

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES

ARCHITECTURAL/ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR  
BENNING PARK COMMUNITY CENTER

Solicitation #: DCAM-15-AE-0157

Addendum No. 3  
Issued: October 9, 2015

---

This Addendum Number 03 is issued by e-mail on October 9, 2015. Except as modified hereby, the Request for Proposals (“RFP”) remains unmodified.

**Item #1**

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

1. Is HAZMAT survey report available or, we should include fee to do it? **Response: No HAZMAT survey is available. Please include this as an add/ alternate price (see revised bid form).**
2. Three water leaks were observed during the walkthrough. Is current roofing under warranty or, new roofing will be required? **Response: It is believed that the roof is over 10 years old, so a new roof will be considered.**
3. Confirm if all existing glazing to be replaced with energy efficient insulated glazing within the 4M budget for the project? **Response: We anticipate replacing the existing glazing to the extent economically feasible for the project.**
4. Confirm that all exterior and interior murals must be protected and retained. **Response: At this time, we anticipate that certain murals may need to be protected and retained and some may not.**
5. Define the scope of work for the following:
  - a. IT infrastructure improvements. **Response: The scope of work for the IT infrastructure will be developed with the design of the project. Additionally, DC OCTO will provide SOW requirements.**
  - b. AV need if any in Dance, Fitness, Lounge and Gym. **Response: A/V can be considered for dance, fitness, lounge and gym, but is not anticipated.**
  - c. Access control/Intrusion detection/Video surveillance. **Response: DGS’s Protective Services Division (PSD) will define the SOW for the security work as required.**
  - d. Exterior building lighting. **Response: SOW will be determined through development of the conceptual design submission.**
6. Looking at the project budget, are we safe to not consider:
  - a. SWM plan.
  - b. Public Space Improvements.
  - c. Traffic Control Plan.
  - d. DC Water and DOEE Technical Approvals.

**Response: Although DGS does not anticipate significant work with the items listed above, the project budget will play a considerable role with determining the SOW with these areas.**

7. Is natural gas available in the area such that it could be delivered to the community center? **Response: The Architect can explore this during the programming/concept phase, if needed.**
8. What temperature do they control their hydronic hot water to (supply and return)? This is the hot water supplying the two air handling units located in the Mechanical Room. **Response: The Architect can explore this during the programming/concept phase, if needed.**
9. What temperature do they control their chilled water to (supply and return)? This is the chilled water supplying the two air handling units located in the Mechanical Room. **Response: The Architect can explore this during the programming/concept phase, if needed.**
10. Are MEP drawings available for the building? **Response: To date, no MEP drawings have been found.**
11. Are test and balance reports available for the existing equipment? **Response: The Architect can explore this during the programming/concept phase, if needed.**
12. If a topographic survey exists will it be made available in advance of the fee proposal and bid being made? **Response: No survey is available. Please include this as an add/alternate price (see revised bid form).**
13. If no survey will be required/provided do we need to create a base plan from DC GIS? **Response: The Architect will need to determine the need and/or means for the survey during the programming/concept phase.**
14. Is it safe to assume there are existing on-site storm drain systems in place for relief of ponding areas? **Response: Yes, there are existing storm drain systems on site, however the performance or condition of these systems is unknown.**
15. Archeological Survey fee will only be included for Phase 1 work? **Response: As stated in Addendum 1, Offerors should bid a Phase 1 Archaeological Survey as an add/alternate.**
16. Is it safe to assume the cost of this renovation will not be more than 50% of the current building Tax Assessed value? Otherwise, SWM will be required even if there is no exterior land disturbance. **Response: The assessed building value (based on an assessment dated facilities condition assessment dated 10/5/2009) was \$3.8 million. The selected Architect will be required during programming/concept to determine how we proceed with SWM.**
17. Please confirm that the tax assessed value of the Community Center structure is less than \$8 million. If so, stormwater management for a \$4 million renovation (50% of the tax assessed value of the structure) will be required. Stormwater management may be provided with an extensive green roof for the building, or possibly on-site with adjustment of plumbing from the building. **Response: Please see response to Question 16 above.**
18. If any site work including ADA upgrades, improvements to the entrance areas, sidewalks, or parking lot, or on-site stormwater management facilities are required for the project, a topographic survey will be required. Please confirm that a limited topographic survey may be required for the project. **Response: Please see response to Question #12.**
19. Geotechnical services will be required for any on-site stormwater management. Please confirm that limited geotechnical services may be required for the project. **Response: A**

**geotechnical report may be required, although it is not anticipated. Please provide an add/alternate fee for this work.**

20. Does the building currently have a sprinkler system? **Response: No, the building does not have a fire suppression sprinkler system.**
21. Emergency Services:
  - a. Is there a requirement for an external emergency generator connection to the building? **Response: The requirement to make the building “generator ready” will be determined programming/concept phase and if economically feasible for the project.**
  - b. Is there a requirement for external IT/Communications connection to the building? **Response: Please see Response to Question 5a.**
22. Please clarify if third party review is allowed to be under contract to the Architect. Consultation with a certified third party review firm indicates that DCRA has issued a position that third party is not allowed to be under contract to the Architect. **Response: This item will be addressed in the draft form of contract issued by subsequent addendum.**
23. Permits:
  - a. Is the Architect responsible for the work associated with obtaining all the permits, e.g. expediting/obtaining all signatures? **Response: This item will be addressed in the draft form of contract issued in subsequent addendum.**
  - b. If the Architect is responsible for obtaining signatures on all permits, is the Architect responsible for permit fees (to be included as a reimbursable expense)? **Response: This item will be addressed in the draft form of contract issued by subsequent addendum.**
24. Site Survey:
  - a. Addendum #2 Item #2 notes that Topographical and Boundary Surveys are not required for this project. Is a site survey- topographic, boundary, site utilities- available to the Architect from the Owner should they be required? **Response: Please see response to questions #12 and 19.**
  - b. If a survey is not available from the Owner, should we include an alternate cost for performing a topographical, boundary, building location and site utility survey? **Response: Yes, please see response to questions #12 and 19.**
25. The site is made up of multiple parcels and lots:
  - a. Does the Owner plan to execute a subdivision prior to permit submission and is that subdivision in the Owner’s or Architects scope? **Response: This item will be explored during programming/concept, if needed.**
  - b. The parcels and lots are listed as owned by the United States of America. Please confirm that all of the lots have been transferred to the District of Columbia. **Response: The Architect can explore this during the programming/conceptual phase.**
26. Reimbursable Expenses:
  - a. How is the Architect to handle reimbursable expenses? **Response: This item will be addressed in the draft form of contract issued by subsequent addendum.**
  - b. Is there a differentiation between travel/in-house (copy, printing, delivery) expenses and expenses providing materials to DGS, DCRA and other Approvals Agencies? **Response: This item will be addressed in the draft form of contract issued by subsequent addendum.**
27. Please clarify the scope of work regarding IT Renovations: Cabling and Infrastructure design only by the Architect with IT equipment- switches, routers, racks etc. selected and

provided by the Owner? **Response: Yes, infrastructure and cabling will be designed by architect and IT equipment will be selected by owner. Please response to question 5a above.**

28. Please clarify the scope of security design: will the security design-layout, equipment and specifications be provided by the Owner for inclusion into the contract documents or is the Architect to develop that information in concert with the Owner? **Response: Please response to question 5c above.**
29. Is there a known UST(s) on this site? **Response: None have been identified to date.**
30. Please clarify if the restroom layouts and fixtures in all or some of the spaces are ADA compliant or require replacement. The Property Condition report does not cite any non-compliant features but also does not address layout-stall size, clearances, etc. **Response: ADA compliance for restroom and/or replacement can be explored during the planning/concept phase.**
31. Should the Architect submit an Alternate Fee for As-Builts (B.6.2)? **Response: Please include this as an add/ alternate price (see revised bid form).**
32. Is there a consideration to be made in terms of future usage – Such as additional services like toilets, etc., to accommodate more occupants in the bldg.? **Response: DGS is not considering future usage of the building.**
33. The façade of the building & site landscape could be revitalized to define the new character of this potential ‘node’ for this up & coming neighborhood. Can we propose more additions to the program in terms of improvement – especially façade and site landscapes? **Response: With the current budget in mind, DGS is not considering new programs or additions other than those noted in the RFP at this time.**
34. Should the design team aim for a LEED rating system for Operations & Maintenance or Interiors? **Response: LEED rating for Building Design and Construction is typical rating, however O&M or Interiors can be considered if more applicable.**
35. We assume a cost estimate will be needed for SD only before the builder/contractor gets on board? **Response: Cost Estimates are required at Conceptual Design and Schematic Designs. Please see RFP Sections, B2.2.o, and B.3.2.e.**

## **Item #2**

**Assessment Report:** A Comprehensive Facilities Condition Assessment and Space Utilization Survey for Benning Park from 2009 can be accessed at <https://leftwichlaw.box.com/s/w2noa4y16avp8avenrm5kw88k91hsvy9>

## **Item #3**

**The bid date is hereby changed.** Proposals are due by **October 20, 2015 at 2:00 pm EDT.** Proposals that are hand-delivered should be delivered to the attention of: Courtney Washington, Contract Specialist, at **Frank D. Reeves Center, 2000 14<sup>th</sup> Street, NW, 8<sup>th</sup> floor, Washington, DC 20009.**

Attachment B

[Insert Date]

District of Columbia Department of General Services  
2000 14<sup>th</sup> Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20009

Att'n: Mr. Christopher Weaver  
Acting Director

Reference: Request for Proposals  
Architectural/Engineering Services – Benning Park Community Center

Dear Mr. Weaver:

On behalf of [INSERT NAME OF BIDDER] (the “Offeror”), I am pleased to submit this proposal in response to the Department of General Services’ (the “Department” or “DGS”) Request for Proposals (the “RFP”) to provide Architectural/Engineering Services for the modernization of the Benning Park Community Center. The Offeror has reviewed the RFP and the attachments thereto, any addenda thereto, and the proposed Form of Contract (collectively, the “Bid Documents”) and has conducted such due diligence and analysis as the Offeror, in its sole judgment, has deemed necessary in order to submit its Proposal in response to the RFP. The Offeror’s proposal, the Design Fee (as defined in paragraph A), and the Add/ Alternate Prices (as defined in paragraph B) and the Hourly Rates (as defined in paragraph C) are based on the Bid Documents as issued and assume no material alteration of the terms of the Bid Documents (collectively, the proposal, the Design Fee, the Add/Alternate Prices, and the Hourly Rates are referred to as the “Offeror’s Bid”).

The Offeror’s Bid is as follows:

A. Design Fee: see attached spreadsheet

The Offeror acknowledges and understands that the Design Fee is a fixed fee and covers all of the Offeror’s costs associated with the preparation of the (i) concept design; (ii) schematic design; (iii) a set of design development documents; (iv) a permit set of construction documents (the “Bid Set”); (v) complete construction documents; and (vi) construction administration, as described in the RFP.

B. Add/Alternate Archaeology Survey: see attached spreadsheet  
Add/Alternate Historical Resources Survey: see attached spreadsheet  
Add/Alternate HAZMAT Survey: see attached spreadsheet  
Add/Alternate Topographic Survey: see attached spreadsheet  
Add/Alternate Geotechnical Report: see attached spreadsheet  
Add/Alternate As-Builts: see attached spreadsheet

The Offeror acknowledges and understands that the Add/Alternate Prices are fixed fees and cover all of the Offeror's costs associated with the Add/Alternates.

C. Hourly Rates: see attached spreadsheet

The Offeror acknowledges and understands that the attached hourly rates are fully loaded hourly rates at which construction administration services and any additional services will be charged.

The Offeror's Bid is based on and subject to the following conditions:

1. The Offeror agrees to hold its proposal open for a period of at least sixty (60) days after the date of the bid.

2. Assuming the Offeror is selected by the Department and subject only to the changes requested in paragraph 5, the Offeror agrees to enter into a contract with the Department on the terms and conditions described in the Bid Documents within ten (10) days of the notice of the award.

3. Both the Offeror and the undersigned represent and warrant that the undersigned has the full legal authority to submit this bid form and bind the Offeror to the terms of the Offeror's Bid. The Offeror further represents and warrants that no further action or approval must be obtained by the Offeror in order to authorize the terms of the Offeror's Bid.

4. The Offeror and its principal team members hereby represent and warrant that they have not: (i) colluded with any other group or person that is submitting a proposal in response to the RFP in order to fix or set prices; (ii) acted in such a manner so as to discourage any other group or person from submitting a proposal in response to the RFP; or (iii) otherwise engaged in conduct that would violate applicable anti-trust law.

5. The Offeror's proposal is subject to the following requested changes to the Form of Contract: **[INSERT REQUESTED CHANGES. OFFERORS ARE ADVISED THAT THE CHANGES SO IDENTIFIED SHOULD BE SPECIFIC SO AS TO PERMIT THE DEPARTMENT TO EVALUATE THE IMPACT OF THE REQUESTED CHANGES IN ITS REVIEW PROCESS. GENERIC STATEMENTS, SUCH AS "A MUTUALLY ACCEPTABLE CONTRACT" ARE NOT ACCEPTABLE. OFFERORS ARE FURTHER ADVISED THAT THE DEPARTMENT WILL CONSIDER THE REQUESTED CHANGES AS PART OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS.]**

6. The Offeror hereby certifies that neither it nor any of its team members have entered into any agreement (written or oral) that would prohibit any contractor, subcontractor or subconsultant that is certified by the District of Columbia Department of Small and Local Business Development as a Local, Small, or Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (collectively, "LSDBE Certified Companies") from participating in the work if another company is awarded the contract.

Mr. Christopher Weaver

[DATE]

Page 3

7. This bid form and the Offeror's Bid are being submitted on behalf of [INSERT FULL LEGAL NAME, TYPE OF ORGANIZATION, AND STATE OF FORMATION FOR THE OFFEROR].

Sincerely,

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Its: \_\_\_\_\_

RFP for Architect/Engineering Services  
 Benning Park Community Center  
 Attachment to Offer Letter

Concept Design	Schematic Design	Design Development Documents	Permit Set	100% Construction Documents	Construction Administration	Total Design Fee

Personnel Classification	Hourly Rate
Principal in Charge	
Design Principal	
Project Architect	
Staff Architect	
Landscape Architect	
Senior Mechanical Engineer	
Mechanical Engineer	
Senior Electrical Engineer	
Electrical Engineer	
Senior Structural Engineer	
Structural Engineer	

Add/ Alternates	Price
Archaeological Survey	
Historical Resources Survey	
HAZMAT Survey	
Topographic Survey	
Geotechnical Report	
As-Builts	

**PLEASE COMPLETE THE SHADED CELLS**