

<b>AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT</b>			1. Contract Number	Page of Pages	
2. Amendment/Modification Number		3. Effective Date	4. Requisition/Purchase Request No.	1	132
GF-2011-R-0030-005		October 21, 2011		5. Solicitation Caption Construction of New Student Center at UDC, Van Ness Campus	
6. Issued By: University of the District of Columbia Capital Procurement Division 4200 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Room C01, Building 38 Washington, DC 20008			7. Administered By (If other than line 6) University of the District of Columbia Capital Procurement Division 4200 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Room C01, Building 38 Washington, DC 20008		
8. Name and Address of Contractor (No. Street, city, country, state and ZIP Code)			(X)	9A. Amendment of Solicitation No. GF-2011-R-0030	
				9B. Dated (See Item 11) September 30, 2011	
				10A. Modification of Contract/Order No.	
				10B. Dated (See Item 13)	
Code	Facility				
11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers <input type="checkbox"/> is extended, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is not extended. Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning <u>1</u> copy of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or fax which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment number. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by letter or fax, provided each letter or telegram makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.					
12. Accounting and Appropriation Data (If Required)					
13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS, IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14					
A. This change order is issued pursuant to: (Specify Authority) The changes set forth in Item 14 are made in the contract/order no. in item 10A.					
B. The above numbered contract/order is modified to reflect the administrative changes (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) set forth in item 14, pursuant to the authority of 27 DCMR, Chapter 36, Section 3601.2.					
C. This supplemental agreement is entered into pursuant to authority of:					
D. Other (Specify type of modification and authority)					
E. IMPORTANT: Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> is not, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is required to sign this document and return <u>1</u> copy to the issuing office.					
14. Description of amendment/modification (Organized by UCF Section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)					
Solicitation No. GF-2011-R-0030 for Construction of New Student Center at UDC, Van Ness Campus is hereby amended as follows:					
1. Questions and Answers (Attachment A)					
2. Additional Wage Determination DC100001 10/14/2011 DC1 (Attachment B)					
3. Environmental Assessment (Attachment C)					
All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.					
Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item (9A or 10A) remain unchanged and in full force and effect					
15A. Name and Title of Signer (Type or print)			16A. Name of Contracting Officer Sherry Jones-Quashie		
15B. Name of Contractor		15C. Date Signed	16B. District of Columbia <i>Sherry Jones-Quashie</i>		16C. Date Signed OCT 21 2011
(Signature of person authorized to sign)			(Signature of Contracting Officer)		

# **ATTACHMENT A**

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

NEW STUDENT CENTER

PRE-BID QUESTIONS

GF-2011-0030-005

NO.	QUESTION	ANSWER
1	Please clarify if the project has a 40% or 35% CBE/SBE requirement.	40% SBE
2	Are there FF&E components (furniture) inside your contract?	No
3	Please clarify if the set-aside requirement is CBE, SBE, or some other.	SBE
4	Is there a set of Amendment drawings? Or RFP documents?	Yes, Amendment 002, can be picked up from UDC, Capital Procurement Division, 4200 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Building 38, Room C01, Washington, DC 20008.
5	How will Amendment 001 be issued to the Contractor?	Amendment 001 has been posted on UDC/OCP websites.
6	Is the contract duration correct as shown (292 days)?	Yes, the contract duration is two hundred ninety-two (292) calendar days.
7	What is the last day for questions?	Friday, October 14, 2011. 2:00 PM
8	Anticipated Start?	Late November or early December
9	Will Sign-in Sheet be issued in Amendment?	The Sign-in Sheet was issued under Amendment No. 1.
10	Is this a public opening?	No
11	Does 75 pages include front and back?	No, proposals should be submitted on single pages only.
12	Will this project fall under DC WIP (Workforce Initiative Program)?	All compliance requirements are outlined in the solicitation. Please see Section H.
13	The amount of time allowed for the bidding of this project is not enough, given the complexity of the job. I understand the time constraints you face, but it is imperative that the bid date gets extended. Please consider a 2-week extension.	The proposal submission date has been extended to Monday, October 24, 2011.
14	Is this project a Davis-Bacon wage scale project?	Yes
15	Will Subcontractors be required to perform the work or can they re-sub out the work?	Yes, unless materials and supplies are being provided by the SBE.
16	Will Contractor's that have had Davis-Bacon violations be excluded?	During the evaluation process, the successful offeror will be subject to a compliance check which will dictate whether or not the proposal will be deemed responsible.
17	Is there a requirement to have an Apprenticeship Program registration in Washington, DC?	Yes, All construction contracts over \$500,000 must be in compliance with the Department of Employment Services Apprenticeship requirement.
18	Who will receive FOIA request?	Terri Carmichael Jackson Assistant General Counsel Office of the General Counsel University of the District of Columbia 4200 Connecticut Avenue, NW
19	Will this project require certified payroll to be submitted? If so, who will receive and monitor?	Yes, the Contract Administrator will receive and monitor.
20	When do you plan to award the contract?	Mid to late November.
21	<b>Par H.5, RFP</b> -- States that all connection fees are to be incorporated into the fixed price proposal. Have you received pricing from the utilities for these fees? Please provide an allowance to carry for this item.	All are directed to include in their fixed price proposal an allowance of \$150,000 to support all utility connection fees.
22	<b>Sol Par B.1, M.8.1</b> -- Please confirm the requirements for CBE vs SBE. The solicitation Section B.1 says 40% small business CBE, Section M.8.1. says 35% SBE.	40% SBE participation.

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

NEW STUDENT CENTER

PRE-BID QUESTIONS

GF-2011-0030-005

NO.	QUESTION	ANSWER
23	Sol Par M.3 -- Please confirm the proposal scoring formula. Technical is stated to be 80 pts, price is 30 points and there is a 12 point preference score adding up to a potential perfect score of 122 but the stated total is 112.	There is a possible 20 Points total for price. There is a possible 12 preference points for companies that qualify for a total of a possible 112 points.
24	The Amendment 1 Solicitation document shows a UDC address for the submittal of the bids; however, the DC Standard Contract Provisions Article 18.K shows a different address. Please clarify.	The address for the submittal of the proposals is: Capital Procurement Division, 4200 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Building 38, Room C01, Washington, DC 20008, as specified in the solicitation.
25	The wage rate standards do not include wage rates for any equipment operators. Please provide wage rates for equipment operators.	Please incorporate General Decision Number DC20080001
26	When you subcontractor out to CBE for a certain contract amount, do the sub have to subtract out the materials, supplies from their contract amount?	Yes, unless materials and supplies are provided by the Prime Contractor.
27	The Prime Contractor joint venture with a CBE, do the CBE have to perform at least 50% of the work with its own organization and resources?	Yes, please refer to Section M.8.3 of the solicitation.
28	Attachment J.1.1 and J.1.2 state the specifications and drawings for the Renovation of "C" Level Offices at Buildings 38 and 39 can be picked up from the Procurement Office. It was my understanding that the renovation portion of the project was part of New Student Center solicitation, therefore, the drawings would be included in the complete set of drawings for the New Student Center. Please clarify.	Section J.1.1 and J.1.2 reads: J.1.1 Specifications for Construction of the New Student Center for the University of the University of Columbia, Van Ness Campus J.1.2 Drawings for Construction of the New Student Center for the University of the University of Columbia, Van Ness Campus
29	Please clarify the scoring system for the proposals. Under the scoring system in documents if a bidder proposed a price of \$30m and was the low bidder it would be awarded the maximum points available, or 30 points. Conversely, if another bidder were \$10m higher, or \$40m, it would be granted 22.25 points. A reduction of only 7.75 points out of a total of 122 available points. This means that someone that is \$10m higher could easily be awarded this project. Is that the intent of the solicitation?	Refer to Amendment 003
30	1. Section M.3 of the solicitation (page #124 of amendment #1) has 35 points for factor 1 - Relevant Experience and Past Performance. However, sub-factor 1 gives 15 points for similar projects and sub-factor 2 has 10 points for achieved LEED Certification. Therefore, these two sub-factors have an accumulated total of only 25 points. They do not add up to 35 points. Please confirm the total point for factor 1.	Refer to Amendment 003
31	Reference to laws of State of New York. (See RFI form).	Reference to New York State will be revised.
32	29. Dollar amounts. PO or Contract, Scope.	Question unclear.
33	49. Provide additional information	Question unclear.
34	88. The Prevailing Wage Requirements did not list a category for "Drill Rig Operator" or "Equipment Operator" etc., please confirm the wage scale for a Drill Rig Operator.	Please incorporate General Decision Number DC20080001
35	1.The specifications require a CD(for both Technical and Price) to be submitted along with our bid, per p.123, item L.34. It is not possible to submit a CD with the price on it along with the bid. We will be receiving subcontractor quotes up until the last few minutes and there is no time to make a CD and get it to the bid opening on time. We request that we be allowed to submit a separate CD within 24 hours of the bid time"?	The requirement to submit a CD with your proposal is hereby deleted.
36	2.Reference L.5.1.1 "Similarity of Projects". The requirements appear to be overly restrictive, favoring large national companies over smaller local firms. We request that the time frame be increased from "worked on in the last 5 years" to "worked on in the last 10 years." We also ask that the dollar value be changed from "\$30 Million" to "\$20-30 Million." Clearly, contractors who successfully performed similar work in a price range of \$20-\$30 Million have demonstrated their ability to complete a project of this nature.	It is the University's decision and responsibility to outline evaluation criteria in accordance with industry standard and to include criteria that is most advantageous to the University. The evaluation as outlined in the solicitation for the performance on similar projects will remain unchanged.
37	6. Ref p.128, para.M.8.3.1. It states that the "LBE, SBE or DBE partner of the joint venture shall perform at least 50% of the contracting effort(excluding the cost of materials...).) What is defined as the contracting effort; is this the total contract price? On a project of this magnitude, it seems impractical to force the LBE firm to perform that much work with their own forces.	Yes. If the successful offerers receive points or price reduction because of LBE, SBE, or DBE certification, it is only fair that both parties perform the contract equality.

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

NEW STUDENT CENTER

PRE-BID QUESTIONS

GF-2011-0030-005

NO.	QUESTION	ANSWER
38	7. At the pre-bid meeting it was stated that if the owner failed to negotiate the remaining 20% with the successful offeror, then the Owner reserved the right to award to the second bidder and renegotiate the remaining 20% with the second bidder. This is in conflict with section L.1.1, p.112 which states that " in the event the parties fail to agree upon a reasonable price, the University reserves the right to terminate discussions and compete for a new General Contractor for the construction of the remaining 20%." This means that the Owner can bring in another contractor to just perform the remaining 20% of the contract. Please clarify what is meant by this statement.	The University will award a contract to the successful offeror for construction of 80% design. It is the University's goal to negotiate successfully negotiate the remaining percentage with the successful offeror. Failure to arrive a reasonable price with the successful offeror of the 80% will result in the University issuing a RFP for the remaining 20% of the project.
39	8. On page 117 of the Solicitation it states we are to submit a notarized subcontracting plan. Do we submit this in addition to pages 104 & 105 (K.4) Subcontracting plan?	Please refer to Amendment No. 003. M.9.10.1 was deleted in its entirety. The successful offeror will be required to submit a statement detailing its subcontracting plan at the time of award.
40	22. Reference L.20 Local Operating Facilities – Is this information to be provided in the Technical or Price Proposal?	Technical proposal
41	23. Reference L.19 Legal Status of Offeror - Is this information to be provided in the Technical or Price Proposal?	Technical proposal
42	24. Reference L.5.2.6 Offeror shall include an organizational chart showing the names and positions of the Offeror's proposed teams who will provide or contribute to the project....., including at a minimum the positions listed in L.7.1. No positions are noted in L.7.1, please provide.	Please refer to Section L.5.2.4
43	2. Please confirm that only page 1 of Section K.4 needs to be submitted with the proposal. The remaining pages can be submitted within the next 10 days, as verbally conveyed.	All documents in Section K (K.1 - K.9) shall be submitted along with your proposal as specified in the solicitation. Please refer to Section L.6.
44	Please reference specification section 024119-Selective Structure Demolition. Paragraph 1.8.D.1 refers to Hazardous Materials specifications. Which section is that?	Delete paragraph 1.8/D./1. which states "Hazardous material remediation is specified elsewhere in the Contract Documents." The University anticipates addressing any identified hazardous materials under a separate agreement or as a change in scope.
45	Is there a Hazardous Materials Survey? Can you make it available?	The University has completed a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment dated February 3, 2009. The University will provide a copy of the Phase I assessment.
46	Some specification sections include sections that appear to be generic, with a variety of options per item and / or missing information. E.g. 033300 from par. 2.3 on, 075323-11, etc. Please finalize.	The identified areas are place holders while the remaining documentation is completed.
47	RFP Section H.4 requires the following permits to be procured by the Contractor: Razing, Sheeting and Shoring. As these permits require deliverables from the Owner and Design Team, please consider making these permits provided by the Owner.	The selected Builder will be responsible for all permits related to the successful completion of the construction process; to include the razing and sheeting & shoring permits. All permits requiring deliverables from Owner or Design Team will be coordinated by the Builder.
48	RFP Section H.5 requires the Contractor to pay for all utility and connection fees. Please consider turning these costs into an allowance that all general contractors can carry.	Refer to answer no. 21.
49	Please provide information on where the corner guards are located.	Wall guards and corner guards will not be required. Delete Section 10 2500 / Wall and Door Protection from the documents.
50	I am writing in regards that I need some information on who to submit a "Substitution Request" to for the Skylights on this project. Please let me know what documentation you require.	During the solicitation period all proposals should be developed using the provided design documentation.
51	I'm hoping you can clarify how the Audiovisual Systems will be purchased for this job? I don't see it included with the current package to the GC, so I'm wondering if it will be purchased separately at a later date? And by the owner or GC? Any information you can provide will be greatly appreciated!	Audiovisual systems information is included in the drawings and specifications. An allowance for equipment is being carried by the owner. Builders are instructed to carry infrastructure cost - conduit, blocking etc.
52	Please define the Limit of Disturbance on the Civil drawings.	This information is being finalized and will be provided at a later date. The design documents should be evaluated based on the provided information.
53	Please confirm that elevation 10/A0612 refers to Room 207 (and not 210 as noted).	Yes
54	Similarly, Sheet A0612: Detail 22 -- Please confirm that this detail is referring to room 113 not 111 as room 111 is the dining area.	The detail refers to Toilet / Room 120.
55	Detail 27 -- Please confirm this detail is referring to C04 and not C05 as C05 is the water service room.	The detail refers to Unisex Toilet / Room C4.
56	Detail 6 -- Please confirm this detail is referring to room 127 not 117. Room 117 is Dry Storage.	The detail refers to Women's Toilet / Room 129.

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

NEW STUDENT CENTER

PRE-BID QUESTIONS

GF-2011-0030-005

NO.	QUESTION	ANSWER
57	Please clarify as to whether or not TA-10 Sanitary Napkin Disposals should be included in the gang bathrooms.	Yes, please provide in all female toilet stalls and unisex toilet rooms.
58	The makeup listed for Section 2.2 G6A is 1 3/4" Guardian SunGuard SNX 62/27. Guardian does not make this in 3/4" and it is not available in 1/2". This thickness is also not available in Solarban 70XL. The attached makeup and thickness is what Glass Dynamics provided as a sample. Sample 2 is the line pattern. Sample 1 is the dot pattern. I am checking on the shipping status of the dot pattern samples. Please clarify which makeup is correct. Also, the maximum size to screen the pattern is 72" X 108". Please advise which addendum the response will be in.	For pricing and proposal purposes, provide glazing of the type and thicknesses indicated to include laminated units as required to achieve overall thickness. Exact frit pattern to be determined at a later date following evaluation of sample materials.
60	Please provide a signage schedule as there are no sizes specified for any of the signage.	Design for project signage as described in Section 10 1400 / Signage has not been finalized, and is being carried separately as an allowance in the overall project budget. Do not assign pricing to these items in the proposal. Selection of actual materials and equipment will occur at a later date. [Note: Questions 74-77 all refer to signage, and have the same response.]
61	Please provide more information for the Directories, Wayfinding Signage, and Exterior Directional Signage as none are shown on the drawings nor are the sizes indicated in the Specification	Design for project signage as described in Section 10 1400 / Signage has not been finalized, and is being carried separately as an allowance in the overall project budget. Do not assign pricing to these items. Selection of actual materials and equipment will occur at a later date.
62	Reference Specification 101400, 2.15 Illumination- Please indicate where and what type of signs these are to be located.	Design for project signage as described in Section 10 1400 / Signage has not been finalized, and is being carried separately as an allowance in the overall project budget. Do not assign pricing to these items. Selection of actual materials and equipment will occur at a later date.
63	Reference Sheet A0311-Please provide size and material to be used for the lettering and symbol on the outside of the building.	Design for project signage as described in Section 10 1400 / Signage has not been finalized, and is being carried separately as an allowance in the overall project budget. Do not assign pricing to these items. Selection of actual materials and equipment will occur at a later date.
64	Specification section 073363 calls for vegetated roof tray system to be provided on the lower roof per drawing A0104.A and A0104.B. Can this vegetated roof tray system be substituted with a built-in-place 4" depth green roof system? Please advise.	Project shall be bid as documented and substitutions shall not be made
65	Specification section 075556, part 2.1 only indicates American Hydrotech, Inc. for the roofing membrane system. Can we use other equivalent manufacturer for the fluid-applied protected membrane roofing system, such as Henry Company? Please advise.	Henry can be used and will be added to next issue of the specifications
66	There are two alternates for roof systems: 1) ethylene-propylene-diene-monomer (EPDM) roofing per section 075323; and 2) ethylene interpolymer (KEE) roofing per section 075416. Are these two alternates will be used to substitute the base bid roofing system – fluid-applied protected membrane roofing system per section 075556? If so, where do we provide these alternate prices to the bid form? Please advise.	The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed.
67	Specification section 079500 specifies the interior and exterior expansion control systems. The architectural drawings do not show and/or provide any details for these expansion control joints. Please provide the missing drawing and details.	The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed.
68	Details 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, and 15 on drawing L0601 and also detail 6/L0605 indicate 4" concrete slab on 6x6 WWF reinforcement over 4" gravel base. What's the gage for the WWF reinforcement? Please advise.	For the sidewalk, we will need 6x6 WWF with W2.1 x W2.1

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

NEW STUDENT CENTER

PRE-BID QUESTIONS

GF-2011-0030-005

NO.	QUESTION	ANSWER
69	Drawings A010-A0104 show interior masonry walls. Are any of these interior masonry walls require any vertical reinforcements. If so, please provide the vertical reinforcement types.	Vertical reinforcement types shall be #5@32" U.O.N.
70	Is it part of the scope of work to provide sump pits, grates and ladders for elevator C, (detail 1/A0531), and elevator 1 (detail 2/A0530)? If so, please provide the appropriate details.	Metal ladders can be found in 055000 Metal fabrications
71	Is there any structural, mechanical, and electrical demolition required for this project? If so, please provide the drawings for the above demolition works.	No Structural Demolition
72	There isn't any custom glass information given for elevator cabs. Please provide drawings and specification for the work.	SEE DWG. A0530
73	Please provide the geotechnical report for this project.	Refer to Amendment 004.
74	Specification section 018113 calls for this project to obtain LEED Platinum certification. Has the LEED design review been submitted to the GBCI? If so, how many credits have been accepted?	The project has been registered with the USGBC. Design Phase submissions have not been made.
75	Specification section 018114, LEED 2009 NC Checklist calls for Enhanced Commissioning. Please confirm if this is correct.	Correct
76	Specification section 018113, part 2.1.A calls for reclaiming wood panels and refers to specification section 064023, part 2.3.A, which calls for salvaged wood from deconstructed buildings throughout the northeast. Please confirm if this is correct.	The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed.
77	Specification section 018113, part 2.1.A calls for salvaged and reinstallation of existing artwork and building materials. Please provide a list of items that will be reinstalled.	UDC wishes to repurpose the tile installation at face of monumental stair (firebird) and seal at entry to escalator enclosure
78	On drawing M0051, note #3 refers to a geothermal test well. Please provide the geothermal test well report.	GEOTHERMAL TEST REPORT not available
79	Please confirm if WMATA has been notified about the location of the geothermal field and installation of concrete piles adjacent to the WMATA's utility tunnels and vault. Does WMATA require the Contractor to monitor the vibration during the installation of the above work? Please advise.	JDAC guidelines will need to be followed by the contractor. Refer to Question 195.
80	There seems to be some contradiction between the finish schedule A1201 and drawing A1213. According to the finish schedule, rooms 116 Kitchen, 120 Toilet, 121 Office, and 122 Dish Room, all receive epoxy. However, by way of the drawing, 121 Office receives ceramic tile, 122 Dish Room receives sealed concrete, 114 Janitor and 117 Dry Storage both receive epoxy. Please clarify.	Provide an epoxy flooring system equivalent to Dex-O-Tex Tek Crete SL Colored Quartz with a minimum monolithic application thickness of 1/4" in all the spaces listed above, with the exception of Toilet 120 and Office 121. Provide ceramic tile flooring in Toilet 120 and Office 121.
81	Finish schedule on A1201 calls for rooms C1 and C2 to have CONC-2 finish but finish plan A1212 shows C1 and C2 as CONC-1. Please clarify.	Rooms C1 and C2 are CONC-1 (Sealed Concrete Floor)
82	Elevation 3/A0513 indicates architectural precast wall @ column line 7.1 bearing elevation to be approximately 257'-0". However, structural section 8/S0301 shows this same wall to be cast in place. Please provide a section running east-west through stair No.3 that shows: precast bearing elevation, connection details and extent of CIP wall.	The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed.
83	Enlarged Plan 4/A0204 shows a Handicapped Bench in both the Mens' & Womens' Locker Rooms. Please provide specifications for these benches.	The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed.

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

NEW STUDENT CENTER

PRE-BID QUESTIONS

GF-2011-0030-005

NO.	QUESTION	ANSWER
84	Specification Section 10 14 00 refers to Signage in the building, but there are no locations of signage shown on the plans. Please provide quantity & location of signage package.	Wayfinding and Signage allowance being carried by the owner as a project cost. See question 71 above
85	Specification Section 11 52 13 refers to Motorized Projection Screens, but they cannot be located in the building. Please provide quantity & location of motorized projection screens.	See response question no. 130
86	Drawing A1003 (Door Schedule) shows opening numbers but does not indicate what material each door is made of. Please clarify the material of the doors shown.	The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed.
87	On Drawing A1003 (Door Schedule), no hardware set designations are shown. Please specify what hardware set each opening is to receive.	TBD - Hardware allowance being carried by owner.
88	There are numerous conflicts between the finish schedule and the finish plan. Should we use the schedule on sheet A1201 or the finish plans?	Please follow Finish Schedule A 1201 .
89	The following rooms say only CPT on the finish schedule (A1201) and do not denote which type of carpet to use. (CPT instead of CPT-3 etc) Please clarify as the visual designations on finish plans are not easily identifiable: 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 139, 141, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 201, 204, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 309, ST4	The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed. Clarification of CPT numbers is pending.
90	The following rooms are scheduled on A1201 to get CONC-2 (polished concrete) but the Finish Plans show Entrance Mats. Please confirm concrete does not need to be polished underneath of entrance mats: 100, 108 113, 143, 219, 221, 222, 333	CONC - 1 ( Sealed Concrete Floor) will be underneath entrance mats in rooms 100, 108 113, 143, 219, 221, 222, 333.
91	The visual designation for Epoxy Flooring is the same as Rubber Flooring-2. Please clarify.	No, they are not the same. The visual designation for Rubber Floor - 2 is incorrect.
92	Room 102 schedule for CPT-2 on A1201 but shown on Finish Plans as CPT-1. Please clarify.	The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed. Clarification of CPT numbers is pending.
93	The following rooms are schedule on A1201 to receive CONC-1 but the Finish Plans shown them as CONC-2. Please clarify: 104, 105, 106, 109	Rooms 104, 105, 106 and 109 are CONC - 1. Follow Finish Schedule A 1201 for now. Finish Plans are not up to date.
94	Room 117 is scheduled on A1201 for CONC-1 but finish plans show either EPF or RF-2 (same visual designation). Please clarify.	Room 117 is Epoxy (Resinous) Flooring.
95	Room 121 is scheduled on A1201 for EPF but Finish Plans show CT. Please clarify	Provide ceramic tile flooring in Toilet 120 and Office 121.
96	Room 122 is scheduled on A1201 for EPF but Finish Plans show CONC-1. Please clarify.	DISH ROOM 122 is Epoxy (Resinous) Flooring
97	The following rooms are scheduled on A1201 to get CT however the Finish Plans show them as CONC-2. Please clarify: 128, 214, 323	Rooms 128, 214 and 323 are CONC - 2 (Polished Concrete Flooring).
98	A1201 designates room 137 as CPT but the Finish Plans show as CONC-2. Please clarify.	Room 137 is CONC - 2 (Polished Concrete Flooring).
99	A1201 designates room 203 as CONC-1 but the Finish Plans show as CPT of some type. Please clarify.	Room 203 STOR - is CONC - 1 (Sealed Concrete Flooring)
100	A1201 schedules rooms 313 and 314 with CPT-5 but the Finish Plans appear to show RF-1. Please clarify.	Ballroom 314 and 313 are Carpet Tile.
101	A1201 schedules room 316 for CPT but Finish Plans show with EPF or RF-1 (same visual designation). Please clarify.	Warming Kitchen 316 is EPF - Epoxy (Resinous) Flooring.

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

NEW STUDENT CENTER

PRE-BID QUESTIONS

GF-2011-0030-005

NO.	QUESTION	ANSWER
102	A1201 designates room 326 as CPT/CONC-2 but the Finish Plans show no CPT in that area. Please clarify.	Room 326 is CONC -2 (Polished Concrete Flooring).
103	A1201 schedules CPT-1 for rooms 327 and 328 but finish plans appear to show CPT-3. Please clarify.	Both rooms are Carpet Tile - CPT. CPT number TBD.
104	A1201 schedules CPT-2 for room 329 but Finish Plans show CONC-2. Please clarify.	Room 329 is CONC - 2 (Polished Concrete Flooring).
105	A1201 schedules CONC-2 for rooms C1, C2 and C9 but Finish Plans show CONC-1. Please clarify.	Rooms C1, C2 and C9 are CONC-1 (Sealed Concrete Floor )
106	Elevators- PO or Contract? Who is provider?	GC should provide pricing for elevators
107	There are no alternates on the bid form, however specification 075323 is entitled "EPDM ROOFING (ALTERNATE)". Please clarify.	Fluid Applied Reinforced roof is the Basis of Design
108	There are no alternates on the bid form, however specification 075416 is entitled "KEE ROOFING (ALTERNATE)". Please clarify.	Fluid Applied Reinforced roof is the Basis of Design
109	Specification 093000 Section 2.2 Products says "refer to Finish Schedule on the drawings" however A1201 Finish Schedule does not define anything.	The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed.
110	The specifications call for motorized projection screen(s) and motorized projection lift however we were not able to locate either of these on the drawings. Please confirm if projection screens/lifts will be needed on this project.	There will be three Projectors on projector lifts in room 313 (ballroom). Drawing #T0203.A The projection screens will also be motorized and ceiling recessed. Note: Because of the angle of the room, the GC will have to do a custom ceiling grid around the projection lift so that it is square to the screen. The projector and lift will not be able to sit diagonally as the ceiling currently shows.
111	See 096519 Sections 2.2.D and 2.3.C. They appear to be unfinished specifications. Please clarify.	Wearing pattern surface to be selected. Remainder of section is complete
112	See 096723 Section 2.3.E. Specifications are unfinished and physical properties are not defined.	The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed.
113	See 096723 Section 3.2.C. Specification calls for 4" integral cove base but Finish Schedule A1201 calls for various different base materials in Resinous Flooring areas. Please clarify.	SEE FINISH SCHEDULE
114	See 124813 Section 1.2.A.4 references "Custom Graphics". We cannot locate custom graphics on the documents and it does not appear to be applicable to this project. Please clarify.	Wayfinding and Signage allowance being carried by the owner as a project cost. See question 63 above
115	We are unable to locate any waterproofing on the building sections, wall sections or section details. Please clarify.	The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed.
116	General Note 9, Drawings S0001 regarding WMATA review and approvals have the plans been approved by this agency? Are there any special inspection or testing requirements related to WMATA proximity to the Work?	See question no 198above

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

NEW STUDENT CENTER

PRE-BID QUESTIONS

GF-2011-0030-005

NO.	QUESTION	ANSWER
117	Please confirm that Architectural Precast bears on CIP foundation wall at approximate elevation 261.00 along column line 6 between H and D.5.	The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed.
118	Will the contractor be required to pay the lost revenue for the parking meters that are taken out of service by the lane closure for the parking lane and the sidewalks or will the DC Government waive these fees?	The selected Builder will be responsible for following current District practices for the removal/displacement of existing parking meters.
119	Will the contractor be required to pay for the public use permit for the lane closure on Van Ness Street or temporary crossing of Connecticut Avenue? Since this is local school will the DC Government waive these fees?	The selected Builder will be responsible for all permits related to the successful completion of the construction process; to include the lane closures and public space permits. All permits requiring deliverables from Owner or Design Team will be coordinated by the selected Builder.
120	Has the Erosion and Sediment Control been submitted and approved by DCRA? Can we assume there will be no cost the E&S Control permit?	The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed.
121	What is the Connecticut Avenue road section for utility cuts and repairs? Also confirm that the permanent patch depicted on the drawings for the sanitary sewer crossing Connecticut Avenue is the satisfactory (disturbed) repair area?	The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed.
122	Can we assume no easement and property restrictions apply for cellar excavation work?	Due to the projects proximity WMATA spaces, it should be assumed all construction activities including cellar and excavation work will be required to comply with JDAC restrictions.
123	Can we get the soils report? Is there any dewatering information noted? Is there any rock information noted? Will the excavated material be suitable for backfill of the cellar walls?	See response to question no. 196
124	Are there any fees / permits / assessments required by the contractor?	The selected Builder will be responsible for all permits related to the successful completion of the construction process; to include the razing and sheeting & shoring permits. All permits requiring deliverables from Owner or Design Team will be coordinated by the Builder.
125	Will the contractor be required to pay any storm discharge fees (after silt filter control into the city storm inlets)?	The selected Builder will be responsible for all fees related to the successful completion of the construction process; to include storm discharge fees.
126	Will Washington Gas relocate this gas line per Note 17, C-3.00 at no cost to the contractor?	The University does not have existing "No Cost" agreements with any of the District's utility companies.
127	Do we need a raze permit?	The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed.
128	Please provide a door hardware allowance.	Per the allowance section of the specifications "do not assign pricing to any of the following items; each will be covered by an allowance to be determined 1) door hardware, 2)bookstore fit out 3) roller shades 4) fitness equipment 5) security systems 6) information technology 7) audiovisual system.
129	In order to have a chance of completing this project on time additional shifts will have to be worked. Can noise factors be waived in order to accomplish this?	It is possible this issue can be addressed with the selected Builder.

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

NEW STUDENT CENTER

PRE-BID QUESTIONS

GF-2011-0030-005

NO.	QUESTION	ANSWER
130	Specification section 10 51 16 "WOOD LOCKERS" are not shown on the drawings anywhere. The only lockers shown are the metal ones in the locker rooms. Please provide location of wood lockers, or confirm that they are not used.	THE WOOD VENEER LOCKERS ARE LOCATED IN ROOM 201 STUDENT ORG. (SEE DWG. A0102.A)
131	Specification section 10 51 23 "PLASTIC LOCKERS" are not shown on the drawings anywhere. The only lockers shown are the metal ones in the locker rooms. Please provide location of plastic lockers, or confirm that they are not used.	No Plastic Lockers. Please provide wood lockers in student org and metal lockers only in the locker rooms
132	Will vibration monitoring be required on the foundation work?	WMATA JDAC Construction Guidelines will need to be followed
133	Are any fees / permits required by the contractor to be paid to this agency? What is the anticipated review time for this agencies final review and the documents?	The process for building permit review and approval is in progress, but has not been finalized. The project has not been submitted for final building permit approval.
134	Window elevations on sheets A1031 thru A1037 do not include elevations for windows W1-18 thru W1-26. Please provide dimensioned elevations for these windows.	SEE SHEETS A1036 FOR W1-18, THERE ARE NO W-19 TO 25
135	There seems to be some contradiction between the finish schedule A1201 and drawing A1213. According to the finish schedule, rooms 116 Kitchen, 120 Toilet, 121 Office, and 122 Dish Room, all receive epoxy. However, by way of the drawing, 121 Office receives ceramic tile, 122 Dish Room receives sealed concrete, 114 Janitor and 117 Dry Storage both receive epoxy. Please clarify.	Provide an epoxy flooring system equivalent to Dex-O-Tex Tek Crete SL Colored Quartz with a minimum monolithic application thickness of 1/4" in all the spaces listed above, with the exception of Toilet 120 and Office 121. Provide ceramic tile flooring in Toilet 120 and Office 121.
136	Specification Section 011000 Summary, section 1.5 Products Ordered in Advance states that the Elevators have been ordered in advance by the Owner by Purchase Order and that the receiving, handling, and installation is to be included in the Contract Sum by the General Contractor. The Elevator Specifications lists several approved vendors for this equipment. Please provide the manufacturer that the Owner is purchasing this equipment from so that we can obtain pricing for installation from the appropriate vendor.	elevators to be provided by contractor; installed by contractor.
137	Wall sections on sheets A0402, A0403, A0405, A0406 etc. do not have dimensions or details showing makeup of exterior walls. Please provide clarification of what is required.	SEE, A0431 TO A0433 FOR DETAILS AND NOTES
138	Detail 8 on drawing M-0711 does not specify a borehole depth. Please provide a detailed "Bore Detail" including the bore depth, loop size, casing requirement, etc.	Currently unknown; awaiting test bore results.
139	According to the biddings documents, there are no drawings illustrating the size/specs of the geothermal vault on M-0051. Please clarify.	The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed.

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

NEW STUDENT CENTER

PRE-BID QUESTIONS

GF-2011-0030-005

NO.	QUESTION	ANSWER
140	Please provide profile of underground geothermal piping shown on M-0051 as it crosses campus and through existing buildings, and provide necessary details and/or sections to show intended construction.	Further development of drawings will include profiles/elevations of piping extension from field to building.
141	Drawing M-0051 Detail 1 does not illustrate a pipe size for the supply and return circuits from the vault to the building. Please clarify.	Pipe size and quantities to be determined following receipt of test bore results.
142	Drawing M-0711 Detail 8 Unconsolidated Formation does not illustrate if we are to provide steel or PVC casing for overburden. Please clarify.	Assume steel for overburden.
143	Please confirm the number of geothermal bores is 150 bores as shown on M-0051.	Currently unknown; awaiting test bore results. Assume 150 as indicated.
144	Please confirm whether or not a thermal conductivity test and test bore for geothermal well was performed? If so, please provide information.	Thermal conductivity test has not been performed at this time.
145	Please provide glass type/s for the following elevations: GE 26, 27, 28, 33, 40, and 47	GE-26, 29 AND G33 ARE G-12, THE REST ARE G-12
146	Fire Rated Framing is to be provided for elevations GE-11, 10, 17, 18, 31, 32, and 39 is there a specification for this?	The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed.
147	Specification section 051200 Structural Steel, part 1.6 states the AISC qualification requirements for installer and fabricator. Please confirm if these requirements are correct.	Installer Category ASE and Fabricator Category STD
148	Section 271500 2.A.1 - the available manufactures listed for cable does not include General Cable.	The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed.
149	Section 271600 2.A.1 - the available manufactures listed for connectivity does not include Panduit.	The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed.
150	We would like to request approval of Panduit Connectivity and General Cable so that we may provide a Pan/Gen 25 Year Warranty on the installed solution, this solution will meet or exceed the specifications listed.	The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed.
151	Fixture Type FD is not shown on the fixture schedule, please confirm what type of fixture.	The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed.
152	Please confirm if the fixture in rm. 111 should be a FTI	There are six type LP1 luminaries in Room 111 Dining B. There are no type FT1 luminaries in this room.
153	Fixture type LPI is shown as a recessed, but listed as a pendant.	Type LP1 is pendant throughout.

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

NEW STUDENT CENTER

PRE-BID QUESTIONS

GF-2011-0030-005

NO.	QUESTION	ANSWER
154	Should fixtures below vestibule 108 on E0101.b be LD1 or LD2?	Luminaries in Vestibules 100, 108, and 143, should all be type LD1
155	Fixture LC3 shown on E00101.B not listed on schedule	The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed.
156	Fixture FP3 shown as Recessed, listed as pendant	Type FP3 is pendant throughout.
157	Note 18 on E0521, please confirm the termination point. Is at building 42 or in the manhole. If it's in the building is a spare breaker available to accept the new load. If it's in the manhole what type of cable are to tap and what size is the existing cable.	The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed.
158	Specification section 051200 Structural Steel, part 1.6 states the AISC qualification requirements for installer and fabricator. Please confirm if these requirements are correct.	Installer Category ASE and Fabricator Category STD
159	There are no aboveground piping systems shown on the plumbing drawings. Are we to assume that the costs for these systems will be negotiated at a later date when the 100% drawings are issued? What are we to include in the current bid?	<i>The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed.</i>
160	Is this project tax-exempt?	Yes
161	Ref.p.124, M.3 ,states that Factor 1 is worth "35 points". However, when you add up the subfactors on p.125 it only comes to 25 points: Sub-factor 1(15 points) plus Sub-factor 2 (10 points). Please clarify.	Refer to Amendment 003
162	Do we provide a watch person as described in the solicitation on page 25 section G.43 sub section a -ii.	The design document are to be bid as provided.
163	The Bid Form in the Solicitation does not list any Alternates, but the Roofing Specs mention alternates. Please confirm that there are no Alternate Bid prices required, or re-issue the Bid Form.	The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed.
164	Please confirm that all windows shown on the Existing East Elevations on dwg A0302 are existing windows. Why are some of these windows shown as dotted lines and others as solid lines ?	The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed.
165	Where are the Tower Clocks specified ? How are the Clock Faces constructed ?	Tower clocks are located on east and west face of tower. See section 10 7413. Design is not complete.
166	What type of Signage is required at the bottom of detail 1 on dwg A0407 ?	The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed.
167	The glass that is specified for the Skylights (Glass type 6A) cannot be fabricated as specified. Guardian does not coat 3/4" lites (and doesn't coat 1/2" lites either). Guardian won't coat another manufacturer's silkscreen product. Please specify another type of glass, or tell us who can make what you specify.	The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed.
168	Please verify or change the following additional items in the Skylight glass spec (Glass type 6A) : A. a low-e coating on the #2 surface and on the #3? B. the interior lites are ultrawhite (low iron) but the outer lite is clear? (this will add tons of money, with no benefit, as I see it)	The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed.

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

NEW STUDENT CENTER

PRE-BID QUESTIONS

GF-2011-0030-005

NO.	QUESTION	ANSWER
169	Provide specifications for the LightLouver Daylighting System provided by LightLouver LLC (ref det 4 on dwg A0432). Can other manufacturers be used ? Is this to be provided by the owner or by the General Contractor ?	The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed.
170	Provide fabrication & attachment details for the vertical "ribs or Fins" of perforated metal panels which are labeled as ( 057000 - Decorative Metal SUNSHADE) on dwg A0401. Also shown on dwg A0409 as "Shading Device".	sunshades are delegated design, details and engineering to be provided by the contractor as specified.
171	What is the strip at the base of the walls, shown on elevations dwg A0606 and labeled as 064023 - Bronze Anodized Aluminum ? Also, how is it installed ?	The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed.
172	Dwg A0704.A is labeled Lower Roof Reflected Ceiling Plan - Area A, but it is completely blank. Do we assume no ceiling work in that area ?	The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed.
173	Ref G.4.3.1 a. viii. Mobilization scheduled value shall be set at \$23,000 plus 1/2% of contract total which equals \$55,180. Payment for mobilization will be paid in two (2). Is the \$55,180 the most we can be paid for mobilization or is it based on 1/2% of the contract total. Please clarify.	The design documents are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed.
174	Due to the size and complexity of this project, we respectively request a two (2) week time extension so we may provide your office with a more accurate and thorough proposal for this work.	The proposal submission date has been extended to Monday, October 24, 2011.
175	I)- Drawing # A-1003 ( Door Schedule), Please clarify the material of the doors/Frames.	<i>The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed.</i>
176	ii)- Drawing # A-1201 (Finish Schedule), what is the type of finish material to be apply on the surfaces ?.	<i>The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed.</i>
177	26. Please verify the elevation of the pile cap shown on detail 2 S0303 with elevation shown on S010C.B	<i>The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed.</i>
178	Specification Sections 075323 and 075416 are listed as Alternates. There are no Alternates mentioned in Section B. Please confirm that the previously listed sections will be deleted.	<i>The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed.</i>
179	Please confirm that louver marked as L40 on Sheet A0312 should actually be marked as L50.	<i>The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed.</i>
180	L6 is listed in the louver schedule, however it does not seem to be shown anywhere else. Please indicate where L6 is located.	<i>The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed.</i>
181	Reference Sheet A0335 Detail 3-There looks to be some type of lettering on the Dining C doors, however it is backwards in not legible. This occurs in several other places on the documents. If we are to include this signage in our bid please clarify what it should say, the material it is made with and the size as well as a sign schedule of all signage to be included.	Wayfinding and Signage allowance being carried by the owner as a project cost. See question 63 above
182	Please clarify as to whether or not we are to include projection screens and motorized lifts in our bid. If so, please indicate where they are to be located as they are not shown on the drawings.	<i>The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed.</i>

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

NEW STUDENT CENTER

PRE-BID QUESTIONS

GF-2011-0030-005

NO.	QUESTION	ANSWER
183	Specification Section 102600-Wall and Door Protection. Wall and corner guards are not shown on the drawings. Please advise how many should be included in our bid and where they should be located.	See response to question no. 52.
184	The Door Schedule on A1003 is mostly blank. There are no Door or Frame Types, Materials, Frame Details or Hardware Sets listed at all. There is also no way to price the labor without knowing these answers. Please provide a completed Door Schedule. If not possible, I would recommend that you provide an allowance to purchase the doors & frames and another allowance for the installation of the doors, frames & hardware.	<i>The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed.</i>
185	The Sliding Metal Fire Doors are not shown on the Door Types dwg A1004. Provide details for these doors, and tell us where they are required, or what Door Opng # they are.	<i>The design document are to be bid as provided. Additional clarification and/or modifications will be made as the documents are completed.</i>
186	In the SUMMARY spec section 011000 para 1.5 it says that the Elevators have been "ordered in advance" on a purchase order, and that we are to include the installation in our Contract Sum. Typically elevators are purchased as "furnished & installed" from 1 vendor. Please clarify who will pay for the installation, and if we are to carry the cost of the elevators in our total bid. If so, please provide the cost to us.	See response to question no. 141.
187	In the ALLOWANCES spec section 012100, there are several items listed as "Each will be covered by an allowance to be determined." Please provide the allowance amounts that we are to include in our Contract Sum, or confirm that they will be paid by Change Order.	<i>No Plastic Lockers. Please provide wood lockers in student org and metal lockers only in the locker rooms</i>
188		<i>The process for WMATA review and approval is progress, but has not been finalized. The project has not received final approval from WMATA. It is anticipated the selected Builder will play a critical role in this.</i>
189		<i>A report of subsurface exploration and geotechnical engineering analysis has been completed, based on the five test boring locations within the project area. Refer to Amendment 004.</i>
190	Have drawings been bid before?	No
191	Has WMATA approved the new project?	The process for WMATA review and approval is in progress, but has not been finalized. The project has not received final approval from WMATA. It is anticipated the selected Builder will play a significant role in the University's receiving final approval.
192	Given that the drawings are 80% complete, how will you ensure that the price provided by Contract A is for the same work scale as Contractor B in order to ensure the price is an apples to apples comparison?	The drawings have been issued to price at 80% construction. Each General Contractor should submit their proposals accordingly. All proposals will be reviewed by the University's Technical Evaluation Panel.
193	Will any spots be allotted in the parking garages for contractors? GC?	No
194	Is a trailer allowed to be placed on campus?	The selected Builder will be granted permission to place construction trailers on campus. The location of all required trailers will be coordinated between the University and the selected Builder.
195	Has the architectural & structural design been modeled in 3D and will it be available for BIM coordination?	The architectural and structural portions of the project are modeled in the Autodesk Revit BIM program. With signed release electronic AutoCAD files may be shared with the GC.

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

NEW STUDENT CENTER

PRE-BID QUESTIONS

GF-2011-0030-005

NO.	QUESTION	ANSWER
196	The razing & sheeting & shoring permits are by the Contractor. However, these permits require Owner & Design Team deliverables. Please confirm these permits will be by the Owner.	The selected Builder will be responsible for all permits related to the successful completion of the construction process; to include the razing and sheeting & shoring permits. All permits requiring deliverables from Owner or Design Team will be coordinated by the selected Builder.
197	Is there a Geotechnical Report available?	Please refer to Amendment No. 004.
198	Are there any roads off limits?	The selected Builder will be required to follow all District regulations related to the use of public streets and roadways. The use of internal campus roadways will require proper notification and prior written from the University.
199	Are there any areas on campus off limits?	The use of adjacent buildings by the selected Builder will ne strictly prohibited unless prior written consent is granted by the University. Such consent will be considered per request.
200	What is the extent of site utilities requirements for this project, i.e. sewer, domestic water, fire, etc?	Refer to the Civil and engineering drawings.
201	Please advise the status of the building permit. The schedule is 292 days from NTP which will require the permit is available immediately.	The process for building permit review is in progress, bujt has not been submitted for final building permit approval.
202	Are there early turnover spaces within the 292 day time of performance, such as IT closets?	The University is willing to consider the turn over of early spaces as identified by the selected Builder.
203	There seems to be some contradiction between the finish schedule A1201 and drawing A1213. According to the finish schedule, rooms 116 Kitchen, 120 Toilet, 121 Office, and 122 Dish Room, all receive epoxy. However, by way of the drawing, 121 Office receives ceramic tile, 122 Dish Rom receives sealed concrete, 114 Janiotor and 117 Dry Storage both receive epoxy. Please clarify. In addition, will the epoxy be a single solid color, a decorative quartz, or what?	Provide an epoxy flooring system equivalent to Dex-O-Tex Tek Crete SL Colored Quartz with a minimum monolithic application thickness of 1/4" in all the spaces listed above, with the exception of Toilet 120 and Office 121. Provide ceramic tile flooring in Toilet 120 and Office 121.
204	We are a full-service independent engineering, consulting, and testing firm. In reviewing the project specification bid documents, we understand that the specialty testing services will be engaged by the Owner. We would like to know if there is already a contract in place for specialty testing services, and specifically testing/inspection of building envelope, air barrier, roofing, and glazing systems.If there is not a contract, how do we go about providing a bid to the Owner?	All vendors interested in providing services other than those directly required by this solicitation are directed to monitor the University's Capital Procurement website at: <a href="http://www.udc.edu/facilities/">http://www.udc.edu/facilities/</a>
205	M0051, M0711 -- What is the design depth of the geothermal boreholes? Nothing was provided on the drawings and spec listed.	The depth is unknown at this time. A geothermal test well is in progress, but has not been completed.
206	Was a geothermal test well completed? If so, can the geothermal thermal conductivity test report with driller's log be provided? This is the most important document for preparing a geothermal estimate because it will show the geology/drilling conditions.	A geothermal test well is in progress, but has not been completed.
207	S0105.A, S0402 -- The joist girders are only sized by the depth, no panel point loads are provided to allow sizing of the members and the possible weight per foot varies by approx 30#/lf. Please provide the anticipated load.	Design joist girders for panel point load of 11. 5kips..

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

NEW STUDENT CENTER

PRE-BID QUESTIONS

GF-2011-0030-005

NO.	QUESTION	ANSWER
208	The Allowance spec also says that "the installation, handling, overhead & profit is to be part of the contract sum and not part of the Allowances" but there is no way to estimate these costs since there are no details provided for these 7 items. Please confirm that the above listed items will also be paid by Change Order, or provide us a detailed list of items in each allowance.	The referenced allowance amounts will be paid by change order.
209	Par H.5, RFP -- States that all connection fees are to be incorporated into the fixed price proposal. Have you received pricing from the utilities for these fees? Please provide an allowance to carry for this item.	All are directed to include in their fixed price proposal an allowance of \$150,000 to support all utility connection fees.
210	The Allowance spec also says that "the installation, handling, overhead & profit is to be part of the contract sum and not part of the Allowances" but there is no way to estimate these costs since there are no details provided for these 7 items. Please confirm that the above listed items will also be paid by Change Order, or provide us a detailed list of items in each allowance.	The referenced allowance amounts will be paid by change order.

# **ATTACHMENT B**

General Decision Number: DC100001 10/14/2011 DC1

Superseded General Decision Number: DC20080001

State: District of Columbia

Construction Types: Heavy (Heavy and Sewer and Water Line) and Highway

County: District of Columbia Statewide.

HEAVY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS (Including Sewer and Water Lines);  
HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

Modification Number	Publication Date
0	03/12/2010
1	03/19/2010
2	04/23/2010
3	05/07/2010
4	06/11/2010
5	07/09/2010
6	07/23/2010
7	08/20/2010
8	09/24/2010
9	11/05/2010
10	12/10/2010
11	12/24/2010
12	01/07/2011
13	01/21/2011
14	04/15/2011
15	05/06/2011
16	06/03/2011
17	06/10/2011
18	07/01/2011
19	07/08/2011
20	07/22/2011
21	08/12/2011
22	08/26/2011
23	09/02/2011
24	09/09/2011
25	09/23/2011
26	10/07/2011
27	10/14/2011

ASBE0024-001 10/01/2010

	Rates	Fringes
Asbestos Worker/Heat and Frost Insulator		
Includes the application of all insulating materials, protective coverings, coatings and finishes to all types of mechanical systems.....	\$ 31.79	14.73

ASBE0024-002 10/01/2010

	Rates	Fringes
HAZARDOUS MATERIAL HANDLER Includes preparation, wetting, stripping, removal, scrapping, vacuuming, bagging and disposing of all insulation materials, whether they contain asbestos or not, from mechanical systems.....	\$ 19.86	7.10
-----		
ASBE0024-005 10/01/2009		

	Rates	Fringes
Fire Stop Technician.....	\$ 24.10	6.94
Includes the application of materials or devices within or around penetrations and openings in all rated wall or floor assemblies, in order to prevent the passage of fire, smoke of other gases. The application includes all components involved in creating the rated barrier at perimeter slab edges and exterior cavities, the head of gypsum board or concrete walls, joints between rated wall or floor components, sealing of penetrating items and blank openings.		
-----		
BOIL0193-001 10/01/2009		

	Rates	Fringes
Boilermakers:.....	\$ 37.66	16.36
-----		
BRDC0001-001 05/03/2010		

	Rates	Fringes
Bricklayer.....	\$ 27.21	7.21
-----		
BRMD0001-004 04/25/2010		

	Rates	Fringes
BRICKLAYER Refractory (Firebrick).....	\$ 33.55	7.72
-----		
CARP0132-001 05/01/2011		

	Rates	Fringes
Carpenter/Lather.....	\$ 26.74	7.45
Piledriver.....	\$ 24.94	8.15
-----		
CARP1831-001 04/01/2011		

	Rates	Fringes
Carpenters:		

Millwrights.....\$ 30.24 7.65

CARP2311-002 05/01/2009

	Rates	Fringes
DIVER TENDER.....	\$ 24.48	7.80
DIVER.....	\$ 36.13	7.80

ELEC0026-001 06/01/2011

	Rates	Fringes
Electricians.....	\$ 39.75	3%+13.10

ELEC0026-008 07/01/2003

	Rates	Fringes
Motor Repairmen Removal and reinstallation of electrical motors.....	\$ 23.69	7.73+3%+a

a. PAID HOLIDAYS:

New Year's Day, Martin Luther King Jr.'s Birthday,  
Inauguration Day, Memorial Day, Fourth of July, Labor Day,  
Veterans Day, Thanksgiving Day, the day after Thanksgiving  
and Christmas Day or days designated as legal holidays by  
the Federal Government.

\* ELEC0070-001 05/02/2011

	Rates	Fringes
Line Construction:		
Cable Splicers.....	\$ 31.20	18.75%+5.00
Equipment Operators.....	\$ 31.20	18.75%+5.00
Groundman.....	\$ 14.49	18.75%+5.00
Linemen.....	\$ 31.20	18.75%+5.00
Truck Driver.....	\$ 16.47	18.75%+5.00

ENGI0077-001 05/01/2011

	Rates	Fringes
Power equipment operators: (HEAVY AND HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION)		
GROUP 1.....	\$ 32.36	8.00+a+b
GROUP 2.....	\$ 31.35	8.00+a+b
GROUP 3.....	\$ 30.89	8.00+a
GROUP 4.....	\$ 30.17	8.00+a
GROUP 5.....	\$ 28.12	8.00+a
GROUP 6.....	\$ 23.53	8.00+a
GROUP 7.....	\$ 32.73	8.00+a

POWER EQUIPMENT OPERATORS CLASSIFICATIONS

GROUP 1: Tower Cranes and Cranes 100 ton and over.

GROUP 2: 35 ton cranes & above, tower & climbing cranes, derricks, concrete boom pump, drill rigs (equivalent to L & Double L), mole.

GROUP 3: Backhoes, cableways, cranes, cherry pickers, elevating graders, hoists, paving mixers, power shovels, tunnel shovels, batch plants, shields, tunnel mining machines, gradalls, front end loaders, 3 1/2 cu. yds. and above, power driven wheel scoops and scrapers (50 cu. yds. struck capacity or above), rail tamper, draglines, boomcat, mucking machines, graders in tunnels, pile driving engines.

GROUP 4: Front end loaders below 3 1/2 cu. yds, boom trucks, hydraulic backhoes 1/2 yds. capacity or below rubber or track mounted, tug boats, power driven wheel scoops & scrapers, blade graders, motor graders, bulldozers, trenching machines, concrete mixer, speed swing pettibone, ballast regulator, concrete pump, mechanic, welder, mechanic welder, shotcrete machines, Hoeram, locomotive (standard, narrow gauge), tuggers.

GROUP 5: High lifts above 10 feet, boilers (skelton), asphalt spreaders, bullfloat finishing machines, concrete finishing machines, concrete spreaders, fine graders, air compressors, welding machines, pumps, generators, well points, deep wells, hydraulic pumps, elevators, freeze units, tunnel motorman or dinky operator, roller, conveyors, well drilling machines, grout pump, fireman.

GROUP 6: Fork lifts, ditch witch, bobcat 1/3 cu. yd. and below, space heaters, sweepers, assistant engineers, oilers.

GROUP 7: Master mechanic.

a. PAID HOLIDAYS: New Years Day, Inaugural Day, Decoration Day, Independence Day, Labor Day, Martin Luther King's Birthday, Veterans' Day, Thanksgiving Day, Friday after Thanksgiving and Christmas Day.

b. PREMIUM PAY:

Tower crane and cranes 100-ton and over to receive \$1.00 per hour premium over Group One.

-----  
ENGI0077-002 06/01/2011

	Rates	Fringes
Power equipment operators: (PAVING AND INCIDENTAL GRADING)		
GROUP 1.....	\$ 26.09	6.60
GROUP 2.....	\$ 23.25	6.60
GROUP 3.....	\$ 19.99	6.60
GROUP 4.....	\$ 18.00	6.60
GROUP 5.....	\$ 26.75	6.40

POWER EQUIPMENT OPERATORS CLASSIFICATIONS

GROUP 1: Gradall operator, Crane.

GROUP 2: Boom Truck, Milling Machine, Excavator, Rubber Tire

Backhoe, Asphalt Paver, Asphalt Plant Engineer, Motor Grader, Track Loader, Rubber Tire Loader, Track Dozer, Concrete Paver.

GROUP 3: Broom Truck, Asphalt Roller.

GROUP 4: Air Compressor, Grade Rollers.

GROUP 5: Mechanic.

-----  
ENGI0077-003 07/01/2011

	Rates	Fringes
Power equipment operators: (SEWER, GAS AND WATER LINE CONSTRUCTION)		
GROUP 1.....	\$ 23.23	6.72+a
GROUP 2.....	\$ 22.83	6.72+a
GROUP 3.....	\$ 22.32	6.72+a
GROUP 4.....	\$ 22.00	6.72+a
GROUP 5.....	\$ 21.18	6.72+a

POWER EQUIPMENT OPERATORS CLASSIFICATIONS

GROUP 1: Excavators, Cranes, Gradalls.

GROUP 2: Backhoes, Front-end Loaders, Fork alift/Lull, Bulldozers, Motor Graders. Qualified Mechanics, Hydraulic Tamper and Hoe Pack, Paving Mixers, Pile Driving Engines, Batch Plant, Concrete Pumps, Low-Boy Driver, Lube Truck.

GROUP 3: Trenching Machine, Well Drilling Machines, Concrete Mixers, Motor Graders, Truck Driver.

GROUP 4. Roller, Air Compressors, Pumps, Welding Machines, Well Points, Firemen.

GROUP 5: Oiler

a. PAID HOLIDAYS: New Year's Day, Inaugural Day, Washington's Birthday, Decoration Day, Independence Day, Labor Day, Veterans Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas Day and Martin Luther King's Birthday.

-----  
IRON0005-001 06/01/2009

	Rates	Fringes
Ironworkers:		
Structural, Ornamental and Chain Link Fence.....	\$ 28.83	13.295

-----  
IRON0201-001 05/01/2009

	Rates	Fringes
Ironworkers:		
Reinforcing.....	\$ 25.20	14.33

-----  
LABO0657-003 09/05/2011

	Rates	Fringes
--	-------	---------

Laborers: (HEAVY AND HIGHWAY  
AND SEWER & WATER LINES  
CONSTRUCTION)

GROUP 1.....	\$ 21.83	6.47
GROUP 2.....	\$ 22.18	6.47
GROUP 3.....	\$ 22.37	6.47
GROUP 4.....	\$ 22.54	6.47
GROUP 5.....	\$ 23.02	6.47
GROUP 6.....	\$ 23.63	6.47
GROUP 7.....	\$ 24.21	6.47
GROUP 8.....	\$ 25.00	6.47

LABORERS CLASSIFICATIONS:

GROUP 1: Carloaders, choker setter, concrete crewman, crushed feeder, demolition laborers, including salvaging all material, loading, cleaning up, wrecking, dumpmen, flagmen, fence erector and installer (other than chain link), including installation and erection of fence, guard rails, medial rails, reference posts, guide posts and right-of-way markers, form strippers, general laborers, railroad track laborers, riprap man, scale man, stake jumper, structure mover, includes foundation, separation, preparation, cribbing, shoring, jacking and unloading of structures, water nozzleman, timber buckler and faller, truck loader, water boys, tool room men.

GROUP 2: Combined air and water nozzleman, cement handler, dope pot fireman (nonmechanical), form cleaning machine, mechanical railroad equipment (includes spiker, puller, tile cleaner, tamper, pipe wrapper, power driven wheelbarrows, operators of hand derricks, towmasters, scootcretes, buggymobiles and similar equipment), tamper or rammer operator, trestle scaffold builders over one tier high, power tool operator (gas, electric or pneumatic), sandblast or gunnite tailhose man, scaffold erector, (steel or wood), vibrator operator (up to 4 feet), asphalt cutter, mortar men, shorer and lagger, creosote material handler, corrosive enamel or equi, paver breaker and jackhammer operators.

GROUP 3: Multi-section pipe layer, non-metallic clay and concrete pipe layer (including caulker, collarman, jointer, rigger and jacker, thermal welder and corrugated metal culvert pipe layer.

GROUP 4: Asphalt block pneumatic cutter, asphalt roller, walker, chainsaw operator with attachment, concrete saw (walking), high scalars, jackhammer operator (using over 6 feet of steel), vibrator operator (4 feet and over), well point installer, air trac operator.

GROUP 5: Asphalt screeder, big drills, cut of the hole drills (1 1/2 " piston or larger), down the hole drills (3 1/2" piston or larger) gunnite or sandblaster nozzleman, asphalt raker, asphalt tamper, form setter, demolition torch operator, shotcrete nozzlemen and potman.

GROUP 6: Powderman, master form setters.

GROUP 7: Brick paver (asphalt block paver, asphalt block sawman, asphalt block grinder, hastings block or similar type)

GROUP 8: Licensed powdermen.

LABO0657-004 09/05/2011

	Rates	Fringes
Laborers: (HAZARDOUS WASTE REMOVAL, EXCEPT ON MECHANICAL SYSTEMS: Preparation for, removing and encapsulation of hazardous materials from non-mechanical systems)		
Skilled Asbestos Abatement Laborers.....	\$ 17.92	6.47
Skilled Toxic and Hazardous Waste Removal Laborers.....	\$ 21.15	6.47

LABO0657-005 09/05/2011

	Rates	Fringes
Laborers: (TUNNEL, RAISE & SHAFT (FREE AIR) FOR HEAVY AND SEWER & WATER LINES CONSTRUCTION)		
GROUP 1.....	\$ 22.62	6.47
GROUP 2.....	\$ 23.33	6.47
GROUP 3.....	\$ 25.12	6.47
GROUP 4.....	\$ 25.89	6.47
LABORERS CLASSIFICATIONS:		

GROUP 1: Brakeman, Bull Gang, Dumper, Trackmen, Concrete Man.

GROUP 2: Chuck Tender, Powdermen in Prime House, Form Setters and Movers, Nippers, Cableman, Houseman, Groutman, Bell or Signalman, Top or Bottom Vibrator Operator.

GROUP 3: Miners, Re-Bar Underground, Concrete or Gunnite Nozzlemen, Powdermen, Timbermen and Re-Timbermen, Wood Steel Including Liner plate or Other Support, Material Motorman, Caulkers, Diamond Drill Operators, Riggers, Cement Finishers-Underground, Welders and Burners, Shield Driver, Air Trac Operator, Shotcrete Nozzlemen and Potman.

GROUP 4: Mucking Machine Operator (Air).

LABO0657-006 09/05/2011

	Rates	Fringes
Laborers: (TUNNEL, RAISE AND SHAFT (COMPRESSED AIR) FOR HEAVY CONSTRUCTION ONLY		
Gauge Pressure Work Period		
(Pounds)	(Hours)	
1-14	7.....	\$ 29.52
		6.47

14-18                    6.....\$ 34.74                    6.47

FOOTNOTE: On any requirement for air pressure in excess of 18 PSI, work periods and rates should be negotiated at a pre-bid conference.

-----  
LABO0657-007 06/01/2010

	Rates	Fringes
Laborers: (PAVING AND INCIDENTAL GRADING)		
Asphalt Raker & Concrete		
Saw Operator.....	\$ 18.42	4.90
Asphalt Shoveler.....	\$ 17.84	4.90
Asphalt Tammer & Concrete		
Shoveler.....	\$ 18.09	4.90
Jack Hammer.....	\$ 18.51	4.90
Laborer.....	\$ 17.70	4.90
Sand Setter & Form Setter...	\$ 19.10	4.90

-----  
LABO0657-008 09/05/2011

	Rates	Fringes
LABORERS (BRICK MASONRY WORK)		
Mason Tenders.....	\$ 15.36	6.47
Scaffold Builders, Mortarmen.....	\$ 16.26	6.47

-----  
MARB0002-003 05/01/2011

	Rates	Fringes
Marble & Stone Mason		
Includes Pointing, Caulking and Cleaning of All Types of Masonry, Brick, Stone and Cement Structures.....		
	\$ 32.88	13.99

-----  
MARB0003-001 05/01/2010

	Rates	Fringes
Mosaic & Terrazzo Worker, Tile Layer		
Marble Mason and Tile Layer.	\$ 25.29	9.59
Terrazzo Worker.....	\$ 26.04	9.59

-----  
MARB0003-004 05/01/2010

	Rates	Fringes
Marble, Tile & Terrazzo Finisher.....		
	\$ 20.48	8.44

-----  
PAIN0051-001 06/01/2010

	Rates	Fringes
--	-------	---------

Painters:

All Industrial Work.....	\$ 27.68	7.86
Bridges, Heavy Highway, Lead Abatement and Flame/Thermal Spray.....	\$ 31.32	7.86
Commercial and Mold Remediation, Painters, Wallcovers and Drywall Finishers.....	\$ 24.64	7.86
Metal Polishing and Refinishing.....	\$ 25.64	7.86

-----  
PLAS0891-001 05/01/2010

Rates Fringes

Cement Masons:

HEAVY CONSTRUCTION ONLY.....	\$ 27.15	9.58
------------------------------	----------	------

-----  
PLAS0891-002 06/01/2011

Rates Fringes

Cement Masons: (PAVING &  
INCIDENTAL GRADING)

Cement Masons.....	\$ 19.56	5.68
Concrete Saw Operators.....	\$ 19.56	5.68
Form Setters.....	\$ 19.56	5.68

-----  
PLUM0005-001 08/01/2011

Rates Fringes

Plumbers.....	\$ 38.17	15.50+a
---------------	----------	---------

a. PAID HOLIDAYS: Labor Day, Veterans' Day, Thanksgiving Day and the day after Thanksgiving, Christmas Day, New Year's Day, Martin Luther King's Birthday, Memorial Day and the Fourth of July.

-----  
PLUM0602-005 08/01/2011

Rates Fringes

Steamfitter, Refrigeration &

Air Conditioning Mechanic.....	\$ 37.62	17.22+a
--------------------------------	----------	---------

a. PAID HOLIDAYS: New Year's Day, Martin Luther King's Birthday, Memorial Day, Independence Day, Labor Day, Veterans Day, Thanksgiving Day and the day after Thanksgiving and Christmas Day.

-----  
SHEE0100-001 07/01/2011

Rates Fringes

Sheet Metal Worker.....	\$ 37.09	13.61
-------------------------	----------	-------

-----  
TEAM0639-001 06/01/2010

	Rates	Fringes
Truck drivers: (HEAVY & HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION)		
Tractor trailer, Low Boy....	\$ 20.50	2.00+a
Truck Drivers.....	\$ 18.50	2.00+a

a. VACATION: Employees will receive one (1) week's paid vacation after one (1) year of service.

-----  
 TEAM0639-005 06/01/2009

	Rates	Fringes
Truck drivers: (PAVING & INCIDENTAL GRADING)		
All paving projects where the grading is incidental to the paving.....		
	\$ 18.00	4.00

-----  
 WELDERS - Receive rate prescribed for craft performing operation to which welding is incidental.  
 =====

Unlisted classifications needed for work not included within the scope of the classifications listed may be added after award only as provided in the labor standards contract clauses (29CFR 5.5 (a) (1) (ii)).

-----  
 In the listing above, the "SU" designation means that rates listed under the identifier do not reflect collectively bargained wage and fringe benefit rates. Other designations indicate unions whose rates have been determined to be prevailing.  
 -----

WAGE DETERMINATION APPEALS PROCESS

1.) Has there been an initial decision in the matter? This can be:

- \* an existing published wage determination
- \* a survey underlying a wage determination
- \* a Wage and Hour Division letter setting forth a position on a wage determination matter
- \* a conformance (additional classification and rate) ruling

On survey related matters, initial contact, including requests for summaries of surveys, should be with the Wage and Hour Regional Office for the area in which the survey was conducted because those Regional Offices have responsibility for the Davis-Bacon survey program. If the response from this initial contact is not satisfactory, then the process described in 2.) and 3.) should be followed.

With regard to any other matter not yet ripe for the formal process described here, initial contact should be with the Branch of Construction Wage Determinations. Write to:

Branch of Construction Wage Determinations  
Wage and Hour Division  
U.S. Department of Labor  
200 Constitution Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20210

2.) If the answer to the question in 1.) is yes, then an interested party (those affected by the action) can request review and reconsideration from the Wage and Hour Administrator (See 29 CFR Part 1.8 and 29 CFR Part 7). Write to:

Wage and Hour Administrator  
U.S. Department of Labor  
200 Constitution Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20210

The request should be accompanied by a full statement of the interested party's position and by any information (wage payment data, project description, area practice material, etc.) that the requestor considers relevant to the issue.

3.) If the decision of the Administrator is not favorable, an interested party may appeal directly to the Administrative Review Board (formerly the Wage Appeals Board). Write to:

Administrative Review Board  
U.S. Department of Labor  
200 Constitution Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20210

4.) All decisions by the Administrative Review Board are final.

=====

END OF GENERAL DECISION

# ATTACHMENT C

# ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

## UNIVERSITY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

4200 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest  
Building 39, Room 301P  
Washington, District of Columbia 20008  
Ms. Barbara Jumper



### PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT

of

### UNIVERSITY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

4200 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest  
Washington, District of Columbia 20008

#### PREPARED BY:

**EMG**  
222 Schilling Circle, Suite 275  
Hunt Valley, Maryland 21031  
800.733.0660  
410.785.6220 (fax)  
[www.emgcorp.com](http://www.emgcorp.com)

#### EMG CONTACT:

**Brian T. Zink**  
Senior Environmental Consultant  
800.733.0660, Ext. 6675  
[btzink@emgcorp.com](mailto:btzink@emgcorp.com)

**EMG Project #:** 89419.08R-009.017  
**Date of Report:** February 3, 2009  
**On-Site Date:** December 3-5, 2008

## PROJECT SUMMARY

University of the District of Columbia  
4200 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest  
Washington, District of Columbia 20008

Assessment Component	Acceptable	Routine Solution	Phase II	Estimated Cost §	Reference Section	Page
Historical Review		(2)		N/A	6	17
Operational Activities	✓				7.1	24
Hazardous Materials	✓				7.2	25
Waste Generation	✓				7.3	26
PCBs	✓				7.4	27
Asbestos		(1)		<b>Document Review:</b> See below <b>Survey:</b> \$31,000	7.5	27
Tanks/Pipelines	✓	(2)		N/A	7.6	28
Surface Areas	✓				7.7	29
Mold		(3)		\$25,200	7.8	29
Regulatory Database Review		(2)		N/A	9	33
Adjacent Properties	✓				10	40

*Conditions noted in the Project Summary Table are representative of the overall conditions of the property. There may be more detail on specific assessment components in the report text, therefore the Project Summary Table should not be used as a stand alone document.*

§ *Costs depicted are for investigation/program development activities. Remediation costs, if required, will be identified as a result of the activities.*

- (1) EMG recommends that any additional ACM documentation be provided for review and comment. The cost for document review is \$700 plus \$175 per hour after the first four hours. If this documentation is not available or is insufficient, additional investigation in the form of a comprehensive asbestos survey may be necessary to more fully evaluate the potential for ACM at the Project.
- (2) EMG recommends continued groundwater sampling and laboratory analysis in accordance with applicable regulations and requirements in order to achieve regulatory closure.
- (3) Prior to remediation by personnel specifically trained in the handling of hazardous materials, a mold assessment should be conducted by a health and safety professional with experience performing microbial investigations. Additional information about the source of the moisture is included in EMG's Property Condition Assessment (PCA) reports.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**1. Certification .....1**

**2. Executive Summary ..... 2**

    2.1. Findings/Conclusions ..... 3

    2.2. Recommendations/Opinions ..... 8

**3. Survey Approach/Purpose .....10**

    3.1. Data Gaps ..... 12

**4. User Provided Information.....13**

    4.1. User Engaged Environmental Cleanup Liens and Activity And Use Limitation  
        (AUL) Review ..... 13

    4.2. User Questionnaire ..... 13

    4.3. Reason for Assessment ..... 13

**5. Project Location/Description .....14**

    5.1. Project Description ..... 14

    5.2. Miscellaneous Systems ..... 14

    5.3. Environmental Setting ..... 15

        5.3.1. Topography..... 15

        5.3.2. Wetlands ..... 15

        5.3.3. Floodplain ..... 16

        5.3.4. Soils/Geology..... 16

        5.3.5. Groundwater Hydrology ..... 16

**6. Historical Review .....17**

    6.1. Chain of Title..... 17

    6.2. Prior Use Interviews ..... 17

    6.3. Local and/or State Government Agency Record Review/Interviews ..... 17

    6.4. Historical Maps ..... 18

    6.5. Aerial Photography ..... 20

    6.6. Previous Investigations/Assessments ..... 21

    6.7. Plans and Specifications ..... 22

    6.8. Historical Summary ..... 22

**7. Project Reconnaissance..... 24**

    7.1. Operational Activities/Noteworthy Tenants ..... 24

    7.2. Hazardous Materials/Petroleum Products Storage and Handling..... 25

    7.3. Waste Generation, Treatment, Storage, and Disposal ..... 26

    7.4. Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) ..... 27

    7.5. Asbestos-Containing Materials (ACM)..... 27

    7.6. Facility Storage Tanks and Pipelines (above or below ground)..... 28

    7.7. Surface Areas ..... 29

    7.8. Mold ..... 29

**8. Interviews .....31**

    8.1. Key Site Manager ..... 31

    8.2. Owner ..... 31

    8.3. User ..... 31

    8.4. Occupants ..... 31



8.5. Past Owners, Operators, and Occupants..... 32  
8.6. Owners Or Occupants of Adjacent or Nearby Property ..... 32  
8.7. Interviews with Others..... 32  
**9. Regulatory Database Review..... 33**  
**10. Adjacent Properties ..... 40**  
**11. Appendices .....41**



---

## 1. CERTIFICATION

---

EMG has completed a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment of the University of the District of Columbia (the "Project"), located at 4200 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest in Washington, District of Columbia 20008. The assessment was performed at the Client's request using the methods and procedures consistent with good commercial and customary practice designed to conform with acceptable industry standards.

This report has been prepared on behalf of and exclusively for the use of The University of the District of Columbia for the purpose stated within Section 2.1. of this report. The report, or any excerpt thereof, shall not be used by any party other than The University of the District of Columbia or for any other purpose than that specifically stated in our agreement or within Section 2.1. of this report without the express written consent of EMG.

Any reuse or distribution of this report without such consent shall be at The University of the District of Columbia and the recipient's sole risk, without liability to EMG.

In expressing the opinions stated in this report, EMG has exercised the degree of skill and care ordinarily exercised by a reasonable prudent environmental professional in the same community and in the same time frame given the same or similar facts and circumstances. Documentation and data provided by the Client, designated representatives of the Client or other interested third parties, or from the public domain, and referred to in the preparation of this assessment, have been used and referenced with the understanding that EMG assumes no responsibility or liability for their accuracy.

The independent conclusions represent our professional judgment based on information and data available to us during the course of this assignment. Factual information regarding operations, conditions, and test data provided by the Client or their representative has been assumed to be correct and complete. The conclusions presented are based on the data provided, observations, and conditions that existed on the date of the on-site visit.

If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact the Senior Environmental Consultant listed on the cover page of this report.

**Researched by:** Clarissa Lobaugh, Project Manager

**Surveyed by:** Clarissa Lobaugh, Project Manager

**Written by:** Clarissa Lobaugh, Project Manager

I declare that, to the best of my professional knowledge and belief, I meet the definition of Environmental Professional as defined in §312.10 of 40 CFR 312.

I have the specific qualifications based on education, training, and experience to assess a property of the nature, history, and setting of the Project. I have developed and performed the all appropriate inquiries in conformance with the standard and practices set forth in 40 CFR Part 312.

**Reviewed by:**



---

Brian T. Zink, Senior Environmental Consultant

[btzink@emgcorp.com](mailto:btzink@emgcorp.com)

---

---

## 2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

---

EMG performed a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, that included on-site observations of the accessible areas of the University of the District of Columbia (the “Project”), from December 3 to 5, 2008. The Project is located at 4200 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest in Washington, District of Columbia 20008, and is approximately 21.8 acres.

The Project, originally constructed in the 1970s, is currently an academic facility consisting of eight buildings, including:

- Building 32 (five levels) occupied by the Mathematics Department and reportedly constructed in 1974-1975.
- Building 38 (six levels) occupied by Student Services and the Law Department and reportedly constructed in 1974-1975.
- Building 39 (six levels) occupied by Administrative and Financial Aid and reportedly constructed in 1974-1975.
- Building 41 (seven levels) occupied by the Arts and Library Department and reportedly constructed in 1979-1980.
- Building 42 (five levels) occupied by the Engineering Department and reportedly constructed in 1978-1979.
- Building 43 (three levels) used as the Physical Plant and reportedly constructed in 1978.
- Building 44 (seven levels) occupied by the Life Sciences Department and reportedly constructed in 1980.
- Two-level underground parking garage reportedly constructed in 1979-1981.

Current facility operations include the maintenance and operations of an academic facility, including but not limited to classrooms, laboratories, and offices. Prior to construction of the current improvements, the Project was a part of the property occupied by the National Bureau of Standards. Properties in the general vicinity of the Project include residential and commercial land uses.

The following summarizes the independent conclusions representing EMG’s best professional judgment based on information and data available to us during the course of this assignment. Factual information regarding operations, conditions, and test data provided by the Client, owner, or their representative have been assumed to be correct and complete. Additionally, the conclusions presented are based on the conditions that existed at the time of the assessment.

We have performed a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment in conformance with the scope and limitations of ASTM Practice E 1527-05 of 4200 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest in Washington, District of Columbia 20008. Any exceptions to, or deletions from, this practice are described in Section 3. of this report. This assessment has revealed no evidence of Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) in connection with the Project, except for the following:

- The Project formerly contained three 30,000-gallon #2 fuel oil UST systems that were used by the campus physical plant. A release from these USTs was identified in January of 1997, which resulted in the removal of the USTs and the initiation of remediation activities at the Project. Please see the *Storage Tanks/Pipelines* and *Regulatory Review* sections below for further discussion.

In addition, the following on-site environmental items of note were identified:

- Suspect ACM in the form of resilient floor tiles/mastic, sheet flooring, ceiling tiles, drywall/joint compound, spray applied fireproofing, pipe wrap, insulation, and roofing materials were visually identified during the on-site assessment. Please see the *Asbestos-Containing Materials* section below for further discussion.
- Suspect mold and water damage were visually observed in multiple areas of the Project during the assessment. Please see the *Mold* section below for further discussion.

A summary of the findings for this assessment are described below.

---

## 2.1. FINDINGS/CONCLUSIONS

---

### *Historical Review (Section 6)*

- The review of the historical data available for the Project and surrounding area identified the following circumstances of environmental concern:
  - The Project was historically occupied by a portion of the property used by the National Bureau of Standards, which oversaw multiple laboratories at the Project. In addition, tunnels that were reportedly used by the National Bureau of Standards remain under the Project and were inaccessible during the assessment; therefore, a determination could not be made as to whether or not the activities in these tunnels, if any, could impact the environmental integrity of the Project. It is possible based on the past uses of the Project as the National Bureau of Standards that the subsurface has been impacted. However, the Project buildings are below grade levels, and during excavation of the below grade levels it is anticipated that any potential associated contamination would have been encountered and removed. Also, because the National Bureau of Standards buildings were removed at least 30 years ago, a natural degradation of any contamination has likely occurred. In addition, there does not appear to be an immediate health risk to the occupants of the Project from this historical use since the Project is serviced by public water and sewer systems and the entire site is covered with relatively impermeable surfaces including the building and sidewalks. Although there is a potential that there has been impact to the subsurface from the past uses, it is unlikely that this poses a significant environmental risk to the operators/occupants of the Project, and no further action or investigation is recommended at this time. However, if additional information is needed regarding this former use and its potential for impact to the Project, further evaluation, in the form of a subsurface investigation, would be necessary.

### *Operational Activities (Section 7.1)*

- EMG observed the following environmental concerns associated with the operational activities at the Project:
  - Physical plant in Building 43 heating and cooling processes.
  - Chemistry academic laboratories in Building 44 and 42.
  - Biology academic laboratories in Building 44.
  - Physics academic laboratories in Building 44.
  - Radiology academic laboratories in Building 44.
  - Respiratory academic laboratory in Building 44.
  - Morgue located in Building 44.

- Asphalt degradation laboratory in Building 42.
- Photography academic laboratories in Building 41 and Building 42.
- Printing shop in Building 42.
- Health Clinic in Building 44.

Please refer to the *Hazardous Materials/Petroleum Products* and *Wastes* discussions below for information on the potential hazards to the Project from these operations.

#### *Hazardous Materials/Petroleum Products (Section 7.2)*

- The Project is involved in the use of hazardous materials and petroleum products in the form of routine janitorial/maintenance supplies, water treatment chemicals for heating and cooling purposes, fuel oil for heating and cooling purposes, hydraulic oil for machinery, refrigerants for heating and cooling purposes, oxygen and acetylene for welding, propane for forklifts, diesel fuel for emergency generators, academic laboratory chemicals and solvents, developer and fixer for X-ray and photograph development, and oxygen for medical use. In addition, the Project utilizes small quantities of various hazardous materials in chemistry laboratories for educational purposes. The identified materials appear to be properly stored. The materials observed do not appear to pose a hazard to the Project, provided they continue to be used as designed, are properly handled, and all regulations regarding their use are followed.

#### *Wastes (Section 7.3)*

- The Project generates hazardous waste in the form of PCBs, waste trichloethylene, waste oxidizing liquids, waste corrosive liquids, waste flammable liquids, waste toxic organic liquids, waste toxic organic solids, and florescent light tubes, medical waste in the form of bio-hazardous media and sharps, and regulated waste in the form of refrigerants and spent x-ray and photograph developer and fixer, as well as non-hazardous solid and liquid wastes, including cooking grease. Generated wastes appear to be stored and disposed of properly; with the exception of spent film developing chemicals (e.g., developers, stabilizers, bleaches, and film fixer) that are not run through a silver recovery system before they are discharged to the public sewer system. According to Ms. Tamiko Bryant, the Project does not currently have a permit for this activity. EMG recommends that waste materials be handled according to appropriate industry standards and all applicable federal, state, and local regulations.

#### *Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (Section 7.4)*

- EMG identified utility-owned transformers which are not classified regarding PCB content. This equipment appeared to be in good condition with no evidence of leaks. The utility is the financially responsible party for maintenance of the transformers. No further action or investigation is recommended regarding the transformers at the Project.
- The Project also uses secondary electrical service from privately owned “dry type” step-down transformers. Dry type transformers do not use oils for cooling purposes; therefore, these transformers are not expected to contain PCBs.
- The Project maintains one hydraulic elevator, which is located in Building 38. Because the unit was installed prior to 1978 (the USEPA banned the manufacturing of PCB-containing hydraulic fluid in 1976, and the manufacture of PCBs ceased in 1977), EMG is of the opinion that the elevator hydraulic fluid potentially contains PCBs. No visual indication of leakage was observed in the area of the elevator operating equipment. The hydraulic elevator unit at the Project should be periodically inspected for leakage. If leakage is identified, the unit should be repaired and any fluid or fluid-soaked waste disposed of in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations.

- A hydraulic trash compactor is located at the Project. PCB-containing hydraulic fluid has not been manufactured since 1977. Therefore, based on the date of installation, PCB-containing hydraulic fluid is not likely to be found in the operating system. No visual indication of leakage was observed in the area of the equipment. No further action or investigation is recommended regarding the trash compactor at the Project.

#### *Asbestos-Containing Materials (ACM) (Section 7.5)*

- Suspect ACM in the form of resilient floor tiles/mastic, sheet flooring, ceiling tiles, drywall/joint compound, spray applied fireproofing, pipe wrap, insulation, and roofing materials were visually identified during the on-site assessment. No samples were collected based on the Scope of Work. With the exception of a partial asbestos survey for Building 43, documentation of asbestos sampling was not provided for review during the site assessment.

The Limited Hazardous Building Materials Survey Report completed by MACTEC Engineering and Consulting, Inc. (MACTEC) for a portion of Building 43, was done to identify ACM and lead-containing surface coatings in boiler components and associated piping that would be impacted during the boiler replacement. Skim coat mud on fiberglass pipe insulation, boiler stack exhaust insulation, boiler door insulation, interior boiler fire brick, and debris were sampled during the inspection. The laboratory analysis indicated that the skim coat mud on the fiberglass pipe insulation associated with the medium pressure steam and feed pipes contained 2-3% Chrysotile asbestos. Results for the other suspect materials sampled by MACTEC were “none detected”. MACTEC recommended that the ACM mud on fiberglass pipe insulation associated with the boiler piping be removed by a qualified asbestos abatement contractor licensed in the District of Columbia prior to being impacted by renovation activities.

EMG recommends that any additional ACM documentation be provided for review and comment. If this documentation is not available or is insufficient, additional investigation in the form of a comprehensive asbestos survey may be necessary to more fully evaluate the potential for ACM at the Project.

#### *Storage Tanks/Pipelines (Section 7.6)*

- The Project formerly contained three 30,000-gallon #2 fuel oil underground storage tank (UST) systems that were located adjacent to the north of the Physical Plant building, in the northeastern portion of the Project. Interruptible natural gas also serviced the physical plant as a heating fuel. On or about January 18, 1997, #2 fuel oil was detected in the surface water and along the banks of nearby Soapstone Creek. Subsequent investigations determined that the #2 fuel oil was being released to the creek from a storm drain system that was traced back to the physical plant area of the University of the District of Columbia. Oil sorbent booms and pads were used in the creeks and storm drain systems, and petroleum contaminated soils were excavated in January 1997. Monitoring wells were installed and results of laboratory analyses indicated TPH concentrations of 840 to 4,300 mg/kg in soil samples and benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, total xylenes, total BTEX, and naphthalene above detection limits in groundwater samples. Free phase fuel oil was recovered via manual bailing and placed in recovery drums.
- The three 30,000-gallon #2 fuel oil USTs were removed from the ground on February 13-21, 1997. A total of 13,000 gallons of fuel oil and contaminated groundwater were recovered from the excavation with vacuum trucks and 2,007.33 tons of petroleum contaminated soil was excavated and removed for off-site disposal. An additional 633.76 tons of petroleum contaminated soil and 11,700 gallons of fuel oil and contaminated groundwater were removed from the Project from February 22-26, 1997. The former UST area was re-filled with non-contaminated, compacted stone and soil. Impermeable seals were placed on the storm drain to prevent “flushing” of free and dissolved phase contaminants from the Project to potential receptor areas.

- Additional monitoring wells were installed from March 12-14, 1997, to delineate the extent of free and dissolved phase contaminants.
- Visual observations identified eight ground water monitoring wells and two metal covers which appear to be associated with the monitoring wells located north of Building 43 in the general location of the former USTs, as well as to the northeast of the Project. The wells are flush mounted with a cover bolted to the outer casing. Reportedly, the ground water monitoring wells were installed in and after 1997 to investigate the release associated with the former Project USTs. Groundwater monitoring is currently on-going at the Project.
- In addition, Building 41 has a rooftop emergency generator with a 200-gallon diesel belly tank and connection to the 250-gallon diesel aboveground storage tank (AST) located in the B level of the parking garage. Building 39 has a rooftop emergency generator with a diesel day tank, which are both reported to be out of use. Building 43 has an emergency generator located on the northwestern corner of the interior of level C with a 250-gallon fuel oil day tank and connections to the two exterior 8,000-gallon fuel oil ASTs. No visual structural concerns, stainage or visible evidence of leakage was observed. Furthermore, Project personnel were unaware of any releases from the tanks. Based on absence of reported releases and visual observations on the date of the assessment, the presence of the ASTs associated with the emergency generators is not anticipated to have an adverse impact on the environmental integrity of the Project.

#### *Surface Areas (Section 7.7)*

- No issues associated with surface areas were identified. No further action or investigation is recommended regarding surface areas at the Project.
- Visual observation of the storm water system did not identify any abnormal accumulation of petroleum run-off or foreign material. No unusual blockages of the storm water control system were observed. No unusual ponding of storm waters was observed. No further action or investigation is recommended regarding storm water systems at the Project.

#### *Mold (Section 7.8)*

- EMG performed a limited visual assessment for the presence of mold, conditions conducive to mold, and evidence of moisture in readily accessible interior areas of the Project.

Suspect mold growth was observed in the following areas:

- Approximately two square feet of water damaged painted drywall ceiling and ten square feet of water damaged painted concrete masonry walls in the break room of the Building 43 C level. Mr. Emanuel Yeoman was unaware of the cause of the water damage.
- According to Mr. Emanuel Yeoman, the drinking water fountain pipe recently burst on the second level of Buildings 32 and 42, which are connected, flooding the floor. He is in the process of repairing the water damage and addressing the pipe issue.
- According to Mr. Emanuel Yeoman, there is a window leak that floods Room 114B of Building 42 when there is a heavy rain.
- Approximately 16 square feet of ceiling tile was removed from the women's room on Level C of Building 32 due to water damage from a burst pipe on the B level in December of 2008.
- Water staining on the concrete in the stairwells of Building 38 and Building 39 was reportedly caused by leaking sky lights. According to Mr. Emanuel Yeoman, these leaks have been repaired.

- Approximately 15 square feet of water stained ceiling tile was observed in the women's room on the first floor of Building 38. Approximately 20 square feet of water damaged ceiling tile was observed in Room 108 and the first level hallways of Building 38. Approximately five square feet of water damaged ceiling tile was observed in A10 and A14 of Building 38. Approximately 10 square feet of water damaged ceiling tile was observed on the first floor of Building 39. According to Mr. Emanuel Yeoman, the damage was caused from a former leak on the second floor from an open valve that flooded the buildings.
- According to Mr. Emanuel Yeoman, there is a window leak that floods Room 103 of Building 38 when there is a heavy rain.
- Approximately 50 square feet of water damaged painted drywall ceiling in the copy room on level C of Building 39. According to Mr. Emanuel Yeoman, this damage was caused by the leaking expansion joint above the area.
- Approximately two square feet of suspect mold was observed on the drywall in Room CC05 of Building 39. According to Mr. Emanuel Yeoman, this damage was caused by a pipe leak.
- Approximately 12 square feet of suspect mold and water damaged drywall and ceiling tile was observed in Room 311 of Building 44, as well as 20 square feet of water damaged floor tiles in the nearby hallway. According to Mr. Emanuel Yeoman, this damage was caused by a roof leak and the roof has since been repaired.
- Approximately eight square feet of water damaged ceiling tiles were removed from the elevator waiting area of Building 44 and the morgue on the second floor. According to Mr. Emanuel Yeoman, the damage was caused from a leaking chiller.
- Significant water damaged ceiling tiles, dry wall, and carpeting was observed on the fifth, fourth, third, second, and first floors of Building 41. According to Mr. Emanuel Yeoman, the damage was caused by a leaking condensation pan and an overflow from a janitorial sink that flooded the building.
- Approximately 10 square feet of suspect mold on painted drywall ceiling in the electrical closet of the parking garage B level. Mr. Emanuel Yeoman was unaware of the cause of the damage.
- Approximately 10 square feet of suspect mold on painted drywall ceiling in the electrical closet of the parking garage B level. Mr. Emanuel Yeoman was unaware of the cause of the damage.
- Significant water damage to concrete was noted throughout the parking garage.

Prior to remediation by personnel specifically trained in the handling of hazardous materials, a mold assessment should be conducted by a health and safety professional with experience performing microbial investigations. Additional information about the source of the moisture is included in EMGs Property Condition Assessment (PCA) report.

### *Regulatory Review (Section 9)*

- Based on review of the regulatory database report, the Project is listed in multiple databases. Information in the FINDS database indicates the Project (also listed as Van Ness Power Plant Campus) is listed on the Aerometric Information Retrieval System Facility Subsystem (AFS) database, the RCRA Info information system, and the Integrated Compliance Information System (ICIS). Information in the ICIS database indicates the Project (also listed as The Teachers College) was on the national enforcement and compliance program for Enforcement Action ID #'s 03-2000-0535, 03-1997-0148, and 03-1997-0133. Information in the ICIS database indicates the Van Ness Power Plant Campus is listed for Enforcement Action ID # 03-1997-0232. The ICIS listings appear to be associated with the AFS and RCRA Info listings; however, no details pertaining to the ICIS, AFS, or RCRA Info listings was available in the regulatory database report. Information in the MLTS database indicates the Project first obtained a license (#08-16631-02) to possess or use radioactive materials on March 2, 1983 and the license expiration date is May 31, 2015. Information in the LUST database indicates that the Project (listed as DC Public Schools, Facility ID# 3-001818) is listed with an open case status for a release reported on January 18, 1997 (Case # 97034). Information in the UST database indicates the Project had three 30,000-gallon heating oil USTs that are listed as permanently out of use. Information in the CERC-NFRAP database describes an incident at the Project as “UDC Oil Spill” under Site ID # 0305283. The CERC-NFRAP database describes the Project as being located in a highly commercial and residential area of the northwest section of Washington and that Soapstone Creek is approximately 500 feet from the University in an easterly direction. Reportedly, a release was discovered on January 18, 1997, and a finding of “no further remedial action” was given on October 14, 1999. The case for the Project was archived on August 24, 2000. More information regarding the former on-site USTs and the circumstances being the LUST and CERC-NFRAP cases is included in Sections 6.7 and 7.6. Information in the RCRA-LQG and Manifest databases indicates the Project has been a large quantity generator of hazardous wastes since 1977 and the United States Government was a generator on-site since 1918. The Project was identified with multiple violations, all of which were brought in to regulatory compliance. More information regarding the hazardous wastes generated at the Project is included in the *Wastes* discussion above. EMG recommends groundwater quality sampling and laboratory analysis be continued at the Project in accordance with all applicable regulations and requirements in order to achieve regulatory closure.
- Based on review of the regulatory database report, none of the off-site listed facilities are anticipated to have negatively impacted the environmental integrity of the Project.

### *Adjacent Properties (Section 10)*

- The adjacent property uses to the east were identified on the UST, FINDS, RCRA-CESQG, Manifest, and LUST databases. The adjacent property uses to the south were identified on the UST, Manifest, and RCRA-CESQG databases. The adjacent property use to the northeast was identified on the CERCLIS and FUDS databases. Based on observations and available regulatory information, the adjacent property uses are not anticipated to adversely impact the environmental integrity of the Project. No further action or investigation is recommended regarding the adjacent properties.

---

## **2.2. RECOMMENDATIONS/OPINIONS**

---

The following additional actions and investigations are recommended:

- EMG recommends that any additional ACM documentation be provided for review and comment. The cost for document review is \$700 plus \$175 per hour after the first four hours. If this documentation is not available or is insufficient, additional investigation in the form of a comprehensive asbestos survey may be necessary to more fully evaluate the potential for ACM at the Project.

Associated cost estimate (comprehensive survey).....\$31,000

- Prior to remediation by personnel specifically trained in the handling of hazardous materials, a mold assessment should be conducted by a health and safety professional with experience performing microbial investigations. Additional information about the source of the moisture is included in EMGs Property Condition Assessment (PCA) reports.

Associated cost estimate for the mold assessment.....\$25,200

- EMG recommends continued groundwater sampling and laboratory analysis in accordance with applicable regulations and requirements in order to achieve regulatory closure.



---

### 3. SURVEY APPROACH/PURPOSE

---

EMG conducted an on-site Environmental Site Assessment of the Project that consisted of a walk-through observation of the accessible areas and interviews with facility personnel and local agency representatives. On-site activities and/or interviews were conducted by Ms. Clarissa Lobaugh, EMG Project Manager, with:

- Mr. David Watts, On-site Point of Contact (POC) and General Counsel
- Ms. Tamiko Bryant, Director of Environmental Health and Safety
- Mr. Emanuel Yeoman, Maintenance Specialist

A Pre-Survey Questionnaire was completed as a part of this assessment which is included in the Appendices (Section 11). The Questionnaire was completed by the POC. Information obtained from the Questionnaire has been used in the preparation of this report.

Areas accessed included the Project boundaries as well as all common areas and all exterior areas of the Physical Plant, Building 32, Building 42, Building 38, Building 39, Building 44, Building 41, and the parking garage.

Visual observation above the drop ceiling tiles was performed as a part of this assessment in the areas where the drop ceiling tiles had previously been removed due to water damage.

Other than the areas noted above, visual observation above the drop ceiling tiles was not performed as a part of this assessment.

Visual observation of pipe chases and behind walls was not performed as a part of this assessment.

Specific areas to which access was limited include the following:

- Classrooms where school was in session (these areas were viewed from the hallway)
- Diesel AST room for Homeland Security in Building 41 B-level parking – security issue
- Remediation building located north of the Building 43 used as the Physical Plant – no keys
- Building 42 Room 110 Laboratory – dormant with no keys
- Building 42 Room CC02 – no keys
- Building 32 Room C03 Laboratory – dormant with no keys (blue plastic 55-gallon drums visible from hallway windows)
- Building 39 Room A02 Childcare – confidentiality issue
- Building 39 Level 2 Cashier office – security issue
- Building 44 Room 320 – no keys
- Building 44 Room P01 – no keys
- Tunnels that were reportedly used by the National Bureau of Standards and remain under the Project – security issue

According to Mr. Emanuel Yeoman, the areas not assessed were similar in construction and conditions to the areas assessed. Mr. Yeoman also stated that he is unaware of any practices in the unaccessed areas (such as the improper handling of hazardous materials or the generation of hazardous, medical, or regulated wastes) which would constitute a material threat or release to the environment, or a hazard to human health. Based on a review of tenant activities and interviews with knowledgeable personnel, it is unlikely that the operations in the unaccessed areas have had an adverse impact on the environmental integrity of the Project.

Weather conditions at the time of the Project assessment were clear, with temperatures in the 30s (°F) and light winds.

EMG reviewed available federal, state, and local records in an effort to identify sites of known or suspected hazardous waste activity located at or near the Project which could have an adverse impact on the Project. In an attempt to determine whether historical uses of the Project and surrounding area have had an environmental impact on the Project, EMG interviewed individuals knowledgeable about the Project and reviewed available pertinent records and documents. This assessment is based on the evaluation of the information gathered, laboratory analysis of samples collected (when required), and accessibility at the time of the assessment.

The purpose of this report is to provide the Client an assessment concerning environmental conditions (limited to those issues identified in the report) as they existed at the Project. The assessment was conducted utilizing generally accepted Phase I industry standards using the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Standard Practice E 1527-05. The scope of work included an evaluation of:

- The Project history in an attempt to identify any possible ownership(s) and/or uses that would suggest an impact to the environmental integrity of the Project as identified through review of reasonably ascertainable standard historical sources.
- Physical characteristics of the Project as identified through review of reasonably ascertainable topographic maps.
- Current Project conditions (as applicable), including compliance with appropriate regulations as they pertain to the presence or absence of:
  - Facility storage tanks, drums, containers (above or below ground), etc.
  - Transformers and other electrical equipment which utilize fluid which may potentially contain PCBs
  - The use of hazardous materials/chemicals and petroleum products, and/or the generation, treatment, storage, or disposal of hazardous, regulated, or medical wastes
- An evaluation of information contained in programs such as the NPL, CERCLIS, SHWS, RCRIS, SWF, LUST, and other governmental information systems within specific search distances of the Project. This evaluation was performed to identify any sites that would have the potential to impact the environmental integrity of the Project.

The regulatory agency report provided is based on an evaluation of the data collected and compiled by a contracted data research company. The report is based on a radius search which focuses on both the Project and neighboring sites that may impact the Project. Neighboring sites listed in governmental environmental records are identified within a specific search distance. The search distance varies depending upon the particular government record being checked. The search is designed to meet the requirements of ASTM Standard E 1527-05. The information provided is assumed to be correct and complete.

- Visual observation of the adjacent properties to identify high-risk neighbors and the potential for known or suspected contamination to migrate onto the Project.

In addition, at the Client's request, the assessment included the following:

- A review of the physical characteristics of the Project as identified through review of reasonably ascertainable wetlands, flood plain, soils, geology, and groundwater data.
- A screening approach for the potential existence of:
  - Asbestos, including the visual identification of all suspect materials in accessible areas (interior and exterior). The materials are considered suspect until tested and proven otherwise. Friable materials are those which can be easily crumbled or pulverized by hand pressure.

This screening approach is not a comprehensive (i.e., AHERA-Style) asbestos survey, nor is it intended to fulfill the NESHAP requirements for demolition/renovation purposes, but is intended to identify the potential for an asbestos hazard in accessible areas. This screening is not intended to be used for demolition, abatement, renovation, or repair work.

The basis for “suspect” determination is taken from the materials listed in Appendix G of the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) publication *Managing Asbestos in Place* (the “Green Book”). Therefore, all materials listed in the Green Book which were installed prior to 1981 are considered suspect with the exception of resilient floor tile, asbestos-cement board (transite), and roofing felt, which are considered suspect regardless of installation date (these materials continue to be manufactured and installed in the United States).

- Mold, including the identification of visible mold growth, conditions conducive for mold growth, and evidence of moisture in accessible interior areas of the Project. In addition, EMG interviewed Project personnel regarding any known or suspected mold contamination, water intrusion, or mildew like odor problems. Sampling was not performed as a part of this assessment. EMG notes that this assessment does not constitute a comprehensive mold survey of the Project, and the conclusions made are based solely on observable conditions in readily accessible interior areas of the Project on the assessment date.

---

### 3.1. DATA GAPS

---

The following *significant* data gap was identified:

- EMG was not able to obtain standard historical sources which document the use of the Project back to first developed use or obtain the Project history in five year intervals. Based on the information obtained during the course of this assessment, the absence of this information is considered a *significant* data gap. According to EDR, historical Sanborn maps for the Project prior to 1960 do not exist; however, this is unlikely. Additional investigation in the form of further research to locate older historical Sanborn maps would be necessary to address this data gap.

---

---

## 4. USER PROVIDED INFORMATION

---

---

This Section documents whether the user reported to EMG information pursuant to the responsibilities described in Section 6 of the ASTM Standard E 1527-05.

---

### 4.1. USER ENGAGED ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP LIENS AND ACTIVITY AND USE LIMITATION (AUL) REVIEW

---

The user did not engage EMG to review title and judicial records for environmental liens or Activity and Use Limitations (AULs) recorded against the Project. Furthermore, these documents were not provided to EMG for review. The lack of or inability to obtain this information represents a data gap. Based on the findings of this report, the absence of this information is not considered a *significant* data gap.

---

### 4.2. USER QUESTIONNAIRE

---

A User Questionnaire was provided to the user (Client) to assist the user and EMG in gathering information from the user that may be material to identifying RECs. EMG did not receive a response to the User Questionnaire that was provided to the user. Furthermore, the user did not provide any of the information requested in the questionnaire and required by Section 6 of the ASTM Standard E 1527-05. The lack of or inability to obtain this information represents a data gap. However, based on the findings of this report, the absence of this information is not considered a *significant* data gap.

---

### 4.3. REASON FOR ASSESSMENT

---

The reason of the assessment was not provided by the user; therefore, it is assumed that the purpose is to qualify for an LLP to CERCLS liability.

---

---

## 5. PROJECT LOCATION/DESCRIPTION

---

---

The Project is located at 4200 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest in Washington, District of Columbia 20008.

---

### 5.1. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

---

The Project lands consist of approximately 21.8 acre of land.

The Project is currently an academic facility and consists of eight buildings including the following:

- Building 32 (five levels), occupied by the Mathematics Department and reportedly constructed in 1974-1975.
- Building 38 (six levels), occupied by Student Services and the Law Department and reportedly constructed in 1974-1975.
- Building 39 (six levels), occupied by Administrative and Financial Aid and reportedly constructed in 1974-1975.
- Building 41 (seven levels), occupied by the Arts and Library Department and reportedly constructed in 1979-1980.
- Building 42 (five levels), occupied by the Engineering Department and reportedly constructed in 1978-1979.
- Building 43 (three levels), used as the Physical Plant and reportedly constructed in 1978.
- Building 44 (seven levels), occupied by the Life Sciences Department and reportedly constructed in 1980.
- Two-level underground parking garage, reportedly constructed in 1979-1981.

The Project is serviced by public water and sanitary sewer systems. The Project is supplied with water from the District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority. According to the annual water quality report, the drinking water supplied to the Project is within federal, state, and local drinking water quality standards.

Domestic hot water is generated by electrically powered water heaters in each building. The associated piping was observed to be insulated with fiberglass and suspect asbestos.

HVAC systems observed consisted of the following:

- Heat is currently supplied to the Project from a temporary natural gas-fired boiler located on the eastern exterior elevation of Building 43. According to Emanuel Yeoman, the Project formerly had two fuel oil-fired boilers installed inside Building 43 that were removed and two combination natural-gas and fuel oil-fired boilers are being installed. Where observed, piping associated with the heating system was insulated with fiberglass and suspect asbestos-containing thermal system insulation.
- Air-conditioning is supplied to the Project via chillers located on the rooftop of Building 43.

---

### 5.2. MISCELLANEOUS SYSTEMS

---

- X-ray machines – Two X-ray machines are located in Building 44 (see Sections 7.1, 7.2, and 7.3 for a further discussion).

- Emergency generators — Building 41 has a rooftop emergency generator with a 200-gallon diesel belly tank and connection to the 250-gallon diesel AST located in the B level of the parking garage. Building 39 has a rooftop emergency generator with a diesel day tank, which are both reported to be out of use. Building 43 has an emergency generator located on the northwestern corner of the interior of level C with a 250-gallon fuel oil day tank and connections to the two exterior 8,000-gallon fuel oil ASTs (see Section 7.6 for a further discussion).
- Cable Elevators — Building 32 and Building 42 share two cable-driven, traction elevators. Building 38 contains two cable-driven, traction elevators. Building 39 contains two cable-driven, traction elevators. Building 44 contains three cable-driven, traction elevators. Building 41 contains five cable-driven, traction elevators. The presence of this equipment is not anticipated to have adversely impacted the environmental integrity of the Project.
- Hydraulic Elevator – One hydraulic elevator is currently in use in Building 38 (see Section 7.4 for a further discussion).
- Trash compactor — One hydraulic trash compactor is located on the northern exterior elevation of Building 38 (see Section 7.4 for a further discussion).

---

### 5.3. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

---

#### 5.3.1. Topography

Review of the Washington West, District of Columbia Topographic Quadrangle, published by the United States Geological Survey (USGS) and dated 1965 (photo-revised in 1983), indicated the following:

- The Project has an average elevation of approximately 280 feet above mean sea level. Elevations range from approximately 300 feet in the southwest portion of the Project to approximately 271 feet in the northeast portion of the Project. Slope in the general area of the Project also is to the northeast.
- The Project is shown to be improved with multiple outlined structures, which appear to correspond to the current improvements.
- The slope of the Project is estimated between approximately zero and eight percent in a northeasterly direction. The nearest surface water feature, Rock Creek, is located approximately 500 feet northeast of the Project.

A copy of the topographic map is appended (Section 11).

---

#### 5.3.2. Wetlands

Review of the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) Map, published by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and dated 2005, indicated the following:

- No wetland areas are indicated at the Project or adjacent properties.

A copy of the wetland map is appended (Section 11).

---

### 5.3.3. Floodplain

Review of the Flood Insurance Rate Map, published by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and dated 1985, indicated the following:

- The Project is located in Zone C, areas outside the 1-percent annual chance floodplain, areas of 1% annual chance sheet flow flooding where average depths are less than 1 foot, areas of 1% annual chance stream flooding where the contributing drainage area is less than 1 square mile, or areas protected from the 1% annual chance flood by levees. No Base Flood Elevations or depths are shown within this zone. Insurance purchase is not required in these zones.

A copy of the flood plain map is appended (Section 11).

---

### 5.3.4. Soils/Geology

Review of the Soil Survey of Washington, District of Columbia published by the United States Department of Agriculture and dated 2005, indicated the following:

- The Project is located in an area comprised of one soil type known as Urban Land (Ub) with estimated slopes between zero and eight percent.
- The urban land complex indicates that one hundred percent of the predominant soil type has been disturbed and covered with an impervious layer consisting of buildings, sidewalks, streets, and other structures.

Review of the Geologic Map of Washington, District of Columbia, published by the USGS and dated 1974, indicated the following:

- The Project is located within the Piedmont physiographic province of the District of Columbia, which consists of Cambrian metavolcanic rocks and Paleozoic sedimentary materials.

---

### 5.3.5. Groundwater Hydrology

Review of the Groundwater Atlas, published by the USGS and dated 1997, indicated the following:

- The Project is located within the Piedmont and Blue Ridge aquifer formations with estimated groundwater levels between ten and twenty feet below ground surface (bgs).

Shallow groundwater flow is expected to follow the ground level slope of surface elevations towards the nearest open body of water or intermittent stream. The direction of this flow at the Project is anticipated to be toward the northeast.

Estimated groundwater levels may vary due to seasonal fluctuations in precipitation, local usage demands, geology, underground structures, or dewatering operations.

---

---

## 6. HISTORICAL REVIEW

---

---

Review of information available from the District of Columbia Atlas indicated that the Project is shown as part of Block Number 1964 Lot 0803. A copy of the tax map is appended (Section 11).

---

### 6.1. CHAIN OF TITLE

---

Review of the available deed records at the District of Columbia Atlas indicates that the Project has been owned by the United States of America since January 1, 2001. Deed records were researched back to 2001.

---

### 6.2. PRIOR USE INTERVIEWS

---

EMG met with Mr. David Watts, On-site Point of Contact (POC) and General Counsel, who was cooperative and provided information which appeared to be accurate based upon our subsequent site observations. It is EMG's opinion that Mr. Watts was somewhat knowledgeable about the Project and questions EMG posed during the interview process. Mr. Watts was unaware of the construction dates of the Project buildings or any prior uses of the Project. Mr. Watts indicated that he has been associated with the Project for the past year and a half.

EMG interviewed Ms. Tamiko Bryant, Director of Environmental Health and Safety, who was cooperative and provided information which appeared to be accurate based upon our subsequent site observations. It is EMG's opinion that Ms. Bryant was somewhat knowledgeable about the Project, and the questions EMG posed during the interview process. According to Ms. Bryant, the Project was developed in the 1970s into the current use. Ms. Bryant stated that prior to the current use the Project was used as a government facility. Ms. Bryant indicated that she has been associated with the Project for four years.

EMG interviewed Mr. Emanuel Yeoman, Maintenance Specialist, who was cooperative and provided information which appeared to be accurate based upon our subsequent site observations. It is EMG's opinion that Mr. Yeoman was somewhat knowledgeable about the Project, and the questions EMG posed during the interview process. According to Mr. Yeoman, the Project was developed in the 1970s into the current use. Mr. Yeoman stated that prior to the current use the Project was used as the National Bureau of Standards. Mr. Yeoman indicated that he has been associated with the Project for 22 years.

---

### 6.3. LOCAL AND/OR STATE GOVERNMENT AGENCY RECORD REVIEW/INTERVIEWS

---

EMG submitted a written Request for Information to the District of Columbia Fire Prevention and Emergency Management Services on December 9, 2008. If a response is received, any environmentally significant information will be submitted to the Client. However, this department does not typically respond in a timely manner, nor is documentation readily accessible once a response is received. As such, EMG does not anticipate that this agency will be able to provide requested documentation within the timeline of this assessment; however, it is not anticipated that this agency would maintain any environmentally significant information that has not already been obtained through other sources.

EMG submitted a written Request for Information to the District of Columbia Department of Consumer Affairs on December 9, 2008. Upon receipt and review, any environmentally significant information will be submitted to the Client.

Review of the available zoning records from the District of Columbia Office of Zoning website indicates that the Project is currently zoned Single-Family Detached Dwellings (R-1-B). The Project has maintained the R-1-B zoning designation since at least July 29, 2003.

---

#### 6.4. HISTORICAL MAPS

---

EMG reviewed available Sanborn maps as provided by EDR. Historical maps are detailed scale drawings that show the location and use of buildings and structures that occupied a given area. EMG's map search revealed the following:

Review of the 1916 historical maps indicated the following:

- Project: The Project is not shown on the map.
- Off-site: The area east of the Project is shown as undeveloped. The area southeast of the Project is shown as undeveloped.

The 1927 historical map indicated the following:

- Project: The Project is not shown on the map.
- Off-site: The area east of the Project is shown as a filling station with six gasoline tanks located at 4201 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest. The area southeast of the Project is shown as dwellings located at 4111-4123 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest.

The 1960 historical maps indicated the following:

- Project: The Project is improved with multiple structures. Notations on the map indicate that the Project is used as part of the National Bureau of Standards. Specifically, the buildings are labeled as an Optical Glass Department Plant and offices (no building number), a Supplies Warehouse (no building number), a High Pressure Laboratory constructed in 1956 (Building 124), an Automobile Building (no building number), a Paint Shop (Building 66), Laboratories (Building 93, Building 97, Building 65, Building 64, Building 68, Building 72, Building 75, Building 64, Building 62, Building 61, and Building 49), a Vault (Building 60), two large Industrial Laboratories (no building numbers) and two High Voltage Laboratories (Buildings 70 and 72) that were constructed in 1949-1953.
- Off-site: The area north of the Project is shown as part of the National Bureau of Standards with a Quonset hut for Shops (Building 63), a Woodworking Shop (Building 102), a Combustion Research Laboratory (Building 96), a Gravitational Chamber (Building 59), a Polymer Laboratory (Building 121), a Tire Testing Laboratory (Building 120), and four storage warehouses (Buildings 100, 101, 53, and 54). In addition, a filling station that was constructed in 1957 is shown located at 4300 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest, a used automobile sales lot is located at 4326 Connecticut Avenue, a Department Store is located at 4250 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest, and a Furnace Shop and Repair is located at 4244 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest. The area east of the Project is shown as a used automobile sales lot located at 4315 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest, a filling station with six gasoline tanks located at 4301 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest, a filling station with ten gasoline tanks and an automobile greasing and service building located at 4225 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest, an automobile sales and service building is shown located at 4213-4221 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest and a filling station with seven gasoline tanks and an automobile greasing building is shown located at 4201 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest, a filling station is shown as 4401 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest, and a filling station is shown at 4339 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest.

- The area southeast of the Project is shown as dwelling located at 4111-4123 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest. The area south of the Project is shown as the National Bureau of Standards Metallurgical Laboratory (Building 7), Scales (Building 28), Transformer Yard (Building 6), and shed (Building 46). The area west of the Project is shown as part of the National Bureau of Standards with a Wind Tunnel (Building 73), Hangar (Building 76), Maintenance Building, Service Garage, Electronic Test Laboratory Annex (Building 80), and Pembroke Park including but not limited to Liquid Storage Vault #3 (Building 79), Material Testing Laboratory (Building 13), Gamma-Ray Laboratory (Building 122), and another Laboratory (Building 17).

The 1977 historical maps indicated the following:

- Project: Only a portion of the Project is shown. The area of the Project that is shown is improved with a surface level parking lot, two structures that were constructed in 1974-1975 and a warehouse. Notations on the map indicate that the Project is used as Washington Technical Institute.
- Off-site: The area north of the Project is shown as a Warehouse with steel tanks (Building 96). In addition, a filling station is located at 4300 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest. The area east of the Project is shown as a filling station located at 4401 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest, a filling station located at 4339 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest, the Van Ness Shopping Mall located at 4301-4309 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest, a filling station located at 4225 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest, an automobile sales building located at 4221 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest, a commercial building located at 4215 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest, and offices and a commercial building located at 4201 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest. The area southeast of the Project is shown as dwellings located at 4111-4123 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest. The area south of the Project is shown as the Washington Technical Institute Technology Building, Scales (Building 28), and Transformer Yard (Building 6). The area west of the Project is shown as Pembroke Park including but not limited to a Materials Testing Laboratory (Building 13), a Vault (Building 79), a Laboratory (Building 17), and a Gamma-Ray Laboratory (Building 122). It is noted on the map that all buildings in Pembroke Park are vacant with the exception of Buildings 13 and 83.

The 1985 historical maps indicated the following:

- Project: The Project is improved with six structures. Notations on the map indicate that the Project is used as the University of the District of Columbia. Specifically, the buildings are labeled Power Plant constructed in 1978, Engineering (two connected buildings) constructed in 1945-1975 and 1978-1979, Instructional Research constructed in 1979-1980, an underground parking garage constructed in 1979-1980, and another building constructed in 1974-1975.
- Off-site: The area north of the Project is shown as part of the University of the District of Columbia with the fine arts buildings (Buildings 6 and 6A), the Physical Education building, a play field, and surface level parking. In addition, a filling station is located at 4300 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest and a commercial building with a metro entrance is located at 4250 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest. The area east of the Project is shown as a filling station located at 4401 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest, a commercial building located at 4339 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest, the Van Ness Shopping Mall located at 4301-4309 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest, a filling station located at 4225 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest, an automobile sales building located at 4221 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest, a commercial building located at 4215 Connecticut Avenue, and a commercial and office building located at 4201 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest. The area southeast of the Project is shown as dwellings located at 4111-4123 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest. The area south of the Project is shown as Intelsat International Telecommunications Satellite Organization Headquarters building located at 4000 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest. The area west of the Project is shown as Pembroke Park which is denoted as a parking lot.

The 1989 historical maps indicated the following:

- **Project:** The Project is improved with seven structures. Notations on the map indicate that the Project is used as the University of the District of Columbia. Specifically, the buildings are labeled Power Plant (Building 43), Engineering (Building 42), Student Center (Building 38), Administration (Building 39), Allied Health (Building 44), Learning Resources Center (Building 41), and an underground parking garage.
- **Off-site:** The area north of the Project is shown as part of the University of the District of Columbia with the fine arts buildings (Buildings 6 and 6A), the Physical Education Building (Building 47), playing field, and tennis courts. In addition, a commercial building is located at 4300 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest and a commercial building with a metro entrance is located at 4250 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest. The area east of the Project is shown as a commercial building located at 4401 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest, a commercial building located at 4339 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest, the Van Ness Shopping Mall located at 4301-4309 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest, a filling station located at 4225 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest, a commercial building located at 4221 Connecticut Avenue, a commercial building located at 4215 Connecticut Avenue, and a commercial and office building located at 4201 Connecticut Avenue. The area southeast of the Project is shown as dwellings located at 4211-4123 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest. The area south of the Project is shown as International Telecommunications Satellite Organization located at 4000 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest. The area west of the Project is shown as undeveloped.

The 1990 historical map does not differ significantly from the 1989 historical map.

The 1992 historical map does not differ significantly from the 1990 historical map.

The 1995 historical map does not differ significantly from the 1992 historical map.

No other historical maps were identified.

Copies of the historical maps are appended (Section 11).

---

## 6.5. AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY

---

Review of the 1988 aerial photograph, available from USGS Microsoft Terraserver, indicated the following:

- **Project:** The Project is improved with eight structures, including an underground parking facility.
- **Off-site:** The area north of the Project is shown as multiple academic and commercial buildings, tennis courts, and a playing field. The area east of the Project is shown as multiple commercial buildings and as what appears to be a gasoline station. The area south of the Project is shown as a large office building. The area west of the Project is shown as a playing field followed by undeveloped land.

The 2002 aerial photograph, available from USGS Microsoft Terraserver, differs from the 1988 aerial photograph in that:

- **Off-site:** The area south of the Project is shown as further developed with another office building.

Copies of the aerial photographs are appended (Section 11).

## 6.6. PREVIOUS INVESTIGATIONS/ASSESSMENTS

EMG was provided by Ms. Tamiko Bryant, Director of Environmental Health and Safety, with a copy of a previous Response Action Plan report for the Project, prepared by Environmental Consultants and Contractors, Inc. (ECC) and dated May 5, 1997. The Scope of Work for this previous assessment consisted of the investigation and remediation of hazardous materials and/or wastes at the site in a timely manner while adhering to the response action activities. Pertinent information identified in that report is as follows:

- The Project formerly contained three 30,000-gallon #2 fuel oil underground storage tank (UST) systems that were located adjacent to the north of the Physical Plant building, in the northeastern portion of the Project. Interruptible natural gas also serviced the physical plant as a heating fuel. On or about January 18, 1997, the National Park Service (NPS) Police detected #2 fuel oil on the surface water and along the banks of Soapstone Creek. Subsequent investigations by the NPS personnel determined that the #2 fuel oil was being released to Soapstone Creek from a storm drain system that was traced to the physical plant area of the University of the District of Columbia. Oil sorbent booms and pads were used in the creeks and storm drain systems, and petroleum contaminated soils were excavated in January 1997. Monitoring wells (MW) 1 through 4 were installed and results of laboratory analyses indicated TPH concentrations of 840 to 4,300 mg/kg in soil samples and benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, total xylenes, total BTEX, and naphthalene above detection limits in groundwater samples. Free phase fuel oil was recovered via manual bailing and placed in recovery drums.
- The three 30,000-gallon #2 fuel oil USTs were removed from the ground on February 13-21, 1997. A total of 13,000 gallons of fuel oil and contaminated groundwater were recovered from the excavation with vacuum trucks and 2,007.33 tons of petroleum contaminated soil was excavated and removed for off-site disposal. An additional 633.76 tons of petroleum contaminated soil and 11,700 gallons of fuel oil and contaminated groundwater were removed from the Project from February 22-26, 1997. The former UST area was re-filled with non-contaminated, compacted stone and soil. Impermeable seals were placed on the storm drain to prevent “flushing” of free and dissolved phase contaminants from the Project to potential receptor areas.
- MWs 5 through 7 were installed from March 12-14, 1997 to delineate the extent of free and dissolved phase contaminants. According to ECC, depth to the water table was approximately 15 feet beneath the ground surface and the water table slopes to the north-northeast.

EMG was also provided by Ms. Tamiko Bryant with a copy of a Second Quarter 2008 Monitoring Report for the Project, prepared by ECC and dated September 17, 2008. The Scope of Work for this previous assessment consisted of free-phase fuel oil recovery and monitoring. Pertinent information identified in that report is as follows:

- During the Second Quarter 2008, ECC performed bi-weekly well gauging and product removal by hand bailing and quarterly groundwater sampling and analysis. The pump and treat remediation system was shut down on April 12, 2005 and did not operate during the reporting period. Monthly reporting was discontinued after June 2005, and was not to be performed while the remediation system was not operating. The frequency of well gauging and free-phase fuel oil recovery visits was increased from monthly to bi-weekly in February 2006 due to the repeated detection of free-phase oil at MW-15.
- Free-phase fuel oil was detected at MW-15 on all six gauging dates at measured thicknesses ranging from 0.07 to 0.21 foot. From January 27, 1997 through June 25, 2008, manual liquid recovery activities removed a calculated total of 118.5 gallons of free-phase fuel oil from the site monitoring wells.
- Groundwater depths beneath the Project ranged from approximately 11 to 23.5 feet and groundwater movement was towards the northeast. Groundwater mounding was evident, caused by differential water retention in the crushed concrete fill used to replace native soils.

- In addition to gauging and product removal, Project storm drains and storm drain outfalls were monitored for the presence of petroleum vapors and sheens on a monthly basis. No petroleum sheens were observed or petroleum odors sensed by ECC personnel.
- The results of laboratory analysis for groundwater samples indicated that dissolved phase TPH-DRO compounds were detected at concentrations ranging from 0.6 to 110 milligrams per liter and was concentrated at the northern and western sides of the former UST excavation.
- The results of laboratory analysis for groundwater samples indicated that dissolved phase BTEX compounds were detected at total concentrations ranging from 4 to 66 micrograms per liter and were generally very low and spatially distributed in and around the former UST excavation.
- The results of laboratory analysis for groundwater samples indicated that dissolved phase naphthalene was detected at concentrations ranging from 3 to 300 micrograms per liter and were distributed widely around the Project at relatively low to moderate concentrations.
- ECC was scheduled to continue performing twice monthly site gauging and product removal by hand bailing, and quarterly groundwater quality sampling and laboratory analysis during the Third Quarter 2008.

Copies of the pertinent sections of the above-reference reports are appended (Section 11).

---

### 6.7. PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS

---

As-built/renovation-site plans, drawings, and specifications were reviewed at the Project as provided by Mr. Emanuel Yeoman, Maintenance Specialist. Documents reviewed included portions of the Washington Technical Institute Phase 2 Construction plans completed by Bryant and Bryant/Chase/Mariani Architects and dated December 6, 1976. Please note that some of the plans were missing. Review of these documents did not identify any unusual or unique systems/equipment installations.

---

### 6.8. HISTORICAL SUMMARY

---

Based upon interviews and a review of chain of title information, local agency records, historical maps, aerial photographs, and prior reports, the previous Project uses included the National Bureau of Standards (approximately 1918-1960s) prior to the development of the current on-site improvements, beginning in the mid-1970s.

As previously indicated, the Project was historically used as the National Bureau of Standards. Notations on the 1960 Sanborn map indicate that the Project was occupied by an Optical Glass Department Plant and offices (no building number), a Supplies Warehouse (no building number), a High Pressure Laboratory constructed in 1956 (Building 124), an Automobile Building (no building number), a Paint Shop (Building 66), Laboratories (Building 93, Building 97, Building 65, Building 64, Building 68, Building 72, Building 75, Building 64, Building 62, Building 61, and Building 49), a Vault (Building 60), two large Industrial Laboratories (no building numbers) and two High Voltage Laboratories (Buildings 70 and 72) that were constructed in 1949-1953. In addition, tunnels that were reportedly used by the National Bureau of Standards reportedly remain under the Project and were inaccessible during this assessment.

It is possible based on the past uses of the Project as the National Bureau of Standards that the subsurface has been impacted. However, the Project buildings have below grade levels, and during excavation of the below grade levels it is anticipated that any potential associated contamination would have been encountered and removed. Also, because the National Bureau of Standards buildings were removed at least 30 years ago, a natural degradation of any contamination has likely occurred. In addition, there does not appear to be an immediate health risk to the occupants of the Project from this historical use since the Project is serviced by public water and sewer systems and the entire site is covered with relatively impermeable surfaces including the building and sidewalks. Although there is a potential that there has been impact to the subsurface from the past uses, it is unlikely that this poses a significant environmental risk to the operators/occupants of the Project, and no further action or investigation is recommended at this time.

EMG was not able to obtain standard historical sources which document the use of the Project back to first developed use or obtain the Project history in five year intervals. Based on the information obtained during the course of this assessment, the absence of this information is considered a *significant* data gap. Refer to Section 3.1. for additional information about the identification of *significant* data gaps.

## 7. PROJECT RECONNAISSANCE

### 7.1. OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES/NOTEWORTHY TENANTS

The Project is an academic facility and is occupied by the departments listed in the Project Departments Table below.

Project Departments	
Name of Department	Description of Operations
<b>Building 43</b>	
Physical Plant	Heating and cooling of Project buildings
<b>Building 32</b>	
Mathematics	Classrooms and offices
<b>Building 42</b>	
Engineering	Classrooms, laboratories, and offices
<b>Building 38</b>	
Student Services and Law	Classrooms and offices
<b>Building 39</b>	
Administration and Financial Aid	Offices
<b>Building 44</b>	
Life Sciences	Classrooms, laboratories, offices, and clinics
<b>Building 41</b>	
Arts and Library	Classrooms, laboratories, and offices
<b>Parking Garage</b>	
Parking	Parking

Considering the operations assessed at the Project, the following environmental permits and/or registrations are required:

- Certificate of Licensure of Registration for Medical X-ray issued on September 30, 2007 that expires on September 30, 2009.
- Information in the MLTS database indicates the Project first obtained a license (#08-16631-02) to possess or use radioactive materials on March 2, 1983 and the license expiration date is May 31, 2015.
- Information in the RCRA-LQG database indicates the Project has been a large quantity generator of hazardous wastes since 1977 and the United States Government was a generator on-site since 1918.

Environmentally suspect operations/activities conducted at the Project include:

- Physical Plant operations in Building 43 heating and cooling processes.
- Chemistry academic laboratories in Building 44 (Rooms 208, 311, 314, 316, and 317).
- Chemistry academic laboratories in Building 42 (Rooms 215 and 216).
- Biology academic laboratories in Building 44 (Rooms 219, 302, 303, 304, 305, and 306).
- Physics academic laboratories in Building 44 (Rooms 301, 310, 312, 318, and 321).
- Radiology academic laboratories in Building 44 (Rooms 110, 111, 112, and 113).

- Respiratory academic laboratory in Building 44 (Room 117).
- Morgue located in Building 44 (Room 216).
- Asphalt degradation laboratory in Building 42 (Room C12).
- Photography academic laboratories in Building 41 (on second floor) and Building 42 (Room B09).
- Printing shop in Building 42 (Room B09).
- Health Clinic in Building 44 (Room A33).

**7.2. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS/PETROLEUM PRODUCTS STORAGE AND HANDLING**

Visual observation for the use and/or storage of hazardous materials and petroleum products was performed. A large number of hazardous materials are used and stored on-site. A complete list of chemicals stored and used at the Project is available upon request.

Observed Materials			
Type of Material	Quantity	Storage Location	Use
Routine janitorial and maintenance supplies	Retail amounts	Maintenance closets and Building 38 Room C07	Project maintenance and upkeep
Water treatment chemicals	55-gallon drums and 5-gallon pails	Building 43	Heating and cooling processes
Fuel oil	Two 8,000-gallon ASTs and one 250-gallon AST	Building 43	Heating and cooling processes
Hydraulic oil	Minor amounts	Building 43	Machinery
Refrigerants	Upright pressurized canisters	Building 43	Heating and cooling processes
Oxygen and acetylene	Upright pressurized canisters	Building 43	Welding
Propane	Pressurized canisters	Building 42 exterior cage	Forklifts
Diesel	200-gallon AST and 250-gallon AST	Building 41	Emergency generator (Homeland Security)
Academic laboratory chemicals and solvents (A complete list of chemicals stored and used at the Project is available upon request)	5 gallons and under	Buildings 42 and 44	Academic
Developer and fixer	5 gallons each	Building 41, 42, and 44	X-ray and photography development
Oxygen	Upright	Building 44 Clinic and Respiratory Laboratory	Medical

The identified chemicals, materials, and products were observed in their sealed, original containers and in designated storage areas. Materials appeared to be properly stored.

No evidence of spills or staining was observed in the area of product storage/usage.

**7.3. WASTE GENERATION, TREATMENT, STORAGE, AND DISPOSAL**

Visual observation for the generation, treatment, storage, and disposal of wastes was performed. The EMG identified the following waste generation listed in the Waste Generation Table below. Refer to Appendix G for the associated waste manifests.

Waste Generation			
Type of Waste	Generation Process	Pre-Disposal Storage	Disposal Method
<b>+ Hazardous</b>			
Polychlorinated Biphenyls	Laboratory	Laboratory	Licensed waste hauler, Midwest Environmental Transport, Inc.
Waste trichloethylene, waste oxidizing liquids, waste corrosive liquids, waste flammable liquids, waste toxic organic liquids, waste toxic organic solids	Laboratory	Laboratory	Licensed waste hauler, Midwest Environmental Transport, Inc.
Florescent Light Tubes	Maintenance	Maintenance	Licensed waste hauler, Midwest Environmental Transport, Inc.
<b>+ Medical</b>			
Bio-hazardous media and sharps	Medical	Building 44	Licensed waste hauler, Environmental Management Services, Inc.
<b>+ Regulated</b>			
Refrigerants	Cooling	Physical Plant	Rapid Recovery System
Spent X-ray and photograph developer and fixer	X-ray and photograph developing	Buildings 41 and 42	Municipal sanitary system
Waste oil	Machinery	Building 43	Licensed waste hauler, Midwest Environmental Transport, Inc.
<b>+ Non-Hazardous Solid</b>			
Municipal trash	N/A	Dumpsters and garbage compactor	Contracted waste hauler
<b>+ Non-Hazardous Liquid</b>			
Cooking grease	Food preparation	Grease trap, Building 38	Contracted waste hauler
Sewage	N/A	N/A	Municipal sanitary system

No evidence of spills or staining was observed in the area of waste generation or pre-disposal storage.

Review of hazardous and medical waste manifests indicated that the waste disposal operations appear to be performed in accordance with regulatory requirements; however, spent film developing chemicals (e.g., developers, stabilizers, bleaches, and film fixer) are not run through a silver recovery system before they are discharged to the public sewer system. According to Ms. Tamiko Bryant, the Project does not currently have a permit for this activity.

No excessive odors or overflowing/excessive ground trash were noted in the vicinity of the dumpsters and trash compactor. No hazardous, regulated, or medical wastes were noted in the dumpsters and compactor.

Prior to entry into the sanitary sewage, grease is removed in a trap located in Building 38 kitchen. According to Mr. Emanuel Yeoman, the grease trap is cleaned on an as needed basis and the waste grease is disposed by a contracted waste hauler.

---

#### 7.4. POLYCHLORINATED BIPHENYLS (PCBs)

---

The Project is supplied with underground secondary electrical service from pad-mounted electrical transformers with secondary containment in electrical vaults. The transformers are designated as the property of PEPSCO, the public utility. The units are not classified regarding PCB content. The units should be periodically inspected for leakage. If leakage is visible, the Project owner/manager should contact the public utility, which will remediate the situation. Should the units have to be replaced, the utility is responsible, provided the cause is equipment failure, not customer misuse. No leakage of the transformers was observed at the time of the assessment.

The Project also uses secondary electrical service from privately owned “dry type” step-down transformers. Dry type transformers do not use oils for cooling purposes; therefore, these transformers are not expected to contain PCBs.

The Project maintains one hydraulic elevator, which is located in Building 38. Because the unit was installed prior to 1978 (the USEPA banned the manufacturing of PCB-containing hydraulic fluid in 1976, and the manufacture of PCBs ceased in 1977), EMG is of the opinion that the elevator hydraulic fluid potentially contains PCBs. No visual indication of leakage was observed in the area of the elevator operating equipment. The hydraulic elevator unit at the Project should be periodically inspected for leakage. If leakage is identified, the unit should be repaired and any fluid or fluid-soaked waste disposed of in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations.

A hydraulic trash compactor is located at the Project. PCB-containing hydraulic fluid has not been manufactured since 1977. Therefore, based on the date of installation (post 1977), PCB-containing hydraulic fluid is not likely to be found in the operating system. No visual indication of leakage was observed in the area of the equipment.

No additional equipment with the potential to utilize dielectric or hydraulic fluid was observed during the site assessment.

---

#### 7.5. ASBESTOS-CONTAINING MATERIALS (ACM)

---

Suspect ACM in the form of resilient floor tiles/mastic, sheet flooring, ceiling tiles, drywall/joint compound, spray applied fireproofing, pipe wrap, insulation, and roofing materials were visually identified during the on-site assessment.

No samples were collected based on the Scope of Work.

No ACM documentation was provided during the site assessment, with the exception of the October 20, 2006 Limited Hazardous Building Materials Survey Report completed by MACTEC Engineering and Consulting, Inc. (MACTEC) for a portion of Building 43. The purpose of the MACTEC report was to identify ACM and lead-containing surface coatings in boiler components and associated piping that would be impacted during the boiler replacement. Skim coat mud on fiberglass pipe insulation, boiler stack exhaust insulation, boiler door insulation, interior boiler fire brick, and debris were sampled during the inspection. The laboratory analysis indicated that the skim coat mud on the fiberglass pipe insulation associated with the medium pressure steam and feed pipes contained 2-3% Chrysotile asbestos. Results for the other suspect materials sampled by MACTEC were “none detected”. MACTEC recommended that the ACM mud on fiberglass pipe insulation associated with the boiler piping be removed by a qualified asbestos abatement contractor licensed in the District of Columbia prior to being impacted by renovation activities.

**7.6. FACILITY STORAGE TANKS AND PIPELINES (ABOVE OR BELOW GROUND)**

The Storage Tank Table below describes the former underground storage tanks (USTs) and current aboveground storage tanks (ASTs) that were identified at the Project:

Storage Tank Table			
	Tank Numbers 1, 2, and 3	Tank Number 4	Tank Number 5
Type: AST/UST	UST	AST	AST
Location	North of Building 43 – Physical Plant	Building 41 rooftop (Homeland Security)	Building 41 B level parking (Homeland Security)
Construction Material	Unspecified	Steel	Unspecified
Year Installed	Unspecified	Unspecified	Unspecified
Tank Size/Capacity	30,000 gallons each	200 gallons	250 gallons
Contents	Heating oil	Diesel	Diesel
Use of Contents	Heating processes	Emergency generator belly tank	Emergency generator
Tank Status (Active, Inactive, Removed, Abandoned)	All removed (1997)	Active	Active
Registered (Yes/No)	Yes	N/R	N/R
LUST List (Yes/No)	Yes	No	No
	Tank Number 6	Tank Numbers 7 and 8	Tank Number 9
Type: AST/UST	AST	AST	AST
Location	Building 39 rooftop (Radio Station)	North of Building 43 – Physical Plant	Northern interior of Building 43 – Physical Plant
Construction Material	Steel	Steel	Steel
Year Installed	Unspecified	1997	Unspecified
Tank Size/Capacity	45 gallons	8,000 gallons each	250-gallon
Contents	Diesel	Fuel oil	Fuel oil
Use of Contents	Emergency generator day tank	Heating processes and emergency generator in Building 43	Emergency generator day tank with steel secondary containment
Tank Status (Active, Inactive, Removed, Abandoned)	Inactive	Active	Active
Registered (Yes/No)	N/R	No	N/R
LUST List (Yes/No)	No	No	No

N/R = Tank is not required to be registered.

Mr. Emanuel Yeoman was unaware of any releases from the ASTs. The ASTs appeared to be in good condition with no evidence of releases such as staining.

A release was identified from the three 30,000-gallon USTs that were removed from the Project in 1997. Please refer to Section 6.7 for a discussion of the release and the subsequent actions taken to address contamination.

In addition, visual observations identified eight ground water monitoring wells and two metal covers which appear to be associated with the monitoring wells, all of which are located north of Building 43 in the general location of the former USTs, as well as to the northeast of the Project. The wells are flush mounted with a cover bolted to the outer casing. According to the Response Action Plan (discussed in Section 6.7), the ground water monitoring wells were installed in and after 1997 to investigate the reported release associated with the former on-site USTs. The prior report noted that the measured ground water levels were approximately 15 feet below ground surface. In addition, the ground water flow direction was reported to be toward the north-northeast.

The additional manways and surface caps observed at the Project were for site services (i.e., domestic water, storm water, and sanitary sewer system).

Based on the review of the state list of registered USTs, no current USTs are registered for the Project.

Interviews with persons knowledgeable of the Project did not identify any evidence of additional current or historic storage tanks (above or below ground) at the Project.

Visual observations did not identify any surface markings indicating the existence of subsurface product pipelines at the Project.

---

## 7.7. SURFACE AREAS

---

The land surface of the Project slopes steeply to the northeast. Surface water flow is in a northeasterly direction.

Visual observation of the Project and adjacent properties did not identify any evidence of distressed vegetation, staining, or surface migration of petroleum releases or hazardous materials onto or off the Project.

Visual observations did not identify any evidence of on-site surface impoundment facilities, pits, dry wells, or dumping of apparent hazardous substances at the Project.

Visual observations did not identify any surface water features including lagoons, ponds or other bodies of water at the Project.

The Project utilizes an underground parking garage. According to Mr. Emanuel Yeoman, road water, oil and dirt flow to storm water sewer drains on the lower level of the parking garage.

Storm water from the roof areas is directed to the municipal sewer via internal drains. Storm water from vegetated surface areas naturally infiltrates into the subsurface.

---

## 7.8. MOLD

---

EMG performed a limited visual assessment for the presence of mold, conditions conducive to mold, and evidence of moisture in readily accessible interior areas of the Project.

Suspect mold growth and water damage was observed in the following areas:

- Approximately two square feet of water damaged painted drywall ceiling and ten square feet of water damaged painted concrete masonry walls in the break room of the Building 43 C level. Mr. Emanuel Yeoman was unaware of the cause of the water damage.
- According to Mr. Emanuel Yeoman, the drinking water fountain pipe recently burst on the second level of Buildings 32 and 42, which are connected, flooding the floor. He is in the process of repairing the water damage and addressing the pipe issue.
- According to Mr. Emanuel Yeoman, there is a window leak that floods Room 114B of Building 42 when there is a heavy rain.

- Approximately 16 square feet of ceiling tile was removed from the women's room on Level C of Building 32 due to water damage from a burst pipe on the B level in December of 2008.
- Water staining on the concrete in the stairwells of Building 38 and Building 39 was reportedly caused by leaking sky lights. According to Mr. Emanuel Yeoman, these leaks have been repaired.
- Approximately 15 square feet of water stained ceiling tile was observed in the women's room on the first floor of Building 38. Approximately 20 square feet of water damaged ceiling tile was observed in Room 108 and the first level hallways of Building 38. Approximately five square feet of water damaged ceiling tile was observed in A10 and A14 of Building 38. Approximately 10 square feet of water damaged ceiling tile was observed on the first floor of Building 39. According to Mr. Emanuel Yeoman, the damage was caused from a former leak on the second floor from an open valve that flooded the buildings.
- According to Mr. Emanuel Yeoman, there is a window leak that floods Room 103 of Building 38 when there is a heavy rain.
- Approximately 50 square feet of water damaged painted drywall ceiling in the copy room on level C of Building 39. According to Mr. Emanuel Yeoman, this damage was caused by the leaking expansion joint above the area.
- Approximately two square feet of suspect mold was observed on the drywall in Room CC05 of Building 39. According to Mr. Emanuel Yeoman, this damage was caused by a pipe leak.
- Approximately 12 square feet of suspect mold and water damaged drywall and ceiling tile was observed in Room 311 of Building 44, as well as 20 square feet of water damaged floor tiles in the nearby hallway. According to Mr. Emanuel Yeoman, this damage was caused by a roof leak and the roof has since been repaired.
- Approximately eight square feet of water damaged ceiling tiles were removed from the elevator waiting area of Building 44 and the morgue on the second floor. According to Mr. Emanuel Yeoman, the damage was caused from a leaking chiller.
- Significant water damaged ceiling tiles, dry wall, and carpeting was observed on the fifth, fourth, third, second, and first floors of Building 41. According to Mr. Emanuel Yeoman, the damage was caused by a leaking condensation pan and an overflow from a janitorial sink that flooded the building.
- Approximately 10 square feet of suspect mold on painted drywall ceiling in the electrical closet of the parking garage B level. Mr. Emanuel Yeoman was unaware of the cause of the damage.
- Approximately 10 square feet of suspect mold on painted drywall ceiling in the electrical closet of the parking garage B level. Mr. Emanuel Yeoman was unaware of the cause of the damage.
- Significant water damage to concrete was noted throughout the parking garage.

This assessment does not constitute a comprehensive mold survey of the Project. The reported observations and conclusions are based solely on interviews with Project personnel and conditions as observed in readily accessible interior areas of the Project on the assessment date.

---

---

## 8. INTERVIEWS

---

---

---

### 8.1. KEY SITE MANAGER

---

EMG met with Mr. David Watts, Key Site Manager, On-site Point of Contact (POC), and General Counsel. Mr. Watts was interviewed by EMG during the site visit and provided information regarding the history of the Project and operations at the Project.

A Pre-Survey Questionnaire was completed as a part of this assessment which is included in the Appendices (Section 11). The Questionnaire was completed by the Key Site Manager. Information obtained from the Questionnaire has been used in the preparation of this report. Mr. Watts indicated that he was not aware of any pending, threatened, or past litigation or administrative proceedings relevant to hazardous substances or petroleum products, or notices from any governmental entity regarding possible violation of environmental laws or possible liability related to hazardous substances or petroleum products.

---

### 8.2. OWNER

---

EMG submitted an Owner Questionnaire to the user in an effort to identify the owner of the Project that could be interviewed to provide information regarding proceedings involving the Project. A completed Owner Questionnaire was not returned to EMG. The lack of or inability to obtain this information represents a data gap. However, based on the findings of this report, the absence of this information is not considered a *significant* data gap.

---

### 8.3. USER

---

EMG submitted a User Questionnaire to the user in an effort to identify the owner of the Project that could be interviewed to provide information regarding proceedings involving the Project. A completed User Questionnaire was not returned to EMG. The lack of or inability to obtain this information represents a data gap. However, based on the findings of this report, the absence of this information is not considered a *significant* data gap.

---

### 8.4. OCCUPANTS

---

EMG interviewed Ms. Tamiko Bryant, Director of Environmental Health and Safety, who was cooperative and provided information which appeared to be accurate based upon our subsequent site observations. It is EMG's opinion that Ms. Bryant was somewhat knowledgeable about the Project, and the questions EMG posed during the interview process. According to Ms. Bryant, the Project was developed in the 1970s into the current use. Ms. Bryant stated that prior to the current use the Project was used as a government facility. Ms. Bryant indicated that she has been associated with the Project for four years.

EMG interviewed Mr. Emanuel Yeoman, Maintenance Specialist, who was cooperative and provided information which appeared to be accurate based upon our subsequent site observations. It is EMG's opinion that Mr. Yeoman was somewhat knowledgeable about the Project, and the questions EMG posed during the interview process. According to Mr. Yeoman, the Project was developed in the 1970s into the current use. Mr. Yeoman stated that prior to the current use the Project was used as the National Bureau of Standards. Mr. Yeoman indicated that he has been associated with the Project for the past twenty-two years.

---

### **8.5. PAST OWNERS, OPERATORS, AND OCCUPANTS**

---

No past owners, operators, or occupants of the Project who would likely have material information regarding the potential for contamination at the Project were identified.

---

### **8.6. OWNERS OR OCCUPANTS OF ADJACENT OR NEARBY PROPERTY**

---

The Project was not an abandoned property with evidence of unauthorized uses or uncontrolled access; therefore, interviews were not conducted with adjacent or nearby property owners or occupants.

---

### **8.7. INTERVIEWS WITH OTHERS**

---

No other individuals were interviewed as part of this assessment.

---

---

## 9. REGULATORY DATABASE REVIEW

---

---

Based on review of the regulatory database report, and by cross-referencing name, address, and zip code, EMG concludes that the Project is listed on the regulatory database. Furthermore, the area search of the Project for sites listed in these databases identified various sites outlined in the regulatory database report included in the Appendices, Section 11. Information about the listed sites is included below.

EMG also reviewed the unmappable sites in the database report, cross-referencing addresses and site names. Unmappable sites are environmental risk sites that cannot be plotted with confidence, but can be located by zip code or city name. In general, a site cannot be geocoded because of inaccurate or missing location information in the record provided by the agency. Any identified unmappable site within the specified search radii is included below.

The following are some of the databases which were reviewed for this assessment. See the appended regulatory database report for a complete listing of databases reviewed for this assessment:

- **NPL Listing:** The National Priorities (Superfund) List (NPL) is United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA's) database of uncontrolled or abandoned hazardous waste sites identified for priority remedial actions under the Superfund Program.
- **Delisted NPL Listing:** The Delisted NPL database is a listing of sites which have been deleted from the NPL list by the USEPA.
- **RCRA-TSD Facilities Listing:** The USEPA's Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Program identifies and tracks hazardous waste from the point of generation to the point of disposal. The RCRA-TSD database is a compilation by the USEPA of reporting facilities that transport, treat, store or dispose of hazardous waste.
- **RCRA-Corrects Facilities Listing:** The USEPA's Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Corrective Action-sites Listing contains information pertaining to hazardous waste treatment, storage, and disposal facilities (RCRA TSD) which have conducted, or are currently conducting, a corrective action(s) as regulated under RCRA.
- **CERCLIS Listing:** This database is a compilation of sites which the USEPA has investigated or is currently investigating for a release or threatened release of hazardous substances.
- **NFRAP Listing:** This database contains information regarding sites which have been removed from the USEPA CERCLIS database.
- **RCRIS-Generator Listing:** The USEPA identifies and tracks hazardous waste from the point of generation to the point of disposal through the Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System (RCRIS). The RCRIS-Generators database is a compilation by the USEPA of facilities that report hazardous waste generation.
- **Emergency Response Notification System (ERNS):** The ERNS is a national database used to collect information on reported releases of oil or hazardous substances.
- **Integrated Compliance Information System (ICIS):** The ICIS supports the information needs of the national enforcement and compliance program as well as the unique needs of the NPDES program.
- **Material Licensing Tracking System (MLTS):** MLTS is maintained by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and contains a list of sites which possess or use radioactive materials and which are subject to NRC licensing requirements.
- **Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS):** FUDS are properties where the United States Army Corps of Engineers is actively working or will take necessary cleanup actions.

- **Federal institutional control registry:** This database contains information on-sites with federal institutional controls.
- **Federal engineering control registry:** This database contains information on-sites with federal engineering controls.
- **SHWS Listing:** The District of Columbia does not maintain a SHWS database; therefore, the search distance for the CERCLIS database was extended to cover the appropriate distance that the SHWS database would have been searched.
- **SWF Listing:** This database is a comprehensive listing of all State Permitted Solid Waste Landfills.
- **Leaking Underground Storage Tanks:** This database contains a summary of information pertaining to leaking underground storage tank (LUST) sites identified by the state.
- **Underground Storage Tanks:** This database contains a summary of information pertaining to registered underground storage tanks (USTs) identified by the state.
- **State Brownfield sites:** This database contains information on brownfield sites as maintained by the State.
- **State Voluntary Cleanup Sites:** This database contains a listing of sites which are in the State voluntary cleanup program
- **Tribal Voluntary Cleanup Sites:** This database contains a listing of sites which are in the Tribal voluntary cleanup program
- **Tribal ODI Listing:** This database contains information on Tribal ODI sites.
- **Tribal LUST:** This database contains information on Tribal LUST sites.
- **Tribal UST:** This database contains information on Tribal UST sites.

The following is a discussion of listed sites:

**UNIVERSITY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

4200 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest

Distance: N/A (The Project)

Direction: N/A (The Project)

Databases listed on: FINDS, ICIS, MLTS, LUST, UST, CERC-NFRAP, RCRA-LQG, and Manifest

The above site is the Project. Information in the FINDS database indicates the Project (also listed as Van Ness Power Plant Campus) is listed on the Aerometric Information Retrieval System Facility Subsystem (AFS) database, the RCRA Info information system, and the Integrated Compliance Information System (ICIS). Information in the ICIS database indicates the Project (also listed as The Teachers College) was on the national enforcement and compliance program for Enforcement Action ID #'s 03-2000-0535, 03-1997-0148, and 03-1997-0133. Information in the ICIS database indicates the Van Ness Power Plant Campus is listed for Enforcement Action ID # 03-1997-0232. The ICIS listings appear to be associated with the AFS and RCRA Info listings; however, no details pertaining to the ICIS, AFS, or RCRA Info listings was available in the regulatory database report. Information in the MLTS database indicates the Project first obtained a license (#08-16631-02) to possess or use radioactive materials on March 2, 1983 and the license expiration date is May 31, 2015. Information in the LUST database indicates that the Project (listed as DC Public Schools, Facility ID# 3-001818) is listed with an open case status for a release reported on January 18, 1997 (Case # 97034). Information in the UST database indicates the Project had three 30,000-gallon heating oil USTs that are listed as permanently out of use. Information in the CERC-NFRAP database describes an incident at the Project as "UDC Oil Spill" under Site ID # 0305283. The CERC-NFRAP database describes the Project as being located in a highly commercial and residential area of the northwest section of Washington and that Soapstone Creek is approximately 500 feet from the University in an easterly direction. Reportedly, a release was discovered on January 18, 1997, and a finding of "no further remedial action" was given on October 14, 1999. The case for the Project was archived on August 24, 2000. More information regarding the former on-site USTs and the circumstances being the LUST and CERC-NFRAP cases is included in Sections 6.7 and 7.6. Information in the RCRA-LQG and Manifest databases indicates the Project has been a large quantity generator of hazardous wastes since 1977 and the United States Government was a generator on-site since 1918. The Project was identified with multiple violations, all of which were brought in to regulatory compliance. More information regarding the hazardous wastes generated at the Project is included in Section 7.3. EMG recommends groundwater quality sampling and laboratory analysis be continued at the Project in accordance with all applicable regulations and requirements in order to achieve regulatory closure.

**MCDOWELL BROTHERS, INC.**

**4201 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest**

**Distance: Adjacent (corrected)**

**Direction: East**

**Databases listed on: UST**

Based on review of the USGS Topographic Map, this site is located topographically downgradient from the Project and estimated groundwater flow in the area of the site is to the northeast, away from the Project. Information in the EDR Historical Auto Stations database indicates the site was a gasoline station and service station in 1940, 1943, 1948, and 1954. Information in the UST database indicates the site had five 1,000-gallon gasoline USTs that are permanently out of use. The UST database is a listing of facilities that are required to register their USTs for tracking purposes and are not necessarily sites with reported contamination incidents. This site is not listed in any database that reports leaks or spills, like the LUST database. Based on topographic relations and estimated groundwater flow, this site is not anticipated to have adversely impacted the environmental integrity of the Project.

**VAN NESS TEXACO/JENSON TEXACO SERVICE**

4225 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest

**Distance:** Adjacent (corrected)**Direction:** East**Databases listed on:** FINDS, UST, RCRA-CESQG, Manifest, and LUST

Based on review of the USGS Topographic Map, this site is located topographically downgradient from the Project and estimated groundwater flow in the area of the site is to the northeast, away from the Project. Information in the FINDS, RCRA-CESQG, and Manifest databases indicates the site is a conditionally exempt small quantity generator of hazardous wastes with violations listed that have achieved regulatory compliance. Information in the UST database indicates four 10,000-gallon gasoline USTs, one 4,000-gallon gasoline UST, and one 550-gallon used oil UST are currently in use. Information in the EDR Historical Auto Stations database indicates the site was a gasoline and service station in 1943, 1948, and 1954. Information in the LUST database indicates the site (Facility ID # 3-000685) had a reported release (Case # 89013) that has been granted a closed status. The regulatory agency awards a case-closed status when contamination, if any, has been investigated and/or remediated in accordance with currently accepted regulatory standards. Based on topographic relations, estimated groundwater flow, and current regulatory status, this site is not anticipated to have adversely impacted the environmental integrity of the Project.

**EMBASSY CLEANERS**

4215 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest

**Distance:** Adjacent (corrected)**Direction:** East**Databases listed on:** FINDS and RCRA-CESQG

Based on review of the USGS Topographic Map, this site is located topographically downgradient from the Project and estimated groundwater flow in the area of the site is to the northeast, away from the Project. Information in the FINDS and RCRA-CESQG databases indicates that the site is a conditionally exempt small quantity generator of hazardous wastes with violations listed that have achieved compliance. The RCRIS-Generator database is a listing of facilities that, due to the amount of hazardous waste generated, are required to register with the USEPA for tracking purposes and are not necessarily sites with reported contamination incidents. Based on topographic relations and estimated groundwater flow, this site is not anticipated to have adversely impacted the environmental integrity of the Project.

**VAN NESS CENTER LTD PARTNERSHIP**

4301 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest

**Distance:** Adjacent (corrected)**Direction:** East**Database listed on:** UST

Based on review of the USGS Topographic Map, this site is located topographically downgradient from the Project and estimated groundwater flow in the area of the site is to the northeast, away from the Project. Information in the UST database indicates the site has a 20,000-gallon heating oil UST that is currently in use and a 5,000-gallon heating oil UST that is permanently out of use. The UST database is a listing of facilities that are required to register their USTs for tracking purposes and are not necessarily sites with reported contamination incidents. In addition, this site is not listed in any database that reports leaks or spills, such as the LUST, NPL, SHWS, or CERCLIS Listings. Based on topographic relations and estimated groundwater flow, this site is not anticipated to have adversely impacted the environmental integrity of the Project.

**INTELSAT****3400 International Drive, Northwest****Distance: Adjacent (corrected)****Direction: South****Databases listed on: UST, Manifest, and RCRA-CESQG**

Based on review of the USGS Topographic Map, this site is located topographically upgradient from the Project and estimated groundwater flow in the area of the site is to the northeast, towards the Project. Information in the UST database indicates the site has three 20,000-gallon diesel USTs currently in use and one 3,000-gallon diesel UST which is listed as permanently out of use. The UST database is a listing of facilities that are required to register their USTs for tracking purposes and are not necessarily sites with reported contamination incidents. Information in the Manifest and RCRA-CESQG databases indicates the site is a conditionally exempt small quantity generator of hazardous wastes with violations that have achieved compliance. The RCRIS-Generator database is a listing of facilities that, due to the amount of hazardous waste generated, are required to register with the USEPA for tracking purposes and are not necessarily sites with reported contamination incidents. Furthermore, this site was not identified on the any database which reports releases or spills such as the LUST, NPL, SHWS, or CERCLIS Listings. Based on the current regulatory status, this site is not anticipated to have adversely impacted the environmental integrity of the Project.

**DIAMOND ORDNANCE FUZE LAB****Connecticut Avenue and Windom Place****Distance: Adjacent (corrected)****Direction: Northeast****Databases listed on: CERCLIS and FUDS**

Based on review of the USGS Topographic Map, this site is located topographically downgradient from the Project and estimated groundwater flow in the area of the site is to the northeast, away from the Project. Information in the CERCLIS database indicates the site had a reported release on January 11, 2001 and was put on high priority for further assessment on November 2, 2001. Information in the FUDS database indicates the site has Federal Facility ID # DC9799F9283. Based on topographic relations and estimated groundwater flow, this site is not anticipated to have adversely impacted the environmental integrity of the Project.

**PARKLANE CLEANERS****4304 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest****Distance: Approximately 50 Feet (corrected)****Direction: Northeast (corrected)****Database listed on: RCRA-CESQG**

Based on review of the USGS Topographic Map, this site is located topographically downgradient from the Project and estimated groundwater flow in the area of the site is to the northeast, away from the Project. Information in the RCRA-CESQG database indicates the site is a conditionally exempt small quantity generator of hazardous wastes with violations that have achieved compliance. The RCRIS-Generator database is a listing of facilities that, due to the amount of hazardous waste generated, are required to register with the USEPA for tracking purposes and are not necessarily sites with reported contamination incidents. Based on topographic relations and estimated groundwater flow, this site is not anticipated to have adversely impacted the environmental integrity of the Project.

**US DEPT STATE ANNEX 33****3507 International Place****Distance: Approximately 50 Feet (corrected)****Direction: South****Database listed on: RCRA-CESQG**

Based on review of the USGS Topographic Map, this site is located topographically upgradient from the Project and estimated groundwater flow in the area of the site is to the northeast, towards the Project. Information in the RCRA-CESQG database indicates the site is a conditionally exempt small quantity generator of hazardous wastes with no violations listed. The RCRIS-Generator database is a listing of facilities that, due to the amount of hazardous waste generated, are required to register with the USEPA for tracking purposes and are not necessarily sites with reported contamination incidents. Based on current regulatory status, this site is not anticipated to have adversely impacted the environmental integrity of the Project.

**SOAPSTONE CREEK OIL SPILL RESPONSE/CHARLES E. SMITH RESIDENTIAL REALTY****4411 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest****Distance: Approximately 250 Feet (corrected)****Direction: Northeast****Databases listed on: CERC-NFRAP and LUST**

Based on review of the USGS Topographic Map, this site is located topographically downgradient from the Project and estimated groundwater flow in the area of the site is to the northeast, away from the Project. Information in the CERC-NFRAP database indicates a release was discovered on July 10, 1998 that received a status of “no further remedial action planned” on May 1, 2000, and was archived on May 2, 2002. Information in the LUST database indicates Case #98108 was reported on July 1, 1998, and received a “no further action status.” The regulatory agency awards a “no further action” status when contamination, if any, has been investigated and/or remediated in accordance with currently accepted regulatory standards. Based on topographic relations and estimated groundwater flow, this site is not anticipated to have adversely impacted the environmental integrity of the Project.

**EMBASSY OF EGYPT****3521 International Court, Northwest****Distance: Approximately 315 Feet****Direction: West****Database listed on: UST**

Based on review of the USGS Topographic Map, this site is located topographically cross-gradient from the Project and estimated groundwater flow in the area of the site is to the northeast, parallel to the Project. Information in the UST database indicates the site has a 1,000-gallon diesel UST currently in use. The UST database is a listing of facilities that are required to register their USTs for tracking purposes and are not necessarily sites with reported contamination incidents. This site was not identified on the any database which reports releases or spills such as the LUST, NPL, SHWS, or CERCLIS Listings. Based on estimated groundwater flow and current regulatory status, this site is not anticipated to have adversely impacted the environmental integrity of the Project.

**VAN NESS APARTMENTS SOUTH**  
**3003-05 Van Ness Street, Northwest**  
**Distance: Approximately 362 Feet**  
**Direction: East - Northeast**  
**Database listed on: UST**

Based on review of the USGS Topographic Map, this site is located topographically downgradient from the Project and estimated groundwater flow in the area of the site is to the northeast, away from the Project. Information in the UST database indicate the site is listed with one 20,000-gallon heating oil UST that is permanently out of use and one 15,000-gallon heating oil UST that is currently in use. The UST database is a listing of facilities that are required to register their USTs for tracking purposes and are not necessarily sites with reported contamination incidents. This site was not identified on the any database which reports releases or spills such as the LUST, NPL, SHWS, or CERCLIS Listings. Based on topographic relations, estimated groundwater flow, and current regulatory status, this site is not anticipated to have adversely impacted the environmental integrity of the Project.

**SIRIUS, LLC**  
**4107 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest**  
**Distance: Approximately 434 Feet**  
**Direction: South - Southeast**  
**Databases listed on: LUST and UST**

Based on review of the USGS Topographic Map, this site is located topographically cross-gradient from the Project and estimated groundwater flow in the area of the site is to the northeast, away from the Project. Information in the LUST database indicates the site had a reported release on December 16, 1997 (Case # 98016) that has received a closed status. The regulatory agency awards a case-closed status when contamination, if any, has been investigated and/or remediated in accordance with currently accepted regulatory standards. Information in the UST database indicates that the site has one 2,000-gallon heating oil UST permanently out of use. Based on topographic relations and estimated groundwater flow, this site is not anticipated to have adversely impacted the environmental integrity of the Project.

**TILDEN GARDEN**  
**3016, 3024, 3000, and 3900 Tilden Street, Northwest**  
**Distance: Approximately 846 Feet**  
**Direction: South**  
**Database listed on: LUST**

Based on review of the USGS Topographic Map, this site is located topographically upgradient from the Project and estimated groundwater flow in the area of the site is to the northeast, towards the Project. Information in the LUST databases indicates the site had a release reported on October 30, 1998 (Case # 99011) that received a closed status, a release reported on October 25, 1996 (Case # 97006) that received a no further action status, a release reported on April 10, 2002 (Case # 2002041) that received a closed status, a release reported on November 12, 2002 (Case # 200305) that received a no further action status, and a release reported on October 25, 1996 (Case # 97007) that received a closed status. The regulatory agency awards a case-closed status when contamination, if any, has been investigated and/or remediated in accordance with currently accepted regulatory standards. Based on distance from the Project and current regulatory status, this site is not anticipated to have adversely impacted the environmental integrity of the Project.

The additional cases listed in the regulatory database report are located greater than 900 feet from the Project at topographically downgradient and cross-gradient positions relative to the Project. Based on such factors as distance, topographic relations, estimated groundwater flow, and current regulatory status, these facilities are not anticipated to have adversely impacted the environmental integrity of the Project.

---

---

## 10. ADJACENT PROPERTIES

---

---

The general vicinity of the Project consists of residential and commercial land uses. The following adjacent properties were observed:

- North** — The Project is bordered to the north by the University of the District of Columbia Auditorium Buildings (Buildings 46W and 46E) and tennis courts as well as a commercial office, retail, and restaurant building with a metro entrance located at 4250 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest and Potbelly Sandwich Works located at 4300 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest.
- East** — The Project is bordered to the east by a Liquor Store, Jerry's Subs, and an office building located at 4201 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest; Embassy Cleaners located at 4215 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest; a KFC Restaurant, Taco Bell Restaurant, Green Apple Restaurant, Cadian Ocean Restaurant, and parking located at 4221 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest; Van Ness Auto Care and gasoline station located at 4225 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest; and CVS and Giant Grocery located at 4301-4309 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest.
- Southeast** — The Project is bordered to the southeast by apartments located at 4111-4123 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest.
- South** — The Project is bordered to the south by Van Ness, Northwest followed by International Telecommunications Satellite Organization (Intelsat) located at 3400 International Drive, Northwest and the Singapore Embassy located at 3501 International Place, Northwest.
- West** — The Project is bordered to the west by a playing field for the University of the District of Columbia followed by International Drive, Northwest.

The adjacent property uses to the east were identified on the UST, FINDS, RCRA-CESQG, Manifest, and LUST databases. The adjacent property uses to the south were identified on the UST, Manifest, and RCRA-CESQG databases. The adjacent property use to the northeast was identified on the CERCLIS and FUDS databases. More information regarding these sites is included in the Regulatory Review discussion (Section 9).

Based on observations and available regulatory information, the adjacent property uses are not anticipated to adversely impact the environmental integrity of the Project.

---

---

## 11. APPENDICES

---

---

APPENDIX A: Photographic Documentation

APPENDIX B: Field Sketch

APPENDIX C: Maps and Aerial Photographs

APPENDIX D: Records of Communication

APPENDIX E: Questionnaires

APPENDIX F: Regulatory Database Report

APPENDIX G: Supporting Documentation

APPENDIX H: Resumes

---

---

**APPENDIX A:  
PHOTOGRAPHIC DOCUMENTATION**

---

---



DUE DILIGENCE FOR THE  
LIFE CYCLE OF REAL ESTATE

### EMG PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

Project No.: 89419.08R-009.017

Project Name: University of the District of Columbia



Photo #1:	Physical Plant - Building 43
-----------	------------------------------



Photo #2:	Mathematics and Engineering - Buildings 32 and 42
-----------	---



Photo #3:	Student Services and Law - Building 38
-----------	--



Photo #4:	Administration and Financial Aid - Building 39
-----------	--



Photo #5:	Life Sciences - Building 44
-----------	-----------------------------



Photo #6:	Art and Library - Building 41
-----------	-------------------------------



DUE DILIGENCE FOR THE LIFE CYCLE OF REAL ESTATE

### EMG PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

Project No.: 89419.08R-009.017

Project Name: University of the District of Columbia



Photo #7: Parking garage



Photo #8: Remediation shed at Building 43 – no access



Photo #9: Electric domestic hot water heaters in each building



Photo #10: Temporary natural gas boiler at Building 43



Photo #11: New natural gas and heating oil boilers in Building 43



Photo #12: Refrigerants in Building 43



DUE DILIGENCE FOR THE  
LIFE CYCLE OF REAL ESTATE

### EMG PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

Project No.: 89419.08R-009.017

Project Name: University of the District of Columbia



Photo #13: Oxygen and acetylene in Building 43



Photo #14: Propane cage for forklifts on the exterior of Building 42



Photo #15: Academic laboratory chemicals in Buildings 42 and 44



Photo #16: Academic laboratory solvents in Buildings 42 and 44



Photo #17: Developer and fixer in Buildings 41, 42, and 44



Photo #18: Oxygen in Building 44



DUE DILIGENCE FOR THE LIFE CYCLE OF REAL ESTATE

### EMG PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

Project No.: 89419.08R-009.017

Project Name: University of the District of Columbia



Photo #19: Waste TCE in 55-gallon drum with secondary containment in Building 42



Photo #20: Medical waste in Building 44



Photo #21: Waste oil 55-gallon drums with secondary containment at Building 43



Photo #22: Cooking grease trap in Building 39



Photo #23: Hydraulic trash compactor at Building 38




Photo #24: Utility-owned transformers in interior electrical vaults in each building



DUE DILIGENCE FOR THE  
LIFE CYCLE OF REAL ESTATE

### EMG PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

Project No.: 89419.08R-009.017

Project Name: University of the District of Columbia



Photo #25: Step down transformer



Photo #26: Hydraulic elevator



Photo #27: Two of 14 traction elevators at the Project



Photo #28: Homeland Security rooftop diesel belly tank for emergency generator on Building 41



Photo #29: Former radio station 45-gallon day tank for rooftop emergency generator on Building 39



Photo #30: Two 8,000-gallon fuel oil ASTs (and former location of three 30,000-gallon USTs)



DUE DILIGENCE FOR THE  
LIFE CYCLE OF REAL ESTATE

### EMG PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

Project No.: 89419.08R-009.017

Project Name: University of the District of Columbia



Photo #31: Emergency generator and 250-gallon day tank in Building 43



Photo #32: Generator associated with Photo #31



Photo #33: One of eight ground water monitoring wells located north of Building 43



Photo #34: Water damaged painted dry wall in break room of Building 43



Photo #35: Water damaged ceiling tile in Building 32



Photo #36: Water damaged ceiling tile in Buildings 38 and 39



DUE DILIGENCE FOR THE LIFE CYCLE OF REAL ESTATE

### EMG PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

Project No.: 89419.08R-009.017

Project Name: University of the District of Columbia



Photo #37: Water damaged painted drywall ceiling in the Building 39 copy room



Photo #38: Water damaged ceiling tiles, drywall, and floor tiles in Building 44 Room 311



Photo #39: Significant water damage throughout Building 41



Photo #40: Significant water damage throughout the parking garage



Photo #41: Adjoining north - commercial and office building with a metro entrance



Photo #42: Adjacent east - Embassy Cleaners (regulatory report listings)



DUE DILIGENCE FOR THE LIFE CYCLE OF REAL ESTATE

### EMG PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

Project No.: 89419.08R-009.017

Project Name: University of the District of Columbia



Photo #43: Adjacent east - Van Ness Auto Care (regulatory report listings)



Photo #44: Adjacent east - CVS and Giant grocery (regulatory report listings)



Photo #45: Adjacent southeast - residential



Photo #46: Adjacent south - Intelsat (regulatory report listings)



Photo #47: Adjoining west - University of the District of Columbia playing field



Photo #48: Overview of Project, facing east

---


---

**APPENDIX B:  
FIELD SKETCH**

---

---

# Field Sketch



	<b>Key:</b>  Project Boundary  Aboveground Storage Tank  Former Underground Storage Tank  Monitoring Well E – Emergency Generator C – Trash Compactor	<b>Project Number:</b> 89419.08R-009.017
		<b>Project Name:</b> University of the District of Columbia

Not drawn to scale. The north arrow indicator is an approximation of 0° North.

---


---

**APPENDIX C:  
MAPS AND AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHS**

---

---

# Topographic Map



**EMG**



**Source:**

USGS Topographic Quadrangle:  
Washington West, District of  
Columbia

Date: 1965 (Photorevised 1983)

The north arrow indicator is an approximation  
of 0° North.

**Project Number:**

89419.08R-009.017


**Project Name:**

University of the District of Columbia

**On-Site Date:**

December 3-5, 2008

# Floodplain Map



NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM

**FIRM**  
FLOOD INSURANCE RATE MAP

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
WASHINGTON, D.C.

PANEL 10 OF 30

COMMUNITY-PANEL NUMBER  
110001 0010 B

EFFECTIVE DATE:  
NOVEMBER 15, 1985




Federal Emergency Management Agency

This is an official copy of a portion of the above referenced flood map. It was extracted using FIRM OnLine. This map does not reflect changes or amendments which may have been made subsequent to the date on the file block. For the latest product information about National Flood Insurance Program flood maps, check the FEMA Flood Map Store at www.fema.gov

	<p><b>Source:</b> FEMA</p> <p><b>Date:</b> 1985</p>	<p><b>Project Number:</b> 89419.08R-009.017</p>
	<p>The north arrow indicator is an approximation of 0° North.</p>	<p><b>Project Name:</b> University of the District of Columbia</p> <p><b>On-Site Date:</b> December 3-5, 2008</p>


# Wetlands Map



	<p><b>Source:</b> United States Fish and Wildlife Services</p>	<p><b>Project Number:</b> 89419.08R-009.017</p>
	<p><b>Date:</b> 2005</p>	<p><b>Project Name:</b> University of the District of Columbia</p>
	<p><b>On-Site Date:</b> December 3-5, 2008</p>	

The north arrow indicator is an approximation of 0° North.

# Soil Map



**Source:**  
USGS Web Soil Survey  
**Date:** 2005

**Project Number:**  
89419.08R-009.017


**Project Name:**  
University of the District of Columbia



The north arrow indicator is an approximation of 0° North.

**On-Site Date:**  
December 3-5, 2008

# Tax Map



**Source:**  
DC Atlas

**Project Number:**  
89419.08R-009.017




The north arrow indicator is an approximation of 0° North.

**Project Name:**  
University of the District of Columbia

**On-Site Date:**  
December 3-5, 2008

# Zoning Map



**Source:**  
District of Columbia Office of Zoning website

**Project Number:**  
89419.08R-009.017




The north arrow indicator is an approximation of 0° North.

**Project Name:**  
University of the District of Columbia

**On-Site Date:**  
December 3-5, 2008

# Aerial Photograph



**Source:**  
USGS Microsoft Terraserver  
Date: 1988

**Project Number:**  
89419.08R-009.017



The north arrow indicator is an approximation of 0° North.

**Project Name:**  
University of the District of Columbia

**On-Site Date:**  
December 3-5, 2008

# Aerial Photograph



**Source:**  
USGS Microsoft Terraserver  
Date: 2002

**Project Number:**  
89419.08R-009.017



The north arrow indicator is an approximation of 0° North.

**Project Name:**  
University of the District of Columbia

**On-Site Date:**  
December 3-5, 2008

---

---

**APPENDIX D:  
RECORDS OF COMMUNICATION**

---

---

---

**RECORD OF COMMUNICATION**

---

Date: December 3-5, 2008 Time: 10:30 AM  
Project Number: 89419.08R-009.017 Recorded by: CJL  
Project Name: University of the District of Columbia

Communication with: Mr. David Watts, General Counsel  
of: Project  
Phone: 202.274.5400

**Communication via:**

- Telephone Conversation  
 Discussions During Site Assessment  
 Office Visitation/Meeting at:  
 Other:

**Re:**

Project history and current operations

---

**Summary of Communication:**

EMG met with Mr. David Watts, On-site Point of Contact (POC) and General Counsel, who was cooperative and provided information which appeared to be accurate based upon our subsequent site observations. It is EMG's opinion that Mr. Watts was somewhat knowledgeable about the Project and questions EMG posed during the interview process. Mr. Watts was unaware of the construction dates of the Project buildings or any prior uses of the Project. Mr. Watts indicated that he has been associated with the Project for the past year and a half.

---

---

**RECORD OF COMMUNICATION**

---

Date: December 3-5, 2008 Time: 10:30 AM  
Project Number: 89419.08R-009.017 Recorded by: CJL  
Project Name: University of the District of Columbia

Communication with: Ms. Tamiko Bryant, Director of Environmental Health and Safety  
of: Project  
Phone: 202.274.7180

**Communication via:**

- Telephone Conversation  
 Discussions During Site Assessment  
Office Visitation/Meeting at:  
Other:

**Re:**

Environmental documentation

---

**Summary of Communication:**

EMG interviewed Ms. Tamiko Bryant, Director of Environmental Health and Safety, who was cooperative and provided information which appeared to be accurate based upon our subsequent site observations. It is EMG's opinion that Ms. Bryant was somewhat knowledgeable about the Project, and the questions EMG posed during the interview process. According to Ms. Bryant, the Project was developed in the 1970s into the current use. Ms. Bryant stated that prior to the current use the Project was used as a government facility. Ms. Bryant indicated that she has been associated with the Project for four years.

---

---

**RECORD OF COMMUNICATION**

---

Date: December 3-5, 2008 Time: 10:30 AM  
Project Number: 89419.08R-009.017 Recorded by: CJL  
Project Name: University of the District of Columbia

Communication with: Mr. Emanuel Yeoman, Maintenance Specialist  
of: Project  
Phone: 202.207.4167

Communication via:  
Telephone Conversation  
Discussions During Site Assessment  
Office Visitation/Meeting at:  
Other:

Re:  
Project history and current operations

**Summary of Communication:**

EMG interviewed Mr. Emanuel Yeoman, Maintenance Specialist, who was cooperative and provided information which appeared to be accurate based upon our subsequent site observations. It is EMG's opinion that Mr. Yeoman was somewhat knowledgeable about the Project, and the questions EMG posed during the interview process. According to Mr. Yeoman, the Project was developed in the 1970s into the current use. Mr. Yeoman stated that prior to the current use the Project was used as the National Bureau of Standards. Mr. Yeoman indicated that he has been associated with the Project for the past twenty-two years.

**RECORD OF COMMUNICATION**

Date: December 9, 2008 Time: 2:00 PM  
Project Number: 89419.08R-009.017 Recorded by: CJL  
Project Name: University of the District of Columbia

Communication with: Ms. Tisa Smith, FOIA Officer  
of: District of Columbia Fire Prevention and Emergency Management Services  
Phone: 202.673.3297

Communication via:  
Telephone Conversation  
Discussions During Site Assessment  
Office Visitation/Meeting at:  
 Other: Fax

Re:  
Records

**Summary of Communication:**

EMG submitted a written Request for Information to the District of Columbia Fire Prevention and Emergency Management Services on December 9, 2008. Upon receipt and review, any environmentally significant information will be submitted to the Client.



**RECORD OF COMMUNICATION**

Date: December 9, 2008 Time: 2:15 PM  
Project Number: 89419.08R-009.017 Recorded by: CJL  
Project Name: University of the District of Columbia

Communication with: Ms. Selena Robinson, FOIA Officer  
of: District of Columbia Department of Consumer Affairs  
Phone: 202.478.9286

Communication via:  
Telephone Conversation  
Discussions During Site Assessment  
Office Visitation/Meeting at:  
 Other: Fax

Re:  
Records

**Summary of Communication:**

EMG submitted a written Request for Information to the District of Columbia Department of Consumer Affairs on December 9, 2008. Upon receipt and review, any environmentally significant information will be submitted to the Client.



**RECORD OF COMMUNICATION**

Date: December 9, 2008 Time: 3:00 PM  
Project Number: 89419.08R-009.017 Recorded by: CJL  
Project Name: University of the District of Columbia

Communication with: Website  
of: District of Columbia Office of Zoning  
Phone: Website

Communication via:  
Telephone Conversation  
Discussions During Site Assessment  
Office Visitation/Meeting at:  
 Other: Website

Re:  
Records

**Summary of Communication:**

Review of the available zoning records from the District of Columbia Office of Zoning website indicates that the Project is currently zoned Single-Family Detached Dwellings (R-1-B). The Project has maintained the R-1-B zoning designation since at least July 29, 2003.



---

---

**APPENDIX E:  
QUESTIONNAIRES**

---

---

**KEY SITE MANAGER PRE-SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE**

Name of person completing questionnaire: **Mr. David Watts**

Association with property: **General Counsel**

Length of association with property: **1.5 years**

Date: **December 5, 2008**

Phone Number: **202.274.5400**

Property Name: **University of the District of Columbia**

EMG Project Number: **89419.08R-009.017**

**Directions:** Please answer all questions to the best of your knowledge and in good faith. Mark the column corresponding to the appropriate response. Additional details necessary to explain any yes or unknown responses should be provided in the "Comments" column.

Note: U/NR indicates "Unknown" or "No Response".

QUESTION		RESPONSE			COMMENTS
		Y	N	U/NR	
1A.	Is the Project used for an industrial use?		X		
1B.	Are any adjoining properties used for an industrial use?		X		
2A.	To the best of your knowledge, has the Project been used for an industrial use in the past?		X		
2B.	To the best of your knowledge, has any adjoining properties been used for an industrial use in the past?		X		
3A.	Is the Project used as a gasoline station, motor repair facility, commercial printing facility, dry cleaners, photo developing laboratory, junkyard or landfill, or as a waste treatment, storage, disposal, processing, or recycling facility?		X		
3B.	Is any adjoining property used as a gasoline station, motor repair facility, commercial printing facility, dry cleaners, photo developing laboratory, junkyard or landfill, or as a waste treatment, storage, disposal, processing, or recycling facility?		X		
4A.	To the best of your knowledge, has the Project been used as a gasoline station, motor repair facility, commercial printing facility, dry cleaners, photo developing laboratory, junkyard or landfill, or as a waste treatment, storage, disposal, processing, or recycling facility?		X		
4B.	To the best of your knowledge, has any adjoining property been used as a gasoline station, motor repair facility, commercial printing facility, dry cleaners, photo developing laboratory, junkyard or landfill, or as a waste treatment, storage, disposal, processing, or recycling facility?		X		
5A.	Are there currently any automotive or industrial batteries, pesticides, paints, or other chemicals in individual containers of greater than five gallons in volume or fifty gallons in the aggregate, stored on or used at the Project?		X		



QUESTION		RESPONSE			COMMENTS
		Y	N	U/NR	
5B.	To the best of your knowledge, have there been previously any automotive or industrial batteries, pesticides, paints, or other chemicals in individual containers of greater than five gallons in volume or fifty gallons in the aggregate, stored on or used at the Project?		X		
6A.	Are there currently any industrial drums (typically 55-gallon) or sacks of chemicals located on the Project?		X		
6B.	To the best of your knowledge, have there been previously any industrial drums (typically 55-gallon) or sacks of chemicals located on the Project?		X		
7A.	Are there currently any groundwater monitoring wells or other groundwater wells (i.e., potable drinking water wells) located on the Project?		X		
7B.	To the best of your knowledge, have there been previously any groundwater monitoring wells or other groundwater wells (i.e., potable drinking water wells) located on the Project?		X		
8A.	Has fill dirt been brought onto the Project which originated from a contaminated site?		X		
8B.	Has fill dirt been brought onto the Project which is of an unknown origin?		X		
9A.	Are there currently any pits, ponds or lagoons located on the Project in connection with waste treatment or waste disposal?		X		
9B.	To the best of your knowledge, have there been previously any pits, ponds or lagoons located on the Project in connection with waste treatment or waste disposal?		X		
10A.	Is there currently, any stained soil on the Project?		X		
10B.	To the best of your knowledge, has there been previously any stained soil on the Project?		X		
11A.	Are there currently any registered or unregistered storage tanks (above or underground) located on the Project?		X		
11B.	To the best of your knowledge, have there been previously any registered or unregistered storage tanks (above or underground) located on the Project?		X		
12A.	Are there currently any vent pipes, fill pipes or access ways indicating a fill pipe protruding from the ground on the Project or adjacent to any structure located on the Project?		X		
12B.	To the best of your knowledge, have there been previously any vent pipes, fill pipes or access ways indicating a fill pipe protruding from the ground on the Project or adjacent to any structure located on the Project?		X		
13A.	Are there currently any flooring, drains, or walls located at the Project that are stained by substances other than water or are emitting foul odors?		X		



QUESTION		RESPONSE			COMMENTS
		Y	N	U/NR	
13B.	To the best of your knowledge, have there been previously any flooring, drains, or walls located at the Project that are stained by substances other than water or are emitting foul odors?		X		
14A.	If the Project is served by a private well or non-public water system, have contaminants been identified in the well or system that exceed guidelines applicable to the water system?				N/A
14B.	If the Project is served by a private well or non-public water system, has the well been designated as contaminated by any government environmental/health agency?				N/A
15A.	Have you been informed of the past existence of hazardous substances or petroleum products with respect to the Project or any facility located on the Project?		X		
15B.	Have you been informed of the current existence of hazardous substances or petroleum products with respect to the Project or any facility located on the Project?		X		
16A.	Are there any environmental liens or governmental notification relating to past or current violations of environmental laws with respect to the Project or any facility located on the Project?		X		
16B.	Have you been informed of the past existence of environmental violations with respect to the Project or any facility located on the Project?		X		
16C.	Are you aware of any pending, threatened, or past litigation relevant to hazardous substances of petroleum products in, on or from the property?		X		
16D.	Are you aware of any pending, threatened, or past administrative proceedings relevant to hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on or from the property?		X		
16E.	Are you aware of any notices from any governmental entity regarding any possible violation or environmental laws or possible liability relating to hazardous substances or petroleum products?		X		
17.	Have there been any environmental site assessments of the Project that indicated the presence of hazardous substances or petroleum products on, or contamination of, the Project or recommended further assessment of the Project?		X		
18.	Does the Project discharge waste water on or adjacent to the project, other than storm water, into a storm water sewer system?		X		
19.	Does the Project discharge waste water on or adjacent to the project, other than storm water, or into a sanitary system?		X		
20.	Have any hazardous substances or petroleum products, unidentified waste materials, tires, automotive or industrial batteries or any other waste materials been dumped above grade, buried and/or burned on the Project?		X		
21.	Is there a transformer, capacitor or any hydraulic equipment for which there are any records indicating the presence of PCBs?		X		

QUESTION		RESPONSE			COMMENTS
		Y	N	U/NR	
22.	Is there now or has there ever been any asbestos-containing materials (ACM), in any application, on the Project?				Impossible to respond
23.	Has there ever been any ACM testing conducted on the Project?				Impossible to respond
24.	Is there an asbestos Operations and Maintenance (O&M) program in place at the Project?		X		
25.	Is there now or has there ever been any lead-based paint (LBP) applications on the Project?				Impossible to respond
26.	Has there ever been LBP testing conducted on the Project?				Impossible to respond
27.	Is there a Lead Paint Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Program in place at the Project?		X		
28.	Has the water at the Project ever been tested for lead?			X	
29.	Has Radon testing ever been conducted at the Project?			X	
30.	Are there any other Operations and Maintenance (O&M) programs in place that we should be made aware of?		X		
31.	Is the Project or any portion of the Project located or involved in any environmentally sensitive areas (i.e., wetlands, coastal barrier resource areas, coastal barrier improvement act areas, flood plains, endangered species, etc.)?		X		
32.	Do you know or suspect that mold was or is present in the building(s) or HVAC system? - If "Yes", proceed to question #33. - If "No", skip question #33 and proceed to question #34.		X		
33.	Are there reliable procedures that specify the actions (i.e. operations and maintenance) to be taken to prevent and/or respond to mold or mold producing problems?		X		
34.	Is there a mold Operations and Maintenance (O&M) program in place at the Project?		X		
35.	Is the HVAC system inspected at least annually?			X	
36.	Have identified HVAC problems been corrected in a timely manner?			X	
37.	Is there now, or has there ever been evidence of mold or mildew present at the building(s)? If so, when?			X	
38.	Is there now, or has there ever been any water damage in the building(s), whether from flooding, plumbing, roof leaks, or other sources? If so, when?	X			
39.	Has there ever been any sort of Indoor Air Quality (IAQ) or mold testing conducted in the building(s)?			X	

QUESTION		RESPONSE			COMMENTS
		Y	N	U/NR	
Summarize historical Project use (when was the Project developed with the current improvements, what modifications have taken place, what was the Project used for prior to it's current use)	Yes.				



**USER QUESTIONNAIRE**

EMG has been retained to conduct a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) of the following property. The Phase I ESA will involve site observations, interviews, and a review of available documentation. To ensure the success of the assessment, and in accordance with the ASTM 05 Scope of Work for this assessment, which documents certain User responsibilities, we are submitting this questionnaire to help you meet those responsibilities. Please complete this questionnaire and return via email or by fax to 410-785-6220 (within one business day of receipt).

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of person completing questionnaire: A completed User questionnaire was not returned to EMG. Company: \_\_\_\_\_

Length of association with property: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Property Name/Address: University of The District of Columbia/ 4200 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest, Washington, District of Columbia 20008

EMG Project Number: 89419.08R-009.017

**Directions:** Please answer all questions to the best of your knowledge and in good faith. Mark the column corresponding to the appropriate response. Additional details necessary to explain any yes or unknown responses should be provided in the "Comments" column.  
 Note: U/NR indicates "Unknown" or "No Response", and "N/A" indicates not applicable.

QUESTION		RESPONSE			COMMENTS
		Y	N	U/ NR	
1	Are you aware of any pending, threatened, or past litigation relevant to hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on, or from the property?				
2	Are you aware of any pending, threatened, or past administrative proceedings relevant to hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on or from the property?				
3	Are you aware of any notices from any governmental entity regarding any possible violation of environmental laws or possible liability relating to hazardous substances or petroleum products?				
4	Are you aware of any environmental cleanup liens against the property that are filed or recorded under federal, tribal, state or local law?				
5	Are you aware of any Activity and Use Limitations, such as engineering controls, land use restrictions or institutional controls that are in place at the site and/or have been filed or recorded in a registry under federal, tribal, state or local law?				
6	As the user of this ESA do you have any specialized knowledge or experience related to the property or nearby properties? For example, are you involved in the same line of business as the current or former occupants of the property or an adjoining property so that you would have specialized knowledge of the chemicals and processes used by this type of business?				
7	Does the purchase price being paid for this property reasonably reflect the fair market value of the property? If you conclude that there is a difference, have you considered whether the lower purchase price is because contamination is known or believed to be present at the property?				
8	Are you aware of commonly known or reasonably ascertainable information about the property that would help the environmental professional to identify conditions indicative of releases or threatened releases? For example, as user				
8 (a)	Do you know the past uses of the property?				



QUESTION		RESPONSE			COMMENTS
		Y	N	U/ NR	
8 (b)	Do you know of specific chemicals that are present or once were present at the property?				
8 (c)	Do you know of spills or other chemical releases that have taken place at the property?				
8 (d)	Do you know of any environmental cleanups that have taken place at the property?				
9	As the user of this ESA, based on your knowledge and experience related to the property are there any obvious indicators that point to the presence or likely presence of contamination at the property?				

In addition, are you aware of any of the following documents, and if so, please forward copies of the document(s) to EMG at 11011 McCormick Road, Hunt Valley, Maryland 21031 (along with a copy of this form):

**Helpful Documents to be forwarded EMG:**

- Environmental site assessment reports (i.e., Phase I, Phase II, tank testing results, radon, lead paint, or asbestos testing, etc.)
- Environmental compliance audit reports; risk assessments; and recorded Activity and Use Limitations (AULs)
- Environmental permits (i.e., solid waste disposal, hazardous waste disposal, wastewater, NPDES, underground injection, etc.)
- Registrations for underground storage tanks (USTs) and aboveground storage tanks (ASTs)
- Registrations for underground injection systems
- Material safety data sheets
- Community right-to-know plan
- Safety plans; preparedness and prevention plans; spill prevention, countermeasure, and control plans, etc
- Reports regarding hydrogeological or geotechnical conditions on the property and surrounding area
- Notices/correspondence from any agency relating to past/current violations of environmental laws, or liens encumbering the property
- Hazardous waste generator notices or reports
- Other:



**OWNER QUESTIONNAIRE**

EMG has been retained to conduct a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) of the following property. The Phase I ESA will involve site observations, interviews, and a review of available documentation. To ensure the success of the assessment, and in accordance with the ASTM 05 Scope of Work for this assessment we are required to ask the following questions to the Owner or Owner representative. Please complete this questionnaire and return via email or by fax to 410-785-6220 (within one business day of receipt).

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of person completing questionnaire: A completed Owner questionnaire was not returned to EMG. Company: \_\_\_\_\_

Length of association with property: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Property Name/Address: University of The District of Columbia/ 4200 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest, Washington, District of Columbia 20008

EMG Project Number: 89419.08R-009.017

Please check one: Owner:  Owner Representative:

**Directions:** Please answer all questions to the best of your knowledge and in good faith. Mark the column corresponding to the appropriate response. Additional details necessary to explain any yes or unknown responses should be provided in the "Comments" column. Note: U/NR indicates "Unknown" or "No Response", and "N/A" indicates not applicable.

	QUESTION	RESPONSE			COMMENTS
		Y	N	U/NR	
1	Are you aware of any pending, threatened, or past litigation relevant to hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on, or from the property?				
2	Are you aware of any pending, threatened, or past administrative proceedings relevant to hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on or from the property?				
3	Are you aware of any notices from any governmental entity regarding any possible violation of environmental laws or possible liability relating to hazardous substances or petroleum products?				

In addition, are you aware of any of the following documents, and if so, please forward copies of the document(s) to EMG at 11011 McCormick Road, Hunt Valley, Maryland 21031 (along with a copy of this form):

**Helpful Documents to be forwarded EMG:**

- Environmental site assessment reports (i.e., Phase I, Phase II, tank testing results, radon, lead paint, or asbestos testing, etc.)
- Environmental compliance audit reports; risk assessments; and recorded Activity and Use Limitations (AULs)
- Environmental permits (i.e., solid waste disposal, hazardous waste disposal, wastewater, NPDES, underground injection, etc.)
- Registrations for underground storage tanks (USTs) and aboveground storage tanks (ASTs)
- Registrations for underground injection systems
- Material safety data sheets
- Community right-to-know plan
- Safety plans; preparedness and prevention plans; spill prevention, countermeasure, and control plans, etc
- Reports regarding hydrogeological or geotechnical conditions on the property and surrounding area
- Notices/correspondence from any agency relating to past/current violations of environmental laws, or liens encumbering the property
- Hazardous waste generator notices or reports



# ENVIRONMENTAL

## ASSESSMENT

89419.08R-009.017

Other:



---

---

**APPENDIX F:  
REGULATORY DATABASE REPORT**

---

---

**Project #: 89419.009.017**

UDC - Phase 1 Report

4200 Connecticut Avenue, NW


Washington, DC 20008

Inquiry Number: 2376358.1s

December 05, 2008

# The EDR Radius Map™ Report

Prepared for EMG



440 Wheelers Farms Road  
Milford, CT 06461  
Toll Free: 800.352.0050  
[www.edrnet.com](http://www.edrnet.com)

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Executive Summary .....	ES1
Overview Map .....	2
Detail Map .....	3
Map Summary .....	4
Map Findings .....	6
Orphan Summary .....	71
Government Records Searched/Data Currency Tracking .....	GR-1
 <b><u>GEOCHECK ADDENDUM</u></b>	
 <b>GeoCheck - Not Requested</b>	
Orphan Details .....	OD-1

***Thank you for your business.***  
Please contact EDR at 1-800-352-0050  
with any questions or comments.

#### **Disclaimer - Copyright and Trademark Notice**

This Report contains certain information obtained from a variety of public and other sources reasonably available to Environmental Data Resources, Inc. It cannot be concluded from this Report that coverage information for the target and surrounding properties does not exist from other sources. **NO WARRANTY EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED, IS MADE WHATSOEVER IN CONNECTION WITH THIS REPORT. ENVIRONMENTAL DATA RESOURCES, INC. SPECIFICALLY DISCLAIMS THE MAKING OF ANY SUCH WARRANTIES, INCLUDING WITHOUT LIMITATION, MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR USE OR PURPOSE. ALL RISK IS ASSUMED BY THE USER. IN NO EVENT SHALL ENVIRONMENTAL DATA RESOURCES, INC. BE LIABLE TO ANYONE, WHETHER ARISING OUT OF ERRORS OR OMISSIONS, NEGLIGENCE, ACCIDENT OR ANY OTHER CAUSE, FOR ANY LOSS OF DAMAGE, INCLUDING, WITHOUT LIMITATION, SPECIAL, INCIDENTAL, CONSEQUENTIAL, OR EXEMPLARY DAMAGES. ANY LIABILITY ON THE PART OF ENVIRONMENTAL DATA RESOURCES, INC. IS STRICTLY LIMITED TO A REFUND OF THE AMOUNT PAID FOR THIS REPORT.** Purchaser accepts this Report "AS IS". Any analyses, estimates, ratings, environmental risk levels or risk codes provided in this Report are provided for illustrative purposes only, and are not intended to provide, nor should they be interpreted as providing any facts regarding, or prediction or forecast of, any environmental risk for any property. Only a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment performed by an environmental professional can provide information regarding the environmental risk for any property. Additionally, the information provided in this Report is not to be construed as legal advice.

Copyright 2008 by Environmental Data Resources, Inc. All rights reserved. Reproduction in any media or format, in whole or in part, of any report or map of Environmental Data Resources, Inc., or its affiliates, is prohibited without prior written permission.

EDR and its logos (including Sanborn and Sanborn Map) are trademarks of Environmental Data Resources, Inc. or its affiliates. All other trademarks used herein are the property of their respective owners.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A search of available environmental records was conducted by Environmental Data Resources, Inc (EDR). The report was designed to assist parties seeking to meet the search requirements of EPA's Standards and Practices for All Appropriate Inquiries (40 CFR Part 312), the ASTM Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments (E 1527-05) or custom requirements developed for the evaluation of environmental risk associated with a parcel of real estate.

### TARGET PROPERTY INFORMATION

#### ADDRESS

4200 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20008

#### COORDINATES

Latitude (North): 38.944740 - 38° 56' 41.1"  
Longitude (West): 77.065550 - 77° 3' 56.0"  
Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 18  
UTM X (Meters): 320988.6  
UTM Y (Meters): 4312465.0

### USGS TOPOGRAPHIC MAP ASSOCIATED WITH TARGET PROPERTY

Target Property Map: 38077-H1 WASHINGTON WEST, DC  
Most Recent Revision: 1983

### TARGET PROPERTY SEARCH RESULTS

The target property was identified in the following records. For more information on this property see page 6 of the attached EDR Radius Map report:

<u>Site</u>	<u>Database(s)</u>	<u>EPA ID</u>
UNIV DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA 4200 CONNECTICUT AVE WASHINGTON, DC 20008	FINDS	110029194280
UNIVERSITY OF THE DISTRICT OF COL 4200 CONNECTICUT AVE WASHINGTON, DC 20008	ICIS	N/A
VAN NESS POWER PLANT CAMPUS 4200 CONNECTICUT AVE NW WASHINGTON, DC 20008	ICIS	N/A
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, UNIV. OF TH 4200 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20008	MLTS	N/A
DC PUBLIC SCHOOLS 4200 CONNECTICUT AVENUE. NW WASHINGTON DC, DC	LUST	N/A
UNIVERSITY OF THE DISTRICT OF COL CONNECTICUT AV & VAN NESS ST NW 4200 CONNECTICUT A WASHINGTON, DC 20008	UST	N/A

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TEACHERS COLLEGE-DC 4200 CONNECTICUT AVE WASHINGTON, DC 20008	ICIS	N/A
UNIV DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA 4200 CONNECTICUT AVE WASHINGTON, DC 20008	ICIS	N/A
UDC OIL SPILL 1997 SITE 4200 CONNECTICUT AVE NW WASHINGTON, DC 20008	CERC-NFRAP	DC0001900000
UNIVERSITY OF THE DISTRICT OF COL 4200 CONNECTICUT AVENUE NW WASHINGTON, DC 20008	RCRA-LQG MANIFEST	DCR000001750
VAN NESS POWER PLANT CAMPUS 4200 CONNECTICUT AVE NW WASHINGTON, DC 20008	FINDS	110010716902

### DATABASES WITH NO MAPPED SITES

No mapped sites were found in EDR's search of available ("reasonably ascertainable ") government records either on the target property or within the search radius around the target property for the following databases:

### FEDERAL RECORDS

NPL.....	National Priority List
Proposed NPL.....	Proposed National Priority List Sites
Delisted NPL.....	National Priority List Deletions
NPL LIENS.....	Federal Superfund Liens
LIENS 2.....	CERCLA Lien Information
CORRACTS.....	Corrective Action Report
RCRA-TSDF.....	RCRA - Transporters, Storage and Disposal
RCRA-NonGen.....	RCRA - Non Generators
US ENG CONTROLS.....	Engineering Controls Sites List
US INST CONTROL.....	Sites with Institutional Controls
ERNS.....	Emergency Response Notification System
HMIRS.....	Hazardous Materials Information Reporting System
DOT OPS.....	Incident and Accident Data
US CDL.....	Clandestine Drug Labs
US BROWNFIELDS.....	A Listing of Brownfields Sites
DOD.....	Department of Defense Sites
LUCIS.....	Land Use Control Information System
CONSENT.....	Superfund (CERCLA) Consent Decrees

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ROD.....	Records Of Decision
UMTRA.....	Uranium Mill Tailings Sites
ODI.....	Open Dump Inventory
DEBRIS REGION 9.....	Torres Martinez Reservation Illegal Dump Site Locations
MINES.....	Mines Master Index File
TRIS.....	Toxic Chemical Release Inventory System
TSCA.....	Toxic Substances Control Act
FTTS.....	FIFRA/ TSCA Tracking System - FIFRA (Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, & Rodenticide Act)/TSCA (Toxic Substances Control Act)
HIST FTTS.....	FIFRA/TSCA Tracking System Administrative Case Listing
SSTS.....	Section 7 Tracking Systems
PADS.....	PCB Activity Database System
RADINFO.....	Radiation Information Database
RAATS.....	RCRA Administrative Action Tracking System
SCRD DRYCLEANERS.....	State Coalition for Remediation of Drycleaners Listing

### STATE AND LOCAL RECORDS

SHWS.....	This state does not maintain a SHWS list. See the Federal CERCLIS list and Federal NPL list.
SWF/LF.....	Solid Waste Facility Listing
AST.....	List of Aboveground Storage Tanks
VCP.....	Voluntary Cleanup Program Sites

### TRIBAL RECORDS

INDIAN RESERV.....	Indian Reservations
INDIAN ODI.....	Report on the Status of Open Dumps on Indian Lands
INDIAN LUST.....	Leaking Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land
INDIAN UST.....	Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land
INDIAN VCP.....	Voluntary Cleanup Priority Listing

### EDR PROPRIETARY RECORDS

Manufactured Gas Plants..... EDR Proprietary Manufactured Gas Plants

### SURROUNDING SITES: SEARCH RESULTS

Surrounding sites were identified in the following databases.

Page numbers and map identification numbers refer to the EDR Radius Map report where detailed data on individual sites can be reviewed.

Sites listed in ***bold italics*** are in multiple databases.

Unmappable (orphan) sites are not considered in the foregoing analysis.

### FEDERAL RECORDS

CERCLIS: The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Information System contains data on potentially hazardous waste sites that have been reported to the USEPA by states, municipalities, private companies and private persons, pursuant to Section 103 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA). CERCLIS contains sites which are either

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

proposed to or on the National Priorities List (NPL) and sites which are in the screening and assessment phase for possible inclusion on the NPL.

A review of the CERCLIS list, as provided by EDR, and dated 07/09/2008 has revealed that there are 2 CERCLIS sites within approximately 1 mile of the target property.

<u>Site</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Dist / Dir</u>	<u>Map ID</u>	<u>Page</u>
<b>DIAMOND ORDNANCE FUZE LAB</b>	<b>CONNECTICUT AVENUE &amp; WI</b>	<b>0 - 1/8 (0.000 mi.)</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>USN NAVAL SECURITY STATION</b>	<b>3801 NEBRASKA AVE., NW</b>	<b>1/2 - 1 (0.906 mi.) WSW</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>70</b>

CERC-NFRAP: Archived sites are sites that have been removed and archived from the inventory of CERCLIS sites. Archived status indicates that, to the best of EPA's knowledge, assessment at a site has been completed and that EPA has determined no further steps will be taken to list this site on the National Priorities List (NPL), unless information indicates this decision was not appropriate or other considerations require a recommendation for listing at a later time. This decision does not necessarily mean that there is no hazard associated with a given site; it only means that, based upon available information, the location is not judged to be a potential NPL site.

A review of the CERC-NFRAP list, as provided by EDR, and dated 12/03/2007 has revealed that there is 1 CERC-NFRAP site within approximately 1 mile of the target property.

<u>Site</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Dist / Dir</u>	<u>Map ID</u>	<u>Page</u>
<b>SOAPSTONE CREEK OIL SPILL RESP</b>	<b>4411 CONNECTICUT AVE.,</b>	<b>0 - 1/8 (0.000 mi.)</b>	<b>B14</b>	<b>30</b>

RCRA-SQG: RCRAInfo is EPA's comprehensive information system, providing access to data supporting the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) of 1976 and the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments (HSWA) of 1984. The database includes selective information on sites which generate, transport, store, treat and/or dispose of hazardous waste as defined by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). Small quantity generators (SQGs) generate between 100 kg and 1,000 kg of hazardous waste per month.

A review of the RCRA-SQG list, as provided by EDR, and dated 09/10/2008 has revealed that there is 1 RCRA-SQG site within approximately 0.125 miles of the target property.

<u>Site</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Dist / Dir</u>	<u>Map ID</u>	<u>Page</u>
<b>DRYCLEAN DEPOT</b>	<b>4418 CONNECTICUT AVENUE</b>	<b>0 - 1/8 (0.013 mi.) NNW</b>	<b>F27</b>	<b>54</b>

RCRA-CESQG: RCRAInfo is EPA's comprehensive information system, providing access to data supporting the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) of 1976 and the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments (HSWA) of 1984. The database includes selective information on sites which generate, transport, store, treat and/or dispose of hazardous waste as defined by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). Conditionally exempt small quantity generators (CESQGs) generate less than 100 kg of hazardous waste, or less than 1 kg of acutely hazardous waste per month.

A review of the RCRA-CESQG list, as provided by EDR, and dated 09/10/2008 has revealed that there are 5 RCRA-CESQG sites within approximately 0.125 miles of the target property.

<u>Site</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Dist / Dir</u>	<u>Map ID</u>	<u>Page</u>
<b>VAN NESS TEXACO</b>	<b>4225 CONN AVE NW</b>	<b>0 - 1/8 (0.000 mi.)</b>	<b>C17</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>EMBASSY CLEANERS</b>	<b>4215 CONNECTICUT AVENUE</b>	<b>0 - 1/8 (0.000 mi.)</b>	<b>C19</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>PARKLANE CLEANERS</b>	<b>4304 CONNECTICUT AVENUE</b>	<b>0 - 1/8 (0.001 mi.)</b>	<b>D24</b>	<b>46</b>

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<u>Site</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Dist / Dir</u>	<u>Map ID</u>	<u>Page</u>
<b>INTELSAT</b> US DEPT STATE STATE ANNEX 33 (	<b>3400 INTERNATIONAL DR N</b> 3507 INTERNATIONAL PLAC	<b>0 - 1/8 (0.005 mi.) S</b> 0 - 1/8 (0.107 mi.) S	<b>E26</b> 42	<b>49</b> 61

FUDS: The Listing includes locations of Formerly Used Defense Sites Properties where the US Army Corps Of Engineers is actively working or will take necessary cleanup actions.

A review of the FUDS list, as provided by EDR, and dated 12/31/2007 has revealed that there is 1 FUDS site within approximately 1 mile of the target property.

<u>Site</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Dist / Dir</u>	<u>Map ID</u>	<u>Page</u>
DIAMOND ORDNANCE FUZE LABORATO		0 - 1/8 (0.084 mi.) S	37	59

### STATE AND LOCAL RECORDS

LUST: The Leaking Underground Storage Tank Incident Reports contain an inventory of reported leaking underground storage tank incidents. The data come from the Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs' District of Columbia LUST Cases list.

A review of the LUST list, as provided by EDR, and dated 04/01/2008 has revealed that there are 23 LUST sites within approximately 0.5 miles of the target property.

<u>Site</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Dist / Dir</u>	<u>Map ID</u>	<u>Page</u>
CHARLES E. SMITH RESIDENTIAL R	4411 CONNECTICUT AVENUE	0 - 1/8 (0.000 mi.)	B15	31
TEXACO	4225 CONNECTICUT AVENUE	0 - 1/8 (0.000 mi.)	C20	44
SIRIUS LLC	4107 CONNECTICUT AVENUE	0 - 1/8 (0.082 mi.) SSE	H35	58
THE BURKE SCHOOL	4101 CONNECTICUT AVENUE	0 - 1/8 (0.087 mi.) SSE	H40	60
<b>CONNECTICUT HOUSE</b>	<b>4500 CONNECTICUT AV NW</b>	<b>0 - 1/8 (0.088 mi.) NNW</b>	<b>I41</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>BRANDYWINE APARTMENTS</b>	<b>4545 CONNECTICUT AV NW</b>	<b>1/8 - 1/4 (0.157 mi.) NNW</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>63</b>
TILDEN GARDEN	3016 TILDEN ST. NW	1/8 - 1/4 (0.160 mi.) S	45	64
TILDEN GARDENS, INC.	3024 TILDEN STREET, NW	1/8 - 1/4 (0.168 mi.) S	46	64
<b>TILDEN GARDEN APARTMENTS</b>	<b>3000 TILDEN ST NW</b>	<b>1/8 - 1/4 (0.174 mi.) SSE</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>65</b>
TILDEN GARDENS, INC.	3900 CONNECTICUT AVENUE	1/8 - 1/4 (0.230 mi.) SSE	48	65
COMMUNITY SYSTEMS INCORP.	4700 CONNECTICUT AVENUE	1/4 - 1/2 (0.302 mi.) NNW	49	65
CARNEGIE INSTITUTE	2801 UPTON STREET, NW	1/4 - 1/2 (0.316 mi.) E	J51	66
DARO REALTY INC.	3726 CONNECTICUT AVENUE	1/4 - 1/2 (0.354 mi.) SSE	K52	66
<b>ESSEX CONDO</b>	<b>4740 CONNECTICUT AV NW</b>	<b>1/4 - 1/2 (0.355 mi.) NNW</b>	<b>L53</b>	<b>67</b>
<b>4707 CONNECTICUT AV CONDOMINIU</b>	<b>4707 CONNECTICUT AV NW</b>	<b>1/4 - 1/2 (0.355 mi.) NNW</b>	<b>L54</b>	<b>67</b>
3701 CONNECTICUT AVE.	3701 CONNECTICUT AVENUE	1/4 - 1/2 (0.377 mi.) SSE	K55	67
ALVIN L. AUBINOE, INC.	4801 CONNECTICUT AVE.,	1/4 - 1/2 (0.403 mi.) NNW	56	68
US POSTAL SERVICE	4005 WISCONSIN AVENUE,	1/4 - 1/2 (0.459 mi.) WSW	57	68
<b>ROYAL NETHERLANDS EMBASSY</b>	<b>4200 LINNEAN AV NW</b>	<b>1/4 - 1/2 (0.459 mi.) E</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>68</b>
DONAHOE AND SONS	3939 WISCONSIN AVENUE,	1/4 - 1/2 (0.460 mi.) WSW	M59	69
<b>FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSO</b>	<b>3900 WISCONSIN AV NW</b>	<b>1/4 - 1/2 (0.464 mi.) WSW</b>	<b>M60</b>	<b>69</b>
CONCORD TRUST	4701 LINNEAN AVENUE, NW	1/4 - 1/2 (0.467 mi.) NE	61	69
HILLWOOD MUSEUM	4155 LINNEAN AVENUE, NW	1/4 - 1/2 (0.470 mi.) E	62	70

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

UST: The Underground Storage Tank database contains registered USTs. USTs are regulated under Subtitle I of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). The data come from the Department of Consumer & Regulatory Affairs' D.C. UST Database List.

A review of the UST list, as provided by EDR, and dated 11/04/2008 has revealed that there are 13 UST sites within approximately 0.125 miles of the target property.

<u>Site</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Dist / Dir</u>	<u>Map ID</u>	<u>Page</u>
FORMER GAS STATION	4201 CONNECTICUT AV NW	0 - 1/8 (0.000 mi.)	C16	31
<b>VAN NESS TEXACO</b>	<b>4225 CONN AVE NW</b>	<b>0 - 1/8 (0.000 mi.)</b>	<b>C17</b>	<b>32</b>
VAN NESS CENTER LTD PARTNERSHI	4301 CONNECTICUT AV NW	0 - 1/8 (0.000 mi.)	D22	45
INTELSAT	3400 INTERNATIONAL DR N	0 - 1/8 (0.005 mi.) S	E25	49
WESTMINSTER INVESTING CORP.	4461 CONNECTICUT AV NW	0 - 1/8 (0.048 mi.) NNW	G31	57
PARK & SHOP LP	4473 CONNECTICUT AV NW	0 - 1/8 (0.060 mi.) NNW	G32	57
EMBASSY OF EGYPT	3521 INTERNATIONAL CT N	0 - 1/8 (0.060 mi.) W	33	57
VAN NESS APARTMENTS SOUTH	3003-05 VAN NESS ST NW	0 - 1/8 (0.069 mi.) ENE	34	58
4107 CONNECTICUT AV NW	4107 CONNECTICUT AV NW	0 - 1/8 (0.082 mi.) SSE	H36	58
ALBEMARLE	4501 CONNECTICUT AV NW	0 - 1/8 (0.086 mi.) NNW	I38	59
THE ALBERMARLE	4501 CONNECTICUT AV NW	0 - 1/8 (0.086 mi.) NNW	I39	60
<b>CONNECTICUT HOUSE</b>	<b>4500 CONNECTICUT AV NW</b>	<b>0 - 1/8 (0.088 mi.) NNW</b>	<b>I41</b>	<b>60</b>
V.N.N.C. INC	3001 VEAZEY TR NW	0 - 1/8 (0.107 mi.) ENE	43	63

BROWNFIELDS: A listing of potential brownfields site locations.

A review of the BROWNFIELDS list, as provided by EDR, and dated 01/28/2008 has revealed that there is 1 BROWNFIELDS site within approximately 0.5 miles of the target property.

<u>Site</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Dist / Dir</u>	<u>Map ID</u>	<u>Page</u>
Not reported	2801 UPTON STREET, NW	1/4 - 1/2 (0.316 mi.) E	J50	66

### EDR PROPRIETARY RECORDS

EDR Historical Auto Stations: EDR has searched selected national collections of business directories and has collected listings of potential gas station/filling station/service station sites that were available to EDR researchers. EDR's review was limited to those categories of sources that might, in EDR's opinion, include gas station/filling station/service station establishments. The categories reviewed included, but were not limited to gas, gas station, gasoline station, filling station, auto, automobile repair, auto service station, service station, etc.

A review of the EDR Historical Auto Stations list, as provided by EDR, has revealed that there are 6 EDR Historical Auto Stations sites within approximately 0.25 miles of the target property.

<u>Site</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Dist / Dir</u>	<u>Map ID</u>	<u>Page</u>
CLEVELAND PARK SERVICE	4401 CONNECTICUT AVE NW	0 - 1/8 (0.000 mi.)	B12	29
MC DOWELL BROS INC	4201 CONNECTICUT AVE NW	0 - 1/8 (0.000 mi.)	C13	30
JENSON TEXACO SERVICE	4225 CONNECTICUT AVE NW	0 - 1/8 (0.000 mi.)	C18	39
EADER JESSE M GULF SERVICE	4339 CONNECTICUT AVE NW	0 - 1/8 (0.000 mi.)	21	44
SKINKER BROS	4441 CONNECTICUT AVE NW	0 - 1/8 (0.026 mi.) NNW	F28	56
SKINKER BROS	4444 CONNECTICUT AVE NW	0 - 1/8 (0.037 mi.) NNW	F30	56

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

EDR Historical Cleaners: EDR has searched selected national collections of business directories and has collected listings of potential dry cleaner sites that were available to EDR researchers. EDR's review was limited to those categories of sources that might, in EDR's opinion, include dry cleaning establishments. The categories reviewed included, but were not limited to dry cleaners, cleaners, laundry, laundromat, cleaning/laundry, wash & dry etc.

A review of the EDR Historical Cleaners list, as provided by EDR, has revealed that there is 1 EDR Historical Cleaners site within approximately 0.25 miles of the target property.


<u>Site</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Dist / Dir</u>	<u>Map ID</u>	<u>Page</u>
CHEVY CHASE VALET SHOP	4447 CONNECTICUT AVE NW	0 - 1/8 (0.032 mi.) NNW	F29	56

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Due to poor or inadequate address information, the following sites were not mapped:

<u>Site Name</u>	<u>Database(s)</u>
WASHINGTON D.C. CHEMICAL MUNITIONS	CERCLIS, FINDS
FORT RENO	CERCLIS
GLOVER BRIDGE SITE	CERCLIS, FINDS
SOAP STONE CREEK	CERC-NFRAP
BOLLING AFB - CAR CARE CNTR	LUST
GRIFFITH CONSUMER	LUST
DPW PROPERTY - 1725 FENWICK	LUST
CATHOLIC U - NUGENT HALL	LUST
DC - HCD	LUST
SUNOCO - FORMER	LUST
CARVER TERRACE APARTMENTS - TCM CO	LUST
NPS FT DUPONT - MAINT. YRD.	LUST
LANO/ARMADA HARBOURSIDE, LLC	LUST
CHISWELL LANGHORNE RESIDENCE	LUST
FT. MCNAIR - GAS STATION	LUST
DC PUBLIC SCHOOLS	LUST
I-295 1/4 MILE NORTH OF	ERNS
14TH ST. BRIDGE - OVER POTOMAC RIV	ERNS
BEAVERDAM CREEK APPROXIMATELY 1/4	ERNS
BEHIND 1900 1/2 ST SW APPEARS TO B	ERNS
CAR SHOP - IVY CITY YARD	ERNS
HICKEY RUN - NATIONAL ABARETUM	ERNS
ON M ST. S.E. - 2 BLOCKS NORTH OF	ERNS
1 MACORD ST BOLLING AFB	ERNS
1 MACORD ST BOLLING AFB	ERNS
NATIONAL AIRPORT, GATE #1	ERNS
NATIONAL ABORETUM - HICKEY RUN	ERNS
SPRING VALLEY AREA - NEAR MONTGOME	ERNS
901 M ST., SE - SISCARD ST. & PATT	ERNS
USEPA - HQ	ERNS

# OVERVIEW MAP - 2376358.1s




-  Target Property
-  Toxic Sites
-  Manufactured Gas Plants
-  National Priority List Sites
-  Dept. Defense Sites

-  Indian Reservations BIA
-  County Boundary
-  Oil & Gas pipelines




<p>SITE NAME: UDC - Phase 1 Report                  ADDRESS: 4200 Connecticut Avenue, NW                  Washington DC 20008                  LAT/LONG: 38.9447 / 77.0656</p>	<p>CLIENT: EMG                  CONTACT: Ron Melchior                  INQUIRY #: 2376358.1s                  DATE: December 05, 2008 2:22 pm</p>
--	---

# DETAIL MAP - 2376358.1s



-  Target Property
-  Toxic Sites
-  Manufactured Gas Plants
-  Sensitive Receptors
-  National Priority List Sites
-  Dept. Defense Sites

-  Indian Reservations BIA
-  Oil & Gas pipelines



SITE NAME: UDC - Phase 1 Report  
 ADDRESS: 4200 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
 Washington DC 20008  
 LAT/LONG: 38.9447 / 77.0656

CLIENT: EMG  
 CONTACT: Ron Melchior  
 INQUIRY #: 2376358.1s  
 DATE: December 05, 2008 2:22 pm

MAP FINDINGS SUMMARY

Database	Target Property	Search Distance (Miles)	< 1/8	1/8 - 1/4	1/4 - 1/2	1/2 - 1	> 1	Total Plotted
<b>FEDERAL RECORDS</b>								
NPL		1.000	0	0	0	0	NR	0
Proposed NPL		1.000	0	0	0	0	NR	0
Delisted NPL		1.000	0	0	0	0	NR	0
NPL LIENS		TP	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	0
CERCLIS		1.000	1	0	0	1	NR	2
CERC-NFRAP	X	1.000	1	0	0	0	NR	1
LIENS 2		TP	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	0
CORRACTS		1.000	0	0	0	0	NR	0
RCRA-TSDF		0.500	0	0	0	NR	NR	0
RCRA-LQG	X	0.125	0	NR	NR	NR	NR	0
RCRA-SQG		0.125	1	NR	NR	NR	NR	1
RCRA-CESQG		0.125	5	NR	NR	NR	NR	5
RCRA-NonGen		TP	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	0
US ENG CONTROLS		TP	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	0
US INST CONTROL		TP	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	0
ERNS		TP	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	0
HMIRS		TP	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	0
DOT OPS		TP	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	0
US CDL		TP	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	0
US BROWNFIELDS		0.500	0	0	0	NR	NR	0
DOD		1.000	0	0	0	0	NR	0
FUDS		1.000	1	0	0	0	NR	1
LUCIS		0.500	0	0	0	NR	NR	0
CONSENT		1.000	0	0	0	0	NR	0
ROD		1.000	0	0	0	0	NR	0
UMTRA		0.500	0	0	0	NR	NR	0
ODI		0.500	0	0	0	NR	NR	0
DEBRIS REGION 9		0.500	0	0	0	NR	NR	0
MINES		0.250	0	0	NR	NR	NR	0
TRIS		TP	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	0
TSCA		TP	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	0
FTTS		TP	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	0
HIST FTTS		TP	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	0
SSTS		TP	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	0
ICIS	X	TP	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	0
PADS		TP	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	0
MLTS	X	TP	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	0
RADINFO		TP	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	0
FINDS	X	TP	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	0
RAATS		TP	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	0
SCRD DRYCLEANERS		0.500	0	0	0	NR	NR	0
<b>STATE AND LOCAL RECORDS</b>								
SHWS		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SWF/LF		0.500	0	0	0	NR	NR	0
LUST	X	0.500	5	5	13	NR	NR	23
UST	X	0.125	13	NR	NR	NR	NR	13

MAP FINDINGS SUMMARY

<u>Database</u>	<u>Target Property</u>	<u>Search Distance (Miles)</u>	<u>&lt; 1/8</u>	<u>1/8 - 1/4</u>	<u>1/4 - 1/2</u>	<u>1/2 - 1</u>	<u>&gt; 1</u>	<u>Total Plotted</u>
AST		0.250	0	0	NR	NR	NR	0
VCP		0.500	0	0	0	NR	NR	0
BROWNFIELDS		0.500	0	0	1	NR	NR	1
<b><u>TRIBAL RECORDS</u></b>								
INDIAN RESERV		1.000	0	0	0	0	NR	0
INDIAN ODI		0.500	0	0	0	NR	NR	0
INDIAN LUST		0.500	0	0	0	NR	NR	0
INDIAN UST		0.125	0	NR	NR	NR	NR	0
INDIAN VCP		0.500	0	0	0	NR	NR	0
<b><u>EDR PROPRIETARY RECORDS</u></b>								
Manufactured Gas Plants		1.000	0	0	0	0	NR	0
EDR Historical Auto Stations		0.250	6	0	NR	NR	NR	6
EDR Historical Cleaners		0.250	1	0	NR	NR	NR	1

NOTES:

TP = Target Property

NR = Not Requested at this Search Distance

Sites may be listed in more than one database

N/A = This State does not maintain a SHWS list. See the Federal CERCLIS list.

---

---

**APPENDIX G:  
SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

---

---



43045 John Mosby Highway  
Chantilly, Virginia 20152  
(703) 327-2900  
(800) ECC-FIRST

**RESPONSE ACTION PLAN  
REVISION 1**

**UNIVERSITY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
VAN NESS CAMPUS  
4200 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C.**

**DOCKET # III-97-002CW**

**May 5, 1997**

ECC Project No. 97-2779

Submitted To: Ms. Deborah E. Carlson  
Project Coordinator  
Removal Enforcement and Oil Section (3HW32)  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region III  
841 Chestnut Street  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107

Prepared by:

Approved by:

---

Paul J. Jones  
Director of Geosciences  
ECC

---

Philip L. Brach, Ph.D., P.E.  
Project Coordinator  
UDC

*A member of the SCI companies.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	Introduction .....	1
2.0	Background Information .....	2
2.1	Location and Site Description .....	2
2.2	Environmental History .....	2
2.3	Geology / Hydrogeology .....	6
3.0	Investigation of Soil and Groundwater Plan .....	8
3.1	Geologic / Hydrogeologic Investigation .....	8
3.2	Free Phase Fuel Oil Recovery .....	12
3.3	Subsurface Investigation Implementation Schedule .	12
4.0	Health and Safety Plan .....	14
4.1	Introduction .....	14
4.2	Scope of Activities .....	14
4.3	Project Team .....	14
4.4	Health and Safety Training and Medical Monitoring .....	15
4.5	On-site Control .....	16
4.6	Hazard Evaluation .....	16
4.7	Personal Protective Equipment .....	17
4.8	Air Monitoring .....	18
4.9	Communications Procedures .....	19
4.10	Personnel Decontamination .....	19
4.11	Emergency Procedures .....	20
4.11.1	Emergency Phone List .....	20
4.11.2	Fire and Spills .....	20
4.11.3	General Response Consideration .....	21
4.11.4	Accidents and Nonroutine Events .....	21
4.11.5	Worker Injury .....	22



4.11.6 Emergency Response Equipment . . . . .	23
4.12 Weather Considerations . . . . .	23
4.13 General Rules and Regulations . . . . .	25
4.14 Special Considerations - Excavation Work . . . . .	26

**LIST OF FIGURES**

Figure 1 - Site Location Map
Figure 2 - Areal Site Plan
Figure 3 - Proposed Well Locations
Figure 4 - Map of Route to Hospital
Figure 5 - Mobile Exclusion Zone Diagram

**LIST OF APPENDICES**

Appendix A - Sampling Procedures
Appendix B - Material Safety Data Sheets and Vapor Phase Monitoring Form
Appendix C - Health and Safety Plan "Sign-Off" Sheet
Appendix D - Site Contractors - Statements of Qualifications