



**GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

**REQUEST FOR OFFERS**

**District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) Excess School Facilities**

**Gibbs  
Mamie D. Lee  
MC Terrell**

Issued by:  
The Government of the District of Columbia by and through  
The Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education

**Offers due by:  
October 20, 2014  
no later than 5:00 p.m. EDT**

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS  
TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. OVERVIEW.....pg. 2

II. PROPOSED REUSE SITES .....pg. 2

III. DISTRICT GOALS FOR THIS SOLICITATION .....pg. 3

IV. DATA OVERVIEW OF THE REUSE SITES .....pg. 4

V. REGULATORY FRAMEWORK.....pg. 12

VI. SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS.....pg. 14

VII. EVALUATION PROCESS.....pg. 19

VIII. RFO UPDATES AND MODIFICATIONS .....pg. 23

IX. SELECTION AND NEGOTIATION .....pg. 23

X. RESERVATION OF RIGHTS AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS .....pg. 24

XI. FLETCHER JOHNSON CO-LOCATION ..... pg. 27

APPENDIX ..... pg. 29

## **I. OVERVIEW**

The Government of the District of Columbia (“District”), through the Deputy Mayor for Education (“DME”), invites interested parties who are “Eligible Entities” (defined below) to respond to this Request for Offers (“RFO”) with offers (“Offers”) for reuse of the following excess District of Columbia Public School (“DCPS”) assets (“Reuse Sites”) listed below:

- **Gibbs – 500 19<sup>th</sup> Street, NE**
- **Mamie D. Lee – 100 Gallatin Street, NE**
- **MC Terrell – 3301 Wheeler Road, SE**

## **II. PROPOSED REUSE SITES**

This RFO seeks Eligible Entities to renovate and operate the Reuse Sites. The District has identified the following space as excess and available for reuse in connection with this RFO:

	<b>School</b>	<b>Square</b>	<b>Lot</b>	<b>Presumed Address</b>	<b>Gross Building Square Feet</b>
1.	<b>Gibbs</b>	4531	0820	500 19 <sup>th</sup> Street, NE	64,800
2.	<b>Fletcher Johnson*</b>	5344	0802	4650 Benning Road, SE	302,000
3.	<b>Mamie D. Lee</b>	PAR 01240136	n/a	100 Gallatin Street, NE	45,800
4.	<b>MC Terrell</b>	PAR 02350075	n/a	3301 Wheeler Road, SE	112,000

\*Note: Because of size of the location and the District’s vision of a multi-tenant/use community hub, a portion of the Fletcher Johnson School is available for a co-location and will have a separate Request for Offers process. For additional information on the Fletcher Johnson School, see Section XI.

Respondents are encouraged to attend the site visit(s) to gather further information. See Section VII. Nothing contained herein or in the Appendix shall be deemed a representation, warranty or guaranty by the District as to the condition of the Reuse Sites. It is the Respondent’s sole responsibility to confirm all site characteristics, zoning requirements, laws, potential historic designation and regulations prior to Offer submission.

## **III. DISTRICT GOALS FOR THIS SOLICITATION**

Through this solicitation the District is seeking to leverage vacant school buildings to make strategic matches between high quality charter operators, available public school buildings, and the needs of the community. To this end, the District is seeking to meet

the following four goals: (1) provide high-quality educational programs that meet the needs of District students and families; (2) optimize building and site use to serve both students and the community; (3) offer stable, and suitable space to public charter schools, particularly those that are currently operating in sub-optimal space; and (4) promote job creation and sustainable development in the District.

**Provide high-quality educational programs that meet the needs of District students and families.**

- Provide high quality educational programs that respond to the specific context of the community, in terms of existing capacity and educational programming in nearby public schools, projected growth, and demand for programs.
- Ensure equitable access to school programs for *all* students, including students with special needs, who are designated as at-risk of academic failure, and who are English Language Learners.<sup>1</sup>

**Optimize building and site use to serve both students *and* the community:**

- Activate closed and vacant public school buildings thereby preventing blight and adverse impact to the surrounding community, while also preserving a public asset for educational use.
- Ensure unique amenities within each site (e.g., gymnasiums, auditoriums, cafeterias, playing fields, and multipurpose space) are available for community activities, and that other uses identified by the community for the site are honored to the extent feasible.
- Provide educational services that will address the needs of the local community.
- Offer stable and suitable space to public charter schools by providing long-term leases.
- Support existing high quality charter schools operating in sub-optimal space.

**Promote local job creation and sustainable development in the District:**

- Create both temporary and permanent jobs for District residents.
- Promote sustainable development practices that adhere to all District of Columbia Green Building Act (GBA) requirements.

---

<sup>1</sup> The definition of “at-risk” is students who are either homeless, in the District’s foster care system, qualify for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) or the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), or who are high school students that are one year older, or more, than the expected age for the grade in which the students are enrolled.

## IV. DATA OVERVIEW OF THE REUSE SITES

The DME compiled information on the areas surrounding the Reuse Sites and solicited community feedback in order to identify potential uses for the Reuse Sites. Please see section VII.D Evaluation Process to understand how this information relates to the eligibility requirements and evaluation scoring.

### A. Gibbs

The DME has compiled data on the area surrounding the Gibbs School and solicited community feedback on the reuse of the Gibbs School. Please refer to the [Gibbs School data sheet](#), [hearing presentation](#), and [community notes](#) in the Appendix when reviewing this section. The summary below outlines some proposed uses for the Gibbs School based on the data, community meetings and current/planned educational offerings in the Gibbs School vicinity.

#### Neighborhood Overview

The Gibbs School is located in Ward 6 in the DC Office of Planning's Neighborhood Cluster 25, which consists of the NoMa, Union Station, Stanton Park, and Kingman Park neighborhoods (as defined by the Office of Planning). Almost 2,900 public school students from all grades lived in the neighborhood cluster in SY2013-14; 1,766 attended DCPS schools and 1,130 attended DC public charter schools. Cluster 25 had the 9th largest number of public school students in the entire city in SY2013-14.

Prior to the Gibbs School closing in SY2008, it had a school boundary. In SY2013-14, there were 682 public school students living in the former Gibbs boundary.

In terms of special populations, the charts below show the percent of students living in the Gibbs boundary in SY2013-14 who were receiving special education services (in total and by individual special education level), who were at-risk of academic failure<sup>2</sup>, and who were English Language Learners:

---

<sup>2</sup> Students at risk of academic failure are those students who are homeless, in the District's foster care system, qualify for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) or the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), or high school students that are one year older, or more, than the expected age for the grade in which the students are enrolled.

**Share of Public School Students Living in the Gibbs boundary by Special Populations, SY2013-14**

All Public Schools	Special Education (all levels)	Special Education Level 1	Special Education Level 2	Special Education Level 3	Special Education Level 4
City Wide	13%	5%	4%	1%	3%
Gibbs boundary	15%	5%	5%	2%	4%

Note: The individual shares of special education by levels do not add exactly to the total due to rounding.

All Public Schools	At Risk of Academic Failure	English Language Learners
City Wide	43%	9%
Gibbs boundary	56%	1%

**Population Projections**

The DC Office of Planning has estimated population forecasts for each of the 39 neighborhood clusters. Neighborhood Cluster 25 is already home to a large number of children, and the DC Office of Planning estimates that the number of children in this neighborhood cluster will grow substantially, much higher than the city average, between 2014 and 2020. Projected growth by age-groups is included below:

- Infants, toddlers, and preschool age (0-3 year-olds) are expected to increase by 24%;
- Elementary school age (4-10 year olds) expected to increase by 87%;
- Middle school age (11-13 year olds) expected to increase by 61%; and
- High school age (14-17 year olds) expected to increase by 36%.

**School Capacity**

Currently, there are 16 DCPS schools and 12 DC public charter schools serving all grades located within 1.5 miles of the Gibbs School. The DCPS schools within a half mile of the Gibbs School are currently operating under capacity, meaning their facility utilization is less than 80% and they have available seats to fill. These schools serve all grade levels, and DCPS is implementing new programs or initiatives to attract enrollment (e.g., the International Baccalaureate (IB) Diploma Programme at Eastern High School and IB Middle Years Programme at Browne and Eliot). In general, the other DCPS elementary and middle schools in the 1.5 mile radius are closer to capacity and have fewer available seats (e.g., they have higher facility utilization). Refer to the Gibbs Data Sheet for school specific details. (Capacity and facility utilization data are not available for public charter schools.)

Two Rivers PCS will also be opening a second campus at Young School, which is approximately a half mile from the Gibbs School, north of Benning Road. This campus will start with PK3-1 in SY2015 and grow to 5<sup>th</sup> grade by 2019.

### **Student Enrollment Patterns**

Like many other parts of the city, students living in the former Gibbs boundary are exercising school choice within both DCPS and the charter school sector. In SY2013-14, the 352 elementary grade students living in the former Gibbs boundary attended 80 different public schools across the city. Almost half (49%) of the elementary-grade students located in the current Gibbs boundary attended schools within a half mile radius of the Gibbs School and 45% of the middle-grade students are attending the two closest DCPS or public charter middle schools.

### **Community Feedback**

Some residents who attended the September 9<sup>th</sup> public meeting at the Rosedale Recreation Center voiced concern about adding another public charter school to the current supply. Their concern is that adding another school will hamper the enrollment efforts of nearby DCPS schools. A number of residents stated that the building should be awarded to an adult education public charter school, as the community has a great need for basic adult education and workforce development.

Questionnaires received from the hearing revealed an interest in:

1. Adult education programs;
2. Vocational and GED training;
3. Dual language; and
4. Montessori programs.

### **Potential Uses for the Gibbs School**

Based on the information above on current and projected population, available school capacity, current and planned program investments at nearby schools, and community input received, the Gibbs School appears to be potentially suited for:

1. A relocation of a nearby public charter school currently operating in a substandard facility;
2. An academic program that typically attracts students from throughout the city (e.g., dual language program, residential program, or Montessori program); or
3. An adult-education and work force development focused public charter school.

Respondents are encouraged to refer to background information provided herein, in the Appendix and at the DME website in their proposal.

Respondents are not however limited to submitting proposals for only the potential uses listed above. If respondents have another suggested use of the Gibbs School, they should submit their proposal along with supporting evidence.

## **B. Mamie D. Lee**

The DME has compiled data on the area surrounding Mamie D. Lee and solicited community feedback on the reuse of the Mamie D. Lee School. Please refer to the [Mamie D. Lee School data sheet](#), [hearing presentation](#), and [community notes](#) in the Appendix when reviewing this section. The summary below outlines some conclusions based on the data, community meetings and current/planned educational offerings in the Mamie D. Lee School vicinity.

### **Neighborhood Overview**

The Mamie D. Lee School is located in Ward 5 in the DC Office of Planning's Neighborhood Cluster 19, which consists of the Lamond Riggs, Queens Chapel, Fort Totten, Pleasant Hill neighborhoods (as defined by the DC Office of Planning). The Mamie D. Lee School is also very near sections of Neighborhood Cluster 18 (the Brightwood Park, Crestwood, Petworth neighborhoods), Cluster 17 (the Takoma, Brightwood, Manor Park neighborhoods) and Cluster 20 (the North Michigan Park, Michigan Park, University Heights neighborhoods). The neighborhoods in Clusters 17 and 18, those west of Cluster 19, have more public school students living in them compared to Cluster 19. Cluster 18 has the second largest number of public school students in the city and Cluster 17 has the 5<sup>th</sup> highest in the city. Cluster 19 is ranked 14<sup>th</sup> out of the 39 neighborhood clusters.

Because Mamie D. Lee is so close to a number of neighborhood clusters and it does not have a school boundary (it has operated as a citywide special education school), the DME identified the number of students living within a mile of Mamie D. Lee. In SY2013-14, there were 6,271 public school students living within 1 mile of Mamie D. Lee.

In terms of special populations, the charts below shows the percent of students living in the 1 mile radius around Mamie D. Lee in SY2013-14 who were receiving special education services (in total and by individual special education level), who were at-risk of academic failure, and who were English Language Learners:

**Share of Public School Students Living within 1 Mile of Mamie D. Lee by Special Populations, SY213-14**

All Public Schools	Special Education (all levels)	Special Education Level 1	Special Education Level 2	Special Education Level 3	Special Education Level 4
City Wide	13%	5%	4%	1%	3%
Within 1 mile around Mamie D. Lee	11%	5%	3%	1%	2%

All Public Schools	At Risk of Academic Failure	English Language Learners
City Wide	43%	9%
Within 1 mile around Mamie D. Lee	35%	19%

**Population Projections**

The DC Office of Planning has estimated population forecasts for each of the 39 neighborhood clusters. They estimated that the number of elementary-aged school students will increase in all of the neighborhood clusters near Mamie D. Lee between 2014 and 2020. For instance, they estimated that elementary children in Cluster 19 will grow by almost 100% and in Clusters 17 and 18 elementary-aged children will grow more than the city average. They also estimated that Cluster 19’s preschool age children will grow by 30% between 2014 and 2020, but Clusters 17’s and 18’s preschool age children will decrease during the same time period.

**School Capacity**

Currently, there are 5 DCPS schools and 12 public charter schools serving all grades located within 1.5 miles of the Mamie D. Lee School. The nearby DCPS elementary and education campus (PK3-8) schools have high facility utilization. Some of these full schools also have robust in-boundary participation rates (meaning a high proportion of their enrollment is from students living within the school’s assigned boundary) while others do not and draw their high enrollments from out-of-boundary students. Some of these nearby DCPS elementary schools, therefore, have little room to add more students, while others have significant room for in-boundary students. Also some of the public charter schools in the area attract students primarily living nearby while other public charter schools draw students from across the city.

Unlike the elementary and education campuses, the nearby DCPS high schools have low facility utilization rates and have sufficient capacity to

add more students. Currently, Roosevelt High School is being modernized and DCPS is implementing a new international world languages program that is slated to open in SY15-16.

The District recently completed a review of student assignment policies and DCPS school boundaries. The resulting plan includes the establishment of three new middle schools within 2 miles of Mamie D. Lee. This includes Brookland MS opening in SY2015-16, MacFarland MS opening no sooner than SY2015-16, and the New North Middle School (which currently has no set location or opening date). In concert with the openings of these new DCPS middle schools, nearby DCPS education campuses will revert back to PK3-5<sup>th</sup> grade, as their 6-8 students will be served at the stand-alone middle schools.

### **Student Enrollment Patterns**

Mamie D. Lee does not have a school boundary because it has been operating as a special education school, so DME's analysis of student enrollment patterns is based on students living within 1 mile of Mamie D. Lee. Like most parts of the city, students living within a mile of Mamie D. Lee's boundary are exercising school choice in both sectors. In SY2013-14, the 3,394 elementary grade students living within 1 mile attended 129 different public schools across the city. Forty percent of the elementary school students living within 1 mile attended schools that were some of the closest to the Gibbs School (within 1.5 miles).

### **Community Feedback**

Residents who attended the September 11<sup>th</sup> public meeting were particularly concerned about the relocation of special education students from Mamie D. Lee to River Terrace. Some were interested in having a charter operator who could serve these students. Other community members had an interest in Mamie D. Lee serving as a senior center, as well as providing recreation and athletic facilities for the greater community.

Questionnaires received at the hearing revealed an interest in:

1. Special Education;
2. Vocational and GED training;
3. Dual language;
4. Senior activities; and
5. Recreation/fitness programs.

### **Potential Uses of the Mamie D. Lee School**

Based on the information above on capacity issues at nearby DCPS elementary schools and education campuses, on public charter school enrollment patterns, on DCPS' plans for new schools and program

investments, and on community input, the Mamie D. Lee School appears to be potentially suited for:

1. A high quality elementary program that is prepared to serve the nearby English Language Learner (ELL) population.
2. A relocation of an operating public charter school that is currently located in the area and is in a substandard facility.

Respondents are encouraged to refer to this background information provided herein, in the Appendix and at the DME website in their proposal. Respondents are not however limited to submitting proposals for only the potential uses listed above. If respondents have another suggested use of the Mamie D. Lee School, they should submit their proposal along with supporting evidence.

### **C. MC Terrell**

The DME has compiled data on the area surrounding the MC Terrell School and solicited community feedback on the reuse of the MC Terrell School. Please refer to the [MC Terrell School data sheet](#), [hearing presentation](#), and [community notes](#) in the Appendix when reviewing this section. The summary below outlines some conclusions based on the data, community meetings and current/planned educational offerings in the MC Terrell School vicinity.

#### **Neighborhood Overview**

The MC Terrell School is located in Ward 8 in the DC Office of Planning's Neighborhood Cluster 39, which consists of the Congress Heights, Bellevue, and Washington Highlands neighborhoods (as defined by the DC Office of Planning). Cluster 39 had the largest number of public school students in the city at 7,482 students in SY2013. The MC Terrell School is also near Neighborhood Cluster 38 (the Douglass, Shipley Terrace neighborhoods), and Cluster 38 has the 6<sup>th</sup> greatest number of public school students (3,658 students). In SY2013-14, there were 7,611 public school students living within 1 mile of MC Terrell.

In terms of special populations, the charts below shows the percent of students living within 1 mile of MC Terrell in SY2013-14 who were receiving special education services (in total and by individual special education level), who were at-risk of academic failure, and who were English Language Learners:

**Share of Public School Students Living within 1 Mile of MC Terrell by Special Populations, SY213-14**

All Public Schools	Special Education (all levels)	Special Education Level 1	Special Education Level 2	Special Education Level 3	Special Education Level 4
City Wide	13%	5%	4%	1%	3%
Within 1 mile around MC Terrell	15%	5%	5%	2%	3%

All Public Schools	At Risk of Academic Failure	English Language Learners
City Wide	43%	9%
Within 1 mile around MC Terrell	61%	0.5%

**Population Projections**

The DC Office of Planning has estimated population forecasts for each of the 39 neighborhood clusters. They estimate that in Cluster 39 the number of 0-3 year olds will hold flat, and there will be modest growth in elementary, middle, and high school aged students. Therefore, while this cluster has the greatest number of children, it is expected to grow at a much smaller rate than the citywide average.

**School Capacity**

Currently, there are 8 DCPS schools and 14 public charter schools serving all grades located within 1.5 miles of the MC Terrell School. Some of the nearby DCPS elementary schools have facility utilization rates close to or above 80%, while other DCPS elementary schools have much lower facility utilization and have available seats. Nearby DCPS middle and high schools have low facility utilization rates.

DCPS is currently modernizing Ballou HS and it will be completed by SY2016-17.

**Student Enrollment Patterns**

Students living within 1 mile of MC Terrell are more likely to attend schools close to home compared to students living near the other buildings that are the subject of this RFO. For instance, 60% of the 4,415 elementary-grade students living within 1 mile of MC Terrell go to nearby schools. Even though students near MC Terrell are more likely to attend school nearby than in other parts of the city, elementary grade students living within 1 mile still attended 129 different public schools across the city.

### **Community Feedback**

Residents who attended the September 15<sup>th</sup> public meeting suggested that MC Terrell be used for adult education programs, middle and high school programs, or to allow Somerset Prep DC Public Charter School to remain in the facility. (Somerset Prep currently has a use agreement for the building for SY2013-14 and SY2014-15.) It should be noted that there was low attendance at this meeting.

### **Potential Uses of MC Terrell**

Based on the information above and due to the large size of the MC Terrell School (112,000 square feet), the MC Terrell School appears to be potentially suited for:

1. A colocation of a public charter school (including adult education) and compatible programs with a strong commitment to and track-record of effectively serving “at-risk” populations; and/or
2. A relocation of an operating public charter school that is currently located in the area, is in a substandard facility, and has a strong commitment to and track-record of effectively serving “at-risk” populations.

Respondents are encouraged to refer to the background information provided herein, in the Appendix and at the DME website in their proposal. Respondents are not however limited to submitting proposals to only the potential uses listed above. If respondents have another suggested use of the MC Terrell School, they should submit their proposal along with supporting evidence.

## **V. REGULATORY FRAMEWORK**

In preparing an Offer to this RFO, Respondents should consider all existing land uses, physical conditions, regulatory requirements, and community interests. Offers need not conform to existing zoning; provided, however, if a zoning change is necessary, the Offer should describe, in detail, the Respondent’s proposed approach to obtain such zoning change(s) and the estimated timeframe thereof.

### **Eligible Entity Right of First Offer**

#### **A. Eligible Entity**

Pursuant to D.C. Official Code § 38-1802.09 (2007 Supp.) revised and known as the “Comprehensive Planning and Utilization of School Facilities Amendment Act of 2014) (the “Act”), the right of first offer must be given to the following described entities (referred to in this RFO as an “**Eligible Entity**”). An Eligible Entity is, as of the date Offers are due in response to this RFO, defined in the Act as:

1. A public charter school;

2. An eligible applicant whose petition to establish a public charter school has been conditionally approved pursuant to section §2203d)(2);
  3. A Board of Trustees; or
  4. A charter school facility incubator, as defined in the Act.
- B. An Eligible Applicant has a right of first offer under the Act. In order to exercise the right of first offer under the Act, a Respondent must be an Eligible Entity as of the date submissions are due under this RFO. An Offer submitted by an Eligible Entity is its offer to the District pursuant to said right of first offer. All Eligible Entities may submit an Offer to this RFO. Two or more Eligible Entities may submit a combined Offer to this RFO.

### **Compliance with Applicable Laws and Related Costs**

If selected, Respondent shall be required to plan, construct and operate the project described in its Offer in accordance with all applicable federal and District of Columbia laws, rules and regulations. Respondent shall further be required to obtain all necessary permits, approvals, and licenses at the appropriate time. Respondent should submit with its Offer a description of all permits, approvals, and licenses expected to be required in connection with its Offer and proposed plans and schedules for obtaining the same. Respondent should indicate in its response its experience and familiarity with such laws and permits at other significant urban reuse projects. All costs associated with complying with applicable laws, rules and regulations, and obtaining all necessary permits, approvals, and licenses shall be borne by Respondent.

### **Certified Business Enterprises and First Source Hiring Requirements**

If an Offer includes construction, the Respondent shall, after selection and prior to lease execution, execute a Certified Business Enterprise (“CBE”) agreement with the DC Department of Small and Local Business Development, which requires compliance with the District’s “Small, Local, and Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Development and Assistance Act of 2005” (D.C. Official Code §§ 2-218.01 et seq.) (“CBE Program”). Additionally, the Respondent shall, after selection and prior to lease execution, execute a First Source agreement with the DC Department of Employment Services, which further requires compliance with “The First Source Employment Agreement Act of 1984” (codified in D.C. Official Code §§ 2-219.01 et seq.) (“First Source Agreement”). The District’s First Source Program requires that 51% of the new jobs created by a redevelopment project be filled by District residents.

### **Historic Reviews**

To the extent that a Reuse Site is a historic resource, it may be subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, 16 U.S.C. 470 *et seq.*, the “Historic Landmark and Historic District Protection Act of 1978,” D.C. Law 2-144, regulations promulgated hereunder and any other applicable historic or preservation law or regulation, in each case as amended. As such, Respondent’s reuse may be subject to review by the DC Historic Preservation Review Board, with regard to designation as a DC Historic Landmark or location within a Historic District, or by the federal Advisory

Council on Historic Preservation. It is Respondent's sole responsibility to ensure that the proposed project adheres to applicable historic regulations.

### **Local Project Review and Local Zoning**

A Respondent will be expected to meet District land use, environmental, planning, zoning, and other regulatory requirements. Please refer to Title 11 of the District of Columbia Municipal Regulations ("DCMR") for a complete list of zoning provisions and requirements. Any Offer must comply with the goals and priorities outlined in the District's Comprehensive Plan, which can be viewed online at: [www.planning.dc.gov](http://www.planning.dc.gov).

### **Green Building Act**

Adherence to the District of Columbia's Green Building Act of 2006 D.C. Official Code 6-1451.01 *et seq.* (2007) is required. An Offer shall meet all requirements of the aforementioned Act for District-owned properties as well as any LEED certification requirements for the construction, rehabilitation and/or renovation of District-owned properties. Charter school projects that are new construction or meet the "substantial improvement" definition of the Act are required to be verified as having fulfilled or exceeded the U.S. Green Building Council's LEED-Gold standard. If there is a legitimate reason why the project cannot fulfill the LEED-Gold level requirement of the Green Building Act due to lack of "sufficient funding," the justification should be explained in the application.

### **Note on Building Conditions**

Respondent shall be required to accept the Reuse Site, including without limitation, any and all improvements, betterments and equipment in its "**As Is**" condition, without warranty, express or implied, by the District as to physical condition or suitability of the Reuse Site for the Respondent's purpose. The District makes no representations regarding (i) the character or extent of soil or subsurface conditions or (ii) the conditions and existence of utilities that may be encountered during the course of any use or redevelopment of the Reuse Site. Each Respondent should draw its own conclusions concerning conditions that may affect the methods or cost of its Offer. Moreover, the Respondent, at Respondent's sole cost and expense, shall comply with all environmental laws applicable to the District of Columbia and shall perform all investigations, removal, remedial actions, cleanup and abatement, or other remediation that may be required pursuant to any environmental laws, including without limitation removing or abating any asbestos, asbestos containing materials and/or underground storage tanks, District shall have no responsibility or liability with respect thereto. Additionally, Respondents shall be responsible for any and all requisite pre-development (including demolition of existing improvements and due diligence studies such as traffic, geotechnical, storm water management and other site preparations, as applicable) and development costs for any redevelopment of part or all of any building or the Reuse Site.

## **VI. SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS**

This RFO is open to any and all Eligible Applicants.

Respondent may submit an Offer on any, all, and /or a combination of the Reuse Sites. Respondent must submit an Offer on each Reuse Site separately, with specific detail to each site which outlines how the Offer relates to the Reuse Site stated goals.

Economic analysis and/or real estate advisory services are **not** being solicited as part of this solicitation.

The District strongly urges that an Offer not exceed 25 pages (excluding appendices).

Respondents shall provide four (4) bound hard copies and one (1) CD ROM or USB Flash Drive of the written Offer in 12 point font size on 8.5” by 11” paper. Each Offer shall be hand-delivered to the location set forth in Section VI.A of this RFO. Electronic and facsimile Offers will not be accepted.

Each Offer shall be submitted in a sealed envelope conspicuously marked: "**Offer in Response to RFO for the Reuse of DCPS Excess Space dated September 19, 2014**".

A Responsive Offer must be timely submitted from an Eligible Applicant and comply with this RFO (a "**Responsive Offer**"). In order to enable the District to fully evaluate Offers, a Responsive Offer should explain, with supporting documents, the Respondent's program, organizational capacity, experience, and financial resources to implement the proposed vision. Offers should respond to each RFO item in the order outlined below with each item marked by tabs to indicate the section number.

Offers should include the following:

***A. Executive Summary/Description of Program and Respondent***

Please describe the following:

- Programmatic vision for the Reuse Site including how the program would complement or add to the educational services in the neighborhood;
- If Respondent has experience operating a charter school in the District of Columbia, then a history of performance including, where applicable, measures of performance such as ranking under the Public Charter School Board's Performance Management Framework (PMF), classification under the ESEA waiver, DC-CAS scores, results according to an accountability framework, enrollment history, high school graduation rates, or college admission and graduation rates;
- Respondents who have not operated a charter in the District of Columbia shall provide comparable information on performance from another jurisdiction;
- How the proposal will meet the needs of students in the vicinity of the school and in the District as a whole;
- A plan to serve high-needs students defined as those with IEPs, those who are "at-risk" or who are English Language Learners;
- Whether the respondent's need for the Reuse Site is to serve a new program, expand an existing program, or obtain permanent space for a program currently in temporary space;

- List of all sites of operation in the District of Columbia including addresses, capacity, and SY14-15 enrollment;
- Parent reviews and/or additional information or documentation Respondent believes is relevant evidence of Respondent's abilities and experience to provide high-quality educational services.

***B. Description of Project Team and Qualifications***

Team Members are each entity that will participate in creating and completing the Offer outside of the Respondent; i.e. architect, real estate company, nonprofit partner, etc. Respondent must demonstrate prior experience and success with developing/operating a charter school facility similar to what is proposed in response to this RFO. Respondent should provide no more than three (3) examples detailing its, or a team member's, experience with comparable projects. Team Member qualifications should include the following:

- Respondent's primary Point of Contact (POC) and legal address;
- Brief organizational description (i.e. corporation, non-profit or charitable institution, partnership, LLC, etc.) and under which laws it is operating;
- Copy of the executed charter agreement and documentation of charter extensions or documentation of conditional approval of the petition for a public charter school;
- An organizational chart or description of key personnel or team members who will be working on the project including a description of their roles and relevant experience;
- Name, address, telephone number, and e-mail address of each team member, including the identity of each principal, partner, or entity that composes such team member;
- Signed tax certificate affidavit;
- Legal status of each key team member, including the state under whose laws the organization/corporation is organized and operating;
- Previous experience for each team member delivering the types of services that such team members will be providing in the redevelopment and operation of the Reuse Site(s); including at least two professional references;
- A description of comparable project(s) and visual documentation (photos or renderings), where available;
- A description of aspects of the projects (e.g., comparable student and community demographics) make it comparable to Respondent's Offer for the Reuse Site;
- A description of the project team's non-academic successes such as jobs created or sustainability measures implemented in other properties;
- Respondents should provide such other information Respondents believe will assist the District in evaluating the capabilities of Respondents and any other team members who will participate in the project; and
- Any personal or professional relationship among or between any team members and any person working for, appointed to a position in, or elected to an office of the District of any entity for which there may be conflict. The District, in its sole discretion, reserves the right to determine a conflict of interest or the appearance thereof.

- Respondents shall provide a certification from each team member:
  - ✓ Noting any debarments, suspensions, bankruptcy, or loan defaults on real estate development projects and/or government contracts of any team member;
  - ✓ Stating that all tax liabilities and other government impositions are current;
  - ✓ Stating that there is no ongoing litigation in which the District is a party that relates to any team member or to any other entity or individual having a controlling interest in the team member (or, if such litigation exists, the name and civil action numbers of such litigation and a description of the subject matter of such litigation); and
  - ✓ Providing the names of any member, employee, or agent of the team member who, within three (3) years prior to the publication of this RFO, were District employees, consultants, or contractors to the District.

### ***C. Financial Feasibility***

Respondents should provide financial information so that the District may assess the feasibility of the Respondent's Offer. Please submit the following information:

- Certificate of good standing issued by the Chief Financial Officer (CFO) or relevant tax authority for each jurisdiction of operation;
- Statement of whether Respondent is a certified local, small, or disadvantaged business enterprise;
- **Sources and Uses Budget:** A sources and uses statement that details the anticipated private and public sources of funds for any acquisition, construction, and ongoing maintenance and operational costs for the reuse plan as described in the Offer. Sources and uses should be presented in a clear and readable format, such as a chart or spreadsheet;
- **Draft construction budget for reuse,** including estimates of hard costs, soft costs (with fees broken out), financing assumptions, and estimated operating expenses (as applicable);
- **Pro Forma:** Respondents should provide an at least 10 year operating pro forma showing all projected revenues and expenses by category. Phasing strategies should be incorporated into the model pro forma so that Respondent's intent with regard to capital improvements and operations are clear. The pro forma should include line items for debt service and capital reserves. The pro forma should be accompanied by a summary of the assumptions used as the basis for such numbers. Respondent should also provide a risk assessment strategy should sources of grant funding (whether for capital or operations) be modified by market or other conditions. This risk assessment should delineate a phasing strategy if applicable;
- **Proposed Transaction Structure:** A detailed description of Respondent's proposed transaction structure including a statement of the material lease terms offered by Respondent;
- **Respondent financial capacity:** Each Offer should anticipate a fair market rental rate for each Reuse Site. Respondent shall demonstrate its ability to pay such rate to the District by furnishing:
  - ✓ Respondent's current balance sheet;
  - ✓ Audited annual reports for last three years;
  - ✓ Operating budget for the last three years;

- ✓ Last three Federal tax returns, if applicable;
- ✓ Last three DC tax returns, if applicable;
- ✓ Five-Year pro forma detailing among other items the Respondent's capital expenses, occupancy expenses, rent payments, and per student allotment; and
- ✓ Explanation, with supporting documentation, of how the Respondent plans to obtain financing;
- ✓ Proposed partnership structures, if applicable; and
- ✓ Lease terms that the Respondent is seeking from the District.

Note that the District may seek additional project financial information from Respondent at any time in the evaluation of RFO responses for the purpose of clarifying project feasibility.

#### ***D. Project Implementation***

Respondent shall identify and describe the following:

- Site plan indicating proposed location and configuration of all uses;
- Respondent's development strategy and proposed timing from predevelopment through completion and occupancy. The project schedule should list each step in the redevelopment process from award through project completion and when the facility will be fully operational. Describe also respondents ability to mobilize and commence predevelopment activities immediately upon selection in order to meet the project schedule submitted by the Respondent; Respondent's ability and plan to guarantee to the District that Respondent's milestones will be met;
- How the Respondent has involved community members or plans to offer community services such as a voting location, access to on-site recreation facilities or meeting space;
- Approximate number of full time and part-time permanent employees upon project completion and how the construction and school operations will generate opportunities to hire District residents and contract with local, small and disadvantaged businesses;
- If the Offer contemplates incidental non-charter school uses, a description of those uses and the proposed development program, including gross square footage of each proposed use;
- A plan to fulfill the requirements of the CBE Program and/or First Source Program or otherwise employing and retaining District residents and utilizing local, small, and disadvantaged business enterprises;
- A plan to fulfill the requirements of the Green Buildings Act (GBA). Charter school projects that are new construction or meet the "substantial improvement" definition of the Act are required to be verified as having fulfilled or exceeded the U.S. Green Building Council's LEED-Gold standard. If there is a legitimate reason why the project cannot fulfill the LEED-Gold level requirement of the GBA due to lack of "sufficient funding," the justification should be explained in the application;
- Proposed repair and maintenance program to ensure that the proposed Reuse Site is maintained and kept in a good condition, repair and working order.

***E. Optional Public Presentation***

Respondents are strongly encouraged but not required to engage in a public hearing at the close of the RFO. This will be an opportunity for the Respondent to give a brief presentation of the Offer before the community to receive public input. The result of the public presentation is not dispositive to the final decision of the RFO Review Panel to award a Reuse Site.

The dates and locations of the public hearings are as follows:

<b>School</b>	<b>Meeting Date</b>	<b>Meeting Time</b>	<b>Meeting Location</b>
<b>Gibbs</b>	10/20/14	6PM	Rosedale Rec Center - 1701 Gales Street, NE
<b>Mamie D. Lee</b>	10/23/14	7PM	Lamont Riggs Library - 5401 South Dakota Ave, NE
<b>MC Terrell</b>	10/22/14	6PM	MC Terrell - 3301 Wheeler Road, SE

Any dates not listed above will be updated on the DME website at [www.dme.dc.gov](http://www.dme.dc.gov). Respondents seeking to present at the aforementioned public hearings must contact Althea Holford at [althea.holford@dc.gov](mailto:althea.holford@dc.gov) **by October 15, 2014 at 5pm with the subject heading “[Name of Reuse Site] Public Hearing RSVP”**. Respondents seeking to offer on more than one Reuse Site can participate in multiple hearings.

**VII. EVALUATION PROCESS**

***A. Deadline for Submission of Proposals***

RFO responses are due by **5:00 p.m. EDT, October 20, 2014**. Any submissions received after 5:00 p.m. will not be considered, without any exceptions. Respondents are required to deliver their Offers to:

The Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education  
ATTN: Althea O. Holford  
1350 Pennsylvania, NW  
Suite 307  
Washington, DC 20024

## ***B. Timetable for Evaluation of RFO Responses***

The District will endeavor to follow the timetable set forth below; however, the activities and timetable represented below are subject to change in the District's sole discretion and without prior notice:

**Issuance of RFO:** 9/19/14  
**Pre-Submission Meeting:** 9/24/14– 11AM  
Reeves Center 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Community Rm.  
2000 14<sup>th</sup> St. NW

### **Site visit schedule:**

- MC Terrell - 9/22/14 – 3pm-6pm
- Gibbs – 9/23/14 – 10am-1pm
- Mamie D. Lee – TBD

**Offers Due:** 10/20/14 – Wilson Building Suite 307

### **Post RFO release Community Meetings:**

- Gibbs – 10/22/14 – 6pm-8pm
- Mamie D. Lee – 10/23-14 – 7pm-9pm
- MC Terrell – 10/24/14 – 6pm-8pm

**Expected Awards:** November 2014

**THE SCHEDULED SITE VISITS WILL BE THE ONLY TIME THE REUSE SITE WILL BE ACCESSIBLE FOR VISITATION DURING THE RFO PERIOD.**

Respondents are encouraged to bring any member of the project team it deems necessary to the site visit.

## ***C. Award and Unsolicited Offers***

The District will aim to conclude the RFO on the Reuse Sites by award or other measure within 30 days of the Submission Deadline.

Pursuant to the Act, "Eligible Entities [will have] an opportunity to submit unsolicited proposals for the [reuse] the [Reuse Sites]... for 12 months or until an Eligible Entity is selected, whichever occurs first." If no award is made 30 days after the Submission Deadline, any Eligible Entity may submit an Offer for any Reuse Site not awarded. Such Unsolicited Offers should be made on the first business day of every month beginning December 2014. These Unsolicited Offers will be evaluated by the same criteria outlined in Section VI. D. (Evaluation Procedure) of this RFO, on a rolling basis until December 1, 2015.

Unsolicited Offers will not be received until December 1, 2014. Additionally, Unsolicited Offers will not be reviewed until all timely and responsive Offers to this RFO have been evaluated.

***D. Evaluation Procedure***

**Eligibility Requirements**

Both requirements are necessary in order for the applicant's proposal to be evaluated. No Offer that is timely will be rejected as non-responsive if it meets the below Eligibility Requirements:

- An Eligible Entity
- Certificate of Good Standing.

**Selection**

A selection panel will be established to review and evaluate the Offers (**the "Selection Panel"**). The composition of the Selection Panel will be determined by the District, in its sole discretion. In addition, the Selection Panel may consult with professional consultants for technical assistance. All Responsive Offers received will be considered by the District. The Selection Panel, however, will evaluate responses submitted in response to this RFO in the context of the evaluation criteria and the regulatory framework outlined in the Act. In selecting an Offer for lease through this RFO:

1. First preference will be given to an existing tenant that is a public charter school that has occupied all or substantially all, of the Reuse Site;
2. Second preference will be given to a public charter school that the Public Charter School Board has determined to be high-performing and financially sound;
3. Third preference to any other Eligible Entity; and
4. The Evaluation Scoring criteria outlined below will be used in conjunction with the above mentioned framework for analysis of the Offers to this RFO.

***E. Evaluation Scoring***

***School/Local Education Authority (LEA) Performance*** **25 Points**

- Respondent demonstrates a record of positive school performance in the District of Columbia or in another jurisdiction. For example, the applicant could provide evidence of a high rating in the DC Public Charter School Board's Performance Management Framework (PMF), a high rating under an accountability framework, or other evidence of strong student outcomes and growth.
- If the applicant has not previously operated a charter school in the District of Columbia, or is a newly established charter school in the District of Columbia the applicant shall describe related experience that provides evidence of the ability to ensure strong academic outcomes such as the experience of school leadership, classroom success, or unique program offerings.

***Financial Feasibility*** **25 Points**

- Respondent has demonstrated fiscal responsibility by providing audited financial statements for at least three years.
- Respondent’s proposed capital improvements are financially feasible, sound and reasonable given expected enrollment and sources of funds. The capital improvements will not require additional District subsidies.
- Respondent’s project team has a demonstrated track record of successfully completing charter school projects such as the one offered.
- Respondent outlines a fiscally sound plan for operation and maintenance of the Reuse Site.

***Project Vision and Implementation Plan*** **20 Points**

- Respondent has a highly qualified leadership team and demonstrates experience managing a public charter school.
- Respondent describes its growth plans, current location, and the limitations of its current location to meet the needs of students. The Respondent’s proposal clearly identifies and provides evidence for how the building will help it meet the needs of students.
- Respondent provides evidence that the project implementation and operation will not detract from its school performance and mission.
- Respondent’s development strategy will meet both CBE and Green Buildings Act (GBA) requirements.
- Both construction and school operations will create jobs for District residents.

***Demonstration of how the Respondent will meet Identified Needs and Provide Equitable Service*** **15 Points**

- The Respondent addresses the needs of students in the surrounding community and the District of Columbia as a whole.
- The Offer demonstrates alignment with District goals and information provided in Section III above, including information on community input.
- The Respondent provides a clear vision and plan to serve special populations, for example students with special needs, students who are defined as “at-risk” (definition above), and students who are English Language Learners. Applicants should include evidence of successfully serving such students.
- Demonstrated commitment to enrollment stability within and between school years as evidenced by the OSSE Equity Reports.

***Community Engagement and Access*** **15 Points**

- Offer reflects information presented in Section III above regarding community input and potential uses of the Reuse Site.
- Respondent has demonstrated strong relationships with community organizations or members, as possibly demonstrated by Letters of Support or positive feedback either during or after the public hearing presentation.
- Plan to combine or partner with community organizations serving the needs of the local community.

## **VIII. RFO UPDATES AND MODIFICATIONS**

DME will post on its website (<http://dme.dc.gov>) any notices or information regarding cancellations, withdrawals, modifications to deadlines, and other modifications to this RFO. Respondents shall have an obligation to check the website for any such notices and information, and the District shall have no duty to provide direct notice to Respondents.

## **IX. SELECTION AND NEGOTIATION**

While the District, may enter into negotiations with one or more Respondent(s) based on Offers submitted in response to this RFO, this RFO does not commit DME or the District to select any Respondent or to enter into negotiations with any Respondent that may respond. The District reserves the right to reject any Offer, or part of an Offer, to amend this RFO, or to reject all Offers and re-issue a RFO at a later date, each at its sole discretion.

The District will determine, in its sole discretion, whether each Offer received in response to this RFO is a Responsive Offer. For any Offer that is considered to be non-responsive, the Respondent will be notified in writing within ten business days after the submission deadline. The decision of the District in this regard is final and will be explained to the Respondent upon request.

Based upon responses, the District, in its sole and absolute discretion, may choose to:

1. Require oral presentations by Respondents;
2. Select a short list of Respondents and require additional information from the short-listed Respondents or that they modify their Offers or provide a 'Best and Final Offer' for the District's review;
3. Enter into exclusive negotiations with one or more selected Respondent(s) without requesting more detailed information or selecting a short list of Respondents;
4. Request more detailed information leading to final Respondent(s) selection; and/or
5. Take no action on the responses received.

Following receipt of additional information, if requested, the Selection Panel may select, in its sole and absolute discretion, one or more Responsive Offer(s), as modified or otherwise, to recommend to the Mayor, who, in his absolute discretion, may accept or reject the Selection Panel's recommendations.

Upon recommendation by the Selection Panel, and if approved by the Mayor, DME shall notify the selected Respondent(s), if any.

If one or more Respondent(s) is thereby chosen for commencement of negotiations, the selected Respondent(s) may be requested by the District to proceed to negotiate final terms consistent with the Respondent's proposed terms or to revised terms. If the District and the selected Respondent are unable to agree on the final terms within ninety (90) calendar days, the District, in its absolute and sole discretion, may terminate negotiations

and select a different Respondent that responded to the RFO, re-issue the RFO, or take such other measures as it deems reasonable, appropriate, and/or necessary.

## **X. RESERVATION OF RIGHTS AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS**

### ***A. Rights Reserved***

The District reserves the right to:

- Cancel or withdraw the RFO at any time prior to or after the submission deadline;
- Issue modifications or clarifications to the RFO prior to the submission deadline;
- Reject any submission it deems incomplete or unresponsive to the submission requirements;
- Reject all submissions that are submitted under the RFO;
- Modify the deadline for submissions or other actions; and/or
- Reissue the RFO or a modified RFO whether or not any submissions have been received in response to the initial RFO issuance.

The District may exercise one or more of these rights, in its sole discretion, as it may deem necessary, appropriate, or beneficial to the District.

### ***B. No Conflicts of Interest***

In its response to this RFO, the Respondent should represent and warrant the following to the District:

- No person or entity employed by the District or otherwise involved in preparing this RFO on behalf of the District (i) has provided any information to potential Respondents which was not made available to all entities potentially responding to this RFO, (ii) is affiliated with or employed by or has any financial interest in any potential Respondent, (iii) has provided any assistance to potential Respondent in responding to this RFO, or (iv) will benefit financially if any Respondent is selected in response to this RFO.
- The Respondent has not offered or given to any District officer or employee any gratuity or anything of value intended to obtain favorable treatment under this RFO or any other solicitation or other contract, and Respondent has not taken any action to induce any District officer or employee to violate the rules of ethics governing the District and its employees. Respondent has not and shall not offer, give or agree to give anything of value either to the District or any of its employees, agents, job shoppers, consultants, managers or other person or firm representing the District, or to a member of the immediate family (*i.e.*, a spouse, child, parent, brother or sister) of any of the foregoing. Any such conduct shall be deemed a violation of this RFO. As used herein, “anything of value” shall include

but not be limited to any (a) favors, such as meals, entertainment, transportation (other than that contemplated by this RFO, if any, or any other contract with the District), etc., which might tend to obligate a District employee to Respondent, and (b) gift, gratuity, money, goods, equipment, services, lodging, discounts not available to the general public, offers or promises of employment, loans or the cancellation thereof, preferential treatment or business opportunity. Such term shall not include work or services rendered pursuant to any other valid District contract.

- The Respondent shall report to the District directly and without undue delay any information concerning conduct which may involve: (a) corruption, criminal activity, conflict of interest, gross mismanagement or abuse of authority; or (b) any solicitation of money, goods, requests for future employment or benefit of thing of value, by or on behalf of any government employee, officer or public official, any Respondent employee, officer, agent, subcontractor, or labor official, or other person for any purpose which may be related to the procurement of this RFO by Respondent, or which may affect performance in response to this RFO in any way.
- Neither Respondent or any subcontractor or affiliate thereof, nor any employee of any of them, shall retain any material or items of any kind salvaged from the Reuse Site at issue in this RFO as memorabilia or souvenirs or otherwise.

***C. Change in Respondent Information***

If information provided in a submission changes (*e.g.*, change or addition to any of the Respondent's team members or new financial information) the Respondent shall provide updated information in the same format for the appropriate section of the RFO may consider the modified submission.

***D. Ownership and Use of Submissions***

All submissions shall be the property of the District. The District may use any and all ideas in any submission, whether the submission is selected or rejected. No Respondent shall be entitled to compensation or reimbursement of costs in connection with their submission of a response to this RFO.

***E. Further Efforts***

The RFO Review Panel may request that Respondents clarify their submissions and/or submit additional information pertaining to their submissions; the RFO Review Panel may request best and final submissions from any Respondent and/or request an oral presentation from any Respondent.

***F. Restricted Communications***

Upon release of this RFO, potential Respondents shall not communicate with the Review Panel or any District staff about the RFO or issues related to the RFO except as authorized in this RFO or in public meetings called in connection with this RFO.

### ***G. Confidentiality***

Submissions and all other information submitted in response to this RFO are subject to the District's Freedom of Information Act (D.C. Official Code § 2-531 *et seq.*) ("FOIA"), which generally mandates the disclosure of documents in the possession of the District upon the request of any person, unless the content of the document falls within a specific exemption category. An example of an exemption category is "trade secrets and commercial or financial information obtained from outside the government, to the extent that disclosure would result in substantial harm to the competitive position of the person from whom the information was obtained." If a Respondent provides information that it believes is exempt from mandatory disclosure under FOIA ("exempt information"), the Respondent shall include the following legend on the title page of the submission:

**THIS PROPOSAL CONTAINS INFORMATION THAT IS EXEMPT FROM  
MANDATORY DISCLOSURE UNDER THE DISTRICT'S FREEDOM OF  
INFORMATION ACT**

In addition, on each page that contains information that the Respondent believes is exempt from mandatory disclosure under FOIA, the Respondent shall include the following separate legend:

**THIS PAGE CONTAINS INFORMATION THAT IS EXEMPT FROM  
MANDATORY DISCLOSURE UNDER THE DISTRICT'S FREEDOM OF  
INFORMATION ACT**

On each such page, the Respondent shall also specify the exempt information and shall state the exemption category within which it believes the information falls. The District will generally endeavor not to disclose information which in the opinion of the District is exempt from disclosure. The District may, in its discretion, contact the Respondent to provide notice that their submission materials have been requested and provide the Respondent with the opportunity to further identify exempt information. The District will independently determine whether any information, whether designated by the Respondent or not, is exempt from mandatory disclosure. The District has the ultimate decision as to whether information is exempt from disclosure. Moreover, exempt information may be disclosed by the District, at its discretion, unless otherwise prohibited by law, and the District shall have no liability related to such disclosure.

### ***H. Non-Liability***

By participating in the RFO process, the Respondent agrees to hold the District, its officers, employees, agents, representatives, and consultants harmless from all claims, liabilities, and costs related to all aspects of this RFO.

### *I. Questions*

Any questions regarding this RFO should be submitted via e-mail to Althea O. Holford at [althea.holford@dc.gov](mailto:althea.holford@dc.gov).

## **XI. FLETCHER JOHNSON CO-LOCATION**

The District has identified a portion of the Fletcher Johnson Site as available for reuse. Due to the opportunity presented by the large size of the building (302,000 square feet) and given identified community needs, the Fletcher Johnson Site will be offered as a colocation between a public charter school, DCPS, and other entities. The process for awarding this site will be distinct from the previous three sites but will also involve a Request for Offers.

The DME has compiled data on the area surrounding the Fletcher Johnson School and solicited community feedback on reuse of the site. (Please refer to the [Fletcher Johnson School data sheet](#), [hearing presentation](#), and [community meeting notes](#) in the Appendix.) Based on this information and input, DME has identified a need for adult programming in Ward 7. The share of adults without a high school diploma is significantly higher than the city average in the neighborhoods surrounding the Fletcher Johnson School. However, currently there is only one adult education focused public charter school operating in Ward 7, and there are no adult focused DCPS programs in the area. During the September 10<sup>th</sup> community meeting, residents also expressed an interest in the Fletcher Johnson School acting as a multi-use community hub for Ward 7, including adult education programming, arts programming for adults and youth, post-secondary education opportunities, and a District agency use.

To facilitate the Fletcher Johnson School as a community hub with multiple tenants (including a portion for a public charter school), the DME is holding a **mandatory** planning meeting for all interested parties to meet other potential parties and to receive additional information about the building. This meeting is intended for public charter school operators, community based service providers, arts and humanities organizations, and entities that can facilitate co-location of multiple tenants. Community stakeholders will also be invited to the meeting so that they can provide input on desired programming. This meeting will be held at the Dorothy I. Heights Neighborhood Library at 3935 Benning Road **on October 9<sup>th</sup> at 6pm**. More information about the meeting and RFO process for the Fletcher Johnson School will be posted on [DME's website](#) during the week of September 22<sup>nd</sup>. Questions about this process or about the meeting should be directed to Althea Holford, Capital Program Manager, at [althea.holford@dc.gov](mailto:althea.holford@dc.gov) or 202-727-4036. If you plan on attending the meeting on October 9<sup>th</sup> you **must RSVP** to Althea Holford by phone or by email.

## RFO Appendix

### A. Gibbs

- a. [Community Feedback](#)
  - i. On September 9, 2014, Deputy Mayor for Education held a public hearing on the surplus designation of the Gibbs School. Notes from that hearing can be found on the DME website.
- b. [Data Sheet](#)
- c. [Public Hearing Presentation](#)
- d. [Floor plan](#)
- e. [Facility Assessment](#)

### B. Mamie D. Lee

- a. [Community Feedback](#)
  - i. On September 11, 2014, Deputy Mayor for Education held a public hearing on the surplus designation of the Mamie D. Lee School. Notes from that hearing can be found on the DME website.
- b. [Data Sheet](#)
- c. [Public Hearing Presentation](#)
- d. [Floor plan](#)
- e. [Facility Assessment](#)

### C. MC Terrell

- a. [Community Feedback](#)
  - i. On September 15, 2014, Deputy Mayor for Education held a public hearing on the surplus designation of the MC Terrell School. Notes from that hearing can be found on the DME website.
- b. [Data Sheet](#)
- c. [Public Hearing Presentation](#)
- d. [Floor plan](#)
- e. [Facility Assessment](#)

### D. Fletcher Johnson

- a. [Community Feedback](#)
  - i. On September 10<sup>th</sup>, 2014, Deputy Mayor for Education held a public hearing on the surplus designation of the Fletcher Johnson School. Notes from that hearing can be found on the DME website.
- b. [Data Sheet](#)
- c. [Public Hearing Presentation](#)
- d. [Floor plan](#)
- e. [Facility Assessment](#)