



Herbert Rouson, Jr., J.D.
Executive Officer

Dana A. Friend
Deputy Executive Officer

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTS
Administrative Services Division
Office: Cadwalader Wickersham & Taft
700 Sixth Street NW, 12th Floor
Washington, DC 20001
Mailing Address: 500 Indiana Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20001-2131



Geoffrey A. Mack
Administrative Officer

AMENDMENT NO. 04

TO: ALL PROSPECTIVE BIDDERS

**AMENDMENT
ISSUE DATE: July 11, 2024**

**SUBJECT: Solicitation No. DCSC-24-RFP-223
Recorder of Deeds Modernization Project**

**PROPOSAL
SUBMISSION
DATE: Monday, July 29, 2024, by 12:00 pm,
Eastern Standard Time**

Questions Round 2 and New Closing Date: Monday, July 29, 2024, by 12:00 PM

Proposals should be delivered to Kenneth Evans, Jr.
Senior Contract Specialist
District of Columbia Courts
700 6th Street, Suite 1224
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 879-8776

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED

One (1) copy of this amendment is being sent to all prospective Offerors. The prospective Offeror shall sign below and attach a signed copy of this amendment to each proposal to be submitted to the Courts in response to the subject solicitation or otherwise acknowledge this amendment with the signed offer as stated in the original solicitation documents. Proposals shall be delivered in accordance with the instructions provided in the original solicitation documents.

Geoffrey A. Mack

Geoffrey Mack
Contracting Officer

Acknowledgment of this Amendment, together with the Offeror’s proposal, must be received by the District of Columbia Courts as stated in the solicitation no later than the closing date and time specified above for the receipt of proposals.

Failure by the Offeror to properly acknowledge receipt of this Amendment Number #04 may be because for rejection of the proposal submitted by the Offeror in response to the subject solicitation.

From: Kenneth L. Evans	Q & A Round: 2
Project: Recorder of Deeds Modernization Project	Date: July 11, 2024
Email: Kenneth.Evans@dccsystem.gov	Pages: 5

NEW CLOSING DATE

Questions Round 2 and New Closing Date: Monday, July 29, 2024, by 3:00 PM

Proposals should be delivered to: Kenneth Evans, Jr.
 Senior Contract Specialist
 District of Columbia Courts
 700 6th Street, Suite 1224
 Washington, DC 20001
 (202) 879-8776

INCLUDED DOCUMENTS

- 1. Attachment A RoD Historic Preservation meeting notes**
- 2. Zip File 2023 DC Courts RoD Hazmat Test Reporting**

Questions Round #2

Q.1 Please confirm if the Division 1 specification provided in the RFP Documents are negotiable and can be modified

A.1 **The question is too broad to provide a response.
 The Courts may consider negotiation on a specific section if the Courts determines it is necessary.**

Q.2 Specification Section 011000, section 1.6 on page 011000-5 refers to Owner Negotiated Contracts that are transferred to the D-B. Please provide any contracts that have been negotiated and/or awarded and any you intend to? Will they be bound by the same Form of Contract provided in the RFP?

A.2 **No Owner Negotiated Contracts will be transferred to the DB.**

Q.3 Please confirm any owner negotiated contracts are outside of the stated RFP budget and will be in addition the firm-fixed price after award as a change order.

A.3 No Owner Negotiated Contracts will be transferred to the DB.

Q.4 Specification Section 011000, section 1.9.D denotes Owner Drug Screening Requirements. Can you please clarify what the contractor has to provided for compliance. Do the requirements match DOT standards

A.4 The court's Drug policy is attachment J.7

Q.5 Page 12 of the Facility Conditions Assessment Report paragraph 3.2 has interim stabilization recommendations provided. Were these completed and when?

A.5 The trench drain work has been complete. The remaining items have not been completed and are presented as recommendations based on the assessments conducted to date. It is the responsibility of the DB to (1) determine "stabilization" or other work required/necessary to deliver the Project and (2) conduct "stabilization" or other work required/necessary to deliver the Project.

Q.6 Has the Historic Preservation Office provided any insight to the Project?

A.6 Meeting minutes from the onsite SHPO meeting are attached for reference.

Q.7 In reference to Amendment 3, K.53, can we provide an hourly rate in lieu of a daily rate?

A.7 Amendment 3, K53 asks for hourly rate.

Q.8 Please extend the RFI deadline to allow subcontractors more time to review the documents and submit relevant questions.

A.8 No extension to the RFI deadline.

Q.9 Please extend the proposal due date past 7/26.

A.9 Proposal due date will be extended to 12:00pm on 07/29/2024.

Q.10 Is there a subcontracting requirement? If so, what are the percentages?

A.10 No.

Q.11 Attachment J which is referenced in the DCSC-24-RFP-223 Solicitation pdf document posted on 6/5/24. We have not been able to locate this attachment or its contents within the solicitation documents. We are hoping you can point us in the right direction as to where we can find Attachment J and listed contents. Specifically, J.21 Bridging Documents would be very helpful for our bid team and subcontractors.

A.11 Attachment J.21 is included in this Amendment. Attachments are included with the solicitation documents through the DC Courts Website. All the information that the offerors have received to this point has this statement at the end of it: "Please remember to check the DC Courts Website daily for posting of amendments and updates.

[“https://www.dccourts.gov/about/procurement-contracts-branch”](https://www.dccourts.gov/about/procurement-contracts-branch)

- Q.12 Will offer proposals be deemed non-responsive if costs exceed a total of \$41M for aggregate of core and shell and selected options?
- A.12 See Amendment 3, Revised section A.3
- Q.13 Will projects currently under construction but 50% complete or more be considered for evaluation under past experience?
- A.13 No.
- Q.14 Will previously completed PPQs or Federal CPAR evaluations be considered in lieu of requesting new PPQs from our clients?
- A.14 DC Courts assumes this RFI refers to Section K.43 Tab C, bullet point #4 of the RFP. CPARS within 5 years will be accepted. PPQs from the client within 2 years will be acceptable. New PPQs directly from the client will be favorable.
- Q.15 Are offerors expected to identify and select mechanical/plumbing, electrical, and fire protection construction subcontractors at this stage of procurement/design? Often it is beneficial to make final subcontractor selections after proposal award and as design progresses further.
- A.15 Means and methods of selection and execution of the contract is by the Design-Builder. The courts has no expectations outside of industry standard practices for Design-Build Delivery.
- Q.16 With an additional site visit scheduled and the volume of information/pricing requested in the RFP, we request a two-week due date extension for the proposal to ensure an accurate proposal, schedule and price can be developed.
- A.16 Proposal due date will be extended to 12:00pm on 07/29/2024.
- Q.17 CIV106 note 10 notes the new gas service, please clarify if costs for the gas service shall be by the DB contractor or by Washington Gas per section 1.2.14.1.2 Utilities.
- A.17 The DB shall coordinate all work related to the provision of gas (with Washington Gas and any other relevant parties). The DB shall be responsible for all costs related to the provision of gas service.
- Q.18 Was there an air quality test performed after mold remediation? If so, could we get copies of the report?
- A.18 Air sampling test reports taken after areas of asbestos abatement are attached for reference. Mold remediation occurred during the same time period, prior to air testing.

Q.19 There was mention of some preliminary discussion with SHPO with regards to this project. Could you provide some clarity as to what was discussed and if SHPO expressed any concerns?

A.19 Meeting minutes from the on site SHPO meeting are attached for reference.

Q.20 The design workflows are predicated upon knowing whether a reliable model exists to serve as an origin for successive work. Please provide any electronic/model files for the 35% concept drawings.

A.20 Native files of the bridging docs will be provided to the DB Contractor after contract award.

Q.21 The Addendum 3 response to Question 8 included a clarification that the future contract will be a lump sum obligation. We do not see a sample agreement in the documents presently provided, please provide a sample agreement.

A.21 Sample agreement will not be provided.

Q.22 The Addendum 3 response to Question 9 included a clarification on the construction duration referencing back to Section B.5. We understand that the approval of the 65% document set will define NTP that will release select scope including abatement, demolition, and other enabling work prior to full definition of the IFC drawings. The required core and shell substantial completion date is 9/18/26 which compared with the NLT 6/15/25 Submit Corrected Final Design (100% IFC) constraint equates to a duration greater than 14 months. Please confirm that the CPM schedule logic provided as part of the proposal will supersede the 14-month duration above.

A.22 DB can propose new date within NTE and provide their reasoning. Refer to last round of pre-bids and applicable solicitation section. The CPM Schedule logic will be reviewed and accepted by the Courts as long as the substantial completion date is September 18, 2026. Refer to section B.5 of the RFP.

Q.23 Are there specific allowable work hours and noise restrictions that must be adhered to during construction, especially considering the location and adjacent buildings?

A.23 Working hours within building permit and regulatory requirements (DCRA, etc.) Noise ordinance compliance is necessary.

Q.24 Are there any existing utility plans, maps, or reports available for the site that detail the locations of current utilities and infrastructure? This will help in planning utility connections and relocations.

A.24 Civ-101 shows utilities known to date with the exception of the 2 communications conduits described in the site visit.

Q.25 Given the proximity to other buildings in the Judiciary Square, are there any specific coordination requirements or restrictions related to construction activities that need to be considered?

- A.25 DB Contractor to follow all code and regulatory requirements.
- Q.26 The solicitation specifies a Not to Exceed (NTE) Project Cost of Thirty-Six Million dollars (\$36 million) for the base contract. Can you provide a detailed breakdown of what is included in this NTE cost? Specifically, what allowances are there for unknown conditions, regulatory permits, and contingencies?
- A.26 No, It is the responsibility of the DB to deliver the Project within the NTE Project Cost.
- Q.27 The solicitation outlines key project milestones. Could you clarify if there are any flexible deadlines or if all dates are fixed? Specifically, what is the flexibility around the Substantial Completion date of September 18, 2026?
- A.27 Intent of the interim milestones to provide a path to the substantial completion date of 9/18/26. There is flexibility in the milestones as long as the project is delivered substantially complete by September 18, 2026.
- Q.28 Are there any environmental impact assessments or studies that have been conducted for this project? If so, can these documents be made available to the Design-Builder?
- A.28 No assessment has been done to date. Within the Basis of Design and Performance Requirements - Core & Shell Bridging Contract Document it indicates environmental permitting and sustainable development requirements to include (but are not limited to). It is the responsibility of the DB to (1) determine assessments or studies that are required/necessary to deliver the Project and (2) conduct assessments or studies as required/necessary to deliver the Project.
- Q.29 The Design-Builder is required to conduct an existing site survey within 21 days of NTP. Can you provide any existing site survey reports or drawings that will be available to the Design-Builder to assist in this task?
- A.29 All available documentation has been provided as attachments to the solicitation (listed in Section J of the RFP).
- Q.30 The solicitation requires various pre-construction activities. Can you provide a more detailed timeline for these activities, including any critical path items or other deliverables that must be prioritized?
- A.30 The Courts have outlined key deliverables in the Section C of the RFP and Division 01 documents attached to the RFP. It is the responsibility of the DB to (1) determine pre-construction activities required/necessary to deliver the Project and (2) conduct pre-construction activities as required/necessary to deliver the Project.
- Q.31 The document mentions that all necessary permits need to be obtained by the Design-Builder. Could you clarify the expected timeline for permit approvals and any known potential delays or challenges with local authorities?

A.31 The D-B is meant to have experience pulling permits on projects of similar scope and size within the District of Columbia and should utilize this experience to accurately depict the permitting process as they have experienced in the past. The DB is recommended to undertake discussions with authorities early in the schedule for assurance that permit variations and issues will have already been vetted by the applicable authorities prior to issuing for permit.

Q.32 What government agencies will need to be coordinated with throughout the project, and can you provide points of contact for each agency? Are there any specific future tenants or other decision makers that the D/B team will be required to interface with during design and construction. Please provide a preliminary stakeholder register if one exists.

A.32 DGS coordination will be via DC Courts. The DB shall be responsible for all other government agency coordination customary for a project of this type in Washington DC (i.e.. DDOT, DCRA, HPO, etc.)

Q.33 For the pre-construction services, the scope includes condition assessments and required testing. Are there any specific testing standards or protocols that need to be followed, particularly for historic preservation aspects of the project?

A.33 The protocols as required to complete the scope of work is the responsibility of the DB Contractor.

Q.34 The scope of work includes the preparation of a Hazardous Material (HAZMAT) Abatement Plan. The Hazardous Materials Assessment contained in the bridging documents does not contain sufficient information to quantify the amount of materials requiring abatement. Please provide quantities that should be assumed for pricing or an allowance that bidders should carry for abatement activities.

A.34 Refer to Addendum 3, Question 4, Answer 4.

Q.35 What is the process for the approval of subcontractors and consultants? Are there any pre-qualified or preferred subcontractors that we should consider?

A.35 No. This is at the discretion of the D-B

Q.36 The solicitation states that award for options shall begin in January 2025. In the event the scope defined in the options impacts the base scope, how will this impact be remedied?

A.36 No scope defined in the options should impact the DB's delivery of the base contract scope/Core & Shell. Options are envisioned as natural succession to the base scope. If the DB has any concern that this should be the case at any point before or after contract award, the D-B shall bring it to the Owner's attention as soon as is it discovered.

Q.37 Please confirm the Design Build Team is not responsible for any maintenance or operations.

- A.37 DB is responsible for operation and maintenance on installed equipment from startup to turnover/acceptance of the completed phase (Base Contract and Options)
- Q.38 Are there any preferred vendors DC Courts would like us to engage now, particularly around GFGI items that may need to be coordinated with the base scope?
- A.38 Siemens, Albireo Energy, and RCI Systems currently have equipment installed and/or hold service contracts in DCC Facilities. The DB shall engage listed vendors at their own discretion.
- Q.39 Please confirm that DC Courts does not anticipate any department or end user requirements which would exceed the assumed structural live loads documented in the bridging documents
- A.39 Confirmed.
- Q.40 Please provide the geotechnical report for the property if available and confirm when the Owner will provide the Final Geotechnical Report. Or confirm the Final Geotechnical Report is to be performed by the Design-Builder.
- A.40 No current geotechnical report is available. A final geotechnical report is the responsibility of the DB.
- Q.41 The Bridging documents note multiple areas of enclosure/facade repair as "Add Alternate" scopes of work. Please confirm how these add alternates should be priced and shown in the proposal. When will decisions be made regarding the exercising of these add alternate options?
- Q.41 The enclosure/façade work is to be priced within the NTE. Proposals shall include unit prices for deductive alts if full repairs are not required.
- Q.42 Please confirm that there are no requirements related to physical security such as ballistic protection, blast, or facade hardening that apply to the project beyond the ballistic storm window requirements as noted in the bridging documents
- A.42 Confirmed.
- Q.43 Please confirm a truck turn study and/or a traffic signaling analysis will not be required for this project
- A.43 Confirmed.
- Q.44 Were the bridging documents created in AutoCAD or Revit? What was the basis for existing conditions? (Existing CAD files, existing drawings, field measurement, scanning?) Will the bridging document plans/BIM model be made available to the Design/Builder?
- A.44 Files for the building are in Revit. Landscaping files are in AutoCAD. Native files will be provided to the DB Contractor after award.

Q.45 Terrazzo floors are clearly identified to be retained in scope and drawings. Drawings don't indicate to salvage and reinstall wall base at demolished walls. Please confirm that salvage and reinstallation of terrazzo wall base is not required.

A.45 Confirmed, salvage and reinstallation of terrazzo is not required. New terrazzo base to be installed at new walls at terrazzo floors.

Q.46 Please confirm there is no exterior signage required in the core & shell scope?

A.46 Refer to Attachment J.20, Division 01 Specification for requirements related to exterior signage. Any code required signage responsibility of the DB.

Q.47 Please confirm owner's vendor to provide all signage design and installation.

A.47 Design and installation of any code required signage responsibility of the DB. The DB shall be responsible for signage infrastructure and incorporation into design (room numbering, signage locations, signage schedule, etc.) for non-code required signage (wayfinding, room signage, etc.) The Owner will procure and install non-code required signage.

Q.48 Will Code requirement for BECx (DC Energy Code Section 11.3.1.3) be satisfied by the Owners Commissioning agent?

A.48 If required, Owner will satisfy BECx.

Q.49 Please provide allowance that should be assumed for restoration of the existing to remain lay lights given that the existing condition is unknown, and the scope of restoration required cannot be determined from the bridging documents.

A.49 Assume \$50,000 allowance included within the NTE.

Q.50 Please confirm or indicate Owners Performance Requirements (OPR) and/or performance field testing requirements for enclosure systems?

A.50 Identification and performance of code/regulatory required testing is the responsibility of the DB.

Q.51 As it relates to GAR requirements, can the assessed building value be confirmed?

A.51 Assessed value available on the website for the Office of Tax and Revenue.

Q.52 Is there a BTU (Boundary, Topographic & Utility survey) in CAD available?

A.52 Files for the building are in Revit. Landscaping files are in AutoCAD. Native files will be provided to the DB Contractor after award.

Q.53 Please confirm all existing utilities are in good condition and will remain.

A.53 A Facility Condition Assessment was provided with the solicitation. Refer to RFP, Section C.2.1. Existing Site Survey that states "Within twenty-one (21) days of the issuance of the core and shell design NTP, the Design-Builder is

required to conduct their own comprehensive survey to verify all information provided within the BCD Package and provide a report per the Division – 01."

- Q.54 Is there a site logistic plan available for Traffic Control Plan?
A.54 Sheet CIV-801 of the Bridging Contract Documents includes a preliminary TCP. Site logistics, traffic control, and coordination with DC Courts, DDOT, and other applicable agencies is the responsibility of the DB Contractor.
- Q.55 Record lot is required during permit process, project is in tax lot. Subdivision will be required Please clarify if DC courts will manage this process or if it will be the Design/Build team's responsibility.
A.55 Permitting is the responsibility of the D-B.
- Q.56 Bridging documents shows public space improvements however it does not show any new streetlight design. Confirm no new streetlights will be required.
A.56 Confirmed.
- Q.57 Can the Design-Builder use EverGreene as the Final Arts Consultant? There are limited qualified specialists in this area
A.57 Yes.
- Q.58 The BOD narrative provides two options for emergency generator sizing in section 1.2.8.1.6 - Please confirm that Option 1 - 100kW generator is the basis that should be used for pricing.
A.58 Confirmed.
- Q.59 Drawing A221 indicates partition type P0J to be installed around the exterior of existing stair S1 - 1 in the lobby. These lobby walls have existing historic marble. Please confirm the design intent for the P0J partitions both at the existing stair and elsewhere in the main lobby and how the preservation of existing marble should be addressed where new partitions are called for.
A.59 Exclude the partition type P0J from the face of the existing stairwell within the Building Lobby only. All other locations denoting P0J are to remain in scope.
- Q.60 Are there any insurance company driven requirements, such as Factory Mutual, that the project needs to comply with
A.60 This question is unclear. Insurance requirements are included in the Solicitation Documents.
- Q.61 Is it acceptable to modify the existing marble window sills noted to remain in order to anchor the new interior storm windows, or is the requirement that the storm window installation not modify the marble window sills in any way? This may be a challenge, especially where impact and ballistic storm windows are required.

- A.61 The existing window sills may be modified to receive the interior storm windows and will be reviewed for approval by the DC Courts.
- Q.62 The exterior window schedule provided in the bridging documents contains notes identifying windows to receive both impact resistant and ballistic glass. Please confirm that these glazing types are for the interior storm window glass types as described in the basis of design narrative under section 1.2.2.2.2 and are not intended to require impact and ballistic rated glazing be installed in the historic window frames. It is likely not feasible to retrofit these glass types into the historic frames.
- A.62 Confirmed. The insulated glass, or ballistic glass, or impact resistant glass is intended to be within the interior storm units. The historical windows are to have the glass replaced with clear, low-iron, single pane glazing units.
- Q.63 Sheet A921 in the bridging documents includes a table for additional partition components that may be required for various partition types, however this table is blank. Please confirm that these additional components are not anticipated to be required.
- A.63 Any additional components have been noted within partition details and/or within the Basis of Design /Performance Requirements, in lieu of marking it within the matrix on sheet A921. Partition requirements by type will be per performance requirements in BOD documents and selection/design the responsibility of DB.
- Q.64 The interior elevation 5/A715 does not identify the significant number of large holes which have been cut in the historic metal faux wood paneling to feed HVAC equipment that is to be removed and which was observed on the recent pre-bid walk through. Given the extent of the damage to these panels, please confirm if patching in place is required and/or if replacement with a reproduction metal panel would be acceptable where damage is significant. Wood office paneling is similarly damaged and may not be feasible for restoration - confirm replacement is acceptable.
- A.64 Replacement of wood panels or metal faux wood paneling is acceptable where repair is not feasible. Coordination with SHPO by the DB is required. Samples for approval by the Courts shall be provided to match to existing panels to remain.
- A.65 Sheet A715 outlines the scope of renovation and restoration in the historic library, and notes the removal of all surface mounted electrical conduit and devices. As the metal wall panels are historic and noted to remain in place and be restored, please clarify the design intent for how new electrical and data service is to be provided to the room. Should bidders anticipate removal and reinstallation of the metal paneling to allow recessed installation of devices or should new surface mounted devices and conduit be provided?

- Q.65 The intent is to provide new recessed electrical while preserving historic elements. All measures shall be taken to keep existing metal wall panels in place if it's determined that removal will damage the paneling. Design-Builder may test panel removal from other walls within the building scheduled for demolition.
- Q.66 Please confirm the design/builder's interpretation that the ballistic glazing requirements noted for the interior storm windows are intended to apply to the glass performance and are not intended to require supplemental structural reinforcing of the adjacent wall surrounding the window system or supports
- A.66 Confirmed. Only the new storm windows located in the documents are to be ballistic rated. Other windows indicated are to be impact resistant.
- Q.67 The RFP documents indicated the building flooded ~20 yrs ago. It's unclear what caused the flooding. The RFP doesn't specifically indicate any flood mitigation requirements. Please confirm there are no flood mitigation protocols that apply to the project
- A.67 No flood mitigation protocols apply to this project above what may be shown in the Solicitation Documents.
- Q.68 Per page 7 of the RFP, this is a design-build fixed-price (lump sum) solicitation, and the price is being determined by the owner with an NTE of \$36M for the Base 1 & Base 2 scope of work and an NTE of \$5M for Options 1, 2 and 3. Also, on page 7, it is stated that "no additional charge shall be made by the design-builder for the requirements of this contract ...". However, on page 9 of the RFP, in the 4th paragraph, it mentions there will be a negotiated fixed price. The "Price Submission Letter" (K52) provides space for the proposer to indicate the breakdown and total for both the Base and the Options but also has bolded an NTE amount, with a statement that reads, "By submitting this proposal ... pricing will result in a firm, fixed price, and pricing will not be subject to any further adjustments."
- A.68 Question is unclear.
- Q.69 According to the RFP, this project requires full design and construction based on the options selected by the owner. Is the intent to develop the design and construction scope to an NTE of \$36M base and an NTE of \$5M for the options? Would you consider allowing for a market informed budget to be submitted in lieu of submitting the Price Submission Letter with the prescribed NTE, providing an opportunity for a price adjustment after the awarded proposer "collaborates with the owner and relevant stakeholders to ensure compliance with the contract documents", as mentioned on page 14 of the RFP?
- A.69 Refer to Addendum 3, revision to A.1 Contract Type.

Q.70 RFP Section C.2, Page 14 of 81. Design-Builders cannot guarantee or insure "the highest standard of care." Please delete the word "highest," or change it to "reasonable."

A.70 Courts would consider a revision to "reasonable."

Q.71 Please confirm the requirement for As-Built Drawings is to update the IFC Drawings to reflect the Design-Builder's red line drawings, and the LOD requirement for As-Built Drawings is the same as the IFC Drawings

A.71 Confirmed. Refer to Division 1 specifications for As-Built/Record Drawing submissions and requirements.

Q.72 RFP Section C.3.3, Page 22 of 81. Design-Builders cannot guarantee or insure "the highest levels of quality throughout the design and construction process." Please replace the words "the highest" with "reasonable."

A.72 Courts would consider a revision to "reasonable."

Q.73 Please clarify the difference between contract requirements for "record drawings" and "As -Built Drawings"

A.73 The requirements for "Record Drawings" and "As-Built" drawings are the same. The DB is required to maintain redlines. Refer to Division 1 specifications for As-Built/Record Drawing submissions and requirements.

Q.74 Please confirm the Design-Builder is not expected to perform an inventory of existing GFGI or GFCI items the Owner intends to relocate in the scope of this project and that a full accounting of GFGI material and equipment will be made available to the design build team for planning and coordination.

A.74 Confirmed.

Q.75 Please confirm the Design-Builder retains ownership of proprietary materials, tools, and intellectual property utilized to prepare material and work for this project.

A.75 All rights in any work product developed by the Design-Builder within the scope of its engagement are assigned to the Courts.

Q.76 Division 01 Section 012000 Part 2.4.A reads "The D-B shall, in the Design Submission Schedule, indicate Owner submittal review periods as identified in the RFP." 1) Please confirm the Design Submission Schedule shall use the review periods in Part 3.2.C for milestone design submissions. 2) Please specify additional time to be added to the identified minimum review time periods to allow for reviews by Other Government Contractors (OGCs) and End Users. 3) Please specify the review period for any Owner or End User approvals required between design submissions.

A.76 1. Confirmed.
2. 3.2.C applies to Courts, end users coordinated through the Courts, and OGCs employed by the Courts for the execution of the agreement.

3. it is unclear what "approvals" are being referenced here

Q.77 Will a Design-Build team be shortlisted or qualified prior to the September 30, 2024 award date? If so, when?

A.77 Refer to Amendment 3, Question 5, Answer 5.

Q.78 When will interviews be scheduled and conducted? Will they be virtual or in-person?

A.78 Refer to Amendment 3, Question 5, Answer 5.

Virtual or in-person will be at the discretion of the Courts.

Q.79 To comply with the Green Building Act of 2006, including the Net-Zero Energy compliance requirements that were added under the Greener Government Buildings Amendment Act of 2022, DC Courts will file for an exemption with DOB & DOEE per the Green Building Act Exemption Application Guidelines. Please confirm this is the responsibility of DC Courts and that the bidders are to assume no responsibility or cost associated with the exemption and any work necessary meet or comply with Net Zero Energy Compliance of the Green Building Act of 2006.

A.79 The DB shall assume responsibility for conformance to all applicable code, laws, and regulations. The Courts may elect to pursue an exemption.

Q.80 Section K.4.4.2 Key Personnel requests the Offeror to provide “Key Personnel experience CV’s and Biodata”. Is a resume with the required information considered CV or Biodata and therefore sufficient?

A.80 Yes.

Q.81 Section 012000 Part 1.3.A Please confirm DC Courts will provide the complete and final Owner’s Project Requirements to the Design-Builder

A.81 OPRs are included with the solicitation documents for Core and Shell and will be developed by the D-B in the Options.

Q.82 Section 012000 Part 1.4.B Early Work Packages Submissions includes two construction document submissions: 50% and 100%. However, Part 1.4.C refers to the IFC-100% design submission. Please confirm the IFC-100% is the same as the 100% Early Work Package Construction Documents and Cost Estimate submission.

A.82 The submission requirements for early work packages are separate from the IFC submissions for the complete base and options.

Q.83 As a follow up to the answer to Amendment 03 Question 10, please confirm that the Design Builder will be compensated for cost and time impacts directly resulting from schedule delays caused by extended review and approval periods, or non-approval, of variance waivers identified within the RFP.

A.83 Refer to Division 01 specifications for review periods.

Refer to Amendment 3, Revised Section H.18 for No Harm for Delay clause.

The DB would not be eligible for an adjustment in cost or time if the non-approval was due to submission quality, non-conformance to project requirements, or untimely submission/application by the DB.

Q.84 Section 012000 Part 3.5.A. Please confirm Design Intent Document (DID) Requirements apply to Option 2 services only.

A.84 Confirmed.

Q.85 Section 012000 Part 3.2.E. Please confirm the D-B will be allowed to incorporate comments made during the design review process into the subsequent design submission.

A.85 Refer to Division 01 specifications for deliverable response requirements.

This Amendment Number #04 is acknowledged and is considered a part of the proposal for Solicitation Number DCSC-24-RFP-223 Recorder of Deeds Modernization Project

Signature of Authorized Representative

Date

Name of Authorized Representative

Title of Authorized Representative

Name of Offeror

Please remember to check the DC Courts Website daily for posting of amendments and updates.

<https://www.dccourts.gov/about/procurement-contracts-branch>