that Offerors should address this as well.
7. As a follow-on to the discussion in paragraph 6 above, it was noted that Section D outlines specifically the evaluation criteria, and the importance of a detailed management plan specific to this project was stressed.
8. The importance of budget and the builder’s role in managing the project to budget was stressed. It was made clear that the Department desires to adhere to the budget and that the builder being engaged through this procurement is expected to be a construction professional, not simply an installer, to manage the design, schedule, and cost and delivering a first class project. The builder needs to be actively participating in preconstruction phase. With regard to the proposals, the Department desires to understand that the builder knows how to manage the project, that it can and will manage the project.
9. Economic inclusion requirements were discussed.
 - a. CBE Participation
 - i. 50% of all dollars in the contract must go to CBEs.
 - ii. 35% of all dollars in the contract must go to SBEs.
 - iii. 20% of all dollars in the contract must go to DBEs.

- iv. It was specifically noted that the only certifications that count are those from DLSBD; no reciprocal certifications are accepted.
 - v. It was also specifically noted that no trades are excluded from the dollar volume calculations for these goals, and that waiver were rarely, if ever, granted.
 - b. First Source Requirements
 - i. Fifty one percent of new hires must be District residents.
 - ii. Offerors were also reminded that the percentage hour requirement for various classifications of workers in the First Source requirement would be triggered by the value of this project.
 - c. It was noted that the certified apprenticeship programs are also required.
- 10. It was noted that the Davis Bacon Act applies, and that Offerors must comply with the requirements of that act, including paying prevailing wages and record keeping, and reporting requirements. It was noted that there have been issues with record keeping and the appropriate classification of workers.
- 11. It was noted that in preliminary conversations, NPS had indicated that it was open to using the NPS land for the swing space trailers.
- 12. An opportunity was provided for questions; no questions were asked.
- 13. In closing, it was noted that an addendum would be issued with the sign-in sheet and confirming the scheduling of the walk through. By separate addendum, the form of contract would be issued.
 - a. It was noted that the form of contract would not be a standard District government contract or AIA contract, although it would look somewhat like prior DGS contracts. It was explained that the form of contract would allocate risks differently than a standard District government contract or AIA contract.
 - b. It was noted that although Offerors were permitted to request changes to the form of contract, this was not encouraged. Offerors were advised that in order to be fair, any requested changes need to be submitted with the Offeror's proposal and to go through the necessary channels within their respective organizations to be able to do so. Offerors were advised that the Department would not be receptive to changes after the bid.
 - c. It was also specifically noted that simply because an Offeror requested a change and that Offeror was ultimately selected, the Department was not by selecting the Offeror, agreed to the requested changes.