
Addendum #3

New Jersey Schools Development Authority
Office of Procurement
32 East Front Street
Trenton, NJ 08625
Phone: 609-858-2981
Fax: 609-656-2647

Date: August 14, 2015

PROJECT #: NE-0003-B01
New South Street Elementary School
Newark Public Schools

DESCRIPTION: Addendum #3

This addendum shall be considered part of the Bid Documents issued in connection with the above-referenced project. Should information conflict with the Bid Documents, this Addendum shall supercede the relevant information in the Bid Documents.

A. CHANGES TO THE PROCUREMENT PROCESS:

1. Not Applicable.

B. CHANGES TO THE PROJECT MANUAL:

1. Not Applicable.

C. CHANGES TO THE PERFORMANCE SPECIFICATIONS:

NOTE that modifications to the following items will be shown as follows: additions in **bold and underlined** text; deletions in *strikethrough and italics*.

1. **MODIFY:** In Section G3030.00, Storm Drainage Utilities, modify Paragraph II.C.6. as follows:
 6. Total Suspended Solid Filters
 - a. The system shall include an offline manufactured treatment device on all inflows to the underground detention basin (*except for roof drains*) **to reduce suspended solids by 80%**.
 - b. Filtration devices must be NJDEP approved.

D. CHANGES TO THE DRAWINGS:

- 1. REPLACE:** Drawing Sheet C-03 Existing Utility Plan, dated June 22, 2015 with Revised Drawing Sheet C-03 Existing Utility Plan, dated August 13, 2015, issued herewith as Attachment 3.1. All other plans, section and elevations are modified accordingly by implication.
- 2. REPLACE:** Drawing Sheet A-101 First Floor Plan, dated June 22, 2015 with Revised Drawing Sheet A-101 First Floor Plan, dated August 14, 2015, issued herewith as Attachment 3.2. All other plans, section and elevations are modified accordingly by implication.
- 3. REPLACE:** Drawing Sheet A-202 Enlarged Building Elevations, dated June 22, 2015, with Revised Drawing Sheet A-202, Enlarged Building Elevations, dated August 14, 2015, issued herewith as Attachment 3.3. All other plans, section and elevations are modified accordingly by implication.
- 4. REPLACE:** Drawing Sheet A-203 Enlarged Building Elevations, dated June 22, 2015 with Revised Drawing Sheet A-203 Enlarged Building Elevations, dated August 14, 2015, issued herewith as Attachment 3.4. All other plans, section and elevations are modified accordingly by implication.
- 5. REPLACE:** Drawing Sheet A-204 Enlarged Building Elevations, dated June 22, 2015 with Revised Drawing Sheet A-204 Enlarged Building Elevations, dated August 14, 2015, issued herewith as Attachment 3.5. All other plans, section and elevations are modified accordingly by implication.
- 6. REPLACE:** Drawing Sheet A-205 Enlarged Building Elevations, dated June 22, 2015 with Revised Drawing Sheet A-205 Enlarged Building Elevations, dated August 14, 2015, issued herewith as Attachment 3.6. All other plans, section and elevations are modified accordingly by implication.
- 7. REPLACE:** Drawing Sheet A-601 Door & Window Elevations, dated June 22, 2015 with Revised Drawing Sheet A-601 Door & Window Elevations, dated August 14, 205, issued herewith as Attachment 3.7. All other plans, section and elevations are modified accordingly by implication.
- 8. REPLACE:** Drawing Sheet AI-101 First Floor Plan Floor Finish Pattern, dated June 22, 2015 with Revised Drawing Sheet AI-101 First Floor Plan Floor Finish Pattern, dated August 14, 2015, issued herewith as Attachment 3.8. All other plans, section and elevations are modified accordingly by implication.
- 9. REPLACE:** Drawing Sheet AI-102 Second Floor Plan Floor Finish Pattern, dated June 22, 2015 with Revised Drawing Sheet AI-102 Second Floor Plan Floor Finish Pattern, dated August 14, 2015, issued herewith as Attachment 3.9. All other plans, section and elevations are modified accordingly by implication.
- 10. REPLACE:** Drawing Sheet AI-103 Third Floor Plan Floor Finish Pattern, dated June 22, 2015 with Revised Drawing Sheet AI-103 Third Floor Plan Floor Finish Pattern, dated August 14,

2015, issued herewith as Attachment 3.10. All other plans, section and elevations are modified accordingly by implication.

E. BIDDER'S QUESTIONS, REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION AND RESPONSES:

1. Question: A quick review of the RFP documents reveals that there are references to a Noise Study Report in section B2010.00, B2020.00 and other places. We find no Noise Study Report in the documents nor is it referenced in the index of the documents. Please advise immediately whether there is such a report since it may add requirements that could be very costly to the bidders or it may modify existing design standards.

Answer: No Noise Study has yet been performed for the Project, but see Addendum #2, dated August 11, 2015, which specified modifications to Performance Specification PS 1030.00 "Project Criteria" Section I.B.2 "Acoustical Comfort," to identify numerous design requirements and standards regarding acoustical performance for the Project Design, including a requirement that obligates the Design Builder to engage an acoustical engineer to perform a Noise Study for the Project.

2. Question: Has the Newark Planning Board performed a courtesy review of the project?

Answer: In accordance with DOE regulations, the Schematic Design documents were submitted to the City of Newark Planning Board pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:26. Accordingly, SDA has performed its obligations with respect to the Planning Board submission and no further action or approval by the Planning Board is required or anticipated.

3. Question: Specification Section G3030.00 Article Ii.C.6 I lists Total Suspended Solid Filters & II.C.8 lists Stormwater Storage Chambers which are not shown on Drawings C-05 and C-08; please clarify if required.

Answer: See modifications to Performance Specifications, Item C.1 listed above.

4. Question: Please confirm that all contractors are responsible to pay the 1% payroll tax fee to the City of Newark.

Answer: Bidders should formulate their bids assuming that the 1% payroll tax applies. While it is not SDA's intent to interpret local law, it is SDA's understanding that all vendors, general contractors, and sub-contractors performing work in the City of Newark are subject to the 1% City Payroll Tax ordinance, and while SDA is a state entity, contractors or subcontractors performing work for state entities are not exempt from the City Payroll Tax ordinance. For additional information, please consult with the City of Newark, Division of Special Taxes at (973) 733-3770.

5. Question: The rim, grate, and invert elevations of the existing storm drainage and sanitary sewer structures that are shown on Drawing C-03 Existing Utility Plan are existing structure elevations shown on Drawing C-02 ALTA Survey Drawing and Drawing

different than the C-06 Proposed Site Utility Plan. Please confirm that the existing structure elevations shown on Drawing C-02 ALTA Survey Drawing and Drawing C-06 Proposed Site Utility Plan are correct and that the elevations shown on Drawing C-03 Existing Utility Plan should be ignored.

Answer: Drawing C-02 and C-06 are correct. Sheet C-03 Existing Utility Plan has been updated and is included as Attachment 3.1. However, the Design-Builder is responsible for verifying all existing utility locations and elevations.

6. Question: Drawing C-05 Proposed Stormwater Sewer Plan shows the proposed storm drainage connection into the existing catch basin at the northwest corner of Dawson St. and Pennington St. intersection and notes "Connect storm to existing inlet with watertight seal and clean existing inlet". The Roadway Performance Specification Section G2010.00 (I.A.4.c) states "Reconstruct all catch basins and replace all curb inlets adjacent to and abutting new roadway, curb and sidewalk construction. Please verify that the proposed storm drainage will connect to the existing inlet "to be cleaned" as shown on Drawing C-05 and clarify that "replace all curb inlets" as stated in the Performance Spec. denotes replacing catch basin frames and grates only.

Answer: Delete the note shown on drawing C-05 concerning the connection to the existing inlet at the intersection of Dawson and Pennington Street. Replace the inlet structure in its entirety per the Roadway Performance Specification Section G2010.00 (I.A.4.c)

7. Question: Drawing C-02 ALTA Survey Drawing and Drawing C-06 Proposed Site Utility Plan show several existing small diameter pipes at the perimeter of the project site which are not noted to be removed.

Answer: The small diameter pipes shown around the perimeter of the project have been terminated. However, it is the responsibility of the Design-Builder to verify the location and elevations of all existing utilities and remove same, at the Design-Builder's discretion, if necessary for construction.

8. Question: Can the proposed parking area be raised to eliminate any removal of historic fill material?

Answer: Yes, if the proper slopes and layout per code and conceptual design can be obtained to the parking entrances and surrounding sidewalks and streets. Proper pedestrian accessibility including ADA standards must be met with any proposed design.

9. Question: Has the meadow mat layer identified in the RAWP been completely removed as part of the remediation activities?

Answer: No. Please refer to the Post Early Site Package (ESP) Site Condition Report.

10. Question: What seismic site class and seismic design category should be assumed for this project?

Answer: Based on Section 1613 of the International Building Code (2009 NJ Edition) and SPT values obtained during drilling, the seismic site class is D. Site soils are not considered liquefiable for a 0.17g Magnitude 4.8 earthquake, having a return period of approximately 2500 years.

11. Question: Based on our review of the Preliminary Geotechnical Report, loose sandy soils were reported in the boring logs, which carry liquefaction potential risk. The report is silent on this issue. What should be assumed for liquefaction potential?

Answer: See Response to Question #10, above.

12. Question: It is identified in the bridging documents that the NJSDA is not assuming responsibility for groundwater investigation. Is the Design-Builder responsible for groundwater investigation, delineation, and/or any NJDEP report submission requirements (e.g. Remedial Action Report, CEA, Remedial Action Permits)?

Answer: The Design-Builder is responsible for groundwater treatment in the event dewatering occurs. If the dewatering activity requires a Treatment Works Approval, the Design-Builder is responsible for obtaining it.

13. Question: It is identified in the bridging documents that a TWA (#14-0135) was utilized for the previous remedial operations. The previous approval identified the use of 2" ID, 330LF forced main connected to the sanitary sewer, however no PVSC approval document was identified for acceptance of the treated water. Looking forward, can the existing TWA and PVSC permits be utilized for the future required dewatering? Are there any additional sampling, reporting requirements for these permits? Can copies of all water discharge permits be provided?

Answer: No. the TWA was obtained for the work of the Early Site Package (ESP), and it is no longer valid for, or applicable to, the Work to be performed by the Design-Builder. Copies of all permits were provided in the Design-Build information Package.

14. Question: Has a deed notice been recorded for any portion of the site? If so, can copies be provided?

Answer: A Deed Notice for the Block 929 portion of the Project Site has been recorded with the Essex County Clerk, and a copy of same is included with this Addendum as Attachment 3.11.

15. Question: The Stormwater Management report refers to the "Regulatory Review Requirements Report" on page 7. Can this report be provided for review?

Answer: No. SDA views the "Regulatory Review Report" referenced in the Stormwater Management Report as stale and/or incomplete, and that report will not be provided

for regulatory information or guidance. The Design Builder is obligated to identify and become informed about, and to design and construct the Project in compliance with, all relevant regulations and Applicable Laws affecting stormwater management, including, but not limited to N.J.A.C. 7:13-11.6, Requirements for a railroad, roadway or parking area.

16. Question: Perimeter air monitoring is indicated in the RAWP to be required during remediation activities, which were already completed. Is perimeter air monitoring required for any of the proposed work?

Answer: No perimeter air monitoring is required; however refer to Specification Section 01500 "Temporary Facilities and Controls" for dust control measures required for the Project.

17. Question: A Preliminary Geotechnical Report was provided as part of the bridging documents and does not include any geotechnical recommendation for the proposed foundation system. Is a Final Geotechnical Report available with foundation recommendations?

Answer: See response to Question #10 above, however, no foundation recommendations will be provided, as it is the Design-Builder's responsibility to design an appropriate foundation system for the Project after reviewing the analytical data provided within the Design-Build Information Package.

18. Question: Peat was indicated in one boring in the Preliminary Geotechnical Report. However, a much more extensive meadow mat layer was identified in the RA WP, Geologic Cross Sections A-A' and B-B' (Figures 4A and 4B). Has this meadow mat layer been removed? This would have a significant effect and cost on the foundation construction.

Answer: No, it has not been completely removed. Please refer to the Post Early Site Package (ESP) Site Condition Report.

19. Question: The Preliminary Geotechnical Report does not provide any borings, which are 100 feet deep and which are required by the code as part of the seismic design category? As such, what should be assumed to the seismic design category?

Answer: Refer to response to Question #10, above.

20. Question: The proposed parking lot is located within the 100 year floodplain based on the current topography. Please verify that this parking lot is not required to be one foot above the 100-year floodplain elevation (el.9) per the NJDEP Flood Hazard Rules. In addition, it appears that the proposed grades further cut into the existing grades. Please verify if this is the intent of the design as it will be difficult to obtain a Flood Hazard Area permit without a strong justification for this current grading design.

Answer: Confirmed, the parking lot design is NOT required to be designed to meet the one-foot-above 100 year floodplain elevation requirement. Please refer to N.J.A.C. 7:13-11.6, Requirements for a railroad, roadway or parking area.

21. Question: Can excavated impacted material from the parking lot site be re-used on the parking lot site if needed?

Answer: For purposes of bidding, Bidders should assume reuse of such material is not permitted; however, the successful Bidder may consult with the LSRP to discuss potential reuse of this material.

22. Question: On July 17, 2015 we forwarded our RFI -1 and are now again requesting advice as to whether there will be a Noise Study Report issued. Since at least several sections of the specifications refer to a report it is confusing at best. It is extremely urgent that the SDA respond to this RFI since the cost impacts could be severe depending upon the information provided in a Noise Study Report. If there is not to be a Noise Study Report, then of course it is our understanding that we are to use the regular Design Standards with no references to special construction, but if there is a Noise Study Report then we should be afforded sufficient time to analyze the study to determine its effect on components of the building itself. Please respond as quickly as possible.

Answer: See Response to Question #1, above.

23. Question: If a Noise Report is not provided, what Acoustical Performance should be used as the basis of design for Exterior Walls?

Answer: See Response to Question #1, above.

24. Question: If a Noise Report is not provided, what Acoustical Performance should be used as the basis of design for Exterior Windows?

Answer: See Response to Question #1, above.

25. Question: Request for Clarification: There are two rooms in and around the Cafeteria which have the same room numbers: Storage Room C-1 02C and Office Room C-1 02 and Storage Room C102B and Staff Locker/Toilet C-102B.

Answer: Renumbered Storage Room C-102B to C-102D and renumbered Storage Room C-102C to C-102E.

26. Question: Section PS 1030.00: Project Criteria references to a requirement for the interior acoustical performance to comply with applicable codes and regulations and also that with respect to Exterior noise control we have the same requirements but including the requirements of NJAC7:29. Since we have no instruction to the contrary we are assuming that the M&SS and the 21st Century Design Manual are still appropriate references with regard to all design issues including Acoustical Comfort. Please confirm.

Answer: See Response to Question #1 above, referring to Addendum #2 modifications to the Performance Specifications within the Design Build Information Package to

provide specific Interior Acoustical Performance standards as well as Building Envelope Acoustical Performance Requirements for this Project.

Note further, that the 21st Century Design Manual is not included in the Design-Build Contract Documents, and is not otherwise contractually applicable or relevant to this Project. Furthermore, pursuant to the Order of Precedence specified in the Design-Build Agreement, note that in the event of a conflict, the provisions of the Performance Specifications supersede those of the Materials and Systems Standards.

27. Question: Please advise the anticipated award date from the bid submission date.

Answer: The anticipated award date for this contract is October 26, 2015, but this date is subject to change at the NJSDA's discretion.

28. Question: Please confirm that all the field testing will be done by an agency hired and paid by the owner.

Answer: Testing in support of special inspections will be performed by a firm engaged by the CM for this Project; all other field testing is the responsibility of the Design-Builder.

29. Question: Please confirm the project will not be submitted to the green building association for any LEED certifications.

Answer: Incorrect, LEED certification under LEED v4 for Building Design and Construction: Schools ("LEED v4 BD+C: Schools") is required for this Project; see Addendum #2 for modifications to Design-Build Contract Documents to refer to LEED v4 BD+C: Schools.

30. Question: Please confirm that the permit fees are to be paid by the Owner.

Answer: Refer to Section 3.6.1 of the Design-Build Agreement, which specifies that SDA will pay for all fees payable to DCA for plan review, permits and inspections (e.g., the fees relating to the DCA Building Permit issued pursuant to the New Jersey Uniform Construction Code), but that "[t]he Design-Builder shall obtain and pay for all other necessary permits, approvals, licenses, government charges and inspection fees required for the Project by any Authority having Jurisdiction over the Project, including but not limited to soils erosion permits, construction trailer permits, water permits, utility permits and street opening permits."

31. Question: Please confirm that the Owner will be responsible for providing the builder's risk policy and the Design/Builder can be added to the policy when the project starts.

Answer: Per Section 14.11.1 of the Design-Build Agreement, Builder's Risk coverage is part of OCIP. See also Section 14.5 of the Agreement, as modified by Addendum#2, which provides that "The Design-Builder's enrollment in OCIP is mandatory prior to the first Construction Notice to Proceed."

32. Question: Please provide the plans and the as-built plans for the existing school building.

Answer: There is no existing buildings on this site.

33. Question: Section PS1030.00 I. Performance B. Amenity and Comfort 2. Acoustical Performance -Requires field inspection, testing and post construction certification of design compliance. This is timely process. Please confirm

Answer: See response in Addendum #2, dated August 11, 2015.

F. CHANGES TO PREVIOUS ADDENDA:

1. Not applicable.

G. ATTACHMENTS:

1. Attachment 3.1: Revised Sheet C-03 Existing Utility Plan, dated August 13, 2015.
2. Attachment 3.2: Revised Sheet A-101 First Floor Plan, dated August 14, 2015.
3. Attachment 3.3: Revised Sheet A-202 Enlarged Building Elevations, dated August 14, 2015.
4. Attachment 3.4: Revised Sheet A-203 Enlarged Building Elevations, dated August 14, 2015.
5. Attachment 3.5: Revised Sheet A-204 Enlarged Building Elevations, dated August 14, 2015.
6. Attachment 3.6: Revised Sheet A-205 Enlarged Building Elevations, dated August 14, 2015.
7. Attachment 3.7: Revised Sheet A-601 Door & Window Elevations, dated August 14, 2015.
8. Attachment 3.8: Revised Sheet AI-101 First Floor Plan Floor Finish Pattern, dated August 14, 2015.
9. Attachment 3.9: Revised Sheet AI-102 Second Floor Plan Floor Finish Pattern, dated August 14, 2015.
10. Attachment 3.10: Revised Sheet AI-103 Third Floor Plan Floor Finish Pattern, dated August 14, 2015.
11. Attachment 3.11: Deed Notice, dated July 16, 2015.

H. SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

1. Not Applicable.

Any bidder attempting to contact government officials (elected or appointed), including NJSDA Board members, NJSDA Staff, and Selection Committee members in an effort to influence the selection process may be immediately disqualified.

End of Addendum No. 3


NJSDA _____ Date 8/14/15



Addendum #3

New Jersey Schools Development Authority
Office of Procurement
32 East Front Street
Trenton, NJ 08625
Phone: 609-858-2981
Fax: 609-656-2647

Date: August 14 2015

PROJECT #: NE-0003-B01
New South Street Elementary School
Newark Public Schools

DESCRIPTION: Addendum #3

Addendum No. 3

Acknowledgement of Receipt of Addendum

Contractor hereby acknowledges the receipt of the Addendum by signing in the space provided below and returning via fax to (609-656-2647) or e-mail (aperry@njsda.gov). Signed acknowledgement must be received prior to the Bid Due Date. Acknowledgement of the Addendum must be made in **Section E.5 of the Price Proposal Submission**.

Signature

Print Name

Company Name

Date