

**New Milford Public Schools
RFP - E - 2627-001 NMHS Tennis Courts
Addendum 1**

Question 1 : How adherent to the proposed timeline is the District?

Answer: The milestone dates leading up to construction are proposed and intended to serve as a reference for the overall flow and progression of the project. However, the ultimate objective is to begin construction at the end of the NMHS competitive tennis season in late spring of 2027. The awarded Consultant will work with the District to establish a finalized schedule that ensures all design, permitting, and bidding phases are completed in time to meet this construction start goal.

Question 2 : Please clarify the required scope and methodology for the geotechnical investigation.

Answer: The District does not prescribe a specific geotechnical methodology. As outlined in Section 2.A of the RFP, the selected Consultant is responsible for determining and executing the appropriate level of geotechnical investigation required to design a structurally sound Post-Tensioned (PT) concrete foundation. Bidders should outline their professional approach to subsurface evaluation and existing sub-base testing in their proposals, ensuring all proposed methods align with industry best practices, ASBA standards, and applicable building codes. The comprehensive cost for this investigation must be included within the single, fixed-price proposal.

Question 3 : Is prior USTA grant experience mandatory to submit a proposal for the project or Add/Alternate No. 1?

Answer: No. USTA experience is not a mandatory prerequisite for submitting a proposal for either the Base Bid or Add/Alternate No. 1. While the District highly values and requests evidence of specific USTA grant experience for the evaluation of the Add/Alternate, firms without this exact experience may still provide pricing for it. Bidders lacking direct USTA references are encouraged to highlight comparable grant administration experience or demonstrate their capacity to fulfill the technical compliance requirements outlined in the USTA standards. The District will evaluate the Base Bid and Add/Alternate to determine the best overall value and reserves the right to award the contract with or without the Add/Alternate.

Question 4 : Does the District require the complete off-site removal of the existing asphalt, or is milling and incorporating the old material into the sub-base an acceptable alternative?

Answer: The reference to "removal of existing asphalt" in the RFP encompasses any method of breaking up or processing the existing asphalt surface. The District does not mandate off-site hauling versus on-site milling. Bidders should state their intended methodology in their proposal and baseline their fee on that approach. The final sub-base design will be confirmed by the awarded Consultant following their post-award geotechnical evaluation.

Question 5 : Is the use of Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) required for this project?

Answer: The District's standard practice requires the use of Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) in conjunction with Call Before You Dig (CBYD) whenever machine digging will occur in a previously undefined space. While the District is not explicitly mandating a full-site GPR sweep of the previously developed one-acre tennis court footprint, bidders are reminded that the awarded Consultant is ultimately responsible for verifying field conditions, ensuring the accuracy of site data, and identifying any subsurface obstacles that may impact their design.

It is the sole responsibility of the bidder to determine the appropriate level of subsurface investigation necessary to mitigate risk and execute their proposed technical approach. Any anticipated use of GPR or utility locating technologies deemed necessary by the bidder must be included in their final lump sum fee proposal.

Question 6 : Will the existing fencing be removed and replaced?

Answer: The anticipated scope of construction will likely necessitate the removal and replacement of all existing fencing. Ultimately, the requirement and specifications for new fencing will be dictated by the final design prepared by the awarded Consultant.

Question 7 : Will a water fountain be incorporated into the project?

Answer: There is currently no water fountain on-site, and the District does not envision adding one as part of this project at this time.

Question 8 : Is there existing drainage associated with the current tennis court site?

Answer: Bidders should refer to the existing site drawings provided as **RFP - E - 26/27-001 NMHS Tennis Courts Addendum 2** ; to review the current site conditions and drainage. As outlined in the RFP, the awarded Consultant will be responsible for reviewing these records.

Question 9 : Are detailed design drawings required to be submitted as part of the proposal response?

Answer: No. Detailed design drawings are not required as part of the bid submission.

Question 10 : Will the installation of practice boards or windscreens be part of this project?

Answer: No. Bidders should not include practice boards or windscreens in their current fee proposal. The District may choose to explore adding these items as bid alternates during the design phase with the awarded Consultant.