



Anne B. Wicks
Executive Officer

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTS
Capital Projects and Facilities Management
Office: Gallery Place
616 H Street NW, 6th Floor
Washington, DC 20001
Mailing Address: 500 Indiana Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20001-2131



AMENDMENT NO. 0001

TO: ALL PROSPECTIVE OFFERORS

**AMENDMENT
ISSUE DATE: December 6, 2016**

**SUBJECT: Solicitation No. CPFMD-17-1115 - District of Columbia
Court of Appeals Audiovisual Update Project**

**PROPOSAL
SUBMISSION
DATE: Friday, December 30, 2016, by 12:00 pm, Eastern
Standard Time**

The subject solicitation is amended as follows:

1. The RFP, Section L.2.2, "Proposal Due Date and Time" "**Delete**" the current proposal submission date of December 20, 2016, and "**Substitute**" the new proposal submission date of Friday, **December 30, 2016, by 12:00 pm, Eastern Standard Time**. The date is being extended because the Courts will be issuing answers to all outstanding questions received after the initial walkthrough conducted on November 17, 2016, and subsequent walkthrough scheduled as per **item #2** of this Amendment #0001, below. All potential offerors will have the opportunity to incorporate the responses into their proposals.
2. The RFP, **Section L.2.7**, is deleted in its entirety and insert the following:

All potential proposal Offerors are required to attend the pre-proposal meeting with site visit on November 22, 2016 at 11:00am or December 12, 2016 at 11:00am located at:

DC Court of Appeals
430 E Street, NW, Room 122
Washington, DC 20001

3. The RFP is amended to add the following subsection:

"L.2.7.1. Following the December 12, 2016 pre-proposal meeting with site visit, all potential Offerors with additional questions, must submit their questions no later than Thursday, December 15, 2016 by 12:00pm to Ms. Wilkerson at the email address noted in Section L.6.1."

4. The RFP, Section L.2.8, is deleted in its entirety and insert the following:

Proposals will not be deemed responsive and therefore, will not be reviewed if the potential Offeror does not participate in the mandatory meeting on November 22, 2016 or December 12, 2016.

5. Please see **Attachment A** to this Amendment No. 0001 – “Round 1 – Responses to Questions” Posed after Pre-proposal Conference and initial Site Visit (walkthrough) conducted on November 22, 2016.
6. Please see Attachment B to this Amendment No. 0001 – “Pre-Proposal Meeting Sign-In Sheet”.

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.



Monica I. Wilkerson
Procurement and Contracts Attorney Advisor

Acknowledgement 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 01 may be cause for rejection of the proposal submitted by the Offeror in response to the subject solicitation.

This Amendment Number 0001 is acknowledged and is considered a part of the proposal for Solicitation Number CPFMD-17-1115

Signature of Authorized Representative

Date

Name of Authorized Representative

Title of Authorized Representative

Name of Offeror

ATTACHMENT A

District of Columbia Court of Appeals Audiovisual Update Project - CPFMD-17-1115
Round 1: Responses to Questions Proposed by Potential Offers

Solicitation questions and answers: Round 01

Question 1. There may be instances where existing AV cabling is being abandoned, but not replaced. Will it be acceptable to leave it within walls and floors, or does it need to be completely removed?

Answer: All existing cables or wire not used in the upgrade shall be removed unless otherwise noted.

Question 2. Since no general construction or high voltage electrical work is in the scope, will a low voltage permit still be required?

Answer: No, low voltage permit is not required.

Question 3. Can you confirm that evening or weekend hours will not be mandatory and that the Courts will accommodate all work during regular business hours?

Answer: Yes, the Courts will accommodate all work during regular business hours, please indicate same in the project schedule.

Question 4. Do any of the VTC systems require multipoint or any other upgrades?

Answer: No, DC Courts has a VTC bridge for this purpose.

Question 5. We weren't allowed to take photos during the walk through. Can photos of the spaces be provided?

Answer: Yes, photos can be downloaded from the Miller, Beam & Paganelli FTP site:

Goto : www.megatrans.com

Select "send / receive files"

Select "Miller, Beam and Paganelli" from the drop down list

Enter Retrieval code "dcca"

The zip file is 409 megs.

Question 6. Will the Courts provide a staging area for temporary storage of equipment being removed or relocated, and for staging of new equipment being installed?

Answer: Yes, the Courts will identify a staging area prior to the successful contractor mobilizing to the work site.

Question 7. In the Solicitation on page 28 of 30 the M.4 Evaluation Criteria lists Understanding of the Project Requirements and Technical Approach to Performing the Work. I didn't see these

ATTACHMENT A

District of Columbia Court of Appeals Audiovisual Update Project - CPFMD-17-1115 Round 1: Responses to Questions Proposed by Potential Offers

listed in the description of Tabs on page 27 for the Volume I Technical Proposal. Can you clarify which Tab(s) should include the Understanding of the Project Requirements and Technical Approach to Performing the Work?

Answer: Formal response will be provided in Amendment 2 to be issued after the second scheduled MANDATORY pre-proposal conference/site visit.

Question 8. Can you confirm that Attachment J.7 Release of Claims is for after award and does not need to be submitted with the bid?

Answer: Attachment J.7 Release of Claims is for after award and does not need to be submitted with the proposal.

Question 9. Is an itemized list of equipment and system documentation available for the existing systems?

Answer: The Courts has a hard copy set of as-builts for the existing system which will be conveyed to the successful Offeror.

Question 10. Is the Marshall VS102HDI H.264 Encoder shown on drawing AV.21 existing equipment? It is not shown on the equipment spreadsheet.

Answer: This unit was replaced with the Datavideo NVS-25, which is on the equipment list.

Question 11. The description of the Future Video Studio 4 recorder says with editing software. Is this customer provided or by the AV contractor? If it is by the AV contractor is it the Future Video software or is a third party software preferred (please specify what if third party). If it is the Future Video software, they offer two versions: one resides on the Studio 4 recorder, and the other resides on a PC. Which version should be included with the Studio 4 recorder?

Answer: No additional software is needed (above what is provided in the Future Video SKU FVS-403). The Courts will export the video as needed for editing on their existing Mac based Final Cut Pro system.

Question 12. The description of the Future Video Studio 4 recorder says with editing software. Is this customer provided or by the AV contractor? If it is by the AV contractor is it the Future Video software or is a third party software preferred (please specify what if third party). If it is the Future Video software, they offer two versions: one resides on the Studio 4 recorder, and the other resides on a PC. Which version should be included with the Studio 4 recorder?

Answer: No additional software is needed (above what is provided in the Future Video SKU FVS-403). The Courts will export the video as needed for editing on their existing Mac based Final Cut Pro system.

ATTACHMENT A

District of Columbia Court of Appeals Audiovisual Update Project - CPFMD-17-1115
Round 1: Responses to Questions Proposed by Potential Offers

Question 13. Was there a Pre Bidder's Conference for the subject solicitation? If Yes, was it mandatory that all potential vendors to attend, if they wanted to submit a bid.

Answer: Yes, the pre-proposal conference/site visit is MANDATORY for all potential Offerors.

END OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

