



## REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS NO. 2026-04

### BUILDING REPAIRS – MOUNT RAINIER ARTIST LOFTS

3311 Rhode Island Avenue, Mount Rainier, Maryland

## ADDENDUM NO. 4

### REVISED DEADLINE AND ITEMIZED PRICING

|                          |                                             |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| <b>Issue Date</b>        | August 31, 2026                             |
| <b>Proposal Due Date</b> | Friday, September 11, 2026, at 3:00 p.m. ET |

To All Prospective Offerors

This Addendum No. 4 is part of RFP No. 2026-04. It supplements the RFP, Exhibits and Appendices B-1 through B-3, Addenda Nos. 1 through 3, officially issued responses, and City inspection information incorporated into the Solicitation Documents.

Except as expressly modified below, all other Solicitation requirements remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

#### 1. Revised proposal deadline

The proposal deadline is extended to Friday, September 11, 2026, at 3:00 p.m. ET. This deadline replaces the September 4, 2026 deadline stated in Addendum No. 3.

#### 2. Scope documents

Offerors shall base their proposals on the complete Solicitation Documents, including the RFP, Exhibits and Appendices B-1 through B-3, Addenda Nos. 1 through 4, officially issued responses, applicable City inspection information, and conditions visible or reasonably observable during the July 30 and August 11, 2026 site visits.

No summary, inspection list, violation list, unit list or estimate limits the complete Work required by the Solicitation Documents.

#### 3. Required pricing

Each Offeror shall submit a Base Scope Lump Sum and develop appropriate additive alternates, deductive alternates, allowances and unit prices. The pricing shall allow RDA to add, deduct, defer, separately procure or separately perform reasonably separable portions of the Work.

For each reported or observed inspection condition or violation, the Offeror shall identify:

1. Applicable unit, space, system or building area;
2. Reported or observed condition and proposed corrective Work;
3. Amount included in the Base Scope;
4. Additive or deductive alternate, where applicable;
5. Allowance or unit price for uncertain quantities;
6. Assumptions and exclusions; and

7. Anticipated schedule, access, design, permitting and coordination requirements.

Offerors shall provide separate pricing by applicable residential unit, commercial space, utility area, common area, exterior area, roof area and building system. Unrelated conditions shall not be combined when separate pricing is reasonably practicable.

#### **4. Site-visit areas and reported conditions**

##### **July 30, 2026 site visit**

Offerors were provided access to Store C; Units B04, 202, 205, 215, 216, 218 and 310; building common areas; utility areas; commercial space; and the roof. Offerors shall price applicable conditions visible or reasonably observable in those locations.

##### **August 11, 2026 site visit**

The second visit focused on occupied units and reported City Code Compliance conditions involving:

- Basement Units B01 through B03;
- First-floor Units 102 through 108;
- Second-floor Units 201 through 207 and 209 through 219;
- Third-floor Units 301 through 305 and 307 through 312; and
- The third-floor hallway, basement egress, waste-management areas, elevator and roof.

Conditions requiring evaluation and pricing may include structural and shoring conditions; damaged floors, ceilings and walls; roof and water damage; HVAC, plumbing and electrical deficiencies; fire and life-safety issues; windows and screens; painting and moisture-related damage; pest activity; egress and trip hazards; sanitation; unpermitted construction; elevator conditions; and waste-management conditions. This list is not exhaustive.

#### **5. August 2026 Reinspection Report - required deductive pricing**

Offerors shall also provide a separate, itemized deductive price for each corrective action identified in the attached August 2026 Reinspection Report for 3311 Rhode Island Avenue if RDA elects to perform or separately procure any portion of that Work.

Deductive pricing shall be provided by apartment, location and individual violation, including the corrective Work identified for Apartments 104, 107, 108, 201, 203, 204, 206, 213, 217, 218, 219, 303, 305 and 312. Apartments 210 and 307, for which access was unavailable, shall be addressed through an allowance or unit price, as applicable.

For each violation, the Offeror shall identify:

1. Apartment or location;
2. Violation and proposed corrective Work;
3. Amount included in the Base Scope;
4. Deductive amount if RDA performs or separately procures the Work;
5. Related assumptions, exclusions and coordination requirements; and
6. Effect of the deduction on the project schedule and remaining Work.

RDA reserves the right to perform or separately procure any individual corrective action, group of violations, apartment-specific Work or other reasonably separable portion of the Work. The corresponding deduction shall include all associated labor, materials, equipment, supervision, overhead, profit and other costs included in the Offeror's Base Scope for the removed Work.

Offerors shall not submit one combined deduction for all reinspection items. Each violation must be separately identifiable so RDA may select deductions individually or in any combination.

## 6. Pricing-option requirements

### Additive alternates

Additive alternates shall identify Work outside the Base Scope that may be required because of further investigation, concealed conditions, quantity increases, expanded repairs, system replacement, or code and permitting requirements. Each additive alternate shall state its complete scope, price, assumptions, exclusions and schedule effect.

### Deductive alternates

Deductive alternates shall be limited to complete, clearly defined and reasonably separable work packages that RDA may remove, defer, separately procure or perform through other resources. Each deduction shall state the Work removed, price reduction, schedule effect and effect on the remaining Work.

No deduction may prevent the remaining Work from being complete, safe, functional or code-compliant. Required structural investigation, immediate life-safety protection, permitting, inspections and closeout shall not be deducted unless expressly identified as a complete and separable work package.

### Allowances and unit prices

Uncertain quantities shall be addressed through clearly defined allowances or unit prices. The proposal shall identify the assumed quantity, unit of measurement, included costs and reconciliation method. Inclusion of an allowance or unit price does not authorize the Work.

## 7. RDA's right to separately perform Work

RDA reserves the right, in its sole discretion, to accept or reject any alternate, allowance or unit price; select an option in whole or in part; add, deduct, or defer specified additive or deductive alternates, allowances, unit-price items, or separately identified work packages; award less than the complete proposed scope; or perform or separately procure any portion of the Work using RDA personnel, consultants, contractors, property-management resources or other parties.

No Offeror is guaranteed any specific portion, category, quantity or value of Work. The exercise of an identified option or deduction shall be governed by the final Contract. Nothing in this Addendum waives any right or remedy that cannot lawfully be waived or that is expressly provided in the final Contract.

## 8. Reported conditions and bidder responsibility

RDA has not independently verified the existence, extent, cause, quantity, completeness or current status of every reported condition. Inspection reports, complaints, unit lists, photographs and summaries are provided to assist proposal preparation and are not exhaustive.

Each Offeror remains responsible for reviewing all Solicitation Documents, conducting due diligence, reconciling the documents with authorized site observations, and pricing the complete and code-compliant result. Failure to investigate or price a stated, visible, reasonably observable or reasonably inferable condition will not, by itself, entitle the selected Offeror to additional compensation or schedule relief.

## 9. Changes, precedence and acknowledgment

A post-award price or schedule adjustment is not automatic. Any change must be authorized in writing by RDA prior to any work being performed and comply with the final contract.

If this Addendum conflicts with an earlier Solicitation provision, this Addendum controls only to the extent of the conflict. Offerors shall acknowledge receipt of Addendum No. 4 in their proposals.

## EXHIBIT A

### BIDDER QUESTIONS AND RDA RESPONSES

The following questions and responses are incorporated into and made part of Addendum No. 4 and the Solicitation Documents.

**Basis of Responses.** These responses are based on the RFP, Appendices B-1 through B-3, and Addenda Nos. 1 through 3 posted on the RDA solicitation webpage. Where the posted documents do not establish a requested fact or commitment, the response states that limitation. These answers should be issued through the formal procurement process before being treated as part of the Solicitation Documents.

**Question 1. What is the plan for work to be done in occupied units? Will the residents be relocated within the building?**

**Answer:** The Solicitation Documents require the selected Offeror to coordinate resident access, sequencing, communications, and relocation needs with RDA, the property owner, and property management. Work in occupied units is included where required. The posted documents do not establish that residents will be relocated within the building. The location, duration, and sequencing of any temporary relocation will be determined based on the final investigation, approved work plan, life-safety requirements, and available units or other accommodations.

**Question 2. If the residents are to be relocated within or elsewhere, will the contractor be required to move them in and out of the units prior to the start of work?**

**Answer:** The selected Offeror is responsible for coordinating relocation, access, and construction sequencing as required by Section 3.4. The posted documents do not direct the Offeror to provide household-moving services as part of the Base Scope. Any physical moving, storage, or resident-relocation services required from the Offeror will be specifically authorized and addressed in the final scope or Contract. Offerors should not include unrequested relocation expenditures as contractor costs.

**Question 3. As regards the lack of existing original plans, is the intent of the as-builts to produce a full set of drawings across all disciplines or just Architectural and Structural drawings only? Will MEP drawings be required?**

**Answer:** The selected Offeror must prepare field-verified existing-condition, repair, permit, and final as-built record documents for every discipline affected by its Work. This includes architectural and structural documents and, where MEP or fire/life-safety systems are investigated, modified, repaired, or replaced, the corresponding MEP and fire/life-safety documents. The requirement is not a full-building redraw of unaffected systems; it applies to the complete permitted repair scope and the systems changed by the Work.

**Question 4. Considering the limited scope of the existing shoring showing the damaged trusses, does RDA anticipate that all ceilings on the second and third floors will need to be removed to fully inspect the condition of all the wood trusses, or should repairs be confined to the known affected areas only?**

**Answer:** RDA is not directing blanket removal of every second- and third-floor ceiling at the proposal stage. Appendix B-1 and Appendix B-2 require a comprehensive structural investigation, structural analysis, and exploratory openings at additional locations because the observed failures may be systemic. The selected Offeror's licensed structural engineer must determine and obtain approval for the extent and locations of openings needed to evaluate the framing safely. Repairs may not be limited to the currently exposed locations if the investigation identifies additional deficiencies. Destructive testing or openings require prior authorization and appropriate resident/access coordination.

**Question 5. Will RDA release a concise scope of work so that all interested contractors bid on the same scope for the building repairs?**

**Answer:** The RFP, Appendices B-1 through B-3, all addenda, officially issued responses, and conditions visible or reasonably observable during the site visits collectively constitute the scope of Work. Addendum No. 2 expressly states that its condition list is supplemental, unverified, and non-exhaustive and does not narrow the Solicitation. RDA is not issuing a separate abbreviated scope that replaces those documents. Each Offeror must reconcile the complete Solicitation Documents and clearly identify its assumptions, allowances, alternates, and exclusions.

**Question 6. Considering that the extent of damage in the entire building will remain unknown until additional structural studies are completed, will RDA entertain a change to the submitted price proposal once the full scope of work is known?**

**Answer:** A post-award price change is not automatic. Offerors must price all requirements and conditions that are stated, visible, reasonably observable, or reasonably inferable from the Solicitation Documents and site visits. The proposal should clearly state pricing assumptions and identify appropriate allowances, unit prices, or alternates for work that cannot reasonably be quantified before investigation. A change may be considered only for an authorized change in scope or a concealed or materially different condition that qualifies under the final Contract and applicable law. Failure to investigate, clarify, or price an observable or inferable condition will not by itself entitle the contractor to additional compensation.

**Question 7. One study contains an estimate of \$713,000 for emergency stabilization, but it is unclear whether some or all of that work has been completed or is included in this RFP. It is also unclear whether the additional \$1 million for resident relocation and utility arrears has been partially or fully expended. Please clarify.**

**Answer:** The amounts in Appendix B-1 are preliminary planning-level estimates, not a record of completed or expended work. The posted materials confirm that temporary shoring was previously installed in Unit 202, but they do not confirm completion of the remaining emergency-stabilization items or expenditure of the relocation and utility amounts. The repair Work required by the RFP remains cumulative and must be evaluated through bidder due diligence. Appendix B-1 separately identifies estimated resident-relocation costs of \$500,000 and unpaid utility balances of \$500,000. Unpaid utility arrears are not contractor costs unless RDA expressly directs otherwise. Offerors should rely on the Solicitation scope and observed conditions, not assume that a planning estimate has been spent or that every item in it is included in the contractor's price.

**Question 8. The Appendix B-2 structural assessment identifies the observed wood-truss framing failures as possibly systemic and recommends a structural analysis that has not yet been performed. Given that Section 3.7.2 assigns structural investigation and analysis to the selected Offeror, how should Offerors reflect the range of potential repair scope in the Base Scope Lump Sum?**

**Answer:** The Base Scope Lump Sum must cover the complete work reasonably established by the Solicitation Documents, site observations, and the Offeror's stated technical approach, including structural investigation, analysis, design, permitting, and identified repairs. Where the extent cannot reasonably be quantified before openings and analysis, the Offeror should use clearly defined allowances, unit prices, and/or alternates and state the associated assumptions and exclusions. The price proposal must remain internally consistent and sufficiently detailed for RDA to compare proposals and evaluate price reasonableness.

**Question 9. The 2021 building permit lists Structura Inc. as Architect/Designer of Record for repairs to floor trusses at Units 202, 214, and 216. Who is the current Engineer of Record, and will prior design work be made available to bidders?**

**Answer:** The posted Solicitation does not identify a current Engineer of Record for the upcoming Work. Appendix B-2 identifies Structura Inc. only as the Architect/Designer of Record shown on the 2021 permit and states that record drawings and prior repair documents were not available to BECS. All prior documents currently available to RDA are included in the posted Solicitation materials. If additional material becomes available during the procurement, RDA may provide it through a formal addendum. The selected Offeror must retain its own Maryland-licensed design professionals for the Work.

**Question 10. How does RDA intend to allocate liability for the adequacy of the pre-existing shoring design and installation? Will the selected Offeror be indemnified against defects in the pre-existing shoring, or must it assume full responsibility upon mobilization?**

**Answer:** The existing shoring was installed by others before this procurement, and Appendix B-2 does not confirm its adequacy. No bidder should treat the existing shoring as an RDA design representation or warranty. The selected Offeror and its licensed structural engineer must inspect the condition, promptly identify unsafe conditions, and design or recommend any required emergency repairs or shoring adjustments before relying on it for the Work. The posted RFP does not promise indemnification for defects in the pre-existing shoring, nor does it transfer responsibility for the original installation merely upon mobilization. Final risk allocation, indemnity, and responsibility for authorized corrective work will be governed by the executed Contract and applicable law.

**Question 11. The BECS report references its immediate-term recommendation as '(May 2027).' Given that the report is dated April 28, 2026, please confirm whether this is a typographical error for May 2026.**

**Answer:** The reference to May 2027 appears inconsistent with the report date and the phrase 'IMMEDIATE TERM.' Regardless of the parenthetical date, Offerors must treat the identified Unit 202/Level 3 framing condition as an immediate life-safety concern and include timely investigation and stabilization in their approach. The consultant report itself has not been revised on the posted webpage; any formal correction to the source report will be issued through the RFP addendum process.

**Question 12. Please confirm the current owner of record, whether the property is subject to receivership or court supervision, and which third-party approvals will be required before notice to proceed.**

**Answer:** The property is owned by Artspace Mount Rainier LP and is currently subject to a Chapter 7 bankruptcy proceeding in the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the District of Maryland. The bankruptcy trustee has authorized RDA to make the necessary repairs to the property. Before notice to proceed, RDA will confirm any additional approvals required based on the ownership, funding, permitting, and contracting structure in place at award.

**Question 13. How can the selected Offeror fulfill Section 3.4 relocation-coordination duties while complying with Section 3.9, which restricts direct communications with residents and occupants?**

**Answer:** Because the property is in Chapter 7 bankruptcy, the selected Offeror shall coordinate resident access, sequencing, and relocation through RDA and the owner- or property-management representative designated for the project. The bankruptcy trustee has authorized RDA to make the necessary repairs. Direct communications with residents, tenants, or commercial occupants may occur only when expressly authorized in writing and in accordance with the approved communications protocol.

**Question 14. Will any federal funding be included in the funding stack, and will Uniform Relocation Act requirements apply? If so, how will those obligations be assigned?**

**Answer:** The posted Solicitation does not identify federal funding or state that the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act applies. Offerors should not assume a federal funding source or independently create URA obligations. If the final funding stack triggers federal or other relocation requirements, RDA will identify the applicable requirements and allocate notice, benefits, recordkeeping, and coordination responsibilities through the Contract or a written amendment before the affected activities proceed.

**Question 15. Will outstanding utility balances be resolved by the owner before notice to proceed, and is continuous utility service warranted for the duration of the Work?**

**Answer:** Section 7.5 provides that unpaid utility balances are not contractor costs unless expressly directed by RDA. The posted materials do not warrant that all arrears will be resolved before notice to proceed or guarantee uninterrupted utility service throughout construction. RDA and the appropriate owner-side parties will address account-level arrears and required owner consents. The selected Offeror remains responsible for identifying utility needs for its Work, coordinating planned interruptions, and promptly reporting service conditions that affect safety, schedule, or performance.

**Question 16. Will the final insurance, additional-insured, waiver-of-subrogation, bond, and indemnity terms be issued by addendum before the questions deadline, or may the selected Offeror augment its price after award?**

**Answer:** Offerors must price the insurance and bonding requirements stated in the RFP, including the required 100% performance and payment bonds, and should identify any material insurance assumptions in the proposal. Section 7.7 states that final insurance and related contract terms will be confirmed before contract execution. The Solicitation does not guarantee a post-award price increase. If RDA materially changes a stated requirement during procurement, the change will be issued in writing and handled through the applicable procurement process; otherwise, the selected Offeror is expected to execute the final negotiated Contract without an automatic price adjustment.

**Question 17. Please provide the written requirements and sequence communicated by the City of Mount Rainier and Prince George's County for restoring temporary or permanent occupancy status.**

**Answer:** Appendix B-3 contains the posted City of Mount Rainier code-violation records, and Appendices B-1 and B-2 identify structural and other conditions affecting occupancy. Addendum No. 2 provides additional inspection priorities and included City Code Compliance participation in the interior site visit. The required sequence is to complete the necessary investigation and design, obtain permits and approvals, correct applicable structural, life-safety, code, building-envelope, MEP, elevator, and related deficiencies, complete required inspections and closeout documentation, and obtain the applicable occupancy approval from the authorities having jurisdiction. The posted materials do not establish a different guaranteed or abbreviated sequence. The selected Offeror must verify current requirements directly with the City, County, fire marshal, and other authorities as part of permitting and Certificate of Occupancy strategy.

**Question 18. Should the Base Scope Lump Sum reflect targeted roof repairs with full roof replacement as an Alternate, or should the Base Scope include full replacement?**

**Answer:** The Base Scope should include the investigation and targeted repairs needed to stop active leakage, correct associated deficiencies, and provide a complete code-compliant result supported by the Offeror's field observations. Because Appendix B-1 recommends that full replacement be considered and Appendix B-2 indicates the EPDM roof appears to have exceeded its service life, Offerors should separately price full roof replacement, including necessary slope and drainage corrections, as a clearly defined Alternate unless their documented technical assessment concludes

that replacement is required to achieve the Base Scope performance requirements. All assumptions must be stated clearly.

**Question 19. Given the single mandatory site visit on July 30, 2026, will RDA schedule additional site access before the proposal deadline?**

**Answer:** Yes. Addendum No. 2 provided an additional interior site visit for eligible respondents who attended the mandatory July 30, 2026 site visit. The additional visit addressed occupied units and reported Code Compliance conditions, while the July 30 visit covered identified vacant or unoccupied units, common areas, utility areas, commercial space, and the roof. Both visits form part of bidder due diligence. No further site access is guaranteed unless RDA issues additional written notice or an addendum.

**Question 20. Will the Owner or RDA retain an owner's representative or program manager to coordinate schedule, budget, draw management, reporting, stakeholder interfaces, and owner-side coordination?**

**Answer:** The posted RFP does not commit RDA or the owner to retaining a separate owner's representative or program manager. The procurement is structured as contractor-led work, and the selected Offeror must provide the project management, schedule, budget control, coordination, and reporting required by the RFP. RDA may use its own staff, consultants, contractors, or other resources under Section 2.5 and will identify its authorized contracting and project representatives after award. That reservation does not reduce the selected Offeror's responsibilities.

**Question 21. Will RDA facilitate access to prior engineering deliverables held by BECS, Arel Architects, or Structura Inc., and establish a coordination protocol with those parties?**

**Answer:** The engineering and assessment materials currently available to RDA are posted as Solicitation appendices. Appendix B-2 states that original construction drawings, prior repair documents, and related building documentation were not available to BECS. RDA cannot guarantee access to documents held by third parties or require those parties to coordinate with the selected Offeror unless a separate right or agreement permits it. If additional deliverables are obtained during procurement, RDA may issue them by addendum. The selected Offeror remains responsible for its own field verification, investigation, analysis, design, and Engineer-of-Record coordination.

**Question 22. Will RDA introduce the selected Offeror to the City of Mount Rainier, Prince George's County, the fire marshal, and other authorities and participate in early jurisdictional coordination meetings?**

**Answer:** RDA will provide reasonable project-level coordination and may participate in early meetings where owner or RDA involvement is necessary. The selected Offeror remains responsible for identifying applicable authorities, preparing complete submissions, securing permits and inspections, responding to review comments, and carrying the Work through closeout and occupancy approval. Participation by RDA or an authority does not transfer the Offeror's permitting or code-compliance responsibility.

**Question 23. Will the Owner or RDA designate a financial coordinator to manage utility arrears, funding-stack coordination, lender consents, and the interface with the property owner?**

**Answer:** The posted Solicitation does not designate or promise a separate financial coordinator. RDA and the appropriate owner-side parties will manage owner-level funding, utility-arrears, lender-consent, and property-control matters. The selected Offeror must provide required cost, schedule, draw, reporting, and supporting documentation and coordinate through RDA's designated representative. Utility arrears are not contractor costs unless expressly directed.

**Question 24. Beyond referral to the Supplier Development and Diversity Division, will RDA provide additional support in developing the certified subcontractor pipeline needed to meet the 30% supplier-utilization target?**

**Answer:** Offerors are responsible for good-faith outreach, team formation, certifications, documentation, and compliance with the participation requirements. The RFP establishes a minimum 15% County-Based Minority Business Enterprise utilization and a minimum 15% County-Based Business or County-Based Small Business utilization, for a combined 30% target, and identifies the Supplier Development and Diversity Division as a resource. The posted Solicitation does not promise RDA-supplied subcontractors or relief from the goals because a specialty trade has a limited certified pipeline. Offerors should document timely outreach and raise any availability issue through the formal RFP process.

**Question 25. Will the Owner or RDA retain independent quality assurance or design peer review, separate from the selected Offeror's internal QA/QC, to review repair documents, verify special inspections, and confirm code-compliance closeout?**

**Answer:** The posted Solicitation does not commit RDA or the owner to retaining a separate independent peer reviewer or quality-assurance consultant. The selected Offeror is responsible for its internal QA/QC, licensed design, required special inspections, testing, documentation, and code-compliant closeout. RDA reserves the right to use its own consultants or other resources and the authorities having jurisdiction will perform their required reviews and inspections, but neither possibility reduces the selected Offeror's obligations.

**Question 26. Evaluation of Pricing.** RDA will evaluate the Base Scope Lump Sum, alternates, allowances, unit prices, schedule of values, assumptions, and exclusions in accordance with Sections 6.1, 6.3, and 6.5 of the RFP. Nothing in this Addendum changes the evaluation criteria or maximum points established in the RFP.

**END OF ADDENDUM NO. 4**