



**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:** April 26, 2016

**PROJECT #:** ET-0031-B01  
New Seaman Avenue Elementary School  
Perth Amboy 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 contained in this Addendum 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:**

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

**1. Modifications to the Advertisement to Extend Date for Submission of Price and Technical Proposals:**

- a. The first two paragraphs of Subsection D of the “Procurement Submission Dates and Deadlines” section of the Bid Advertisement for this procurement shall be modified to extend the date for submission of Price and Technical Proposals, as follows:

Procurement Submission Dates and Deadlines:

- D. Bidders must submit a Technical Proposal, consisting of two separate parts, the responses to “Experience Criteria” and the separate “Project Approach Criteria,” which corresponds to the non-price “other factors” evaluative criteria requirements of the RFP. The Technical Proposals must be received by the NJSDA by **2:00 PM** on ~~May 10, 2016~~ **May 24, 2016**. Faxed or e-mailed submittals will not be accepted.

Bidders must simultaneously submit a sealed Price Proposal along with the Technical Proposal, and all bidders' Technical Proposals and Price Proposals must be received by the NJSDA by **2:00 PM** on ~~May 10, 2016~~ **May 24, 2016**. Faxed or e-mailed Price Proposals shall not be accepted. Any Technical or Price Proposals received after this date and time will be returned unopened. Technical Proposals and sealed Price Proposals shall be delivered to **Marty Taylor** at the NJSDA address below:

**2. Modifications to the Advertisement to Extend Date for Opening of Price Proposals:**

- a. Subsection E of the "Procurement Submission Dates and Deadlines" section of the Bid Advertisement for this procurement, shall be modified to extend the date for opening of Price Proposals, as follows:

E. The sealed Price Proposals shall be publicly opened and read at a bid opening at the NJSDA office on ~~May 26, 2016~~ **June 10, 2016** at **2:00 PM**.

**3. Modifications to the Request for Proposals to Extend Date for Submission of Price and Technical Proposal:**

- a. **REVISE:** The fourth paragraph of Section 1.3 B.2 ("Technical Proposal") shall be modified as follows, to change the due date for submission of the Technical Proposal to ~~May 10, 2016~~ **May 24, 2016**:

2. Technical Proposal

The Technical Proposals must be received by the NJSDA by 2:00 PM on ~~May 10, 2016~~ **May 24, 2016**. Faxed or e-mailed Submittals shall not be accepted.

- b. **REVISE:** The fourth paragraph of Section 1.3 B.3 of the RFP ("Price Proposal"), shall be modified as follows, to change the due date for submission of the Price Proposal to ~~May 10, 2016~~ **May 24, 2016**.

The Price Proposal must be sealed and submitted with the original Technical Proposal and received by the NJSDA by **2:00 PM** on ~~May 10, 2016~~ **May 24, 2016**. Faxed or e-mailed Price Proposals shall not be accepted.

**B. CHANGES TO THE PROJECT MANUAL:**

1. NOT APPLICABLE.

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

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

**1. Volume 2 Performance Specifications**

- a. REPLACE: In Sections C1010.50, C1020.00 and C1030.00, replace Paragraph I.B.1. with the following:

**1. Comply with Performance Specifications Section PS1030.00 and all code requirements and referenced standards.**

**D. CHANGES TO THE DRAWINGS:**

1. **REPLACE:** Drawing C-01 Boundary Survey, dated 2/3/16, with Revised Drawing C-01 Boundary Survey C-01, dated 4/14/2016, issued herewith as Attachment 4.1. All other plans, sections and elevations are modified accordingly by implication.

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

1. Question: Classroom Walls: Per Section C1010.00 II. A. 2. It states that cold formed steel and drywall partitions can be used to enclose all other areas, however, the plans depict masonry CMU walls. Is the partition type at the Classroom Areas up to the DB?  
  
Answer: Yes, provided that the selected assembly meets all project performance requirements, including those of Performance Specifications Section PS1030.00 I B.2.e.
2. Question: Referencing Addendum# 1 and the response to the question 69, specifically, "The NJSDA does not require this certification (AISC); however, the Design-Builder must follow all presiding code requirements." This RFI requests Clarification to this response. According to the NJ adopted International Building Code, 1704.2.5.1 "Fabricator approval; Special inspections during fabrication are not required where the work is done on the premises of a fabricator registered and approved to perform such work without special inspection. Approval shall be based upon review of the fabricator's written procedural and quality control manuals and periodic auditing of fabrication practices by an approved agency. At completion of fabrication, the approved fabricator shall submit a certificate of compliance to the owner or the owner's authorized agent for submittal to the building official as specified in Section 1704.5 stating that the work was performed in accordance with the approved construction documents." Since the AISC provides the standards for the FABRICATION, ERECTION AND QUALITY CONTROL of a steel structure, is the NJSDA relaxing the quality standard and accepting the potential for inferior quality? Every state Department of Transportation (DOT) requires their bridge fabricators to be AISC certified. Reconsideration to this response should be made  
  
Answer: The response remains unchanged.
3. Question: Addendum No. 1, Attachment 1.6-Preliminary Assessment Report, pages 9 and 10, summarizes the documents associated with Appendix F, one of which is

described as a Geotechnical Report by Medina Consultants dated October 2004. It appears however that none of the documents associated with Appendix F are accessible for review since the Appendix F documents provided appear to be in the form of a hard disk, a picture of which is located on page 2,603 of this document.

Answer: The Medina Consultants report dated October 2004 will not be provided. The Melick-Tully Associates report dated February 18, 2015, provided with the D-B information package is the controlling document for this project. In addition, the SDA is including, as Attachment 4.3 of this Addendum, pages 8 – 21 of that report for informational purposes only. It is incumbent upon the Design-Builder and its Consultants to reach their own conclusions and select an appropriate foundation/structural system given all project considerations.

4. Question: Addendum No. 1, Attachment 1.7-Site Investigation Report/Remedial Investigation Report/Remedial Action Workplan appears to be missing a folder for the documents associated with Appendix C.

Answer: Appendix C of the SIR/RI/RAWP is the PEC Preliminary Assessment Report dated 3/13/15, which was provided separately in Addendum #1 as Attachment 1.6

5. Question: The bid documents appear to contain several different geotechnical reports. Please clarify which of these reports is to be used as the final geotechnical reference for establishing the existing soil bearing capacity at the site and for defining the geotechnical recommendations for constructing the foundations, slab on grade, means of ground improvement, etc.

Answer: The Melick-Tully Associates report dated February 18, 2015, provided with the D-B information package is the controlling document for this project. In addition, the SDA is including, as Attachment 4.3 of this Addendum, pages 8 – 21 of that report for informational purposes only. It is incumbent upon the Design-Builder and its Consultants to reach their own conclusions and select an appropriate foundation/structural system given all project considerations.

6. Question: Referencing Addendum #2 and the response to the bidder's question 2, the response by the NJSDA to reference the project specification does not answer the original RFI question. The bidders are aware of the content in the RFP specification and logically the RFI question was constructed to eliminate the vagueness in the RFP documents. The NJSDA's circular logic to the RFI question places a disadvantage for all prospective bidders to be able to provide a responsive and cost competitive proposal. It is incumbent upon the NJSDA (the writer) in a public forum to provide clear and direct response to the prospective bidders question to avoid any cost disadvantage and the potential for the NJSDA's unjust enrichment if the prospective bidder interprets the RFP incorrectly. This RFI requests that the original question be restored and a clear and direct response be given. Will the emergency vehicles need to be taken into account during the outdoor noise study and will the costs associated to

abate the sound impacts be part of the allowance? Drawings C-01 and C-02, Note 15, indicates that property corners have not been set, and may be set at a later date upon completion of site construction. Is this correct? Please clarify whose responsibility it is to perform this work.

Answer: In accordance with ANSI/ASA S12.60 A.2.2.1, extraordinary sounds such as a vehicle crash, a loud airplane where normally there are none, or siren where normally there are none, shall be excluded from the reported hourly environmental noise level.

7. Question: Referencing Addendum #2 and the response to the bidder's question 3, the response by the NJSDA to reference the project specification does not answer the original RFI question. The bidders are aware of the content in the RFP specification and logically the RFI question was constructed to eliminate the vagueness in the RFP documents. The NJSDA's non-answer and circular logic to the RFI question places a disadvantage for all prospective bidders to be able to provide a responsive and cost competitive proposal. It is incumbent upon the NJSDA (the writer) in a public forum to provide clear and direct response to the prospective bidders question to avoid any cost disadvantage and the potential for the NJSDA's unjust enrichment if the prospective bidder interprets the RFP incorrectly. This RFI requests that the original question be restored and a clear and direct response be given. Include a restatement of the response to Addendum # 1 and the question #40. Identify the location and the specific glazing. Please do not refer to the specification section.

Answer: It is assumed that the phrase "Homeland Security" in Addendum #1, Bidders Question #40, is referring to the DCA BEST PRACTICES STANDARDS FOR SCHOOLS UNDER CONSTRUCTION OR BEING PLANNED FOR CONSTRUCTION (the DCA "Best Practices Standards") which is a code requirement. It is the responsibility of the Design-Builder and their Design Consultant, based upon their knowledge and expertise in school design and construction, to provide a design which complies with any and all applicable code requirements including the DCA "Best Practices Standards", and to account for such a design in their Price Proposal.

8. Question: Referencing Addendum #2 and the response to the bidder's question 4, the response by the NJSDA does not answer the original RFI question. In order for all the prospective bidders to be able to provide a responsive and cost competitive proposal, it is incumbent upon the NJSDA (the writer) in a public forum to provide clear and direct response to the prospective bidders question to avoid any cost disadvantage and NJSDA's unjust enrichment if the prospective bidder interprets the RFP incorrectly. For clarity, it is understood that the referenced section is the bidder's responsibility, but is it the bidders' cost when the scope of work is unknown, or will the costs be part of the allowance?

Answer: The response remains unchanged.

9. Question: Referencing Addendum #2 and the response to the bidder's question 6 and similar question 67. The response by the NJSDA refers to Addendum #1 and the response to question #24, which states: "The site maximum allowable soil net bearing pressure is 4,000 per square foot and seismic site class "D" as defined by the 2015 IBC New Jersey Edition and Melick-Tully Associates, PC." Here the NJSDA declares bearing capacity.

The NJSDA declaration to the response clearly identified the bearing capacity, which indicates adequate bearing for a spread footing. In the event the bearing capacities are not as declared by the NJSDA, will the differing condition be treated as part of the allowance?

Answer: See Section F, Changes to Previous Addenda, Item #1 listed below.

10. Question: Referencing Addendum #2 and the response to the bidder's question 12, the response by the NJSDA does not provide constructible solution. In order for all the prospective bidders to be able to provide a responsive and cost competitive proposal, it is incumbent upon the NJSDA (the writer) in a public forum to provide clear and direct response to the prospective bidders question to avoid any cost disadvantage and NJSDA's unjust enrichment if the prospective bidder interprets the RFP incorrectly. Painting the walls of new freezers/refrigerator is contraindicated for a new installation as painting is reserved for restoration work. Confirm whether the paint is required for a new installation.

Answer: The masonry enclosure walls surrounding the walk-in refrigerator/freezer are to be painted with epoxy paint.

11. Question: Referencing Addendum #2 and the response to the bidder's question 16 and 17, the response by the NJSDA does not provide constructible solution. In order for all the prospective bidders to be able to provide a responsive and cost competitive proposal, it is incumbent upon the NJSDA (the writer) in a public forum to provide clear and direct response to the prospective bidders question to avoid any cost disadvantage and NJSDA's unjust enrichment if the prospective bidder interprets the RFP incorrectly. The NJSDA declares that the stormwater design is conceptual in nature. The Bidders can only interpret the information within the RFP documents. If the design changes, will the change be compensated under the allowance?

Answer: As noted in the prior responses in Addendum #2, the stormwater design included in the DBIP, which references a potential stormwater discharge location, is conceptual in nature, with the final design (including locations for stormwater discharge) to be provided by the Design Builder. As the stormwater design is merely conceptual, a modification of the conceptual design will not result in a compensable "change". As previously noted in the cited Addendum #2 responses, if an easement is required to facilitate the Design-Builder's design for the stormwater system (once such design is accepted and approved

by NJSDA) , the NJSDA will be responsible for securing, and paying for, such easement.

**12. Question:** Referencing Addendum #2 and the response to the bidder's question 20, the response by the NJSDA does not provide a constructible solution. In order for all the prospective bidders to be able to provide a responsive and cost competitive proposal, it is incumbent upon the NJSDA (the writer) in a public forum to provide clear and direct response to the prospective bidders question to avoid any cost disadvantage and NJSDA's unjust enrichment if the prospective bidder interprets the RFP incorrectly. The Bidders can only interpret information provided in the RFP documents. If the NJSDA cannot confirm that all on-site soil is considered "clean" then in the event soils are not "clean", will the change be compensated under the allowance?

**Answer:** The NJSDA stands by its original response. NJSDA has indicated that soils on site cannot be confirmed to be "clean" but has indicated that on-site reuse of soils may be acceptable under engineering controls, and outside of utility corridors, provided the soils are geotechnically appropriate as fill materials. The DB will only be compensated through the allowance for Subsurface conditions and hazardous materials if soil that must be removed from the site is tested and confirmed to constitute RCRA hazardous material.

**13. Question:** Referencing Addendum #2 and the response to the bidder's question 34, the response by the NJSDA does not provide a response to the question. In order for all the prospective bidders to be able to provide a responsive and cost competitive proposal, it is incumbent upon the NJSDA (the writer) in a public forum to provide clear and direct response to the prospective bidders question to avoid any cost disadvantage and NJSDA's unjust enrichment if the prospective bidder interprets the RFP incorrectly. The original question requested a copy of the PREVIOUS HAP for insight into the previous environmental investigation. The NJSDA answers "NO" and requires the D/B to submit their own plan does not answer the question. Please provide the previous documents as requested so the D/B can evaluate what was previously performed.

**Answer:** The Health and Safety Plan for the previous project is provided with this Addendum as Attachment 4.2. Bidders are advised that the requested document was created under a prior contract and for a different purpose, and with reference to conditions that may have since been altered or that may no longer exist. Therefore the document is provided for informational purposes only and may not have relevance to current conditions. The Design-builder is required to prepare its own employee Health and Safety Plan for this project.

**14. Question:** Referencing Addendum #2 and the response to the bidder's question 36, the response by the NJSDA does not provide a response to the question. In order for all the prospective bidders to be able to provide a responsive and cost competitive proposal, it is incumbent upon the NJSDA (the writer) in a public forum to provide clear and direct response to the prospective bidders question

to avoid any cost disadvantage and NJSDA's unjust enrichment if the prospective bidder interprets the RFP incorrectly. The Bidders can only interpret information provided for in the RFP documents. The NJSDA's response that "No, a vapor intrusion investigation was not performed ... and that ground water information is available ... " the concepts do not correlate. In the event a vapor intrusion is required, will the change be compensated under the project allowance?

Answer: Any vapor intrusion investigation will be performed, and paid for, by the Authority.

15. Question: Referencing Addendum #2 and the response to the bidder's question 37, the response by the NJSDA to reference the project specification does not answer the original RFI question. The bidders are aware of the content in the RFP specification and logically the RFI question was constructed to eliminate the vagueness in the RFP documents. The NJSDA's circular logic to the RFI question places a disadvantage for all prospective bidders to be able to provide a responsive and cost competitive proposal. It is incumbent upon the NJSDA (the writer) in a public forum to provide clear and direct response to the prospective bidders question to avoid any cost disadvantage and the potential for the NJSDA's unjust enrichment if the prospective bidder interprets the RFP incorrectly. This RFI requests that the original question be restored and consideration for the laboratory testing be part of the project allowance. The NJSDA has remediated the site sufficient to eliminate any environmental contaminate speculation and burden of cost on the D/B.

Answer: The response remains unchanged.

16. Question: Referencing Addendum #2 and the response to the bidder's question 38 (and related #44), the response by the NJSDA does not answer the original RFI question. In order for all the prospective bidders to be able to provide a responsive and cost competitive proposal, it is incumbent upon the NJSDA (the writer) in a public forum to provide clear and direct response to the prospective bidders question to avoid any cost disadvantage and NJSDA's unjust enrichment if the prospective bidder interprets the RFP incorrectly. For clarity, the bidder's questioned detailed a justified and technically competent description of the utility corridor excavation. The concluding statement that 'a minimum 1 ' of clean fill on top, sides, and bottom of (the utility is acceptable? The NJSDA's response is an added burden to the project costs and does not follow utility construction. There is no value to the project's cost to replace the utility excavation with clean fill. Reconsideration of the original question is requested.

Answer: The response remains unchanged.

17. Question: Referencing Addendum #2 and the response to the bidder's question 48, the response by the NJSDA does not provide constructible solution. To help with the interpretation of the Code and the corresponding specification, the



following is offered for the various conditions in the project:

The general specifications for the doors and windows per ANSI S12.60 are:

- a. Interior door assemblies and up to 1 m<sup>2</sup> (10 ft<sup>2</sup>) window glazing area immediately adjacent to the door opening into core learning spaces from corridors, stairways, offices, or conference rooms shall achieve a STC rating of 30 or greater in their operable condition. (i.e. ALL core learning space doors must meet STC 30 including any glazing in the windows) Note that no mention is made for interior doors or glazing in support areas.
- b. The STC rating for interior entry doors into music rooms from corridors or staircase areas shall be at least STC 40 if such doors are within 9 m (30 ft) of a door to a core learning space. Most stair towers are within 30 ft of core learning spaces, and the Stage/Instrumental Music Room and Multi-Purpose/Assembly Room may require STC 40 doors if the Music Office/Lesson Room (C-106) is interpreted as a core learning space.
- c. A vestibule entry composed of two sets of doors with STC ratings of 30 or greater shall be considered to conform to the STC 40 requirement.

As the forgoing meets the Code requirements, confirmation that this information can be used as the basis of design and the specifications sections be adjusted as they do not match the Code.

Answer: NJSDA has reviewed the prior Addenda responses cited in the above question, and finds them to be responsive; however, by way of clarification, the following is offered with respect to the prior Bidder Question 48 included in Addendum No. 2:

The SDA concurs that the noted references to FSTC and NIC are erroneous, and has made appropriate corrections. See Changes to the Performance Specifications, Item C.1.a above.

Furthermore, with respect to the additional information cited in the question above, NJSDA responds that it should be noted that ANSI 12.60 is not a “Code” but rather is a referenced standard incorporated into the project requirements by Performance Specification Section PS1030.00, I.B.2 and, as indicated in that Section, shall be modified by the SDA performance requirements which follow in that Section. In accordance with Performance Specification Section PS1030.00, I.B.2.e, wall and floor-ceiling assemblies that separate core learning spaces from adjacent spaces, including doors, windows, and penetrations in such assemblies, shall be designed in accordance with the requirements of ANSI S12.60 Section per 5.4.2. Specific responses to additional Bidder “questions”:

- a. The conclusion that all interior doors and windows to core learning areas shall have a minimum STC rating of 30 is correct. However, depending upon specific adjacencies, a higher rating may be required. The reference to

“support areas” is interpreted to mean ancillary learning spaces. Per Performance Specifications Section PS1030.00 I.B.2.e (3), ANSI 12.60 Table B.1 should be consulted to determine STC ratings for isolation of ancillary spaces from one another or from other spaces.

b. The analysis provided is incomplete. ANSI 12.60 Table B.1 should be consulted to determine STC ratings for isolation of music rooms from one another or from other spaces. The following additional information is provided for determining specific requirements:

(1) Based on the use described in the Educational Specifications, the Stage/Instrumental Music Room should be considered both a core learning space and a music room and the more restrictive STC requirements should be applied.

(2) Based on the use described in the Educational Specifications, the Music Office/Lesson Room should be considered both a core learning space and a music room and the more restrictive STC requirements should be applied.

**18. Question:** Referencing Addendum #2 and the response to the bidder's question 49, the response by the NJSDA does not provide constructible solution. The NJSDA's circular logic to the RFI question places a disadvantage for all prospective bidders to be able to provide a responsive and cost competitive proposal. It is incumbent upon the NJSDA (the writer) in a public forum to provide clear and direct response to the prospective bidders question to avoid any cost disadvantage and NJSDA's unjust enrichment if the prospective bidder interprets the RFP incorrectly.

This RFI request the NJSDA respond to the content of the original RFI question 49. Effectively, the D/B is proposing the use of approved calculation methods to provide an acoustical evaluation of the project at time of design versus testing after the building is built. Sound level testing is not required by the NJSDA's referenced codes. Therefore, confirmation is requested that the NJSDA will accept the approved calculation method at time of design.

**Answer:** Upon review, the SDA finds the prior answer to be responsive. However, in order to ensure clarity, the following supplemental information is provided:

The previously cited Performance Specification Section PS1030.00 I.B.2.1 clearly indicates that field testing for conformance with acoustical performance requirements is only necessary when the Design-Builder is unable to demonstrate design compliance through engineer's certification of acoustically rated materials, equipment, assemblies and junctures between assemblies.

**19. Question:** Referencing Addendum #2 and the response to the bidder's question 51, the response by the NJSDA does not provide constructible solution. In order for all the prospective bidders to be able to provide a responsive and cost competitive proposal, it is incumbent upon the NJSDA (the writer) in a public forum to

provide clear and direct response to the prospective bidders question to avoid any cost disadvantage and NJSDA's unjust enrichment if the prospective bidder interprets the RFP incorrectly.

The NJSDA declares, "the performance specification Section B2020. 00 can meet the minimum acoustical performance requirements of (the Project is (properly specified. ...(as indicated of) STC 35." In practice, the specified window rating of STC-35 in a STC-62 wall will achieve a composite of ONLY STC-40. The NJSDA requires STC 50 for the entire elevation along Seaman Avenue. This RFI requests the NJSDA respond to the content of the original RFI question 51.

Additionally, the NJSDA does not address in the original question the concerns of operable windows. Once the window is open, there is no STC rating. Effectively, the NJSDA specified window will not achieve the STC rating if properly specified.

Answer: Upon review, the SDA finds the prior answer to be responsive. However, in order to ensure clarity, the following supplemental information is provided:

It is understood that windows and doors shall meet the minimum STC performance requirements in their normally closed position.

**20. Question:** Referencing Addendum #2 and the response to the bidder's question 52, the response by the NJSDA does not provide constructible solution. In order for all the prospective bidders to be able to provide a responsive and cost competitive proposal, it is incumbent upon the NJSDA (the writer) in a public forum to provide clear and direct response to the prospective bidders question to avoid any cost disadvantage and NJSDA's unjust enrichment if the prospective bidder interprets the RFP incorrectly.

The NJSDA declares that the approach to design be similar in content to the response to Addendum #2 question 51. In practice, the specified window and metal panel exterior construction for the Media Center rating will not achieve the STC 50 rating. This RFI request the NJSDA respond to the content of the original RFI question 52.

Answer: Upon review, the SDA finds the prior answer to be responsive. However, in order to ensure clarity, the following supplemental information is provided:

As regards the exterior walls of the Media Center, it is incumbent upon the Design-Builder to provide a design which meets the minimum composite STC performance requirements for that space. It is acknowledged that providing component elements (wall, windows, and metal panel systems) which only meet their individual minimum STC requirements will not be sufficient. It is the responsibility of the Design-Builder to determine and provide for a combination of elements with higher STC ratings as necessary to satisfy the composite STC requirements.

21. Question: Referencing Addendum #2 and the response to the bidder's question 54 and 57, the response by the NJSDA does not provide constructible solution. In order for all the prospective bidders to be able to provide a responsive and cost competitive proposal, it is incumbent upon the NJSDA (the writer) in a public forum to provide clear and direct response to the prospective bidders question to avoid any cost disadvantage and NJSDA's unjust enrichment if the prospective bidder interprets the RFP incorrectly.

The NJSDA references the ANSI/ASA S12.60 section 5.4.3, however Code declares that: "*In new construction, gymnasias, dance studios, or other rooms with high floor-impact activity shall not be located above classrooms or other core learning spaces.*" The NJSDA has not designed the space per the Code for new construction. However, the code does allow in renovations an IIC 65 to be applied. Confirmation that IIC 65 is appropriate for the design.

Answer: Upon review, the SDA finds the prior answer to be responsive. However, in order to ensure clarity, the following supplemental information is provided:

As discussed in the response to Bidder Question 18 above, ANSI 12.60 is not a "Code" but rather is a referenced standard incorporated into the project requirements by Performance Specification Section PS1030.00, I.B.2 and, as indicated in that Section, shall be modified by the SDA performance requirements which follow in that Section. The ANSI prohibition of locating a gymnasium over a core learning space does not apply as the cafeteria has been identified as an ancillary learning space. Per the prior response, the floor-ceiling assembly between these spaces shall be design in accordance with the requirements of ANSI 12.60 including a minimum IIC of 40 per the referenced ANSI S12.60 5.4.3. requirements.

22. Question: Referencing Addendum #2 and the response to the bidder's question 56, the response by the NJSDA does not provide constructible solution. In order for all the prospective bidders to be able to provide a responsive and cost competitive proposal, it is incumbent upon the NJSDA (the writer) in a public forum to provide clear and direct response to the prospective bidders question to avoid any cost disadvantage and NJSDA's unjust enrichment if the prospective bidder interprets the RFP incorrectly.

The NJSDA references Addendum #1 response to questions 6 and 40. Question #6 directs the "Interpretation and Intent" of the Code references. The referenced series of questions request clarification to the type of glazing for the securable perimeter. The proposed School is located within a Municipal complex with the Police and Fire Departments within 50-ft of the property. Direct guidance is requested from the NJSDA as there may be jurisdictional claims that the D/B is unaware.

Answer: NJSDA has reviewed the prior Addenda responses cited in the above question, and finds them to be responsive; however, by way of clarification, the following is offered with respect to the prior Bidder Question 56 included in Addendum No. 2::

For purposes of complying with the referenced DCA “Best Practices Standards”, the Media Center and Gymnasium should be considered to be “instructional areas”.

Supplemental response to additional information provided in Bidder Question 22 of this Addendum:

1. The proposed school site and adjoining municipal complex have different owners and should be considered as separate sites for purposes of compliance with DCA “Best Practices Standards”.
2. The SDA is unaware of any “jurisdictional claims” which would impact application of or compliance with DCA “Best Practices Standards”.

**23. Question:** Referencing Addendum #2 and the response to the bidder's question 66, the response by the NJSDA does not provide constructible solution. In order for all the prospective bidders to be able to provide a responsive and cost competitive proposal, it is incumbent upon the NJSDA (the writer) in a public forum to provide clear and direct response to the prospective bidders question to avoid any cost disadvantage and NJSDA's unjust enrichment if the prospective bidder interprets the RFP incorrectly. The NJSDA has provided a conundrum for the D/B, namely:

1. The original question, paraphrased here, is that the Existing Conditions Plan C-02 dated 2/3/2016 does not appear to be an accurate depiction of the actual existing grades and if so, will a updated survey be provided.

2. The NJSDA response directs the use of the Existing Conditions Survey included in the Remedial Action Progress Report, which is dated 9/25/2015 or 131-days older than the C-02 plan.

This RFI request clarification. There is approximately 5000-CY of material discrepancy between the referenced plans. First, why would the D/B be directed to use an outdated plan; and second, will the discrepancy be managed through the use of the project allowance?

Answer: Upon review, the SDA finds the prior answer to be responsive. However, in order to ensure clarity, the following supplemental information is provided:

Bidders are advised to utilize the PEC Existing Conditions Survey included in the Remedial Action Progress Report. While the PEC survey shows a date (9/25/2015) that appears to predate the VNHA Existing Conditions Plan (C-02)

dated 2/3/2016, the PEC Existing Conditions Survey included in the RAPR was produced using more recent field survey data, obtained after the District remediation work was concluded in the autumn of 2015.

24. Question: Referencing Addendum #2 and the response to the bidder's question 62, the response by the NJSDA to reference Addendum #1 question #24 does not answer the original addendum #1 question, does not answer the addendum #2 question #62. The current answer references a response to a question which is completed unrelated. Addendum #1 question #24 relates to types of suitability of foundations systems. The question #62 relates to the IBC Risk Category of the project and found in IBC Table 1604.5. The NJSDA alludes the question and states that the D/B take the responsibility for determining the Authority's use of the structure. There are four categories from which to pick from in the IBC and all are dependent on the owner's use, and not the D/B interpretation. If Category IV is selected then there are cost implications that exceed millions of dollars which relate to the components to be included. This RFI requests a review and confirmation that the building be designed to Category III as it relates to IBC Table 1604.5 as this is the typical response given by the NJSDA.

Answer: The building is to be designed to Risk Category III as it relates to NJIBC Table 1604.5.

#### **F. CHANGES TO PREVIOUS ADDENDA:**

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

1. The response to Addendum #1, Question #24 is modified as follows:

24. Question: The preliminary geotechnical report only identifies subsurface conditions with no design and construction recommendations. Please verify the type of the foundation system (i.e. shallow foundation or piles), allowable bearing pressures and seismic site class to be used as a basis of bidding this project.

Answer: The Design Builder and their Licensed Design Professionals are to determine the type of foundation system suitable for this project. The Design Builder and their Licensed Design Professionals shall utilize the Preliminary Geotechnical Report provided as well as the content of any additional geotechnical investigation(s) they are required to provide to meet presiding codes and other related project criteria. **As noted on page 7 of the Melick-Tully Preliminary Geotechnical Report dated February 18, 2015, the site is underlain by fill having a thickness ranging from approximately three to seven feet below grade within the eastern two-thirds of the main site (and up to 9.5 feet in Test Pit 13), and up to as deep as approximately eight to twelve feet below grade in the explorations within the western one-third of the main site.** ~~The site maximum allowable soil net bearing pressure is 4,000 per square foot and~~

The project site has a seismic site class "D" as defined by the 2015 IBC New Jersey Edition and Melick-Tully Associates, PC.

2. The response to Addendum #2, Question #67 is modified as follows:

67. Question: The Answer to Question No. 24 in Addendum No. 1 states that “the site maximum allowable soil net bearing pressure is 4,000 per square foot and seismic class “D” as defined by the 2015 IBC New Jersey Edition and Melick Tully Associates, PC.” Please clarify where in the bidding documents there is a reference by Melick Tully to this soil bearing pressure. The preliminary geotechnical report only identifies subsurface conditions with no design and construction recommendations. Please verify the type of the foundation system (i.e. shallow foundation or piles), allowable bearing pressures and seismic site class to be used as a basis of bidding this project

Answer: Refer to page 16 of the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation Report. **A description of the subsurface conditions at the site is provided on page 7 of the Melick-Tully Preliminary Geotechnical Report. The entire site is underlain by fill material that is considered structurally unsuitable in its current condition to support a conventional spread-foot foundation for the proposed project.**

---

**NJSDA’s current practice is to let the Design Builder and their Licensed Design Professionals review the entirety of the preliminary information provided, and apply their engineering judgment and expertise to arrive at the best and most cost-effective approach for a school foundation type for the purposes of submitting a bid. NJSDA purposely requested that Melick-Tully remove its preliminary geotechnical design recommendations from its Preliminary Geotechnical Report dated February 18, 2015. However, in consideration of the bidder’s questions, and to provide further clarification to the bidders, the NJSDA has decided to retract and modify its response to Bidder Question No. 24 in Addendum 1 and Bidder Question No. 67 in Addendum 2, and is hereby providing the previously omitted Preliminary Geotechnical Design Recommendations found on pages 8 through 21 of the February 18, 2015 Melick-Tully Preliminary Geotechnical Report as Attachment 4.3 of this Addendum 4.**

3. The response to Addendum #3, Question #23 is modified as follows:

23. Question: Confirmation is requested as to whether a concrete roof is needed to comply with the ANSI S12.60 requirement for Outdoor-Indoor Transmission Class (OITC) rating for the core learning spaces.

Answer: *While this may be likely, a determination in this regard is dependent upon both the location and the performance of the specific equipment provided in the Design Builder’s final design* **The Design-Builder’s Price Proposal shall include the cost of a roof-ceiling assembly which meets the minimum STC and OITC ratings specified in Performance Specifications Section**

**PS1030.00 I B.2. The cost of agreed-upon enhancements to the roof-ceiling assembly which may be necessary as a result of the Outdoor Noise Study required by Performance Specifications Section PS1030.00 I B.2.i shall covered by the Building Envelope Acoustical Enhancement Allowance. Selection and inclusion of a roof-ceiling assembly which meets the minimum STC and OITC rating requirements is the responsibility of the Design-Builder and may or may not include a concrete roof.**

**G. ATTACHMENTS:**

1. Attachment 4.1 Revised Drawing C-01 Boundary Survey dated 2/3/16 with Revised Drawing C-01 Boundary Survey, dated 4/14/2016.
2. Attachment 4.2 Health and Safety Plan, dated January 2015, prepared by Pennjersey Environmental Consultants.
3. Attachment 4.3 Melick-Tully Report, dated Feb. 18, 2015, pages 8 through 21.

**H. SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION**

*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

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
NJSDA                      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:** April 26, 2016

**PROJECT #:** ET-0031-B01  
New Seaman Avenue Elementary School  
Perth Amboy Public Schools

**DESCRIPTION:** Addendum #4

Addendum No. 4

**Acknowledgement of Receipt of Addendum**

Contractor hereby acknowledge the receipt of the Addendum by signing in the space provided below and returning via scanned copy ([MATaylor@njsda.gov](mailto:MATaylor@njsda.gov)) or fax (609-656-4609). 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