RFP – ADDENDUM #2
Ridgewater College (RWC) – Roof Replacement C1, C5, C6, S1, S2, S3
December 10, 2020

Additional Questions Received:

1. On page 2 of the RFP, the last key feature bullet item states “Additional Scope as described in the Pre-Design”, and the last bullet item in item 9 on page 4 of the Pre-Design states “The precast stone fascia and brick façade should be replaced...”. Will the owner please confirm if responders are to replace all of the precast stone fascia and brick façade below Area A5 with masonry cavity wall construction that meets Minnesota Design Standards? *The pre-design is a guideline or framework for the project. This is currently our understanding of the project wall scope based on recommendations in the pre-design. The selected A/E team reviews the pre-design assumptions in the design phase (Page 7, 2b of the RFP) and addresses any new or different information that might arise at that time.*

2. The participants at the RFP meeting were able to view the original documents. It was indicated that only the awarded Design Team will receive the original documents (which are not available in digital form per Addendum #1). It is unknown whether they are the complete documents or that the building was built per the documents. Should the bidders include the fees necessary to conduct destructive test openings of the existing conditions for the roof, wall construction, and through-wall flashings to verify integrity of materials, attachment, and verification of existing construction to reduce possible change orders or will the design be based only on the original documents available? *We do encourage the practice of doing destructive test openings during design if warranted to verify existing conditions and to assist the design team in developing critical details during the design phase. The owner would pay for any destructive testing during design that is recommended by the A/E team outside of the A/E fees. This would never be expected to be included in the A/E fees. The A/E team should plan for a thorough evaluation of all existing conditions early in design, as actual construction can vary from what is shown on existing plans. The campus will provide all existing documentation that they have on the original building construction and any remodels performed.*

3. Based on Addendum #1, question 15, regarding allowing existing roof insulation that is in good condition to remain in place. The existing roof systems on these buildings do not meet the Minnesota State Roofing Design Standards. The existing roof systems are laid loose over concrete and steel decks and have a combination of perlite insulation and expanded polystyrene insulation which has low R-value. The Roofing Design Standards require the installation of a two-ply vapor retarder, which will require the removal of the existing insulation. Does the Campus...
and Minnesota State want the new roof system to meet the Minnesota State Design Standards and current Energy Code?

Yes, the new roof system will need to meet Minnesota State Design Standards and all energy and other building codes. Respondents should familiarize themselves with the Minnesota State Facility Design Standards [FDS link]. The answer to question #15 in Addendum #1 was not meant to weigh in on if existing insulation would be allowed to remain in place, but was instead using that example to ask if we allow unit prices in our bidding processes and if we carry contingency funds for the project, both of which we do.

4. The answer to item 13 in Addendum No. 1 confirms all of the precast stone fascia on building/roof CS is to be replaced (per page 4 of the Pre-Design), and that the Campus has concerns with going back with new stone panels. With the general wall work scope and the yet to be determined panel wall replacement material, could the responders provide a Schematic Design fee in this RFP response, allowing fee adjustment negotiation once the specific scope and materials are determined after Schematic Design?

No, the full architecture/engineering fees for all phases need to be included in this RFP response. The RFP template used for this project is our standard A/E RFP for roof replacement projects, so perhaps respondents are concerned about the extent of the wall evaluation for this reason? All we can advise is that A/E fees should include time for adequate design exploration, which in the case of the fascia panels could include product evaluation and recommendation in the design phase.

5. For fairness to the RFP responders, should the responders provide fee pricing for the construction observation timeframes indicated on page 11 of the Pre-Design (ten weeks full-time roofing, ten weeks full-time masonry, and two weeks of combined periodic)?

Yes, this is the basis of this solicitation. We would amend the contract later if adjustments to the construction schedule are made during design.

6. Is there any window replacement work on this project even though window replacement is called out in the Purpose of the RFP on page 1? If there is window replacement, please define the window replacement scope.

No, any existing clerestory windows seen on the Science Building roof will be removed and infilled. This scope was not clearly defined in the pre-design report but was discussed during the roof tour. There is no window replacement planned.

7. If there is window replacement in this project, is the scope large enough that the Owner will retain the services of a curtain wall consultant to review the design details and installation?

See answer to question #6.
8. Should respondents include plan review and mortar testing costs in their fee, and if so, what allowance amount should respondents use, since such costs seem to vary a great deal between projects?

Mortar testing costs will be coordinated and paid for by the Owner. Regarding plan review fees, page 11 of the RFP describes how the A/E fees are evaluated and what is required. Because we spend funds through the e-Builder program, we prefer the A/E team pay the plan review costs and invoice them as a reimbursable. The AIA B101-2017 Contract, article 11.8 defines plan review as an allowable reimbursable:


We will amend the A/E contract later to address plan review fees when those fees are exactly known.

9. The campus wishes to correct one item in the Pre-Design, Pages 5-6. They do not want the manufacturer controls for new mechanical equipment but would like the mechanical engineer to work with Uhl, the campus’s controls Vendor, to specify controls that will integrate with their existing system.

Kip Oveson, Physical Plant Director, Ridgewater College