

**Addendum #4**

New Jersey Schools Development Authority  
Office of Procurement  
32 East Front Street  
Trenton, NJ 08625  
Phone: 609-858-2984  
Fax: 609-656-4609

**Date:** August 20, 2014

**PROJECT #:** EL-0042-B01  
New Elementary School  
Elizabeth Public Schools

**DESCRIPTION:** Addendum #4

This addendum shall be considered part of the Design-Build Information Package issued in connection with the referenced project. Should information conflict with the Design-Build Information Package, this Addendum shall supersede the relevant information in the Design-Build Information Package.

---

**A. CHANGES TO THE PROCUREMENT PROCESS**

Modifications to the Price Proposal:

1. Replace Price Proposal Form dated 7-2013, with Price Proposal Form revised 8-18-2014, issued herewith as Attachment 4.9.

**B. CHANGES TO THE PROJECT MANUAL**

NOTE: Additions are shown in **bold and underline** text; deletions are shown in *strikethrough and italics*.

**1. Volume 1 Modifications to the Design-Build Agreement**

1. Not applicable.

**2. Volume 1 Modifications to Division 1 General Requirements**



a. **REVISE:** In Section 01010, Summary of Work, revise Paragraph 1.4. ALLOWANCES as follows:

1.4. ALLOWANCES

A. The Contract contains the following Allowance categories and amounts:

	<u>AMOUNT</u>
1. GMP Reserve Allowance	\$500,000.00
<b>2. Emergency Responder Radio Coverage Allow.</b>	<b>\$155,000.00</b>
<b>3. Fire Pump Allowance</b>	<b>\$100,000.00</b>

B. GMP Reserve Allowance

1. The GMP Reserve Allowance shall be utilized to cover unanticipated or unforeseen costs which are necessary to complete the Services and Work, or to achieve Authority-directed upgrades in the Services and Work, authorized at the discretion of the Authority.

**C. Emergency Responder Radio Coverage Allowance**

- 1. The Emergency Responder Radio Coverage Allowance shall be utilized to cover the cost of design and installation of a radio coverage system if determined to be necessary by the local emergency responder authority and authorized by the Authority.**
- 2. The radio coverage system, if determined to be necessary, shall be designed and installed by the Design-Builder in full compliance with Section 915 of the International Building Code, Section 510 of the International Fire Code, requirements of the local emergency responder authority, and all other applicable codes, including Appendix J of the International Fire Code if required by the local emergency responder authority.**
- 3. The Design-Builder is responsible for coordination with the local emergency responder authority and the Department of Community Affairs with respect to design, installation, testing and startup of the radio coverage system.**



**D. Fire Pump Allowance**

- 1. The Fire Pump Allowance shall be utilized to cover the cost of design and construction of a fire pump system if determined to be necessary for compliance with the New Jersey Uniform Construction Code and authorized by the Authority.**
- 2. The fire pump system, if determined to be necessary, shall be designed and installed by the Design-Builder in full compliance with Section 913 of the International Building Code and NFPA 20 and all applicable codes and requirements.**
- 3. The Design-Builder is responsible for coordination with the local water utility with respect to design, installation and testing of the fire pump system.**

**C. CHANGES TO THE EDUCATIONAL SPECIFICATIONS:**

1. Not applicable.

**D. CHANGES TO THE DRAWINGS:**

- 1. REPLACE:** Replace the following drawings with revised drawings of the same numbers and names, all dated August 13, 2014, and issued herewith as Attachments 4.1 through 4.8. All other plans, sections and elevations are modified accordingly by implication.
  - a. Sheet G-2, Grading Plan – Overall Site.
  - b. Sheet G-5, Overall Utility Plan.
  - c. Sheet G-6, Utility Plan Northern Area.
  - d. Sheet G-7, Utility Plan Southern Area
  - e. Sheet G-11, Profiles
  - f. Sheet G-12, Construction Details
  - g. Sheet G-13, City of Elizabeth Construction Details
  - h. Sheet G-17, Existing and Proposed Conditions – NJ Flood Hazard Area, Block 4, Lot 1278.

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

1. Question: With the posting of Addendum #2 and notations within the Addendum that there will also be an Addendum #3 to be released sometime in the future we are requesting an extension to the proposal due date of August 19,2014 as there are



less than 3 weeks to respond to this new information and the information not yet posted.

Answer: See Addendum #3 for revised project timelines.

2. Question: In Volume 3, page 19, Article 4.0.L of Executive Order No. 215 Environmental Assessment states, "The proposed project will use non-polluting lighting." Please clarify the meaning of "non-polluting".

Answer: The Design-Builder must meet all requirements of Executive Order No. 215 however, per the NJSDA Material and Systems Standards, Section D5040.50 Exterior/Site/Security Lighting, the exterior lighting shall be designed in accordance with IESNA Handbook-2000, 9th addition, ANSI/ASHRAE/IESNA Standard 90.1-2007-Exterior Lighting Section, and the International Dark-Sky Association (IDA). In addition, all exterior lighting fixtures are to be "Dark Sky Friendly".

3. Question: Due to its location adjacent to the new facility, it is virtually impossible to keep construction activities completely out of the JMEUC Easement as stated in Note 4 on drawing G-2. Exterior wall construction alone on the south elevation places scaffolding and material handling equipment in this space. Without any information on the trunk sewer's material or allowable loading, the Design/Builder has no way of determining what is needed to protect this utility prior to the bid. Please provide all known information that is available for this trunk sewer so that the appropriate protection can be accounted for in the bid. If there is no additional information than that already provided in the bid documents, we suggest that NJSDA set up an allowance for this cost so as to eliminate bidders "guessing" on how to work around this condition.

Answer: See response to Question #49, Addendum #2. This scope of work is part of the Design-Builder's responsibility and the NJSDA will not establish an allowance.

4. Question: Currently there are two LEED versions available to register projects, LEED v3 and LEED v4. The LEED checklist provided within the bid package, 'LEED 2009 for Schools New Construction and Major Renovations' appears to be in line with the LEED version 3. It is the intent of the NJSDA to have this project registered in LEED version 3? Or LEED version 4?

Answer: LEED 2009 for Schools New Construction and Major Renovations is the project reference standard for purposes of LEED certification.



**F. CHANGES TO PREVIOUS ADDENDA:**

**1. Changes to Addendum #2:**

**a. In Addendum #2 SDA indicated that certain Bidders 'Questions would be addressed in a subsequent Addendum. SDA now responds to those questions as follows:**

9. Question: Will the NJSDA provide the referenced missing data on sanitary sewer capacity to accept projected flow from a new 920+ occupant structure on site.

Answer: The City of Elizabeth and Joint Meeting of Essex & Union Counties Authority have both endorsed the proposed project's required flows. A copy of the NJDEP Treatment Works application has been signed by both the City of Elizabeth and the JMEUC giving their approval to move ahead authorizing the SDA to submit a formal application for a NJDEP Treatment Works Approval. This application has recently been submitted to NJDEP and is waiting for their review.

10. Question: Our recent site visits revealed a prevalent sewer gas odor not just adjacent to the existing twin sewer main that bisects the site but also as far away as at Clinton Avenue. Please elaborate on the SDA's expectation for odor mitigation on-site outdoors as well as within the new building from the fresh air intakes?

Will the existing odors be documented and objectively quantified by NJSDA prior to the start of construction as a bench line to compare against any post construction odor conditions?

What are the current carbon monoxide levels at the site due to adjacent vehicular traffic and are there any expectations that they should be mitigated in bringing fresh air into the new school?

Answer: The Design-Builder is responsible for designing the fresh air intake system to adhere to applicable National and NJ State Codes and Standards, including but not limited to ASHRAE 62.1 current edition.

No information pertaining to air quality will be quantified by NJSDA. Current Air Quality data can be obtained from the New Jersey Division of Air Quality at <http://www.njaqinow.net/>.



Current Carbon Monoxide (CO) levels can be obtained from the New Jersey Division of Air Quality at <http://www.njaqinow.net/>. The Design-Builder is responsible for designing the fresh air intake system to insure CO levels within the school adhere to applicable National and NJ State Codes and Standards, including but not limited to ASHRAE 62.1 current edition.

12. Question: KS Engineer's report avoids defining an average bearing capacity of the soil substrates and bedrock by suggesting they lack information about the weight of the proposed new building. Will the NJSDA furnish this consultant with the missing information so the respective bearing capacities can be established for estimating purposes?

Answer: Per the Geotechnical Investigation Report; Section 5.1; based on the subsurface soil exploration program, starting at the ground surface to a depth ranging from approximately 10 to 15 feet below grade the soil material appears to be predominately Clay and Silt.

Based on IBC-NJ Edition 2009 Table 1806.2 "Presumptive Load-Bearing Values" the vertical foundation pressure cited for clay and silt appears to be 1,500 PSF.

Section 5.1; Based on the subsurface soil exploration DEBRIS was encountered in 10 of the 16 test borings.

Based on the soil boring logs in Appendix A, several N-values within this debris material were noted as weight of hammer (WH) or weight of rod (WR).

Based on this it is impossible to estimate a soil bearing pressure within areas of debris.

Therefore spread footings are not to be considered as a viable option for foundations for this project.

Section 5.1 of the geotechnical Investigation Report provides a Rock Core Data Table. The data contained therein is based on the field exploration program (Appendix A) and laboratory testing (Appendix B).

Based on IBC-NJ Edition 2009 Table 1806.2 "Presumptive Load-Bearing Values" the vertical foundation pressure cited for sedimentary and foliated rock appears to be 4,000 PSF.



Per Section 1.0 of the Geotechnical Investigation Report, *"This geotechnical investigation feasibility study is not a geotechnical report nor shall it be utilized for the purpose of a foundation design. This document is for general site geotechnical informational purposes only, not intended for design. The Design-Build Team assigned to this project, shall prepare any and all additional geotechnical investigations and analysis it deems technically and professionally necessary to meet all presiding codes or otherwise, and shall determine the appropriate foundation and structural system and geotechnical improvements for their design. All recommendations discussed herein for consideration shall be verified and ultimately determined/designed by the Design-Build Team assigned to this project."*

13. Question: The KS Engineer's report discusses a possible size of drilled shaft caisson supports at 4' diameter which is quite substantial in size. What is the capacity of such caissons in the soils and bedrock on this site?
- Answer: See response to Question #12 listed above.
14. Question: The KS Engineer's report recommends drilled shaft caissons socketed into rock substrate; to what depth of rock drilling should be anticipated and should that extent of rock drilling be anticipated across the entire site or just at specific locations?
- Answer: See response to Question #12 listed above.
15. Question: What frequency of drilled shaft supports should be anticipated on this site? One per column with grade beams spanning from caisson to caisson or is the bearing capacity of the soil such that additional, intermediate caissons be required at mid points or third points under the column grid grade beams?
- Answer: See response to Question #12 listed above.
27. Question: The geotech report fails to discuss the slab on grade design in any appreciable detail. Typically, a geotech report will report the slab can be supported on grade and provide a subgrade modulus for the slab design OR the report would state that the soils are no good to support a slab on grade design and recommend the design should be a structural slab



supported by the deep foundation system. Is it possible to arrange for the missing data to be furnished?

Answer: See response to Question #12 listed above.

45. Question: The numbering of the notes indicated by Site Plan G-2 appear to be incorrect and/or out of order.

Answer: A revised Sheet G-2, dated August 13, 2014 is included as Attachment 4.1.

47. Question: The Geotechnical Investigation Report by KSE dated Final Issued June 9, 2014 refers to unconfined compression strength tests for the bedrock at the site, but provides no specific information as to the bearing capacity of the bedrock which is needed in order to perform a preliminary analysis of foundation systems for the project. Please furnish this information and also confirm that the proposed foundation design shall be based upon the assumption that the bedrock strata extends throughout the entire footprint of the building.

Answer: See response to Question #12 listed above.

72. Question: The Site Investigation Report (SIR) states that two (2) Historic fill samples were collected per acre for a four (4) acre site. Since the site comprises 5.79 acres and the NJDEP requires four (4) Historic samples per acre, it appears that this would result in a requirement for twenty-four (24) discrete Historic fill classification soil samples for the site. It also appears that additional samples may be required due to the presence of PCB's above the RDCSRS. Confirm is this is correct and if so, who is to be responsible for providing these additional samples.

Answer: According to the NJDEP Historic Fill Technical Guidance document, two (2) samples per acre, per defined strata are required to be collected for SI. Based on the 5.9 acres, twelve (12) samples were collected. PCB's are discussed in Section 8.0 of the June 9, 2014 SIR. The question appears to be based on outdated regulations.

78. Question: Since the borings show the existing historic soil at the site to be red clay and "the majority to be in a soft state" and since the finished slab is approximately 3'4" above the surface of the existing soil, new fill will





be required above the existing soil surface. The Geotechnical Investigation Report by KSE dated Final Issued June 9, 2014 does not appear to address the compaction requirements for the existing historic fill prior to overlaying this material with new fill and the presumptive remedy cap. Please clarify.

Answer: See response to Question #12 listed above.

86. Question: Please provide descriptions for the keynote numbers within pentagons as indicated by Section A-A on Drawing G-12.

Answer: A revised Sheet G-12, dated August 13, 2014 is included as Attachment 4.6.

88. Question: Please confirm whether PVC piping is acceptable for use in the gas mitigation system.

Answer: The Design-Builder must comply with the requirements of the N.J. Uniform Construction Code, Radon Hazard Section.

91. Question: Please confirm whether a fire pump, a pre-action system and sprinkler system maintenance are required for the fire suppression system for the project.

Answer: See Revisions to the Project Manual, Item B, 2, b listed above.

#### **G. ATTACHMENTS**

1. Attachment 4.1: Revised Sheet G-2, Grading Plan – Overall Site, dated June 9, 2014 with Sheet G-2, Grading Plan – Overall Site, dated August 13, 2014.
2. Attachment 4.2: Revised Sheet G-5, Overall Utility Plan, dated June 9, 2014 with Sheet G-5, Overall Utility Plan, dated August 13, 2014.
3. Attachment 4.3: Revised Sheet G-6, Utility Plan Northern Area, dated June 9, 2014 with Sheet G-6, Utility Plan Northern Area, dated August 13, 2014.
4. Attachment 4.4: Revised Sheet G-7, Utility Plan Southern Area, dated June 9, 2014 with Sheet G-7, Utility Plan Southern Area, dated August 13, 2014.
5. Attachment 4.5: Revised Sheet G-11, Profiles, dated June 9, 2014 with Sheet G-11, Profiles, dated August 13, 2014.



- 6. Attachment 4.6: Revised Sheet G-12, Construction Details, dated June 9, 2014 with Sheet G-12, Construction Details, dated August 13, 2014.
- 7. Attachment 4.7: Revised Sheet G-13, City of Elizabeth Construction Details, dated June 9, 2014 with Sheet G-13, City of Elizabeth Construction Details, dated August 13, 2014
- 8. Attachment 4.8: Revised Sheet G-17, Existing and Proposed Conditions – NJ Flood Hazard Area, Block 4, Lot 1278, dated June 9, 2014 with Sheet G-12, Existing and Proposed Conditions – NJ Flood Hazard Area, Block 4, Lot 1278, dated August 13, 2014.
- 9. Attachment 4.9: Revised Price Proposal Form dated 07-2013 with revised Price Proposal Form dated 8-18-2014.

**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. 4

AUG 20 2014

---

NJSDA Director  
Corrado Minervini  
Director

Date



**Addendum #4**

New Jersey Schools Development Authority  
Office of Procurement  
32 East Front Street  
Trenton, NJ 08625  
Phone: 609-858-2984  
Fax: 609-656-4609

**Date:** August 20, 2014

**PROJECT #:** EL-0042-B01  
New Elementary School  
Elizabeth Public Schools

**DESCRIPTION:** Addendum #4

**Acknowledgement of Receipt of Addendum**

Contractor hereby acknowledges the receipt of this Addendum by signing in the space provided below and returning via fax to (609-656-4609) or E-mail (MATaylor@njsda.gov). Signed acknowledgements must be received prior to the Bid Due Date. Acknowledgement of the Addendum must be made in Section E.6 of the Price Proposal Submission.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Print Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Company Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date