

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

**DESIGN-BUILD SERVICES
PLAY AREAS AT FOREST HILLS PARK AND ROSE PARK**

Solicitation #: DCAM-14-CS-0106

**Addendum No. 4
Issued: February 24, 2014**

This Addendum Number 04 is issued by e-mail on February 24, 2014. Except as modified hereby, the Request for Proposals (“RFP”) remains unmodified.

Item #1

Revised Offer Letter: Attached to this Addendum is a revised form of offer letter and schedule of values for Sherwood Recreation Center. The schedule of values for Sherwood Recreation Center is also available for download at <https://leftwichlaw.box.com/shared/static/am0g05a8nb0ij4q31rdd.xls>.

Item #2

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

Forest Hills Park and Rose Park:

1. Information provided does not indicate Utilities (onsite or public space), will this be provided? Do we include it in the fee? **Response: The Design-Builder is responsible for the collection, assessment and verification of the existing conditions, which include the utilities (onsite or public space).**
2. Do we have to submit documentation for Subdivision? Both parks are on various lots? **Response: The Design-Builder will have to meet the requirements set forth by DCRA in order to obtain building permits.**
3. Please confirm project durations for the (A) Preconstruction/Design Phase; and (B) Construction Phase. Currently the RFP indicates that the projects should be complete by approximately August 2014 (approximately 5 months from NTP). Has this factored in time for the necessary design submissions and approval? Please advise and/or extend design-build durations associated with this RFP. **Response: The Substantial Completion Date for Rose Park has been extended to August 30th, 2014.**
4. Please confirm the required design submissions for this project (i.e. 75%, 95%, 100%). **Response: The Design-Builder shall at a minimum submit schematic design, design development and permit set of documents.**
5. Are there any specific construction phasing requirements associated with this RFP? Will construction of one park have to be completed before work can take place at the other park, or can both sites be constructed concurrently? Please advise. **Response: Both parks will be under construction at the same time.**

Forest Hills Park

6. Please confirm if the thirteen seating benches should be 6' or 8' in length? **Response: The thirteen seating benches should be 6' in length.**
7. Concept drawing shows permeable pavers at all locations identified in Alternate 7. Please clarify Alternate 7. **Response: The Design-Builder shall price stone dust for the base bid for the locations identified as Item #1, #13, #10, and #16 on the concept plan. Alternate 7 is the installation of permeable pavers in lieu of stone dust in locations identified as Item #1, #13, #10, and #16 on the concept plan.**
8. Same as above. Please clarify Alternate 8. **Response: The Design-Builder shall price stone dust for the base bid for the locations identified as Item #13 and Item #16 on the concept plan. Alternate 8 is the installation of asphalt in lieu of stone dust in locations identified as Item #13 and Item #16 on the concept plan.**
9. Concept drawing shows permeable pavers at path identified as Item #17. Please clarify Alternate 10a. **Response: The path as shown as Item #17 in the concept plan is not part of the base bid.**
10. The half-basketball court is shown at a location that would require substantial earthwork and would likely require a retaining wall along the W side of the court. Furthermore, the asphalt area falls right next to a mature, substantial tree, meaning that its construction would likely damage the tree root system. Has this issue been considered? Should the work be priced to include the retaining wall and the removal of the mature tree? **Response: The Design-Builder shall make every effort to minimize tree removal during the design process. Any trees that must be removed to accomplish the work set forth in the concept plan shall be at the expense of the Design-Builder.**
11. Is there any plan to remove existing trees from the site? The locations of the fitness equipment and basketball court may require this consideration. **Response: The Design-Builder shall make every effort to minimize tree removal during the design process. Any trees that need to be removed to accomplish the work set forth in the concept shall be at the expense of the Design-Builder.**
12. Have the locations for the proposed rain-gardens been determined due to the needs of the site or more arbitrarily? **Response: The rain-gardens on the concept plans are shown as potential locations. It is up to the Design-Builder to determine the best location based on the planned improvements. Any rain gardens designed shall meet the new requirements of the stormwater management regulations.**
13. Will the sand box be part of the \$250K allowance? **Response: No the sand box is not part of the \$250,000 allowance.**
14. Will park be closed throughout the renovation project? **Response: Yes, the park will be closed throughout the renovation process.**
15. How many security lights will be required for this park? There are existing lights onsite. Are these to remain? **Response: The number of lights required will depend on the photometric study and lighting needed to provide safe pedestrian environment as recommended by your design team. A .50 footcandle level average is typical for most parks.**
16. What is a "Community Circle"? Material, intended use, etc? Its location appears to fall right within a hillside... is it to be built into the existing grade or to be flat/level with walking path elevation? **Response: The community circle is identified as Item #15 in the conceptual plan. The community circle shall be constructed from a stone block**

system. The community circle shall be built into the existing grade with the bottom step to be flat/level with the walking path elevation.

17. Does existing message board at Chesapeake Street require demo and replacement?
Response: The existing message board shall remain.
18. Are we to assume that the picnic tables and shelter located between the proposed Community Circle and Tennis courts are to be demolished and hauled away? **Response:**
19. Is the material planned for the fitness equipment surfacing the same as the stone dust to be installed at the pathways? **Response: The fitness equipment will be installed on concrete pads as per the manufacture's requirement.**
20. The RFP calls for 13 seating benches but 15 are shown on the concept plan. Please clarify the desired number of benches. **Response: Thirteen seating benches are required.**
21. The concept design shows 9 assorted picnic and game tables, however only 5 are specified in the RFP. Also, two styles of picnic tables are included in the RFP. Please clarify desired quantity of tables and desired type/design. **Response: The Design-Builder shall install three (3) tabled and benches and two (2) ADA accessible tables and benches per DPR standards.**
22. The RFP indicates that the design-builder will be reimbursed for the cost of the building permit only. Please confirm that this reimbursement will cover DDOE fees (e.g. storm water management review and sediment and erosion control fees) and other review fees by DCRA agencies, which are part of the building permit review process. **Response: The Design-Builder will be reimbursed for permitting fees. The Design-Builder will not be reimbursed for any trade permits that are pulled from the building permit. Those costs should be covered by the appropriate trade subcontractors.**
23. Items #17 and #15 are shown in the conceptual plan and are discussed in the add/alternates section but do not appear in the base bid description of the RFP. Please confirm whether these items should be included in the base bid. **Response: Item #17 and Item #15 are not part of the base bid for this RFP.**
24. Please clarify whether DPR wants decks to be ADA accessible. **Response: The deck should be ADA accessible.**
25. RFP includes strict requirements for tree protection, however concept drawing shows numerous elements to be constructed on top of existing trees and existing root zones. Please clarify whether these trees are to be removed to accommodate new features and construction, or whether DPR will accept some construction activity in root zones for the trees. **Response: The Design-Builder shall make every effort to minimize tree removal during the design process. Any trees that need to be removed to accomplish the work set forth in the concept drawings shall be at the expense of the Design-Builder. The Design-Builder shall protect existing root systems of existing vegetation in areas in which construction will occur. Design-Builder shall not store materials, equipment or drive machinery, within drip line of existing trees and shrubs. The Design-Builder shall retain the services of a certified Arborist to advise regarding tree protection activities during construction.**
26. Has the District's State Historic Preservation Office been notified about the project and is there an archeological resources identification document available that summarizes previous work in the area (near and in the park)? **Response: A Phase I archeological**

study has been conducted for this site and it has been determined by the District's State Historic Preservation Office no additional archeological testing is needed.

27. What percolation test results should bidders assume for stormwater management estimating purposes? If DDOE requires changes or major additions to the stormwater management design during the permitting process, (e.g. due to differing interpretations of the new design requirements) will DGS cover the additional costs associated with these changes (if any)? **Response: The Design-Builder needs to provide a design that meets the new stormwater management regulations and is acceptable by DDOE and DCRA.**
28. Storm Drain system is not present at site, do we extend to nearest system found? **Response: The Design-Builder shall provide adequate stormwater management for the site based on the plan improvements shown in the concept plan. The storm water management shall meet the new stormwater management regulations.**
29. Is an Archeological Survey needed for this park? **Response: See response to question 26.**
30. Per the Forest Hill Concept drawings Note # 12, bollards are to be installed. The detail for the removable bollards shows it to be R-7901 Or R-8901 (Steel or Stainless steel). What type of bollard would DGS prefer? **Response: The bollards are to be stainless steel.**

Rose Park

31. There is a note that all new brick pavers must match existing onsite, however the RFP specifies permeable pavers. These do not match the existing materials onsite. Are you only referring to matching of colors? **Response: The Design-Builder shall match color and pattern with the permeable pavers.**
32. Are there any areas onsite that require specific drainage considerations (i.e. inclusion of bioretention zones or swales)? **Response: The Design-Builder must meet existing DDOE stormwater regulations in all areas of planned improvements.**
33. Has a playground design been developed? **Response: Yes. See Attachment F to Rose Park narrative scope of work.**
34. Is there a specific reason this playground will be using EWF rather than other playground surfacing? **Response: The Owner has chosen to use Engineering Wood Fiber for this playground project.**
35. Is the proposed sand box/table to be located within the playground area? The RFP refers to the concept drawing, but it is not identified. **Response: Yes the proposed sandbox/table is to be located within the playground area. See Attachment B and Attachment F to Rose Park narrative scope of work.**
36. Will the sand box be part of the \$250K allowance? **Response: The sandbox is not a part of the \$250,000 allowance.**
37. Will park be closed throughout the renovation project? The field-house? **Response: No, the recreation center will remain open for summer camp. An accessible route to the recreation center must be provided at all times during construction.**
38. How many security lights will be required for this park? There are existing lights onsite; are these to remain? **Response: The number of lights required will depend on the photometric study and lighting needed to provide safe pedestrian environment as**

recommended by your design team. A .50 footcandle level average is typical for most parks.

39. There is a spec included in the RFP for the existing lights on the Rock Creek Trail. Why was this included? **Response: This style of lamp is similar to what is found in the surrounding environment and should be used as basis of bid as security lights for the park.**
40. In the landscape features scope of work, the RFP refers to a Raingarden, yet none is shown on the concept design. Is a raingarden intended for this project? **Response: The Design-Builder shall adequately address stormwater management for the improvements areas through its design. All stormwater management shall meet the new stormwater regulations.**
41. Regarding the fencing scope of work, there is existing iron fencing throughout the site. From the RFP, it looks as if the only new fencing that will be required is for the 2 playgrounds. Can you confirm that all other fencing is to stay as-is? **Response: All existing fencing is to remain.**
42. Can you confirm if no work is to occur on the Rock Creek trail and the trail is to remain open throughout the project? **Response: The Design-Builder shall perform no work outside of the District of Columbia's property. The Rock Creek Trail belongs to the National Park Service and must remain open at all times.**
43. Can you confirm that the limits of the construction on this site will be the existing brick path N of the 2-12 YO playground (i.e. no work to be performed at the baseball field area) and no further South or West than the Tot Play area? **Response: There will be no improvements made to the baseball field.**
44. What is the "walking track" that is referenced in the note regarding the sandbox/sand table? I do not see any track in the concept plan. **Response: There is no walking track planned for this project.**
45. Do the basketball backboards require replacement? **Response: Not at this time.**
46. Does the existing message board at O Street entrance require demo and replacement? We noticed a new message board is part of the scope, yet the existing looks good. **Response: The message board in this scope of work will be placed in a location on the site that is acceptable to the Owner.**
47. Do existing traffic gates need to be removed or remain as-is? **Response: The existing traffic gates shall remain as is.**
48. Are any trees to be removed for this project? **Response: The Design-Builder shall make every effort to minimize tree removal during the design process. Any trees that need to be removed to accomplish the work set forth in the concept plan shall be at the expense of the Design-Builder.**
49. The steps between the courts and the field house are damaged. Are these to be replaced or remain as-is? **Response: At this time the replacement of the damaged steps are not part of this RFP. However, the Owner may direct the steps to be replaced once a Design-Builder is selected.**
50. Should the 2 long concrete slabs behind the field house be demolished or left as is? **Response: The two long concrete slabs behind the field house shall remain.**
51. Should any improvement budget be included for the field house? **Response: This solicitation is for improvements to the existing play areas and do not include the field house.**

52. Does the field house have functioning power? Is this where the panel and meter are located? **Response: Yes.**
53. There is no mention of replacement for existing pavers onsite. There are areas where the brick pavers are not in good condition. What is to be done at these locations? **Response: The existing brick pavers shall remain as is.**
54. The landscaped hills surrounding the elevated field-house area have metal edging that appears to be failing. Does DPR want some sort of retaining measures installed for these areas? **Response: No.**
55. Are all benches to be removed from the site? Many appear to be in good condition. **Response: The Owner desires to salvage as many benches as possible. Before construction begins, the Design-Builder, in coordination with the Owner, will verify which benches are to be removed from the site.**
56. Are the existing pavers called out in item 9 on the concept drawing permeable? If not, are they to be replaced with permeable pavers? **Response: The existing pavers on site are to remain as is.**
57. During the pre-bid meeting, DGS indicated that the Old Georgetown Board has already reviewed a portion of the design. Please clarify what elements of the Old Georgetown Act have already been completed. Has DGS/DPR taken the concept design through an official OGB Concept Review? If so, what comments did OGB provide and what was the outcome of the review? **Response: DGS and DPR formally presented the concept shown in the RFP to the Old Georgetown Board (OGB) on November 7, 2013. The concept was approved by the OGB and was forwarded to the Commission of Fine Arts (CFA) committee for final concept approval. Final concept approval and comments can be found in the CFA meeting minutes under the consent calendar dated November 21, 2013.**
58. Has OGB indicated whether a full presentation at a CFA public meeting will be required? **Response: The Design-Builder must follow the requirements of the OGB and CFA which can be found on their website.**
59. RFP indicates that design---builder will be reimbursed for the cost of the building permit only. Please confirm that this reimbursement will cover DDOE fees (e.g. storm water management review and sediment and erosion control fees) and other review fees by DCRA agencies, which are part of the building permit review process. **Response: The Design-Builder will be reimbursed for permitting fees. The Design-Builder will not be reimbursed for any trade permits that are pulled from the building permit. Those costs should be covered by the appropriate trade subcontractors.**
60. What percolation test results/infiltration rates should bidders assume for stormwater management estimating purposes? If DDOE requires changes or major additions to the stormwater management design during the permitting process, (e.g. due to differing interpretations of the new design requirements) will DGS cover the additional costs associated with these changes (if any)? **Response: The Design-Builder needs to provide a design that meets the new stormwater management regulations and is acceptable by DDOE and DCRA.**
61. Has the District's State Historic Preservation Office been notified about the project and is there an archeological resources identification document available that summarizes previous work in the area (near and in the park)? **Response: Yes the District's State Historic Preservation Office has been notified about this project. The Design-**

Builder will need to contact DC SHPO for the archeological resource identification document.

62. Do we have to keep the existing railing found throughout the site? or do we propose new railing? **Response: The existing railing remains throughout the site.**

63. Any need to propose railing along Rock Creek Parkway slope? **Response: No.**

Item #3

Additional Requests for Information: Please note that the Department anticipates issuing a subsequent addendum with responses to additional requests for information received to date. Please be advised that the deadline to submit questions for this Project is Friday, February 28, 2014 at 2:00 pm EST.

Item #4

The bid date remains unchanged. Proposals are due by **March 7, 2014 at 2:00 pm EST.** Proposals that are hand-delivered should be delivered to the attention of: Annmarie McQueen, Contract Specialist, at **Frank D. Reeves Center, 2000 14th Street, NW, 8th floor, Washington, DC 20009.**

- End of Addendum No. 4 -

Attachment B

[Offeror's Letterhead]

[Insert Date]

District of Columbia Department of General Services
2000 14th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20009

Att'n: Mr. Brian J. Hanlon
Director

Reference: Request for Proposals
Design-Build Services – Play Areas at Forest Hills Park and Rose Park

Dear Mr. Hanlon:

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 Design-Build services for Forest Hills Park and Rose Park. 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 Lump Sum Contract Price (as defined in paragraph A) and the add/alternate price (as defined in paragraph B) are based on the Bid Documents as issued and assume no material alteration of the terms of the Bid Documents. (Collectively, the proposal and the Lump Sum Contract Price (including Schedule of Values) and the add/alternate price are referred to as the "Offeror's Bid".)

The Offeror's Bid is as follows:

A. The Lump Sum Contract Price for Forest Hills Park is: \$ _____

The Lump Sum Contract Price for Rose Park is: \$ _____

The Lump Sum Contract Price for Sherwood Recreation Center is: \$ _____

A schedule of values for each of the Lump Sum Contract Prices is attached hereto.

The Offeror acknowledges and understands that the Lump Sum Contract Price is a firm, fixed price to fully complete the work described in the RFP and attachments thereto and that such amount includes funding for work which is not describe in the RFP and attachments thereto but which is reasonably inferable therefrom.

In addition to the Lump Sum Contract Prices set forth above, lump sum add/alternate prices for the add/alternate scope items outlined in the Bid Documents are as follow:

B. Forest Hills Park

<u>Add/Alternate 1</u> : Chalk art wall	\$ _____
<u>Add/Alternate 2</u> : Entry pergola	\$ _____
<u>Add/Alternate 3</u> : Solid color safety surfacing	\$ _____
<u>Add/Alternate 4</u> : Leaf-themed safety surfacing	\$ _____
<u>Add/Alternate 5 (Deduct)</u> : Stone dust for play track	\$ _____
<u>Add/Alternate 6</u> : Asphalt for play track	\$ _____
<u>Add/Alternate 7</u> : Permeable pavers	\$ _____
<u>Add/Alternate 8</u> : Asphalt	\$ _____
<u>Add/Alternate 9</u> : Ten foot chain-link fence	\$ _____
<u>Add/Alternate 10a</u> : Permeable pavers path	\$ _____
<u>Add/Alternate 10b</u> : Asphalt path	\$ _____
<u>Add/Alternate 10c</u> : Stone dust path	\$ _____
<u>Add/Alternate 11</u> : Tennis practice backboard	\$ _____
<u>Add/Alternate 12</u> : Art memorial	\$ _____

Rose Park

<u>Add/Alternate 1</u> : Fitness equipment	\$ _____
<u>Add/Alternate 2</u> : Segmented block / retaining wall	\$ _____
<u>Add/Alternate 3</u> : Phase 1 archeological survey	\$ _____

Sherwood Recreation Center

<u>Add/Alternate 1</u> : ADA accessible concrete ramp	\$ _____
<u>Add/Alternate 2</u> : Chain link fence fabric	\$ _____
<u>Add/Alternate 3</u> : Basketball goals	\$ _____
<u>Add/Alternate 4 (Deduct)</u> : 50/50 EPDM	\$ _____
<u>Add/Alternate 5</u> : New decorative entryway	\$ _____

<u>Add/Alternate 6</u> : Plant identification signs	\$ _____
<u>Add/Alternate 7</u> : Interpretive sign at rain garden	\$ _____
<u>Add/Alternate 8</u> : Additional automatic locking gate	\$ _____
<u>Add/Alternate 9</u> : Semi-circle bench	\$ _____
<u>Add/Alternate 10</u> : 6-8 inch concrete curbing	\$ _____
<u>Add/Alternate 11</u> : Metal landscape fencing	\$ _____

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 one hundred twenty (120) 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 Office of Department of Small and Local Business Enterprises as a Local, Small, Resident Owned or Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (collectively, "LSDBE Certified Companies") from participating in the work if another company is awarded the contract.

Mr. Brian J. Hanlon

[DATE]

Page 4

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: _____

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES



Design-Build Services
Sherwood Recreation Center Playground

<u>Item Description (per Concept Design)</u>	<u>Cost</u>
Demolition	
Erosion & Sediment Control	
Earthwork	
Concrete	
Asphalt/Striping	
Trash Enclosure/Dumpster	
Storm Water Management	
Electrical	
Plumbing	
Fencing/Gates	
Safety Surfacing	
Site Furnishings & Amenities	
Landscaping	
Stone Dust/Flagstone	
Signage	
Irrigation	
Testing & Inspection	
Allowance for Play Equipment	\$ 250,000.00
Playground Equipment Freight & Installation	
Total Construction Costs	<u>\$ 250,000</u>
Design/Engineering Costs (including Geotechnical & Arborist)	<u>\$ -</u>
Cost of Insurance	<u>\$ -</u>
Cost of Payment and Performance Bond	<u>\$ -</u>
Total Lump Sum Price	\$ 250,000