

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES



Addendum No. 4
To
ARCHITECTURAL/ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR
BRENT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
Solicitation No: DCAM-19-AE-0004

Issued: July 3, 2019

This Addendum No. 4 is issued and hereby published on the DGS website on July 3, 2019. Except as modified hereby, the Request for Proposals (“RFP”) remains unmodified.

Item #1: The Questions and Answers are hereby attached herein as (**Exhibit 1**).

Item #2: The reference to “West Elementary school” within Section D.3.4 (Acceptability of Design Approach and Management Plan) is hereby deleted and replaced with “Brent Elementary School”.

Item #3: Section C.2 of the RFP (LSDBE Participation) is hereby revised, as follows:

Section C.2 LSDBE Participation

At least 35% of the dollar volume of the Agreement shall be subcontracted in accordance with (**Attachment I**) to entities that are certified as Small Business Enterprises by the DSLBD. Offerors shall submit a SBE Subcontracting Plan (**Attachment I**) with their proposals. The SBE Subcontracting Plan must demonstrate how this requirement will be met and, to the extent possible at this stage in the project, should identify the specific firms that will be used and their respective roles

Item #4: The Proposals Due Date is hereby extended to July 15, 2019 at 2:00 pm.

By: _____

Ebti K. Hana
Contracting Officer

Date: 07/03/2019

- End of Addendum No.4 -

EXHIBIT 1

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

[EXHIBIT WILL APPEAR ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE]

No.	Questions	Answers
1	<p>A persistent problem in the District of Columbia is the widely known fact that many <u>large, out-of-town firms</u> have arranged to get themselves CBE-certified as local and small, even though they are neither local nor small.</p> <p>In part, to prevent the total exclusion of small and disadvantaged businesses, DC Government requires that at least: <u>35%</u> of the work on its projects be done by <u>Small CBE firms</u>, and at least <u>20%</u> by <u>Disadvantaged CBE firms</u>.</p> <p><u>Clause C.2.1.3</u> on page 16 of the RFP totally eliminates this critical subcontracting requirement. This clause allows large firms passing as CBEs to do <u>no subcontracting whatsoever</u>. This clause must be deleted. <u>Is DGS willing to delete this clause and compel large firms – CBE or not – to comply with the subcontracting requirements of Section C.2.? If not, why not?</u></p>	<p>Refer to Item No. 3 of Addendum No. 4.</p>
2	<p>It can certainly be argued that large, out-of-town firms should <u>not</u> be CBE certified in the first place. DC residents all agree. But the reality is that many of them <u>are</u>. As a result, large firms are already monopolizing the marketplace. DGS does not need to make their monopolization 100% by allowing them to get away</p>	<p>Refer to D.C. Official Code § 2-218.46(a)(3) and DSLBD website.</p>

	<p>with doing <u>zero subcontracting</u>. Would DGS be willing to replace clause C.2.1.3 with the following:</p> <p>“A prime contractor – <u>CBE or not</u> – whose <u>parent company</u> is a large business must <u>comply with all of the subcontracting requirements</u> as set forth in <u>Section C.2.</u>”</p> <p>“The size and location of a DC office, a subsidiary office, a regional office, or an affiliate office are all irrelevant. It is the size and location of the <u>parent company</u> that applies.”</p> <p>The insertion of these two statements forces large firms – <u>CBE or not</u> – to do subcontracting with Small and Disadvantaged CBEs. <u>Is DGS willing to make this change so that large firms are not allowed to do zero subcontracting with small and disadvantaged CBE firms? If not, why not?</u></p>
3	<p>Should org chart and resumes be included under E.4.1.2.C or D.3.2.B.2/3? Section E.4.1.2.C seems to be repeat of the section under D.3.2.B.</p>
4	<p>D.3.2.A – this section requests us to submit 3 projects where the prime served as the architect on a CMAR project, and 2 for each sub-consultant. Does this mean that if we have 15 subconsultants, we need to submit 3 projects for us, plus 2 x 15 projects for consultants = a total of 33 projects in this section?</p>

it should be included as part of Section E.4.1.2.C. Section D.3.2.B is describing what is being evaluated, whereas Section E is the Proposal organization.

DGS wishes to see projects that are represented of the prime and sub consultants tied to the Key Personnel as identified in Section B.8. To that end those sub consultants would be MEP and Structural.

5	<p>As discussed at the June 10th pre-proposal meeting and June 11th site walk through, the project includes an initial concept design phase to establish an overall approach to the design of the site and building with an initial phase of approximately \$10,000,000. Section D.3.1 Paragraph A request's offerors to submitted "All projects...in the last 10 years similar to this project...where the Offeror has served as the lead design consultant for a school construction project where the construction cost exceeded \$25,000,000". This criteria is worth 30 total points.</p> <p>As described in the pre-proposal and walkthrough, the scope of work for the project does not appear in alignment with the criteria requested in Section D.3.1 paragraph A. It would seem experience with feasibility designs, phasing and projects where the construction cost exceeded \$10,000,000 would be in alignment with the information presented at these 2 sessions . Please provide clarification to align the stated scope with the written requirements requested by the section.</p>	<p>DGS and DCPS are seeking a design for the full modernization of Brent Elementary School, DGS/DCPS is also seeking phasing options based on available funding. Based on recently completed elementary schools projects the full modernization cost have ranged from \$55M to \$65M.</p>
6	<p>Section A.3 mentions delivering the project on time and on budget. Please define the budget and whether this completion clauses relate to the total project design and completion or only the first phase. Also, please clarify project delivery; is that delivery of design documents or delivery of construction?</p>	<p>Determination of final project budget and schedule will be developed as the design progresses and phasing options and funding availability will become clearer. Final schedules and budgets will be determined as part of the definitive contract.</p>
7	<p>Please clarify how/if you want fees broken out given the potential for a long term, phased project.</p>	<p>Fees should be provided for the full modernization with considerations given for the phasing. Offerors shall clearly list all assumptions their fee is based on.</p>

8	Given that NTP is in late July and Concept is due Sept 1, will community engagement with parents and students, and SIT participation be possible during that critical design phase?	Yes
9	In B.2.1.1.g please confirm that you want HAZMat survey and reporting to be under architect contract.	Confirmed
10	Can the project funding schedule discussed in B.2.1.1.1 be shared with the teams?	The current available funding is approximately \$10M. DCPS/DGS is engaging the successful offeror to assist with future possible phasing, schedule and budget requests.
11	Please define what is meant by 'prepare all traffic control plans' in B.5.2.d. These are typically prepared by CM. Do you want Architect to have a traffic consultant to submit traffic plans?	DGS/DCPS expects some level of coordination between the successful Offeror and the construction manager as related to traffic control plans and permit submission. DGS/DCPS will require a traffic consultant or other consultant necessary to complete the scope identified in Section B.2.1.of the RFP within the Concept Design Phase.
12	If possible, please confirm if off site swing space will be utilized during construction.	DGS/DCPS is not able to make that determination at this time.
13	In Section A.3 Design Fees and Incentives, the typical DGS contract language for a 5% retainage and 5% incentive are included. If there is currently no stated budget, how will the determination be made whether the project was on budget so that the incentive could be awarded? Similarly, there is no schedule for construction. How would the determination be made whether the project's delivery was on schedule?	Refer to the answer of Question No. 6.
14	RFP Section D.3.2 indicates that "The Offerer / A / E shall include at least three (3) projects where the Offeror served as the architect on a CMAR Project and two (2) for each sub-consultant"	Refer to the answer of Question No. 4.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For previous DGS schools RFPs, there was a maximum limit of 8 projects to be presented. Please confirm that there is no maximum limit to the number of projects presented in this section for this RFP. ○ Are two projects required for every sub-consultant on a team, including those with a small scope of work such as LEED Consultants, or Lighting Designers? 	
15	<p>There were no existing building drawings included in the RFP or in the attachments. Will DCPS share additional drawings, plans, or site plans for Brent Elementary?</p>	<p>This was included in Addendum 1. Additionally, the live link is on DGS website and can be used to access the existing conditions drawings.</p>
16	<p>On page 23 under section D.3.2. A. you state, “The Offeror/A/E shall include at least three (3) projects where the Offeror served as the architect on a CMAR Project and two (2) for each sub-consultant.” Will sub-consultants need to submit projects that are CMAR builds?</p>	<p>Refer to the answer of Question No. 4.</p>
17	<p>At the preproposal meeting it was discussed that the project might be completed through a modified Design-Build method or CMAR, but in the proposal on Page 3 under section A.1 it states, “The Department intends to implement the Project through a Construction Manager at Risk (“CMAR”) delivery method. Can you please clarify how you intend to complete this project?”</p>	<p>The current plan is to complete the project through a CMAR project delivery method.</p>