### Question No. 1:
In section 2.7 of the RFP, you ask for resumes and references for key personnel including a "Lead Preservation Architect". It is our intention to include a Historic Preservation Consultant on the team to advise on preservation matters. Given that this phase of the selection process does not ask for consultants, shall we merely include the approach to working with a preservation consultant or would you prefer that we include the resume and references of the anticipated consultant?

### Response No. 1:
The Library considers a demonstrated ability to negotiate the challenges of dealing with the local preservation process (DC and federal) to be a key element of this assignment. If the firm will be relying on a Historic Preservation Consultant, they should consider that person to be one of the Key Personnel, and to explain fully how they expect to integrate that person into negotiations with review agency staff and dealings with the Mayor’s Agent for Historic Preservation. If the firm has experience with the consultant on similar projects, specific examples of the role the consultant has played vis-à-vis the rest of the design team would be important. The Library reserves the right to modify specialty consultants to meet the needs of the project.

### Question No. 2:
How will preference points be awarded to Joint Ventures consisting of CBE and non-CBE firms?

### Response No. 2:
The proposals must include a fee breakdown at the architecture level only. This breakdown must stipulate how much and what percentage of the architecture fee is going to CBE and non-CBE firm(s). The Library will confirm the DSLBD certified points of a CBE firm. Those points will be applied proportionally to the percentage of the architecture fee. For example if the team fee is $100,000 and the CBE’s portion of the fee is 20% and the CBE firm is certified by DSLBD to have 10 CBE points, then that team would receive 2 preferential points. (20% times 10 = 2). If neither team member is a certified CBE by DSLBD, then there are no preferential points.

### Question No. 3:
If a team wanted to form a Joint Venture for this pursuit, does the JV have to be in place at the time of submittal?
| **Response No. 3** | Teams may adjust roles of the members from what was described in Phase 1, but a new teaming agreement is needed to reflect those changes. |
| **Question No. 4** | The RFP lists the minimum key personnel as (i) the Design Principal; (ii) the Project Architect; (iii) the Project Designer; and (iv) Lead Preservation Architect. Will you please clarify what the Library is specifically seeking for those roles or further define their responsibilities? |
| **Response No. 4** | The Library has provided a scope of work in the RFP. It is up to the bidder to assign responsibilities to their personnel to meet that scope. Recognizing that firms label the key design roles differently, the library’s main objective re: requesting key personnel is establishing a firm commitment that any personnel proffered as having important experience and expertise be clearly designated as playing a lead role, with detailed explanation of that role, and sufficient time being allocated for them to fill that role. |
| **Question No. 5** | Does the DC Architect team member need to be named Prime and the non-DC Architect team member be named as the Sub-Consultant? |
| **Response No. 5** | The Library cannot and will not advise how a bidding team should set up their partnership arrangement. Teams may adjust roles of the members, but a new teaming agreement is needed to reflect these changes. The Library must comply with all District of Columbia regulations necessary to complete this project. Therefore the Architect of Record for all work published on behalf of this project must be an architect with appropriate DC licensing and accreditations. |
| **Question No. 6** | Please advise how CBE participation will be evaluated in Phase 2 vs Phase 3 |
| **Response No. 6** | There is a 35% CBE participation requirement for this scope of work. In phase 2 the Library will only review the bidder’s future CBE utilization plan. The submission should elaborate how 35% CBE participation will be met without identifying specific firms outside of the architectural level. Also elaborate on experiences in meeting CBE participation requirements on past or current DC public-related projects. See question 2 above for preferential CBE points. The Library will request discreet subconsultant fees, qualifications and CBE designations in phase 3. |
| **Question No. 7** | The “library component“ is indicated to be “at least 250,000 sf” in total area. If the indicated 250,000 sf is not the total net area for the existing library, please advise what the net total area is and what is the maximum area that could be considered for the renovation work? |
| **Response No. 7** | Please consider this an official correction to the RFP. The maximum area for the library will be no greater than 250,000 sf. The entire building footprint will need to |
be renovated. The total net usable sf is approx. 250,000 sf. In the Library only component, the library is the total program. In the Library with Mixed Use component, the library and some other use such as residential or office will share the building program.

**Question No. 8**

It is suggested that the library functions may expand beyond the existing library envelope. In this scenario could the expanded library functions become part of the entitlement package? What is anticipated to be the total area for the library expansion?

**Response No. 8**

The Library functions will not expand beyond the existing envelope of 250,000 sf. Any expansion of the building envelope under the Mixed Use component will be for other uses not library uses.

**Question No. 9**

Please confirm if the renovation work is anticipated to be a gut renovation (complete and total rehab of the building and all systems)?

**Response No. 9**

See Attachment C Facility Assessment Condition Report, in the materials released with the RFP in the Dropbox. Most building systems are in critically poor condition indicating a need for a gut renovation. [https://www.dropbox.com/sh/ps9ts4dtgsv5mtw/AFsU5ZvAnf](https://www.dropbox.com/sh/ps9ts4dtgsv5mtw/AFsU5ZvAnf)

**Question No. 10**

Is the renovation work to include extensive exterior renovation/restoration in addition to window replacement?

**Response No. 10**

See, Attachment C Facility Assessment Condition Report. The primary exterior work is will include but not limited to window replacement, roof, brick point up an caulking repairs or replacements.

**Question No. 11**

Can you please provide floor plans (or images of the floor plans) for the existing library?

**Response No. 11**

See, Attachment C Facility Assessment Condition Report. The floor plans are contained in the report.

**Question No. 12**

Please clarify if the indicated “estimated budget of $125,000,000-$150,000,000” is “estimated Project Budget” or “estimated Construction Budget”?

**Response No. 12**

It is the estimated total development budget.

**Question No. 13**

If the indicated budget represents “Project Budget” what are all the included costs?

**Response No. 13**

The costs include hard cost, soft cost, financing costs and contingency.

**Question No. 14**

Is the asbestos abatement cost included in the estimated budget?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No.</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Is the funding for the renovation project in place or is this subject to government appropriation and/or fundraising?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Is there any flexibility with the established estimated budget?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>What is the expected project delivery process? Will this be a single bid package or will multiple bid packages be required?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Will there be a CM involved throughout the project development process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Does the $125,000,000 - $150,000,000 estimation include FF&amp;E?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The “mixed-use component/entitlement package” is indicated to be “a minimum of 130,000sf” in total area. What is the anticipated potential maximum area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Although the estimated budget for the “mixed-use component” is not indicated in the RFP brief, but we understand from the presentation that an estimated total “Project Budget of $225,000,000- $250,000,000” is allowed. Please confirm if this is an “estimated Project Budget” and not an “estimated Construction Budget”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question No. 22</td>
<td>If the indicated budget represents “Project Budget” what are all the included costs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response No. 22</td>
<td>See response 13.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question No. 23

If the total area for the “mixed-use component” currently indicated to be a minimum of 130,000 sf is increased, will the budget allowance increase respectively?

Response No. 23

Presumably, but the Mixed Use component in the RFP is limited to entitlements, which requires only schematic design.

Question No. 24a

Attachment K, Section 2.3.1 describes the scope of services for the “mixed-use component” to be limited to concept design phase only. Additionally it suggests that post entitlement; this project component may be transferred to another private entity. Are we to understand that if the mixed-use component/addition is to move forward it will not be by the Architect awarded the project based on the competition results?

Response No. 24a

The awarded architect from this procurement will be the Architect for the building envelope and the library component. If a private developer is utilized, they may select another design architect for the Mixed Use component.

Question No. 24b

Under what conditions would the Design Architect be able to carry out the project through further design and project development stages?

Response No. 24b

If a private developer is utilized, they may opt to use the awarded architect from this procurement for the Mixed Use component. Presumably, the awarded architect from this procurement will have a substantial advantage over competitors, given their familiarity with the project.

Question No. 25

The RFP brief describes the “mixed-use component” to be either commercial office or residential development. The effort required to design and develop different building types are varied and therefore reflected in the professional compensation. Is it possible to get clarity as to the direction of the development?

Response No. 25

It is not possible to provide any further clarity at this point. It will depend on the strength of the market, availability of financing, inclination of the chosen developer and other factors. Again, in terms of compensation, the Mixed Use scope of work under this procurement is through the entitlement phase only which includes concept design, so the differential should be minimal.

Question No. 26

We understand that both project components will be running concurrently and therefore the schedule for the “mixed-use component” is approximately 4 months for programming & Concept Design and approximately 6 months for Schematic Design. Please confirm.
| Response No. 26 | Schedule details on the Mixed Use component are undefined at this time. If the Library proceeds with a Mixed Use scenario the entitlement package for both components would be submitted as one package. |