ADDENDUM NO.3
August 24, 2015

ARCHITECTURAL REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
OPENING DATE: August 27, 2015
OPENING TIME: 10:30 a.m.
BID NUMBER: 2036-15

This Addendum No.3 is being issued to answer the following questions:

QUESTION:

Section V of the RFP calls for LEED tracking and mentioned elsewhere, but there is no reference to a LEED requirement/goal, correct? Do you want the firms to submit/include the pricey USGBC fees and application costs for LEED filing, etc.

ANSWER:

Yes, firms should include a LEED component that is broken out should the NLBC wish to consider such a standard.

QUESTION:

Section 5, Approach, asks for 'an estimate of the construction cost of the firms concept?" Are you requiring a conceptual design and conceptual estimate of the A/Es in this submission?

ANSWER:

No conceptual design is required.

QUESTION:

Please confirm that the New Scheme D Revised is the scheme we are to propose on. (that the students/staff will be relocated off-site for the duration of the construction, etc)

ANSWER:

It is anticipated that students/staff will be relocated off-site during construction. Scheme D is the approved site of the new school building.

QUESTION:

Section V.E asks that “Proposals should include a separate category for restoration/modifications to the original school site…..” Can you explain this further and Where do you want this identified on the published proposal form?

ANSWER:

At the end of the project, the site, in its entirety, needs to be school ready. Thus any restoration/modifications of any existing elements need to be addressed to make the school safe and usable.

QUESTION:

Are we to include Playscape design into our scope of services?

ANSWER:

Yes

QUESTION:

Are COMPLETE existing AS-DESIGNED drawings available as they will be needed for the demolition documentation?

ANSWER:

Complete Cads are not available. We have architectural Cads and the District can’t confirm their accuracy.

QUESTION:

Are CAD data files of the existing school and site available from the Fletcher Thompson 1995 project?

ANSWER:

No

QUESTION:

If you don’t know the drawing status, can you characterize “How complete are the drawings?’

ANSWER:

We can not characterize

QUESTION:

The proposal form lists Haz Mat as an A/E service. How were estimates for the demo developed….i.e. were haz mat sampling and reports done, and can those be scanned to us by addendum?

ANSWER:

The District has not developed a demo plan. The content of HAZ Mat service is unknown.

QUESTION:

If as reported at the prebid meeting that remediation costs were not included in the budget, how will the demolition/abatement work be funded?

ANSWER:

Only soil remediation costs, and not demolition costs, were excluded from the budget.

QUESTION:

Are recent land survey data files available? Is survey by us or by town?

ANSWER:

The BOE anticipates receiving an A2-T2 survey in next several days.

QUESTION:

Are CA fees to include hazardous material CA services during construction? They are practically impossible to predict at this early stage.

ANSWER:

Yes

QUESTION:

Was the overall construction budget factored for the escalation of costs thru completion in 2018? If not, what will be the mechanism to assure adequate funding at this conceptual time.

ANSWER:

Yes

QUESTION:

Where in the Option D budget in RFP Section IV are the Construction Manager, A/E and other fees carried?

ANSWER:

The Construction Manger A/E and other fees are carried in the total budget.

QUESTION:

Are we to propose on one bidding phase only?

ANSWER:

Firms should bid on all phases

QUESTION:

If you expect multiple bidding phases are they to be concurrent or separate?

ANSWER:

While the budgetary process must be considered, firms should include all aspects of the project in their bids, so that separate contracts may be issued.

QUESTION:

Will an independent Program Manager consultant be involved with this project?

ANSWER

It is anticipated that project administration will be addressed, in part, by a CM/PM or other similar project management type position.

QUESTION:

Has a decision of Construction Manager involvement been decided? It affects our fees.

ANSWER

No

QUESTION:

If a CM does cost controls (estimating), does the Town still want to pay the A/E for separate estimating?

ANSWER:

Yes

QUESTION:

How often does the committee meet? Day or Evening?

ANSWER:

At least once a week, on an as needed basis, usually at 8 AM on Wednesdays.

QUESTION:

The Ed Spec does not have much on site elements. What recreation or play spaces are required?

ANSWER:

The project should include all age appropriate playgrounds and fields for recreational activities.

QUESTION:

Geothermal is listed as a given in the ed spec. Has a geothermal bore been drilled to determine veracity of geothermal? If not, do you want A/E to include the cost of the geothermal bore and conductivity testing in our proposal?

ANSWER:

NO studies have been performed to determine the feasibility of geothermal energy. This will be part of the design scope.

QUESTION:

The ed spec lists a new design that exists. Are we to copy that design? If so, is a release going to be provided by the Study architect?

ANSWER:

No, Scheme D solely relates to the location of the new building and is not intended to limit the design of the new building.

QUESTION:

Will the Committee/Town consider RENOVATE-AS-NEW as an option for the project? It has a totally different fee approach than a new project.

ANSWER:

As stated during the site visit, the BOE Ed Specifications call for a new school to be built. Firms should determine what, if any, existing elements would remain in building a new school.

QUESTION:

Has a pre-demolition National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) survey been completed for asbestos, lead based paint, universal waste and PCB's. If not, will it be the responsibility of the design team to carry fee to complete that testing?

ANSWER:

The NESHAP survey has NOT been completed and thus Firms should issue the costs of such a survey as a separate component of their fee proposal.

QUESTION:

If a pre-demolition NESHAP survey has been completed, we would like to confirm that the design team will only be responsible for preparing a hazardous material demolition design specifications and drawings based on the existing survey.

ANSWER:

See response above. (The NESHAP survey has NOT been completed and thus Firms should issue the costs of such a survey as a separate component of their fee proposal.)

QUESTION:

Addendum 2A includes information from Environmental Planning Services (EPS) on wetland delineation. Will the town continue to retain EPS during the design and entitlement process or should the design team include scope and fee for their own wetland scientist?

ANSWER:

The BOE will NOT continue to retain EPS on wetland delineation during the project, however, an A2/T2 survey is expected within the next several days.

QUESTION:

Exhibit C includes the Fee Proposal Form and additional forms (Insurance Procedure, Sample Endorsement Letter, Certificate of Insurance and Non-Collusion Affidavit). Please clarify where the additional forms should go. Are they included in the Technical Proposal and/or Fee Proposal in a separate sealed envelope?

ANSWER:

All forms must be included in the proposal package.

QUESTION:

RE: Insurance Procedure Statement and Non-Collusion Affidavit
Please clarify: Do you want just **one** copy of both of these forms?

ANSWER:

Each proposal must be submitted with one (1) original copy/set, and fourteen (14) copies/sets and one (1) electronic copy (flash drive) of the proposal.

QUESTION:

Are both of these forms to be included in the Separate Sealed Fee Proposal envelope?
ANSWER:

See above answer

QUESTION:

Do you foresee there being an extension for the RFP since we just received the new scheme at yesterday's site visit

ANSWER:

No

QUESTION:

Can you provide a list of the attended at the walk-thru?

ANSWER:

The Slam Collaborative
Geddis Architects
Silver Petrucelli +Associates
Quisenberry Arcari
Fletcher Thompson
SQ Architects
LCL Architecture
Peter Gisolfi Associates
Antinozzi Associates
Dattner Architects Marvel
Architects
Marvel Architects
IBI Group * Gruzen Samton
Wiles Architects
Site Design Associates
Fuller D'Angelo P.C.
Newman Architects
Svigals + Partners
Perkins Eastman
Aris Land Studio
Davis Brody Bond
Tai Soo Kim Partners
Architects
KG&D Architects
Langen

All project requirements, except for those that are specifically added or modified by this Addendum, shall remain in full effect.

Eugene H. Watts

END OF ADDENDUM NO. 3