

<u>Question</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>Response</u>
RFP-1	8/24/2006	Are the anonymous submission materials to include all submission items or just those related to the concept?	<i>Only those materials related to the concept and environmental mitigation shall be submitted anonymously.</i>
RFP-2	8/24/2006	Shall there be separate books for submitting material on each option?	Yes.
RFP-3	8/24/2006	The boundaries for the zones differ slightly between what is shown in the RFP and the boards on the wall at the RFP kickoff meeting. Which are accurate?	<i>The zone boundary that should be used is the zone boundary located on page 35 of the AFRH Draft Master Plan. An update of Appendix C, Template C will be provided with the correct zone boundary as soon as possible and posted to the project website. (www.afrhdevelopment.com)</i>
RFP-4	8/24/2006	The RFP states that the term for residential condominiums is 99 years but DC law requires that there be an automatic renewal. Will the lease terms conform to DC law?	<i>Lease terms will conform to DC law.</i>
RFP-5	8/24/2006	Has AFRH specified what levels of affordability are required and how the affordable units should be allocated between condominiums and rental units?	<i>Developers shall propose their affordable housing programs; AFRH has not expressed a preference. The units should be made affordable by other means than a land write-down from AFRH.</i>
RFP-6	8/24/2006	Will the successful developer need to deal with existing tenants on the property?	No.
RFP-7	8/24/2006	May developers adapt the existing financial templates?	<i>No. Developers may submit additional financial information in a format of their choosing with appropriate documentation for clarification. However, the templates need to be completed,</i>

<u>Question</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>Response</u>
			<i>as provided, and will be the basis of AFRH's evaluation of the financial offer.</i>
RFP-8	8/24/2006	Is there any kind of timing issue related to the requirement for 100 beds? Does VA have money budgeted for a specific year that is required to be spent?	<p><i>Developers shall propose the timing for transitional housing for veterans. With regard to the timing of money available from VA, Mr. Cox provided contact information for each of the developers to Nate Banks of VA and he should be contacting you. This question would be better asked of VA. Mr. Banks' contact information is:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Mr. Nate Banks Domiciliary Care Chief Department of Veterans Affairs 202745-8606 nathaniel.banks@med.va.gov</i></p>
RFP-9	8/24/2006	Does the current veterans-in-transition facility have to be demolished?	<i>No. As additional information, there are only 37 beds in that facility, and it is operated through a subcontract with U.S. Vets, which receives funding from VA.</i>
RFP-10		How important is it to preserve historic roads and tree lines intact vs. re-aligning, mitigating or replacing them?	<i>Per the Draft Master Plan, the existing tree line along Pershing Drive should be preserved to the greatest extent possible, and its alignment should respect the curvilinear path of the existing street. However, it is acknowledged that Pershing Drive is too narrow to be used as-is, and would require some modification.</i>
RFP-11		To where will the lost golf holes be re-located?	<i>The golf holes that currently encroach on Zone 4 will be relocated outside Zones 3 / 4 in a location to be determined by AFRH.</i>
RFP-12		Is it likely that the Preservation Plan may change the	<i>It is unlikely that wholesale changes in the historic</i>

<u>Question</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>Response</u>
		historic preservation requirements? E.g. retaining the Pipes Building.	<i>preservation requirements will occur in the draft Preservation Plan. The draft Preservation Plan will be available in late September / early October, and will made available to the development teams as soon as possible. The draft will be reviewed through the NHPA Section 106 process where AFRH will receive input from many interested parties. To date, there has not been a request to preserve the Pipes Building.</i>
RFP-13		Confirm if the CAD files for the Composite Topographic/Utility Map are available to the Developer. There appear to be discrepancies between the topographic data provided in the AutoCAD model file and the composite maps. The composite maps provide more accurate description of the <i>existing</i> field conditions. The CAD file will accelerate our ability to generate accurate drawings and 3D models of the site.	<i>CAD files are available for Composite Topographic/Utility Map drawings 2-8, 10, 11 and 13 listed in Appendix A, and will be provided to each of the development teams. For security purposes, these drawings will not be posted on the project website, and are for internal use of the development teams only.</i>
RFP-14		Can the plan assume that there is flexibility for potential right-of-way dedication as part of frontage improvements that could facilitate access off the North Capitol Street corridor (i.e., Scale Gate Road interchange) and off Irving Street NW?	<i>AFRH would consider this concept provided that it is compensated for the land as part of the overall offer and that the concept conforms with the design guidelines and the requirement to mitigate adverse impacts.</i>
RFP-15		Considering the importance of benefits accruing to the local community, can assumptions be made regarding potential access from the west (via Marshall Drive) off Rock Creek Church Road, if appropriate mitigation measures are incorporated in the proposal?	<i>If security and other potential adverse impacts are appropriately addressed, AFRH would consider pedestrian access to Zones 3 & 4 via Marshall Drive as part of the proposed design concept. AFRH has a strong preference against allowing vehicular traffic on this route.</i>
RFP-16		Will our team be allowed to run the Master Plan process or must we use and advise the existing team of consultants?	<i>AFRH will control the Master Plan process with input from its consultants and the selected developer(s).</i>
RFP-17		Who, in the US Army, is participating in the Section 106 process?	<i>U.S. Army David Moshier 21 Harewood Road, NW</i>

Question	Date	Question	Response
			Washington, DC 20011-4902 202-829-1829 David.moshier@anc.army.mil
RFP-18		Can the Developer rely on the expansion of the existing Home's shuttle service to include the proposed development? This will help reduce the amount of vehicular traffic within the Campus.	<i>No. The AFRH shuttle system serves a very specific population. Expansion of the shuttle service could put this population at higher risk and would represent an increased financial burden on AFRH.</i>
RFP-19		The RFP stresses Transportation Management Plan measures. To what extent will the ultimate plan need to comply with local/DDOT capacity standards for the roadway system that would potentially be impacted?	<i>The ultimate plan would need to be fully compliant with local / DDOT capacity standards.</i>
RFP-20		Considering the proximity of the site to the Medical Triangle (WHC/CNMC/VA) as well as the CUA, would it be acceptable to include understandings with and comments from major institutions in the area (and with DDOT) regarding potential joint or cooperative Transportation Management Plans?	<i>Yes. AFRH encourages collaborations with other institutions in the area regarding the Transportation Management Plan.</i>
RFP-21		In the past DC, has taken the position that zoning is required unless there is both federal use and ownership. Please elaborate on AFRH's discussions with the District of Columbia.	<i>This issue is a point of ongoing discussion between AFRH/GSA, DCOP, and NCPC. Because the federal government will retain rights in the property as ground lessor and the Master Plan is subject to NCPC review, a hybrid process has been proposed to address this issue. AFRH/GSA, DCOP, and NCPC met on 30 August, and follow-up meetings are scheduled for 8 September and 18 September. The development teams will be updated as the review process is determined.</i>
RFP-22		If our Option 1 and Option 2 schemes utilize the same design strategy, do we need to submit a complete resubmission (i.e. resubmit all the drawings, narratives, etc.), or would a partial resubmission be more appropriate?	<i>Separate submissions will be needed. The Option 2 proposals (Zones 3 and 4 separately) will be evaluated independently, thus the need for separate submissions.</i>

<u>Question</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>Response</u>
		[Page 5]	
RFP-23		The RFP indicates that a Phase II environmental investigation is underway. Is a scope of work for the Phase II assessment available for our review now prior to issuance of the Phase II in October? [Page 14]	<i>Yes. The scope for the Phase II environmental work will be sent to each development team. In addition, the sampling plan from the ongoing work will be provided. In the event of questions, direct all inquiries to the Project Manager. Developers should not contact the environmental consultant performing the work directly. The environmental consultant has been instructed not to take calls from other than its client.</i>
RFP-24		Have any underground storage tanks been removed since the Phase I report was prepared by Greenhorne & O'Mara in January 2005? [Page 14]	<i>No.</i>
RFP-25		Does CFA have a role in the approval process beyond that of a consulting party to the programmatic agreement? Please clarify their role. [Page 16]	<i>Yes. CFA will provide comments on the Final Master Plan prior to submission to NCPC, and will be a consulting party to the programmatic agreement in the Section 106 process. CFA will also provide advice and comment on exterior building designs.</i>
RFP-26		The RFP indicates that the successful developer will remediate Zones 3 and 4. Will this remediation be conducted under the District of Columbia oversight, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency oversight or both? Also, will land use restrictions, groundwater use prohibitions, and engineering controls be allowed to minimize the remediation expense? [Page 19]	<i>Remediation will be conducted under District of Columbia oversight.</i> <i>At this time, a Phase II environmental assessment is ongoing. Until this assessment is completed, we cannot provide definitive guidance on whether the proposed mitigations would be acceptable.</i>
RFP-27		Regarding the inclusion of Small, Disadvantages Business Enterprises - does AFRH have a goal for such inclusion? [Page 31]	<i>No. AFRH does not have a specific target in mind. Note the following RFP content: "The extent to which the project will include Small, Disadvantaged Business Enterprises and apprenticeship programs will be evaluated. Proposals that demonstrate the developer's thorough understanding of and high level of commitment to these programs will be evaluated more favorably with respect to this particular element "</i>

<u>Question</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>Response</u>
RFP-28		Regarding the Apprenticeship Program - are both union and non-union Apprenticeship Programs acceptable, provided they meet the standards stipulated in the RFP? [Page 31]	<i>The development teams should make an independent assessment regarding the acceptability of union versus non-union Programs under the RFP guidance. As stated in the RFP, the term “registered apprenticeship program” means an apprenticeship program that is accepted and recorded by the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, or by a recognized State Apprenticeship Agency, as meeting the basic standards and requirements of the United States Department of Labor for approval of such program for Federal purposes. An apprenticeship program contains all terms and conditions for the qualification, recruitment, selection, employment, and training of apprentices. For further information about registered apprenticeship programs, refer to 29 CFR Part 29.”</i>
RFP-29		Are historical maps or aerial photographs of the facility available for review and use by project teams? [Appendix A]	<i>Yes. They will be made available for the development teams to review at the AFRH resource room. Please make an appointment with the Project Manager to review.</i>
RFP-30		Are lead-based paint surveys available for review? [Appendix A]	<i>No surveys are available.</i>
RFP-31		Is the Law Engineering Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report from 1998 available? [Appendix A]	<i>Yes. This document will be provided to the development teams, but is limited to internal team use only.</i>
RFP-32		Please clarify what type of transaction would require compliance with Davis Bacon. [Page 22]	<i>Developers are responsible for compliance with all applicable law and regulations. The development teams should make an independent assessment regarding the applicability of Davis-Bacon to the concept and transaction structure proposed.</i>
RFP-33		Is the Housing for Veterans in Transition a leased or purchased facility? What term (i.e. duration) or	<i>The facility could be a direct lease of the sale of a leasehold interest where AFRH would retain ownership of the land.</i>

Question	Date	Question	Response
		commitment would come of such a use? Does AFRH have a preference regarding the location of this facility?	<i>The term of the commitment should be proposed by the developer. AFRH does not have a preference regarding the location of this facility.</i>
RFP-34		There was some discussion about the exact boundary between Zones 3 and 4 during the pre-proposal conference. Should AFRH select two developers under the Option 2 scenario, this could create design challenges with regard to the design of the Master Plan as there could be competing visions. To what extent should teams craft their proposals so that no buildings are constructed on this imaginary boundary? Can AFRH clarify the exact Zone 3 and 4 boundaries to be used and how teams should address the potential design issues associated with competing visions that will share this edge?	<i>The Zone 3 / 4 boundary that should be followed is the boundary that is shown on page 35 of the AFRH Draft Master Plan. Developers, at their option, may provide a concept showing an alternate proposed Zone 3 / 4 boundary in addition to their base case concept using the boundary as shown in the RFP. Any design coordination issues that arose as a result of AFRH selecting Option 2 would be resolved in the Final Master Plan development, and in the transaction documents.</i>
RFP-35		Please clarify how developers should quantify the mitigation measures required for certain development, environmental and socio-economic issues when the Final EIS and ROD have yet to be issued and the Draft EIS offers little in the way of proposed mitigation measures or solutions.	<i>Quantification of mitigation measures may be difficult; however, the RFP requests that the development teams identify mitigation concepts or approaches used to mitigate any anticipated adverse impacts.</i>