

July 12, 2012

ADDENDUM NUMBER (3)

TO THE RFP DOCUMENTS FOR

NEW ORLEANS SIGNATURE CENTER CAMPUS
(DERHAM SITE)

STATE OF LOUISIANA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
RECOVERY SCHOOL DISTRICT

RSD PROJECT NO. 2011-0872-0001

Evans-Graves Engineers, Inc.

E-G Project No. 2011-21-750

The acknowledgement date for this Addendum will be July 12, 2012.

The original RFP documents for this project, dated June 22, 2012, are amended as noted in this Addendum Number (2)

This Addendum consists of 4 page(s), 0 page(s) of attachments, and 0 Drawing(s).

ITEM NO.

DESCRIPTION

ADD 3-1 CHANGE the *Performance Standards* of the RFP Document as follows: On page 130, Section Q *Equipment*, Subsection "Specialties", ADD the following language:

"Contractor shall provide electronic fire escape plans, which consists of an editable electronic file (editable pdf or similar) of the floor plan and site plan layout with fire escape arrows shown, that can be printed and posted throughout the school to show fire escape routes."

ADD 3-2 CHANGE Appendix E *Geotechnical Information* of the RFP Document as follows: On Page 16, Paragraph 48, DELETE the second sentence of this Paragraph. The remainder of the Paragraph remains unchanged.

ADD 3-3 FOR INFORMATION: Proposers are notified that, in accordance with Section 2 *Request for Proposal* of the RFP Document, Paragraphs 2.3 and 2.5, the deadline for receiving proposer inquiries has passed.

ADD 3-4 QUESTIONS SUBMITTED IN WRITING PRIOR TO THE DEADLINE:

1. *Question:* Is the Project intended to be a Design/Build Project? The sample contract is an A-101 Stipulated Sum Contract with no provisions for design review as Schematic, Design Development or Construction Document Phases. I am unaware how to administer a project with no initial design with a Standard State contract. How is final design approval documented?
Response: The project is not a design build contract. Required design elements of the project will be provided by selected general contractor during the submittal/shop drawing process to Evans-Graves Engineers, the Owner's A/E design consultant, for review.
Resolution: N/A.
2. *Question:* If it is not a D/B contract and we follow Attachment I / Scope of Services Functional and Technical Requirements that say to "Install a precast modular campus on existing cleared site"; where are the plans to follow to install the Modular Bldgs on the site? The Additions and Supplementary conditions to the A 101 contract reference Plans and Specifications, and there are none listed in the Contract. There is only a Survey and example floor plans in the RFP.
Response: See response to #1 above. Required design elements of the project will be provided by selected general contractor during the submittal/shop drawing process to Evans-Graves Engineers, the Owner's A/E design consultant, for review.
Resolution: N/A.
3. *Question:* A question was asked about who produces drawings and submits for the Bldg. Permit and completes the planning and zoning review and approval process and State Fire Marshall submission for plan review and permitting. It was answered that the proposer does. If that is the case then the Proposer would be the Professional of Record (Architect and Engineer) and this would only be possible through a Design / Build arrangement with a Contractor led Design / Build team. Who reviews Shop dwgs? Professional of Record with knowledge of Design requirements and calculations (working with the proposer), or the Owners' administrator?
Response: Shop drawings will be reviewed by Evans-Graves and the Owner in a manner similar to "delegated design" (for example, roof trusses, curtain wall, or prefabricated metal buildings), in which a professional engineer procured by the contractor/subcontractor designs, certifies, and professionally seals the calculations and drawings, which are then submitted for review to the A/E consultant, who is the Owner's agent.
Resolution: N/A.

4. *Question:* A survey was provided that indicates two Squares 468 and 469 make up the existing site. There is a note indicating interior lots not shown. If this is the case the Sq., or Sq.s' as well as the now closed street used to site the new campus on will require resubdivision during the planning and zoning process to be redeveloped as one site. Has the State initiated the resubdivision process? Will this be the responsibility of the Proposers?
Response: We are currently researching this issue with the City Zoning and Permits Departments. We will respond via a future Addendum.
Resolution: To be addressed in a future Addendum.
5. *Question:* What is the project budget?
Response: Per Addendum #2 dated 7-9-12, the project's construction budget range has been established as between \$5,800,000 and \$6,500,000.
Resolution: N/A; addressed in Addendum No. 2.
6. *Question:* Is there any LEED requirement for the project? LEED is referenced in the sample Schedule of Values.
Response: Per Addendum #2 dated 7-9-12, this is not a LEED project. Please disregard all references to LEED in the RFP Document, notably in the sample schedule of values submitted with the RFP Document.
Resolution: N/A; addressed in Addendum No. 2.
7. *Question:* What are the project LD's? None are referenced in the appropriate section of the draft contract.
Response: Per Addendum #2 dated 7-9-12, a paragraph was added to Section 2 *Request for Proposal* of the RFP Document to address LD's.
Resolution: N/A; addressed in Addendum No. 2.
8. *Question:* Is a 16 Division SOV acceptable with the proposal? The detailed example is not produceable at bid time. There is too much detail and proration of common costs.
Response: Yes. Per Addendum #2 dated 7-9-12, refer to Section 2 *Request for Proposal* of the RFP Document, Attachment I, Paragraph 3.H. The SOV provided in the RFP Document is a guide only for example and reference.
Resolution: N/A; addressed in Addendum No. 2.
9. *Question:* What are the 2 Schedule milestone dates? There are 3 listed in the RFP. Dec., Feb. and May.

Response: Per Addendum #2 dated 7-9-12, the February 20, 2013 date has been corrected in Addendum #2 to be May 1, 2013. There is no February 2013 milestone on this RFP schedule.

Resolution: N/A; addressed in Addendum No. 2.

10. *Question:* A single PreCast Concrete manufacturer is listed in the sample specifications. Is prior approval of a substitution req'd before proposal or can it be after?

Response: Pages 110 and 111 of the Performance Standards, Paragraph 2.2, allows for "or approved equal. Submit substitution request for approval." Prior approval of a substitution is not required; however, if a proposer wishes to submit a substitute product for prior approval, he shall do so no later than seven (7) working days prior to the RFP proposal submission deadline. The engineer will respond within three working days following the substitution request submission with written approval or denial of the substitution. After award to the successful proposer, the proposal will be assumed to include the "basis of design" product or any successful substitutes granted prior approval. The contractor may still submit a product for substitution in accordance with the standard shop drawing submittal process; however, if this product is denied "or equal" status, the basis of design product or any successful substitutes granted prior approval will govern.

Resolution: N/A.

11. *Question:* Section 11 of the A 201 contract specific to Insurance has no requirement for Professional Liability coverage or limits. As the Professional of Record shouldn't the proposer have this coverage? If so how much coverage and with what specific requirements.

Response: The design related submittals will require sealed engineering documentation as applicable. The selected general contractor should provide the appropriate coverage amounts as required for this specific scope of work.

Resolution: N/A.

ATTACHMENTS

None.

*** * * END OF ADDENDUM No. 3 * * ***