

**New Milford Public Schools
RFP - E - 2627-001 NMHS Tennis Courts
Addendum 3**

Question 1: Has the District established an anticipated construction budget for the tennis-court reconstruction?

Answer: The District does not disclose construction budget estimates during the design procurement phase. Bidders should provide their fixed-price fee for the design and engineering services requested. Refining the anticipated construction cost will be an expected deliverable from the awarded Consultant during the design phases.

Question 2: Please confirm that both Option A and Option B are to be developed only through the conceptual-design phase, after which the District will select one option to advance through final design, permitting, and construction documents.

Answer: Yes, that is correct. The Consultant will develop both Option A and Option B through the conceptual design phase, which must include providing preliminary construction-cost estimates for both. The District will utilize these conceptual designs and estimates to select one preferred option. Only that single selected option will be advanced by the Consultant through final design, permitting, and construction documents. Bidders should structure their fee proposals based on this progression.

Question 3: For Option B, please identify the intended uses/sports for the multipurpose court, and the desired capacity/style for the spectator seating. Answer:

The specific intended uses and seating capacity for Option B will be finalized in collaboration with the District during the conceptual design phase. For the purpose of providing a baseline fee proposal, bidders should assume standard multipurpose court dimensions (e.g., basketball or volleyball) and a standard portable bleacher system.

Question 4: Should the Base Bid include sampling or analytical testing of the existing pavement or underlying materials for hazardous disposal characterization?

Answer: No. For the purpose of the Base Bid, bidders may assume the existing materials are non-hazardous. If field conditions or historical data indicate otherwise during the project, any required hazardous material testing and remediation design will be addressed as an additional service.

Question 5: How many District review meetings, presentations, and formal design-review submissions should consultants include in the Base Bid fee?

Answer: Bidders should propose a meeting and submission schedule they determine is necessary to successfully deliver the project based on their technical approach. At a minimum, this must include formal review meetings for the Conceptual Design selection, the 90% Draft Construction Documents review, and the 100% Final Construction Documents approval, as outlined in Section 3 of the RFP.

Question 6: At which design milestones are construction-cost estimates required?

Answer: The Consultant must provide preliminary construction-cost estimates alongside the delivery of the Conceptual Design Packages (for both Option A and Option B) to assist the District with option selection, project budgeting, and funding procurement. Furthermore, the Consultant shall provide an updated estimate for the selected option at an intermediate (approx. 60%) design milestone to ensure budget alignment, and a final pre-bid estimate alongside the Draft Construction Documents (90% Review).

Question 7: Will the District provide standard front-end bidding documents and general conditions for the construction RFP, or is the Consultant expected to prepare the entire procurement package?

Answer: The District will provide its standard administrative front-end bidding documents and general conditions. The awarded Consultant will be responsible for integrating these with their technical specifications, project manual, and Stormwater Pollution Control Plan (SWPCP) to create a single, comprehensive bid package.

Question 8: Will the District provide a current wetland delineation and survey, or should the Consultant include wetland delineation and application preparation in their Base Bid?

Answer: Because this project involves the reconstruction of tennis courts on an existing, previously developed footprint, the District does not anticipate the need for new wetland delineations or extensive inland-wetlands applications. Therefore, bidders should **not** include wetland delineation or associated specialized environmental application services in their Base Bid. If the local regulatory agencies determine these services are required as the design develops, they will be addressed as an Additional Service with the awarded Consultant at that time.

Question 9: Should the Consultant include all municipal and state application, registration, and permit fees in their Base Bid, or will those fees be paid directly by the District?

Answer: The Consultant's Base Bid must include all professional time and engineering services required to prepare, submit, and coordinate all necessary permits. The actual hard costs for municipal and state application or registration fees will be paid directly by the District.

Question 10 : Please confirm whether reuse of the existing perimeter drainage and downstream stormwater system is acceptable if the Consultant verifies that the system is structurally sound and has adequate capacity.

Answer: Yes. The District encourages the reuse of the existing drainage and stormwater systems to minimize the project footprint and construction costs. This reuse is fully acceptable, provided the awarded Consultant's engineering assessment verifies that the existing system is structurally sound and possesses adequate capacity to support their final design.

Question 11: Regarding the CTDEEP construction stormwater permit and local approvals, please clarify the intended allocation of permit responsibilities.

Answer: As defined in Sections 2.B, 2.C, and 2.D of the RFP, the Consultant is responsible for preparing the SWPCP, securing initial approvals, conducting weekly compliance monitoring, and recommending the final Notice of Termination. The technical specifications drafted by the Consultant must explicitly require the future Construction Contractor to act as the co-permittee, perform the routine BMP maintenance, and execute daily or storm-event inspections. Any required registration fees will be paid by the District.

Question 12: Must the Consultant's structural engineer prepare and seal the complete post-tensioned (PT) slab design, or may this be a delegated design provided by a specialty engineer retained by the future construction contractor?

Answer: The RFP explicitly requires the Consultant to provide the "Full PT concrete slab design, details, and structural calculations" (Section 2.B). This scope may not be deferred as a delegated design to the future construction contractor.

Question 13: Does the Consultant's Base Bid need to include the cost of an independent testing laboratory for construction-phase material testing, or will that be carried in the construction contract?

Answer: The Consultant is responsible for defining all testing protocols in the bid documents, performing specific specialized inspections, and verifying stressing logs/strength tests as outlined in Section 2.D. However, the actual monetary cost of hiring a third-party independent testing laboratory for routine physical material testing will be carried by the future Construction Contractor and must be specified as such within the construction bid package.

Question 14: Please define the required limits of supplemental surveying. Should the survey extend beyond the tennis-court enclosure to include access routes, proposed bleacher areas, downstream drainage structures, drainage outfalls, property boundaries, easements, and adjacent environmental-resource areas?

Answer: The District does not prescribe strict limits for supplemental surveying. As outlined in Section 2.A of the RFP, the awarded Consultant is responsible for reviewing the provided historical site drawings and performing any necessary supplemental surveying required to ensure the accuracy of the final site data used for their engineering. Bidders must determine the appropriate survey limits based on their specific technical approach, including necessary tie-ins for access routes, drainage, and site improvements and include those assumed costs in their Base Bid.