



Greater New Haven Transit District

840 Sherman Avenue, Hamden, CT 06514

Phone: 203.288.6282 Fax: 203.288.7471

Request for Qualifications for Architectural & Engineering Services Development of a Repair and Rehabilitation Plan for Maintenance and Administrative Facility at 840 Sherman Avenue, Hamden, CT GNHTD RFQ # 01-2020

Amendment No. 3

Consultant Questions and Answers

Firm Name: Wendel

Questions and Responses:

- 1. Is the SF330 form included in the page limit in Section III, subsection 1?**

No.

- 2. What Appendices aren't included in the page count? Forms and Certifications?**

All submittals noted in Section III, Response Criteria, subsection 2, with the exception of the forms and certifications, the Affirmative Action Plan and the SF330 will go into your page count. That will include narrative regarding the firm's qualifications, key staff and resumes, information on other relevant projects, your work plan, etc.

Firm Name: AEPM International

Questions and Responses:

- 1. We understand there may be some drawings of the existing facility available. Can they be posted to the website?**

The District does have some paper plans. They are quite large and not conducive, especially in the short run, to being copied and posted. But the plans will be available for viewing by proposers who pass through the first screen and come in for interviews or for commencement of contract negotiations.

- 2. The Construction Management tasks outlined in RFQ Section II, 3E appear to be “Construction Admin” tasks that would typically fall under the Architect’s services. Please confirm?**

Is bidding assistance included as part of the Construction Management tasks?

Are estimating services included as part of the Construction Management tasks?

The tasks outlined in the scope section are indicative of the range of potential work efforts at this time. The final work scope will be negotiated, and scope expansion to some other tasks not specifically included in the RFQ document is probable.

- 3. In the Draft Agreement (Exhibit B), Section 17D, there appears to be a typo that reads “Nine Million Dollars”, but the numbers indicate “\$5,000,000”. Please clarify.**

In Sections D & E, the provision for \$5,000,000 of Umbrella insurance and E&O insurance seems excessive for essentially a Facilities Assessment agreement. Are these limits negotiable?

In Section F, please clarify whether Pollution insurance is required for “design services”?

The “Nine Million Dollars (\$5,00,000)” discrepancy is an error. It should be “Five Million Dollars (\$5,000,000).”

The draft agreement included in the RFQ document is only an illustrative agreement. The agreement used as a base for this draft was for a project that had significant environmental risk. This project is not expected to have a significant environmental risk. Therefore, the level of insurance specified in Sections D and E of the draft, and the inclusion of Pollution Liability Insurance as indicated in Section F will be negotiable but ultimately must be approved by the District’s insurance broker.

- 4. The RFQ seems to focus mainly on infrastructure concerns and deferred maintenance issues. To what extent should the scope address latent code and/or life safety issues?**

See Section II, subsection 3, C, d. It would be expected that in your review of the Building Inspection Report and your own building system survey, other areas requiring further study or additional action may be recommended and, if approved, by the District would be negotiated as additional work.

- 5. Has a Phase I assessment been performed in recent years? If, so can it be posted to the website?**

No.

- 6. For specific projects emanating from the scope of services (Section II, 3D), should the construction documents assume work in an occupied building?**

Yes. We are essentially a 24/7 operation so work must be conducted without significant disruption to our core business operations. Having said that, work schedules and phasing of certain inspection or construction activities are negotiable and shut-downs of certain functions for a period of time could be considered as the scope and schedule are negotiated.

- 7. The BIR distributed at the pre-proposal meeting may be missing pages (or information) under the Recommended Building Improvements section. The handout does not include any electrical recommendations/costs. Was this an oversight?**

The BIR distributed at the meeting and with Addendum #2 is accurate. There were no recommendations for electrical in the Recommended Building Improvements section. However, in reviewing the BIR and in conducting your assessments and inspections, you may find electrical issues that should have been included in the report or that you are recommending based upon your own work.

End of Addendum No. 3.

