

**RFP for Architect – Municipal Garage Project
ADDENDUM #1**

Date of Addendum: March 14, 2016

NOTICE TO ALL POTENTIAL RESPONDENTS

The Request for Proposals (RFP) is modified as set forth in this Addendum. The original RFP Documents, dated February 23, 2016 remain in full force and effect, except as modified by this Addendum, which is hereby made part of the RFP. Respondent shall take this Addendum into consideration when preparing and submitting its Proposal.

PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL DEADLINE

The Proposal submittal deadline remains the same and is not changed by this Addendum.

1.0 – RFP for Architect

Item	Section	Description of Change
1.1	Introduction Section 1	Delete the second paragraph in Section 1 and replace it with the following language: “The Architect will be responsible for determining the suitability of the Project Site. It shall engage an engineer to prepare a final geotechnical report and a surveyor to complete an existing conditions and topographic survey of the site that satisfies the requirements of the Design Contract (defined below) as soon as possible after the contract is awarded. It is also known that the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) has identified on their wetland inventory map, wetlands within the project boundary. It should be noted that it is not anticipated that wetlands exist to the extent on the historical wetland inventory map. It is recommended that a wetland delineation of the site be completed and a report prepared as soon as site conditions allow and the wetland boundary be included on the topographic survey of the site. These services shall be included as part of the “Technical Proposal” and the associated fee be included as part of the “Compensation Proposal”. If Unknown conditions arise during the design phase additional consultants will be engaged by the Architect. The new sub-consultant will be identified along with their scope of work and adjustments to the contract fee will be approved by change order prior to initiating the new work. In addition, as soon as the improvements are sited, the Architect will fast track the design development documents and specifications for the Independent Facilities, which specifications will designate manufactured units that could be installed by the Owner.”

Item	Section	Description of Change
1.2	Introduction Section 1	Delete the first sentence of paragraph three in Section 1 and replace it with the following language: “The Village will be utilizing a “team approach” described in detail in the modified AIA B101 (Standard form of Agreement between Owner and Architect (the “ <i>Design Contract</i> ”) attached as <u>Exhibit E.</u> ”
1.3	Technical Proposal Submission Requirements Section 5	Delete sub-section “h.” in Section 5 and replace it with the following: “h. Consultants: (2 pages maximum) Identify the engineering consultant for the geotechnical report, the person and firm responsible for the wetland delineation, and the surveyor for the existing conditions and topographic survey, with a brief introduction to their experience and capabilities.”
1.4	Compensation Proposal Section 6	Delete the second bullet item prior to final paragraph in Section 6 and replace it with the following language: • The name and lump sum cost for the engineer, wetland delineator, and surveyor;
1.5	Compensation Proposal Section 6	Delete the first sentence of last paragraph in Section 6 and replace it with the following language: “Firms are encouraged to direct any questions via email to James Fenlon by 1:00 p.m. CST on 03-10-16.”

2.0 – QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

The following questions and answers are provided as a matter of information to clarify issues raised about the document referenced above. To the extent that changes to the RFP are required based on the questions received, the RFP has been modified as noted in the referenced section of this Addendum.

Item	Questions and Answers
2.1	<p>Question: <i>I am requesting the RFP Documents for the Municipal Garage Project that is bidding on March 18, 2016? Do you also have an Estimated Value or Budget Value for this project?</i></p> <p>Answer: <i>RFP information, which contains the information requested for both Architectural design and Construction Manager services can be found at the following link: http://www.littlechutewi.org/432/Requests-for-Proposals.</i></p> <p><i>The Village reserves the right to separately install the Salt Storage Building, Cold Storage Building, Yard Waste Site and Material Storage Bins (collectively the “Independent Facilities”) after design development is completed, with an approximate total value of \$1,000,000.</i></p> <p><i>The Preliminary Scope is subject to modification through the design and budgeting process. The maximum construction budget for this project is \$5,000,000 and includes the “Independent Facilities”.</i></p>

Item	Questions and Answers
2.2	<p>Question: <i>Our Firm is interested in doing both the design and the construction management. My question is, given the amount of similar content required, do you believe it would be easier for your review to have them submitted in one proposal? Or should those be submitted individually? Is the Village open to having one firm do both Architectural design and Construction Management?</i></p> <p>Answer: <i>The Village would recommend that you submit a proposal for Architectural design and then another for the Construction Management services. Also, the Village is open, pending the proposals, to have one firm execute both the design and construction management.</i></p> <p><i>If it is stated that the two submitted proposals are contingent on obtaining both Architectural and Construction Management services the proposals will not be reviewed for consideration due not meeting the requirements of the RFP.</i></p>
2.3	<p>Question: <i>On page (2) of the Architectural RFP 2nd to last paragraph it states, “The Village may accept the lowest bid from a qualified Architect as may be required by applicable law, provided that the architectural services may be re-bid if the lowest bid is unacceptable. Please clarify. Does that mean if the Architectural services portion cost is too high the Village may re-bid again?”</i></p> <p>Answer: <i>If all proposals for Architectural Services provide a wide variety of work and are not consistent between the respondents, the Village has the option to reject all proposals so that the scope of work can be revised in order to better define the bidders understanding of work for the project.</i></p> <p><i>This statement can also be applied if the lowest bid did not allow for sufficient effort to complete the work or by not meeting the work requirements identified in the RFP.</i></p>
2.4	<p>Question: <i>Exhibits for Architects RFP, Page 3, Background Information, final sentence references an attached Space Needs Assessment. Can you direct us to the location of the Assessment as the overall building size varies from the 30,000 to 40,000 square foot listed on this paragraph to the 44,500 listed on page 1 of the Request for Proposals?</i></p> <p>Answer: <i>It is listed in the RFP that a 44,500 square foot building is being required. In previous studies the building size varied depending on office space requirements which is now reduced due to the Department of Public Works offices being located at Village Hall. The final size of the building to be used for the Architect’s proposal is 45,500 square feet as indicated in the RFP. The final building size will be based on the Architect’s recommendation for space requirements.</i></p>

3.0 – INFORMATION

The following item(s) are provided as a matter of information only to all respondents and do not modify or become part of the Contract Documents.

Item	Description
3.1	Item 1.5 is revised because CDT does not begin until Sunday March 13 at 2:00 A.M.

END OF ADDENDUM