

PURCHASING DEPARTMENT

The bid listed below has had addenda issued. Documents are available over the Internet at <http://www.bid.ci.norwalk.ct.us>. Adobe Acrobat reader is required to view this document. If you do not have this software you may download it for free from Adobe. A link to the Adobe site is provided on the internet bid page. This service is also available via FAX. Dial 203-854-7897 from any phone to access the Purchasing Department's Express Request Line. The document number to request will be the same as the project number indicated above.

Project #	Addendum #	# of pages	Original Issue Date	Request Doc #
2938	2	8	May 6, 2010	1001 - see text below

Date	May 21, 2010	
Project Number	2938	
Addenda Number	2	
DEADLINE	2:00 PM	May 27, 2010
Project Title	ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN SERVICES for the construction of the new Norwalk Fire Department Headquarters Facility	

This Addendum is a contract document modifying previously issued documents, which remain in full force except as specifically modified below.

Quotations appearing on the Proposal are to reflect the provisions of this Addendum. Failure to acknowledge receipt of this Addendum in the space provided on the response sheet may subject candidate to disqualification.

Responses to Questions

1. Question: Was the pre-proposal conference for this project mandatory?

Response: *No, the pre-proposal conference for this project was not mandatory.*

2. Question: I understand that you are looking for a designer for the new Fire Department Headquarters, and was wondering if you will also be retaining a construction management firm. If so, do you have any information on that front you can provide?

Response: *Yes, a construction management firm will be retained for this project. However construction management services are not within the scope of this solicitation. Instead the services of a construction management firm shall be solicited under a separate solicitation at a later date.*

3. Question: When I go to your website I see a reference to document #1005, but the link to it appears to be broken. Please advise?

Response: *Document #1005 is not referenced in this RFP. Additionally, the contents of this documents are not related to this RFP.*

4. Question: We are interested in responding to the above referenced RFP however we only received it today (from a potential Consultant) and realized that we've missed the Pre-Proposal Conference? Will you accept our RFP response even though we did not attend the Pre-Proposal Conference? Please advise

Response: *Yes. Attendance at the pre-proposal conference was not mandatory, therefore the City shall accept submissions of Firms even though they did not attend this pre-proposal meeting.*

5. Question: in 1.6 Proposal Submission format, Proposal Response Forms, it references 2.2 I assume that you mean 2.1 as indicated on the top of the page

Response: *Yes you are correct. This was a typographical error, it should have read 2.1 not 2.2.*

6. Question: Does the City have a list of consultants that you have successfully worked with previously? I am specifically referring to the RFP list of: Surveyor, Environmental, IT, Geotech, Commissioning.

Response: *No. This information is not required as a component of your submission. The City anticipates that the success Firm would be responsible to provide this information at a later date.*

7. Question: Page 45 of the RFP indicates that we are responsible to obtain document Number 1006, which is to be dated revised 042010 or later. When we go to the website we find that 1005 is General Bidding Information for Construction, and appears to predate 042010. It may be that the form you intend for us to obtain is 1005, Terms and Conditions for Architectural Services. It appears that the website link to that form is broken. We have unsuccessfully attempted to send a fax regarding this, and have not had llick at the Express Request Line. How can we obtain the necessary form?

Response: *Document Number 1005 does not pertain to this RFP. The link to document number 1006 has been reset and now reflects the revision date of the document outlined within the RFP. A copy of this document is available on the Purchasing Department's website. <http://www.bid.ci.norwalk.ct.us> within the section of the website labeled Terms and Conditions.*

8. Question: Are there any minority or disadvantaged business sub-consulting goals?

Response: *No, there no minority or disadvantaged business sub-consulting goals for this RFP.*

9. Question: 1.7, G, lists a consultant budget for off-site design services at \$20,000. Is this the same service that is referred to as “Traffic Consulting Service,” on page 8

Response: *No, “Off-site Facilities Design Services” relates to relocation of temporary relocation of existing operation. Whereas the City anticipated that the Traffic Consulting Services would be incorporated into overall fees as a base consulting services such as those for mechanical, electrical, etc....*

10. Question: The total project budget has been identified in the RFP as \$14 million. On page 6 of the RFP states a building size of 30,000 sq ft and a construction budget of approximately \$10 million. At the walk through it was stated that the building would be 33,000 sq ft with a construction budget of \$11.5 million. What is the construction budget?

Response: *The total project budget, including soft costs and hard costs, is projected to be \$14 million.*

11. Question: Under the Executive summary, you are requesting that the SF330 be included. Are you expecting all sections of the SF330 for the Lead team/s to appear in this section?

Response: *Yes, it is the City’s expectation that SF330 documents for the lead teams would appear in the executive summary section of your submission.*

12. Question: Under Scope of Services, you are requesting SF330 for key consultants. Again, are you expecting all sections of the SF330 to appear here for each key consultant – i.e. projects, resumes as well as Part II – General Qualifications?

Response: *Yes.*

13. Question: The complete SF330 provides sections to capture a lot of the information that you are requesting under Project Team Organization and Staffing including an organizational chart, a description of relevant projects, team resumes and projects where key personnel have worked together as a team. Are you expecting this information to be presented on both the SF330 and again, in the written RFP response?

Response: *Yes.*

14. Question: Does the City have a list of local Environmental Consultants that it regularly solicits proposals from? Will you share that list?

Response: *No. Please refer to the response to question #7 of this addendum.*

15. Question: Does the City have a list of IT Consultants with City of Norwalk

Response: *No. Please refer to the response to questions numbers 7 and 14 of this addendum.*

16. Question: Would you please confirm that the City wishes to combine the DD and CD Phases into a single Phase?

Response: *No. Please refer to the response form contained within the RFP document. The City, on this response form, has requested separate pricing for both the Design Development and the Construction Document Phases*

17. Question: A NTE Allowance is requested for SI under the DD/CD Phase Scope of Services. Are you requesting that the NTE Allowance is included in our RFP Response/Fee Proposal, or is this NTE Allowance to be provided during the DD/CD Phase?

Response: *The City is unclear on the abbreviations you have listed within your question [NTE & SI]. For this response the City has presumed that "NTE" is an abbreviation for Not-to-exceed, and that "SI" is an abbreviation for Special Inspect Inspections and Testing. Special Inspection and Testing is considered an additional service as indicated in the proposal form. The allowance should reflect total cost for the duration of the project including both the design development [DD] phase and the construction document phase services.*

18. Question: Regarding Page 15, Section 1.7, Special Instructions, Item G. In lieu of "Included in the Bid Response Form Item 1-E...." should the first line read "Included in the Bid Response Form Item 1-**F**...."?

Response: *Yes, that was a typographical error, and instead should have read Form 1-F, not Form 1-E.*

19. Question Do you have an approximate site budget?

Response: *No.*

20. Question: Allowances totaling \$180,000.00 have been established for six sub-consultants. On Page 7 regarding Environmental Investigations there includes the words, “The architect shall separately identify a environmental consultant/engineer to...” Are we being asked to identify the “licensed environmental consultant/engineer” as part of the submission? Are we expected to identify the other five sub-consultants as part of the submission?

Response: *No, Firms are not required to submit the names of their selected sub-consultant under Allowance as part of their initial submission to the City.*

21. Question: The Milestone Schedule on Page 13 of the RFP indicates November 1, 2011, is to be beginning of the DD phase and December 15, 2011, is to be the beginning of CD Phase. Are the dates intended to be during **2010** in lieu of the stated 2011?

Response: *Yes, that was a typographical error, and instead should have read 2010, not 2011.*

22. Question: Do you know what the municipal approvals process will be? Will a Land Use and/or Zoning review be required?

Response: *All municipal projects have the same requirements as private development projects. Therefore, this project shall be required to comply with all Land Use and Zoning requirements and apply for variances as necessary.*

23. Question: Do you anticipate the building staying in the middle with access on both sides? In which case, much of the existing site might remain...or should we assume it will all be stripped out and we're starting from scratch?

Response: *The placement of the building structure on the site shall be determined through the initial design phases. The City is anticipating that the entire site to be redone. After all, the City does not want to erect a brand new building in the same deteriorated setting.*

24. Question: Do we assume that any street lighting will be ‘existing to remain’ (since it’s Route 1 and managed by the State)...or does Norwalk have plans for enhancements?

Response: *At present, the City has no plans to change the street lighting as it relates to this project.*

25. Question: What is the scope of work for the Fire Department relocation during construction?

Response: *To be determined.*

26. Question: Please provide a copy of the survey. Only a partial image was included in the RFP?

Response: A complete survey is included as an exhibit to the RFP.

27. Question: Would you anticipate the CM or the architect to manage the commissioning agent and the LEED consultant (if desired)?

Response: The Architect.

28. Question: Section 1.6 of the RFP, 9th bullet item references Section 2.2. Section 2.2 was not provided. However, section 2.1 was provided and appears to be the correct section. Is 2.2 a typo?

Response: Yes, this is a typo. See also response to question #5 of this addendum.

29. Question: Will the architect be required to provide meeting minutes for the Design Development and Construction Document phase?

Response: Yes.

30. Question: Should the proposal include information on subconsultants that the City of Norwalk have included as allowances (ie. surveyor, environmental) or can that be determined at a later date?

Response: The names of any subconsultants included as allowances can be provided on a later date. However any major subconsultants (ie HVAC) shall be provided as part of the initial proposal.

31. Question: Should only subconsultants that are not specifically listed as allowances be included in the proposal?

Response: Yes, see response to question #30 of this addendum.

32. Question: Are there provisions to comment on the contract?

Response: If you intend to take any exceptions to the City's contract document, you should include them within your proposal submission.

33. Question: The RFP states “The City shall also require the building be designed to qualify and meet/exceed the minimum standards for LEED Silver certification.” Obtaining a Silver certification costs significantly more than meeting/exceeding the minimum standards for LEED Silver certification. Does the City want to pursue the certification? If so, does the City want that cost in the base fee?

Response: *As part of the Architect’s basic services, the Architect shall provide a detailed analysis of available Alternative Energy technology. Services shall include description of technology options; applicability of each option for this project and site; financial proforma associated with capital investment (including all soft and hard costs), energy savings and payback period; maintenance / operating requirements and costs; available incentives; and life cycle and replacement costs associated with the equipment. In the event that the City elects to incorporate an Alternative Energy Technology into this project, the Architect shall submit a proposal for the design services of such Alternative Energy Technology as Additional Services and the City shall consider the acceptance of said submission for these additional services.*

34. Question: Item 7 on page 10 of the RFP states “Additionally, the Architect, in conjunction with its consultants, shall provide an analysis of alternative energy options and in the event the City decides to incorporate one or more of the selected option(s), the Architect shall provide all design services as required.” Since it is unknown if and what options may be selected, how can we price this? Can this be time & materials?

Response: *No time and materials pricing would not be acceptable. See also response to question #33 of this addendum.*

35. Question: Will it be the architect’s responsibility to submit the applications/paperwork to the USGBC for LEED registration?

Response: *Yes.*

36. Question: If LEED registration is desired by the City, would the City of Norwalk also hire a separate LEED consultant?

Response: *No.*

37. Question: If a LEED consultant is desired, would that consultant’s fee be provided by the City as an allowance?

Response: *No.*

38. Question: Regarding the IT design: Does the allowance for the IT design services are \$70,000 include the MEP design services for the data center or are the Tier III data center MEP design services part of the base design services?

Response: MEP design services for the IT Equipment shall be included as part of base design services.

39. Question: Regarding Off-site Temporary Facility Improvements: Are MEP Design services included in the \$20,000 design service allowance?

Response: *Yes. At this time, the City has not developed the full scope for Temporary Off-Site Improvements and therefore, except for conceptual design and planning services associated with Off-Site Improvements, all design and construction document phases related to Off-Site Improvements will be charged against the allowance.*

End of Addendum #2

PURCHASING DEPARTMENT

The bid listed below has had addenda issued. Documents are available over the Internet at <http://www.bid.ci.norwalk.ct.us>. Adobe Acrobat reader is required to view this document. If you do not have this software you may download it for free from Adobe. A link to the Adobe site is provided on the internet bid page. This service is also available via FAX. Dial 203-854-7897 from any phone to access the Purchasing Department's Express Request Line. The document number to request will be the same as the project number indicated above.

Project #	Addendum #	# of pages	Original Issue Date	Request Doc #
2938	1	5	May 6, 2010	1001 - see text below

Date	May 14, 2010		
Project Number	2938		
Addenda Number	1		
DEADLINE	2:00 PM	May 27, 2010	
Project Title	ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN SERVICES for the construction of the new Norwalk Fire Department Headquarters Facility		

This Addendum is a contract document modifying previously issued documents, which remain in full force except as specifically modified below.

Quotations appearing on the Proposal are to reflect the provisions of this Addendum. Failure to acknowledge receipt of this Addendum in the space provided on the response sheet may subject candidate to disqualification.

New Information:

1. A pre-proposal conference for this project was held at 10:00am, Thursday, May 13, 2010 at the existing Norwalk Fire Headquarters, 121 Connecticut Ave, Norwalk CT. A copy of the sign-in sheets from that meeting is included as an attachment to this addendum.
[(three) 3 pages]

End of Addendum #1

PRE - PROPOSAL CONFERENCE
BID #2938 - DESIGN SERVICES FOR CONSTRUCTION OF THE
NEW NORWALK FIRE DEPARTMENT HEADQUARTERS FACILITY
10:00AM, Thursday, May 13, 2010

PLEASE PRINT

NAME	TITLE	COMPANY	E-MAIL	TELEPHONE / FACSIMILE
1. Richard Zini	SR Architect	Doyle Coffin Architecture	RZ@doylecoffin Architecture.com	TEL: 203.431.6001 FAX: 203.431.9764
2. Michael Tribe	Partner	250 South 55th St. Merrimack 150 Water Street Ave. Haverhill, MA 01822	tribe@tribe 9501/5500455.604	TEL: 914.978.3677 FAX: 914.978.1600
3. Robert Mitchell	Owner	Mitchell Associates Architects	Robert@mitwell-architects.com	TEL: 518-765-4571 FAX:
4. Peter Bernoulli	Architect	Restonick Architects	Restonick@horsham.pa.us	TEL: 860.576.0869 FAX:
5. Carl Burdick	I. Arch.	TLB Architecture	CBurdick@TLBArchitecture	TEL: 800.586.9448 FAX:
6. Ryan Malin	Partner	AKF Group 750 E. Main St Stamford, CT 06902	RMALIN@AKFGROUP.COM	TEL: 203.388-1211 FAX: 212-594-2868
7. Gussie Schultz	Director	Romonte Rube Architects	guss@romonte-rube.com	TEL: 212-594-4015 FAX:
8. Cassie Brock	Intern	Romonte Rube Architects	CRBROCK@ROMONTE-RUBE.COM	TEL: (203) 910-1510 FAX:
9. Harrison Gill	Principal	Preis/PreisMeyer PA	harrison@phartlts.com	TEL: 203.356.1666 FAX: 203.357.7819
10. Ken Jones	Principal	The H. Salvo Emson Grp	kenj@tdag.com	TEL: 203-438-9581 x228 FAX: 203 431 6168

Matt Myers Associates
 203 374 3748 x 3315
 Page 1 of 4

PRE - PROPOSAL CONFERENCE
BID #2938 - DESIGN SERVICES FOR CONSTRUCTION OF THE
NEW NORWALK FIRE DEPARTMENT HEADQUARTERS FACILITY
10:00AM, Thursday, May 13, 2010

PLEASE PRINT

NAME	TITLE	COMPANY	E-MAIL	TELEPHONE / FACSIMILE
1. CAROL ROYHONIS	Assoc. Manager	WASK/SPOOLS	RSTRANDTC@WASKLLI.COM	TEL: 203 532-9449
2. HENRY SMITH MILLER	PARTNER	SMITH MILLER & HAWKINS ARCHITECTS	HSM@SMITHMLL.COM	TEL: 203 266-3873 FAX: 203 266-3873
2. JOHN CUTRUPPAS	PRACTICER	LOTHROP ASSOC. ARCH.	JPC@LOTHROPASSOC.COM	TEL: 914-741-1115 X240
DAV PETERSON	PRINCIPAL	Reason Engineering	depeter@reg-eng.com	FAX: 203 810 5193 E.
3. RAY SULLIVAN	PRINCIPAL	SULLIVAN ARCHITECTURAL GROUP	R.SULLIVAN@ARCHITECTURALGROUP.COM	TEL: 203 810 5036 FAX: 203 810 5036
FRITZ WORKERS	PRINCIPAL	BEUTNER ARCHITECTS	FRITZ@BEUTNER.COM	FAX: 708 203 8383 5789
4. DAN MCGOVERNS	SR. V.P.	THE BBA GROUP	DWCGOVERNS@BBAGROUP.COM	TEL: 640-300-7183
5. Karen Destafanis	Associate	Environmental Logistics Group	Kdestafanis@lbgct.com	TEL: 203 929-8555
Peter Gaito	Architect	Peter F. Gaito & Assoc.	pgaito@pfga.net	FAX: 203 926 9140
6. PETER COATO JR	ARCHITECT	PCA	pcato@pca.net	TEL: 914 682-3381 FAX: 914 682-4192
7. DEBORAH VERNE	ARCHITECT	URBAIN ARCHITECTS	VERNE@URBAIN.COM	T: 212-239-0220 X9095 F: 212.563.5021
* John Block	Principal	Tyche & Bond	jblock@tychebond.com	TEL: 203-717-1111
Stroffler J Alf	Principal	FULLER & DRAGLO P.P.	josephfr@fullerdraglo.com	FAX: 914 592 4444 1717
8. Tom Mc Namara	MANAGER	BVH Integrated Services	MANAR@BVH15.COM	TEL: 800-386-9171
BOB SCHEINER	PRINCIPAL	H2M ARCH & ENGINEERS	SCHEINER@H2M.COM	FAX: 631-694-4122
9. Veronica Byrnes	Architect	H2M Architects & Engineers	Vbyrnes@h2m.com	TEL: 631.756.9000 / 631.694.9122
10.				TEL: FAX:

PRE - PROPOSAL CONFERENCE
BID #2938 - DESIGN SERVICES FOR CONSTRUCTION OF THE
NEW NORWALK FIRE DEPARTMENT HEADQUARTERS FACILITY
10:00AM, Thursday, May 13, 2010

PLEASE PRINT

NAME	TITLE	COMPANY	E-MAIL	TELEPHONE / FACSIMILE
1. Peter Rader	Architect	hru Architects & Engineering	pete@hru.net	TEL: 203.637.1114 FAX: 203.637.4017
2. Bill Silvera	President	Silvera Petrucelli + Assoc.	bsilvera@silverapetrucelli.com	TEL: 203-230-9007x200 FAX: 203-230-8247
3. Jelenahan	Proj. Manager	Fuss & O'Dell	jlenahan@fandol.com	TEL: 203-374-3748x3509 FAX: 203-374-4398
4. Selina Jones	Interior Design	AM Design Arch.	amdesignsrj@amdesign.com	TEL: 800-344-1559 FAX:
5. PAUL LISI	PRINCIPAL	AUTINOZZI Assoc.	PLISI@AUTINOZZI.COM	TEL: 203-377-1300 FAX: 203-378-3002
6. ROBERT J. CAVELLO	PRINCIPAL	WESTVIEW ARCHITECTURAL	Rob@cavellowestview.com	TEL: 203-299-0656 FAX:
7. THOMAS J. HANNES	PRINCIPAL	HANNES ARCHITECTS & INTERIORS, INC.	thom@hannesinteriors.com	TEL: 800-818-9111 FAX: 800-818-9113
8. AZUKA AMYLIKA	ENGINEER	TECTONIC	jscales@tectonicengineering.com	TEL: 860-563-2341 FAX: 860-787-9719
9.				TEL: FAX:
10.				TEL: FAX:

Preproposal Conference
Bid # 2938 - Design Services - Construction of new
Sign in Fire Department Headquarters Facility.

NAME	FIRM
GUSSIE SCHOLTZ	RONNISTE RILEY ARCH.
MICHAEL TRIBE	PETER / SOLFI ASSOCIATES
HENRY SMITH-MILLER	SMITH-MILLER + HAWKINS
CARL POTTHANZ / WASA/STUDIO	WASA/STUDIO A
Robert Mitchell	Mitchell Associates Architects.
PETER BOSTWICK	BOSTWICK ARCHITECTS.
CARL BURDICK	TLBA
Karen Destefanis	Leopette, Brashears & Graham
DAN MCGOVERN	THE RBA GROUP
RYAN MALIN	AKF GROUP
FRITZ MORRIS	BEWFIELD ARCHITECTURE
RAY SULLIVAN	SULLIVAN ARCH GROUP
DOU PETERSON	PETERSON ENGINEERING GROUP
JOHN CUTSUMPAS	LOTHROP ASSOCIATES
JOE FULLER JR AIA	FULLER + D'ANGELO P.C. ARCHITECTS
John Block	Tight & Bond
Rick Zini	Doyle Coffin Architecture, LLC.
DENNIS A ROSS	PACHECO ROSS ARCH P.C.
BOB SCHEINER	H2M ARCH. & ENGINEERS
Veronica Bymes	H2M architects + engineers.
ROBERT J. CAVELLO	WESTVIEW ARCHITECTURAL, LLC
Tom Mc Namara	BVH Integrated Services
Ken Jones	The Di Salvo Ericson Group.
Math Myers mmymyers@pando.com	Fuss & O'Neill Environ Sci. Inc.
KATY LYNCH	LANGAN ENGINEERING @PERKINSWILL.COM
RONALD QUICQUARO	PERKINS + WILL RON. QUICQUARO
BARRY FROEBERT	DE CARLO + PAUL
William F. Moore	Roth & Moore Architects
ROBERT CECATA	BL COMPANIES
Tom Thurstin	Roth & Moore Architects

Bid # 2938, Thursday, May 13, 2010
 Page 4 of 4
 4