Adendum #2
January 8, 2010

Re: HACC, Central Pennsylvania’s Community College
Senator John J. Shumaker – Public Safety Center
Architectural Services
Solicitation # 10-19

From: Eastern pcm, LLC
Construction Manager – HACC
645 N. 12th Street
Lemoyne, PA 17043

To: All Planholders

This Addendum is hereby made part of the Request for Proposal dated December 11, 2009 for the above referenced project. The provisions of this Addendum are intended to supplement the provisions of the Request for Proposal and/or supersede them where contradictory thereto.

This Addendum contains changes to the requirements of the Request for Proposal. Such changes shall be incorporated into the Request for Proposal and shall apply to the requirements with the same meaning and force as if they had been included in the original Request for Proposal. Where this Addendum modifies a portion of a paragraph or phrase of the Request for Proposal, the remaining unmodified portion of the paragraph or phrase shall remain in force.

The conditions and terms of the Request for Proposal shall govern the requirements described in this Addendum. Whenever the conditions of the requirements, or any information or quantities are not fully described in this Addendum, the conditions of the requirements etc. included in the Request for Proposal for similar items shall apply to the information described in this Addendum.

2.0 GENERAL CLARIFICATIONS

a) The electrical engineering required for the site lighting will be the responsibility of the Architect.

b) Solicitation 10-19: Architectural Services
   1. Section II(a): Provide a brief summary of general experience and in addition, provide three (3) references including client name, address, contact, title and contact information.
   2. Section II(f): Provide three (3) specific projects with a description of each, photos and project characteristics which are similar in nature to that of Option 1(B) as described in the Master Plan.
   These projects can be the same as Section II(a) or in addition to Section II(a).
c) Phase 1 / 2 Environmental Site Assessments have not been conducted for this site.

d) Solicitation 10-19: Architectural Services: Section III – Fee Proposal
   The Scope of Services upon which the fee should be based is outlined in Section I – Administrative.

e) Solicitation 10-22: Civil Engineering Services: Section III – Fee Proposal
   The Scope of Services upon which the fee should be based is outlined in Section I, IA and IB.

f) Construction Phase Services:
   Construction Phase Services are to be included under both contracts;
   Architectural/Civil. These services include but are not limited to:
   1. Meeting attendance
   2. Submittal review
   3. RFI issues
   4. Change Order review/approval
   5. Issue construction changes
   6. Pay application review

Refer to AIA B141 CM/a - 1992


2.3 Change: Solicitation 10-19, Architectural Services: Section III – Fee Proposal: Change second sentence to read “The total fee indicated below covers all items and reimbursables for the scope as listed in Section I – Administrative.”

2.4 Change: Solicitation 10-22, Civil Engineering Services: Section III – Fee Proposal: Change second sentence to read “The total fee indicated below covers all items and reimbursables for the scope as listed in Section I, IA, IB.”

2.5 Paragraph IX-Attachments: ADD
   a) Wetlands Delineation Plan Appendix E
   b) Harrisburg Campus Utility Plans – 9 pages
   c) Site Photographs, Master Plan Appendix C
   d) Soil Descriptions – Appendix D

2.6 Attached hereto and incorporated as part of this Addendum #2 are the Answers to the Questions submitted relative to Solicitation # 10-19 and 10-22 through January 6, 2010.

END OF ADDENDUM
### Low Voltage Underground Conduit Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conduit No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Conduit Diam. (in)</th>
<th>Splice</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>004 4&quot;</td>
<td>LOW VOLTAGE MANHOLE #1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Loop 1</td>
<td>1 1/2&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005 4&quot;</td>
<td>LOW VOLTAGE MANHOLE #2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Loop 2</td>
<td>1 1/2&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006 4&quot;</td>
<td>LOW VOLTAGE MANHOLE #3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Loop 3</td>
<td>1 1/2&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007 4&quot;</td>
<td>LOW VOLTAGE MANHOLE #4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Loop 4</td>
<td>1 1/2&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008 4&quot;</td>
<td>LOW VOLTAGE MANHOLE #5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Loop 5</td>
<td>1 1/2&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009 4&quot;</td>
<td>LOW VOLTAGE MANHOLE #6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Loop 6</td>
<td>1 1/2&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010 4&quot;</td>
<td>LOW VOLTAGE MANHOLE #7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Loop 7</td>
<td>1 1/2&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011 4&quot;</td>
<td>LOW VOLTAGE MANHOLE #8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Loop 8</td>
<td>1 1/2&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012 4&quot;</td>
<td>LOW VOLTAGE MANHOLE #9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Loop 9</td>
<td>1 1/2&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013 4&quot;</td>
<td>LOW VOLTAGE MANHOLE #10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Loop 10</td>
<td>1 1/2&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014 4&quot;</td>
<td>LOW VOLTAGE MANHOLE #11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Loop 11</td>
<td>1 1/2&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015 4&quot;</td>
<td>LOW VOLTAGE MANHOLE #12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Loop 12</td>
<td>1 1/2&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Underground Cable Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conduit No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Contact Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>010</td>
<td>LOW VOLTAGE MANHOLE #1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011</td>
<td>LOW VOLTAGE MANHOLE #2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012</td>
<td>LOW VOLTAGE MANHOLE #3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013</td>
<td>LOW VOLTAGE MANHOLE #4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014</td>
<td>LOW VOLTAGE MANHOLE #5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015</td>
<td>LOW VOLTAGE MANHOLE #6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016</td>
<td>LOW VOLTAGE MANHOLE #7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>017</td>
<td>LOW VOLTAGE MANHOLE #8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018</td>
<td>LOW VOLTAGE MANHOLE #9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019</td>
<td>LOW VOLTAGE MANHOLE #10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020</td>
<td>LOW VOLTAGE MANHOLE #11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>021</td>
<td>LOW VOLTAGE MANHOLE #12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Notes

- Refer to the project's electrical plans for detailed conduit and cable routing.
- Conduit diameters are specified in Standard Conduit Sizes (SCS).
- Locations are marked with blue dots on the site plan.
- Conduit and cable quantities are approximate and subject to change.
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APPENDIX C

Site Photographs (A-FF)
Photographs Taken on February 18, 2009
Photo A: Eastern view of Wetland 1.

Photo B: Northern view of old field along Industrial Road.
Photo C: Eastern view of Wetland 1 at a culvert under an existing access road.

Photo D: Northern view of the existing access road.
Photo E: Eastern view of Wetland 1, located east of the existing access road.

Photo F: Northern view of the scrubby woods located in the southeastern portion of the study area.
Photo G: Northern view of the old field in the southern portion of the study area.

Photo H: Northwestern view of the southern portion of Wetland 2.
Photo I: Southeastern view of the southeastern portion of Wetland 2.

Photo J: Southwestern view of the central portion of Wetland 2.
Photo K: Northwestern view of the northwestern portion of Wetland 2.

Photo L: Southwestern view of the north central portion of Wetland 2.
Photo M: Northern view of the northeastern portion of Wetland 2. This portion of the wetland is bisected by a pedestrian trail.

Photo N: Northern view of the northeastern portion of Wetland 2. This portion of the wetland is bisected by a pedestrian trail.
Photo O: Eastern view of Wetland 3. This wetland area is located within a man-made stormwater swale that conveys stormwater into an adjacent stormwater basin.

Photo P: Southeastern view of two corrugated metal pipes that convey stormwater from Wetland 3 and into the adjacent stormwater basin.
Photo Q: Northern view of Wetland 3 within the existing stormwater detention basin.

Photo R: Eastern view of the outfall structure within the existing stormwater detention basin. This outfall drains into the adjacent Paxton Creek (Watercourse 1).
Photo S: Northern view of Wetland 4.

Photo T: Southern view of Wetland 4.
Photo U: Northeastern view of mowed lawn.

Photo V: Southern view of Wetland 5.
Photo W: Southeastern view of Wetland 5.

Photo X: Southern view of the fire pond.
Photo Y: Northern view of Watercourse 1 and the culvert under 1-81.

Photo Z: Southern view of Watercourse 1.
Photo AA: Southern view of the scrubby woods in the northeastern portion of the study area.

Photo BB: Northern view of Wetland 6.
APPENDIX D

Soil Descriptions
Map Unit: DP—Dump

Component: Dumps (90%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Dumps is a miscellaneous area.

Component: Andover (1%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major components. The Andover soil is a minor component.

Map Unit: DvB2—Duncannon very fine sandy loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes, moderately eroded

Component: Duncannon (100%)

The Duncannon component makes up 100 percent of the map unit. Slopes are 3 to 8 percent. This component is on terraces. The parent material consists of coarse-silty loess over residuum weathered from sedimentary rock. Depth to a root restrictive layer is greater than 60 inches. The natural drainage class is well drained. Water movement in the most restrictive layer is moderately high. Available water to a depth of 60 inches is high. Shrink-swell potential is low. This soil is not flooded. It is not ponded. There is no zone of water saturation within a depth of 72 inches. Organic matter content in the surface horizon is about 3 percent. Nonirrigated land capability classification is 2e. This soil does not meet hydric criteria.

Map Unit: Lr—Lindside silt loam

Component: Lindside (85%)

The Lindside component makes up 85 percent of the map unit. Slopes are 0 to 3 percent. This component is on flood plains. The parent material consists of alluvium derived from sedimentary rock. Depth to a root restrictive layer is greater than 60 inches. The natural drainage class is moderately well drained. Water movement in the most restrictive layer is moderately high. Available water to a depth of 60 inches is high. Shrink-swell potential is low. This soil is frequently flooded. It is not ponded. A seasonal zone of water saturation is at 27 inches during January, February, March, April, December. Organic matter content in the surface horizon is about 3 percent. Nonirrigated land capability classification is 2w. This soil does not meet hydric criteria.

Component: Melvin (5%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major components. The Melvin soil is a minor component.
Map Unit: Ma—Made land, sanitary fill

Component: Udorthents, sanitary landfill (95%)

The Udorthents, sanitary landfill component makes up 95 percent of the map unit. Slopes are 0 to 15 percent. This component is on upland slopes. The parent material consists of mixed fill. Depth to a root restrictive layer, bedrock, lithic, is 10 to 70 inches. The natural drainage class is well drained. Water movement in the most restrictive layer is very low. Available water to a depth of 60 inches is very low. Shrink-swell potential is low. This soil is not flooded. It is not ponded. There is no zone of water saturation within a depth of 72 inches. Organic matter content in the surface horizon is about 2 percent. Nonirrigated land capability classification is 7s. This soil does not meet hydric criteria.

Component: Nanticoke (1%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major components. The Nanticoke soil is a minor component.

Component: Othello (1%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major components. The Othello soil is a minor component.
1. **Question:** Has a Phase 1 Environmental Assessment Report been prepared?

   **Answer:** No. All Due Diligence information is included in the Master Plan Report.

2. **Question:** Are there reports or soils tests previously completed concerning the subsurface landfill issue?

   **Answer:** No.

3. **Question:** Has there been an environmental assessment of the Public Safety Center site? If so, how does it address the presence and extent of the underlying dump?

   **Answer:** There has not been an environmental assessment of the site. All information relative to the site Due Diligence is included in the Master Plan Report.

4. **Question:** Does the College have any information on the large stormwater pipe that drains eastward from Industrial Road to Paxton Creek, just south of the Public Safety Center?

   **Answer:** All information relative to storm water and underground utilities is included on the Utility Plans dated 9.20.93 attached to this Addendum.

5. **Question:** Presuming that the site designer will be responsible for site lighting, will the College require additional site items, i.e. security cameras, security phones, etc.?

   **Answer:** Solar powered "call boxes" will be placed throughout the site by HACC under a separate contract. Electric for these items is not required.

6. **Question:** Will HACC provide mapping that shows wetlands locations?

   **Answer:** The wetlands delineation plan (80 scale) is included in Appendix ‘E’ of the Due Diligence Report within the Master Plan. A copy is attached to this Addendum.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Is the detailed survey information on the website the extent of base information?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Are there rim and inverts available for manholes and inlets?</td>
<td>Refer to utility plans included in this addendum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Who is to provide the electrical plans for the parking lot lights?</td>
<td>The parking lot lighting will be the responsibility of the architect under the building design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Page 4 of the RFP under scope makes reference to a wetlands presence/absence determination but the Due Diligence Investigation prepared by K&amp;W Engineers dated 9/10/2009 states that a wetland investigation and report was performed on 2/25/2009 by Vortex Environmental, Inc. and JD was performed on 4/13/2009. Please clarify the need for another wetland determination as specified in the RFP.</td>
<td>The information contained in the Master Plan, although deemed accurate, is to be confirmed by the land development engineer. The clause states “as/if” required. If the information is sufficient, then no further delineation is necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. M&amp;D was the only one making mention of the Feb 2-3 dates. I assumed that the minutes reflected Feb 2-3 on both 10-19 and 10-22, that the date was changed at the Pre-Proposal Meeting.</td>
<td>The minutes have been corrected to reflect the following: Architectural Interviews: January 28-29, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Are wetland impacts expected as a result of construction?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. If so, do you know what the wetlands impacts (size) are expected to be?</td>
<td>Refer to Master Plan, Due Diligence Section and Wetlands Delineation Plan attached to this Addendum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. **Question**: We are looking at some teaming/prime options for the project. Is there any reason a responding firm would not be able to submit as a prime and also as a sub-consultant on other teams (federal funding)? I understand the answers are to be provided January 8th but would you be able to respond to this question sooner?

**Answer**: There is no restriction to submitting as a Sub Consultant, Prime Consultant or both.

15. **Question**: Reference Site Plan prepared by Skelly and Loy, Inc.:
   Did Skelly and Loy survey the property outbounds?

**Answer**: Yes.

16. **Question**: Reference Site Plan prepared by Skelly and Loy, Inc.:
   Were there metes and bounds assigned to the title line for the site and the Right of Way Line for Industrial Road in the vicinity of the site?

**Answer**: All available information is indicated on the plan.

17. **Question**: Was a traffic impact study prepared for the HACC?

**Answer**: No.

18. **Question**: Was a traffic impact study prepared for the existing public safety building?

**Answer**: No.

   a) **Question**: Are these reports available?

      **Answer**: N/A

   b) **Question**: And who prepared these two traffic reports?

      **Answer**: N/A

19. **Question**: Has HACC decided if stormwater management facilities shall be designed for Option 1B only or for the full build-out/master plan?

**Answer**: Option 1B only.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is sidewalk/pedestrian bridge from Evans Gym to Public Safety Center area (Option 1C) to be designed as ADA accessible?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are application and permit fees to be included in our proposal or will HACC cut the checks form them when the amounts are determined?</td>
<td>Application and Permit Fees will be paid for by the Owner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Site Master Planning and Due Diligence Investigation Report references a Wetland Delineation Plan included as Appendix E. Is this available to be provided at this time? Maybe as a .pdf file?</td>
<td>Plan is included in this Addendum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The floodplain show on the existing conditions plan does not correspond to the FEMA Mapping referenced in the Due Diligence Report. Have any floodplain revisions been submitted previously to revise boundary show on the FEMA Map?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has HACC inquired, or received, any input from the City of Harrisburg regarding the sewer and water capacity required for the new construction?</td>
<td>Preliminary discussions have been held with the City of Harrisburg; refer to Section 9.0 of the Due Diligence Report in the Master Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have any archeological studies been done on the site, as recommended in the Due Diligence Report?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are meeting minutes available for the site meeting with the USACOE and DEP regarding the existing wetland on the site?</td>
<td>The substance of the meetings is summarized in Section 2.0 of the Due Diligence Report in the Master Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has any response from DCNR been received for the Botanical Survey of the site?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Given the accepted Master Plan and its proposal for the Law Enforcement Complex, does HACC anticipate that the schedule will accommodate an effort to validate the program in detail and in response to such findings allow modifications to the concept proposed in Option 1B?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 29. It is our understanding that all Site Training Elements, with the exception of Burn Building upgrades, are included in the A/E project scope. Please confirm and list site training elements to be included in A/E scope. | a) Flash over simulator & prep  
b) Existing smoke building  
c) Car extraction  
d) Flag area training props  
e) Street and directional signage  
f) Exterior street and building lighting  
g) Confined space prop  
h) Trench rescue prop  
i) Exterior propane tanks props |
| 30. Are vendors currently engaged with the College and master planning team with regard to possible proprietary public safety systems – range equipment, fire equipment? If so, please identify. | No. |
| 31. Is it the desire of the College to have range or fire equipment vendors on the A/E teams? | That is to be determined by the proposing teams. |
| 32. Please provide further scope definition regarding an IT, security or special systems that may be required, designed and documented by the A/E team. | a) IT (Voice/Data) Specifications will be provided to the architect by HACC for incorporation into the project.  
b) Card access, CCTV cameras and audio-visual systems will be contracted separately by HACC and are not to be included in the architect’s scope; however, conduit and power rough-in are the responsibility of the architect. |
33. **Question:** Preliminary review of indoor firing range plans and immediate siting included in master plan, suggests that several issues may need to be addressed. These issues suggest some replanning of the facility plan. Based on pre-proposal commentary, how much re-planning is allowed to address these issues?

**Answer:** The programming elements and building presence along Industrial Road are not to be compromised. Changes to the conceptual design will be considered keeping the aforementioned elements intact.

34. **Question:** Are Appendices C, D, & E from K&W’s Due Diligence Report available for review?

**Answer:** Appendices C, D & E are included in this Addendum.

35. **Question:** It was stated at the pre-proposal meeting that a campus-wide utility plan will be available. Is this information tied/cross referenced with the topo survey?

**Answer:** The plans were prepared independently at different times. The information contained on each can be reasonably coordinated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) <strong>Question:</strong> Will additional utility surveys be required?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answer:</strong> Additional surveys are to be determined by the engineer based upon the information that is available through public means and HACC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. **Question:** During K&W’s due diligence a wetland delineation was performed for areas west of Paxton Creek. Is this wetland information available for re-use when permitting and is it tied/cross referenced with the topo survey?

**Answer:** The information contained in the Master Plan is available for re-use in permitting. It is the responsibility of the engineer to provide any additional information required to secure the required permits. The plan was created independently and is not necessarily tied to the Building/TOPO survey.

37. **Question:** It appears that additional wetland delineations will be required on the east side of Paxton Creek in the area of the bridge/walkway. Can we assume the intent is not to replicate the work performed by Vortex Environmental on the west side of the Creek? It is my understanding that the Corps performed a Jurisdictional Determination (JD) in the area.

**Answer:** The intent is not to replicate but to supplement as required to secure the necessary permits.
38. **Question:** Do you have an estimated cost for the pedestrian bridge construction and related walkway?

**Answer:** No.

39. **Question:** Do you have an estimated duration of construction for the building? (A schedule was requested in the RFP but this time constraint is typically beyond the control of the site engineer).

**Answer:** The schedule for the site and building construction as indicated in the Master Plan is 14 months.

40. **Question:** Is Greenbelt relocation limited to those areas south of exiting entrance 5? It appears the Greenbelt north of the drive was recently constructed.

**Answer:** Yes.

41. **Question:** Will North Hall remain open during the duration of the public safety complex?

**Answer:** Yes.

   a) **Question:** If so, will it be necessary to relocate North Hall parking into one of the newly proposed parking lots?

   **Answer:** Parking will need to be maintained; the new lot(s) is an option.

42. **Question:** Is the boundary and location of the landfill known?

**Answer:** Generally, the entire site.

43. **Question:** What are the contents of the landfill? Trash, construction spoils?

**Answer:** Generally, construction spoils and debris from the construction of the I-81 and Cameron Street interchange. Design professional to confirm.

44. **Question:** Is there a liner installed around the landfill?

**Answer:** No.

45. **Question:** Has the site been classified as contaminated? Contaminated soils?

**Answer:** Not to our knowledge.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46. What is the depth of the backfill soil placed on top of the landfill?</td>
<td>Unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Has there been an environmental assessment report prepared for the site?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Can you direct me to where I may find the following attachment? a) Boundary &amp; Topo survey of Harrisburg Campus b) Site Plan of Shumaker Public Safety Center c) Public Safety Center Master Plan—2009</td>
<td>They are posted on HACC’s Website under Business &amp; Community/Purchasing/Request for Proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. While researching for my proposal, I noticed on the FEMA mapping that much of the area for the proposed Public Safety Center appears to be within the flood zone of Paxton Creek. Should I list the steps/costs that would be required to accomplish the permitting for this?</td>
<td>Include in the response any information that the proposer determines is necessary to comply with the requirements of the RFP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. After spending a little more time looking at the flood issue and the site topo map, it appears that the area was filled since the FEMA maps were prepared. It also appears that the flood line on the topo was approximated by the surveyor who did the topo, using the FEMA WSE of 327: Do you know if a flood study was ever done for the site?</td>
<td>Not to our knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. In regards to Solicitation No. 10-22 for Senator John J Shumaker Public Safety Center, will the cover letter, table of contents, and legal forms be counted in the 30 page limit?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Has anyone looked at the feasibility of constructing the proposed bridge?</td>
<td>A detailed feasibility study has not been conducted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where can we find the Scope of Work?</td>
<td>Architectural RFP Section I - Administrative Civil RFP Section I, IA, IB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will geotechnical borings/subsurface investigations be necessary for the building/structure foundation designs, or is this something that the architectural consultant is responsible for under their scope of work (i.e. as part of RFP #10-19)?</td>
<td>Each consultant (Architectural/Civil-Site) is responsible for their respective geotechnical work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The master plan identifies a new pump house to be constructed. Is the civil engineering consultant responsible designing the contents (i.e. pump equipment) of that building or is this being handled by the architectural consultant as part of RFP #10-19?</td>
<td>For the purposes of this RFP, the pump house improvements will be under the site improvements and the responsibility of the civil engineer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>According to 2009 Master Plan prepared by Crabtree, Rohrbaugh and Associates, page 1.4, assuming authorization in November of 2009, 10-12 months of design and 14-16 months of construction, completion of construction would occur in December of 2011. The RFP listed Contract issuance of March 28, 2010.: Please confirm that the completion of construction should be anticipated to occur 24-28 months after the March 28, 2010 contract issuance.</td>
<td>For the purposes of these RFPs, a contract will be issued in March of 2010. Responses are to include a schedule as requested in the RFP and not necessarily as depicted in the schedule included in the Master Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a site electric power/circuitry plan part of the scope or will this be the responsibility of the electrical engineer associated with the building design?</td>
<td>The site electric is included in the architect’s scope of work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can we have a copy of the Jurisdictional Determination wetlands plan prior to bid?</td>
<td>Please refer to the Master Plan for the extent of the available information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. The RFP scope includes wetland delineations and wetland reports, however a wetland report was included in the due diligence package and it states that a JD was obtained. Can further wetland delineation be excluded from the scope and the prior delineation by Vortex Environmental used?</td>
<td>Yes—however, it is the responsibility of the civil engineer to provide all information necessary to secure the required permits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. What are the ‘expanded wetland areas’ shown on the plan?</td>
<td>Relocated or mitigated wetlands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. The plan for option 1C depicts an additional 140 car parking lot east of the existing public safety building. This is not in the contract nor an alternate, correct?</td>
<td>Correct. Only the sidewalks and pedestrian bridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Under Section II - Response Criteria, subsection I.G it specifies a maximum of 3 reference projects. However, subsection II.A requests experience on specific projects, with references. Is this in addition to the max 3 reference projects? Is there a limit to specific project experience under subsection II.A?</td>
<td>Answered in Addendum #2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Was a phase 1 &amp; phase 2 environmental assessment study performed? Are there any issues with contaminants?</td>
<td>A phase 1 and 2 was not performed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Are the blue areas shown in the drill field intended to be stormwater management basins?</td>
<td>Not necessarily—however, that area could be considered for that use if needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Since HACC is providing a survey plan, can you specify the exact scope of survey work required, or is the survey to be provided sufficient?</td>
<td>The survey provided is for the engineers use. The engineer is to determine if the information is sufficient or if additional information is necessary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
66. **Question:** Under section I.A – Criteria it lists site training elements/props, but at the pre-proposal meeting it was specified that these were the responsibility of the architect. Is the scope limited to grading a pad/specifying a surface for props?

**Answer:** Yes.

67. **Question:** Are there existing subsurface confined space props on site?

**Answer:** No.

68. **Question:** Are proposed subsurface confined space props part of the scope or is it the responsibility of the architect?

**Answer:** Confined space prop is the responsibility of the architect.

69. **Question:** Can a plan be provided clearly demonstrating the limits of work and what is proposed (new) versus what is existing (to remain)? This is not entirely clear from the plan provided.

**Answer:** Site Plan – Option 1B in conjunction with the corresponding cost estimate table defines the scope.

70. **Question:** Is design of fire protection lines on site part of the scope?

**Answer:** The civil engineer is responsible to design the fire protection main.

71. **Question:** Is the ‘New Pump House’ part of the scope? If so, please provide more detail.

**Answer:** It is under the site improvements and civil engineer’s responsibility. Refer to the Master Plan, it generally requires additional pumps for redundancy.

72. **Question:** The scope of work did not specify construction phase services. Are these desired as part of the scope of work?

**Answer:** Construction phase services are required in both the architectural and civil services including but not limited to:
1. Meeting attendance
2. Submittal approval
3. Addressing RFIs
4. Change order review and approval
5. Issuing ASIs or bulletins as needed
6. Pay application review
73. **Question:** It is noted in the due diligence report that the wetlands limits have been approved by the USACOE and therefore we assume there should be no need for additional wetlands delineation with the exception of the pedestrian bridge crossing. Are the approved limits available in CAD format?

**Answer:** See additional Exhibit – Appendix ‘E’ – Wetlands Plan

74. **Question:** Will there be additional points awarded for the use of WBE/DBE sub consultants?

**Answer:** Refer to the evaluation matrix.

75. **Question:** Regarding the Traffic Study, the proposed land use (Public Safety Center) does not fall under any of the land uses provided in the ITE Trip Generation manual, the accepted standard for determining new trips for a proposed facility. Will the anticipated number of new trips to be generated by the facility be provided? If not, will trip generation information of similar sites be provided so that the number of new trips can be estimated?

**Answer:** The facility will provide projected student enrollments and building occupancy for the engineers use in determining the number of trips to be generated.

76. **Question:** As recommended in the due diligence report has HACC had any additional discussions with the city regarding zoning issues.

**Answer:** No.

77. **Question:** Will the evaluation strictly follow the matrix/point system outlined in the Evaluation Matrix of the RFP?

**Answer:** Yes.

78. **Question:** Should proposers organize submissions with separate qualifications for a) architecture and b) engineering teams to follow the organization of the Evaluation Matrix?

**Answer:** The proposer is free to organize as they see fit.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>79. Question:</strong> The map included in the due diligence report shows wetland flags. Are all these flags still present on site?</th>
<th><strong>Answer:</strong> Yes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a) Question:</strong> Have the locations of these flags been surveyed?</td>
<td><strong>Answer:</strong> Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b) Question:</strong> The owner provided a topographic survey of the property. Where and what is the benchmark; location and elevation?</td>
<td><strong>Answer:</strong> Refer to plan provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c) Question:</strong> Is there a survey plan showing the location, invert and description of the existing utilities on and around the site, i.e. drainage structures, outlet pipes, end walls, type and size of pipe, manholes?</td>
<td><strong>Answer:</strong> Plan has been included in Addendum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>80. Question:</strong> Describe the wetlands.</td>
<td><strong>Answer:</strong> Refer to the Due Diligence section of the Master Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>a) Question:</strong> Are we assuming that we can build on the land (Site Civil)?</td>
<td><strong>Answer:</strong> Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>81. Question:</strong> For design purpose who will supply geo-technical?</td>
<td><strong>Answer:</strong> Each service (architectural/civil) is responsible for their own geotech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>a) Question:</strong> Survey on existing land?</td>
<td><strong>Answer:</strong> Provided on the HACC website as attachment to RFP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>82. Question:</strong> Are there drawings available for the building?</td>
<td><strong>Answer:</strong> Yes. They will be provided to the successful firm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 83: Who will hire LEED commissioning committee?

**Answer:** HACC.

- **Question:** Who will register the project?
  
  **Answer:** The architect.

- **Question:** How will LEED cost be addressed?
  
  **Answer:** The fees to submit the project will be considered a reimbursable cost. Provide an estimate within your Fee Proposal.

### Question 84: Who is handling the power to the building?

**Answer:** The architect.

### Question 85: What power is available? Where?

**Answer:** Refer to the Utility Plans provided in Addendum #2.

- **Question:** Budget for bridge and walkway?
  
  **Answer:** Not established.

- **Question:** New Pump House?—Upgrades
  
  **Answer:** Refer to Master Plan and Option 1(B), cost breakdown.

### Question 86: Clarification for site training elements? Define in a narrative—detail what they are

**Answer:** Refer to Master Plan.

### Question 87: Existing Utilities? (Site plan)

**Answer:** Provided in Addendum #2.