REQUEST FOR INFORMATION
BID PACK B

TO: EDIS COMPANY

PRE-BID RFI#: 016

FROM: J.D. BARTLETT, EDIS COMPANY

DATE: 3/19/2020

PROJECT: SILVER LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

DWG. # / DETAIL: SPEC. SECTIONS: 024119, 011100-08

PAGE: 

REQUEST:

Submitted By: Brightfields

Date: 3/19/2020

1.) Division 2 – Section 02 41 19 Part 1.9 says owner will remove all furniture, fixtures, and furnishings. However, Part 3.3 #4 says demo contractor needs to cover and protect furniture, fixtures, furnishings that have not been removed. Is the owner removing all or some – if its some which ones are to remain?

2.) Is there any stockpiling of material allowed inside the demo area or does all demo debris need to be live loaded?

3.) The below section of wording from Volume 1 – Summary of Work Page 011100-8 states that the demo contractor is to provide all labor, material, trucking etc., for the performance of demolition work as identified on drawings listed. The wording then says that some of the work will be done by the specific contractor under their contract, is there a way to clarify what items the demo contractor is responsible for? Example there are areas of slab that are shown as needing removal on the plumbing plans that are not called out on the architectural demo plans which one is correct?

RESPONSE:

1.) Refer to revision to Specification 024119 via Addendum #4. Owner will remove all loose furniture, fixtures, and furnishings prior to demolition.

2.) Stockpiling of material is permitted in accordance with Specification Section 011100 - Summary of Work, Contract B-01 demolition, paragraph 17, and as directed by the applicable AHJ.
3.) All demolition detailed in the documents is the responsibility of the Demolition Contractor, unless noted otherwise. The reference paragraph details exclusions. Bidders are responsible for having a complete understanding of the construction documents and should review Section 011100 - Summary of Work, in its entirety.

Response By: J.D. Bartlett, EDiS Company Date: 4/1/2020
REQUEST FOR INFORMATION
BID PACK B

TO: BOB GROVE, RG ARCHITECTS 
PRE-BID RFI#: 025

FROM: J.D. BARTLETT, EDiS COMPANY       DATE: 3/24/2020

PROJECT: SILVER LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL


REQUEST:

Submitted By: Ralph G. Degli Obizzi and Sons       Date: 3/24/2020

1.) It appears the duct in area “A” mezzanine (dwg M10.A); area “B” mezzanine (dwg M11.B); area “C” mezzanine (dwg M11.C) is called out to receive 2” thick 6# ASJ fiberglass rigid board. I believe not all of this duct is above a mezzanine floor but some is above ceiling rafters and would be OK to receive flexible wrap instead of rigid board. Do you have information on this and if so is it possible to identify the limits of the rigid board vs standard duct wrap?

RESPONSE:

1.) Rigid board insulation to extend 60” beyond mezzanine.

Response By: Bob Grove, RG Architects       Date: 4/1/2020
REQUEST FOR INFORMATION  
BID PACK B

TO: BOB GROVE, RG ARCHITECTS          PRE-BID RFI#:  026

FROM: J.D. BARTLETT, EDiS COMPANY       DATE:  3/24/2020

PROJECT: SILVER LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL


REQUEST:

Submitted By: Diamond Mechanical       Date: 3/24/2020

1.) “It appears the duct in area “A” mezzanine (dwg M10.A); area “B” mezzanine (dwg M11.B); area “C” mezzanine (dwg M11.C) is called out to receive 2” thick 6# ASJ fiberglass rigid board. I believe not all of this duct is above a mezzanine floor but some of the duct is above ceiling rafters. Would you allow the duct above the mezzanine rafters to receive flexible insulation wrap instead of rigid board?

RESPONSE:

1.) Refer to response to RFI 025.

Response By: Bob Grove, RG Architects Date: 4/1/2020
REQUEST FOR INFORMATION
BID PACK B

TO: BOB GROVE, RG ARCHITECTS

FROM: J.D. BARTLETT, EDIS COMPANY

DATE: 3/24/2020

PROJECT: SILVER LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

REQUEST:
Submitted By: Union Wholesale Co. Date: 3/24/2020

1.) Reference Section 116623 Gymnasium Equipment, Part 2.3 Volleyball Equipment. Please clarify the total number of Volleyball Systems required for Alternate #1.

RESPONSE:

1.) Base Bid: One (1) Volleyball System is required.
2.) Alternate#1: Two (2) Volleyball Systems are required.

Response By: Bob Grove, RG Architects Date: 4/1/2020
REQUEST FOR INFORMATION
BID PACK B

TO: EDIS COMPANY             PRE-BID RFI#: 028
FROM: J.D. BARTLETT, EDIS COMPANY       DATE: 3/24/2020
PROJECT: SILVER LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

DWG. # / DETAIL: AD.A, AD.B SPEC. SECTIONS: PAGE:

REQUEST:

Submitted By: Dependable Construction of DE       Date: 3/24/2020

1.) Are the floor finishes being removed in the classrooms?
2.) On drawings AD.A and AD.B on Demo note 2BL says to remove the mezzanine concrete slab. Per our walk through, it was stated that a section remains. Are we removing it? Or is it remaining?
3.) On drawing AD.B where the new courtyard is going, the exterior wall on the left and right side "column lines 3 and 7" on demo note 2AD states to remove bearing wall. Per our walk through, it was stated that some of the structure remains. Is it being removed or remaining?
4.) Who is responsible for shoring and temporary protection?

RESPONSE:

1.) Yes.
2.) Refer to revised Drawing AD.A, issued in Addendum #3, which details extent of mezzanine demolition. Drawing AD.B accurately reflects the intended scope as originally published.
3.) Portions of walls are bearing walls, others are not. The demolition plans indicate accordingly. There is existing steel columns along these column lines that remain.
4.) Shoring is the responsibility of the Demolition Contractor. Temporary weather protection indicated in Demolition General Notes, Item D, is the responsibility of the Carpentry & General Trades Contractor.

Response By: J.D. Bartlett, EDIS Company       Date: 4/1/2020
REQUEST FOR INFORMATION
BID PACK B

TO: BOB GROVE, RG ARCHITECTS

FROM: J.D. BARTLETT, EDIS COMPANY

DATE: 3/24/2020

PROJECT: SILVER LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

SPEC. SECTIONS: PAGE:

REQUEST:

Submitted By: Merit Mechanical Date: 3/24/2020

1.) Please advise if the mezzanine floor is a post tension floor.
2.) It appears the duct in area “A” mezzanine (dwg M10.A); area “B” mezzanine (dwg M11.B); area “C” mezzanine (dwg M11.C) is called out to receive 2” thick 6# ASJ fiberglass rigid board. I believe not all of this duct is above a mezzanine floor but some is above ceiling rafters and would be OK to receive flexible wrap instead of rigid board. Do you have information on this and if so is it possible to identify the limits of the rigid board vs standard duct wrap?

RESPONSE:

1.) Mezzanine floor is not a post tension floor.
2.) Refer to response to RFI 025.

Response By: Bob Grove, RG Architects Date: 4/1/2020
REQUEST FOR INFORMATION
BID PACK B

TO: BOB GROVE, RG ARCHITECTS
FROM: J.D. BARTLETT, EDiS COMPANY

PROJECT: SILVER LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

DWG. # / DETAIL: A90.A SPEC. SECTIONS: PAGE:

REQUEST:

Submitted By: EDiS Company Date: 3/25/2020

1.) Detail 4/A90.A does not appear to depict Alternate #4e as shown on enlarged detail 5/A13.1. Please revised, and clarify the distinguish the extent of finishes with Alternate layout.

RESPONSE:

1.) Refer to drawing 5/A90.A issued per Addendum no. 4.

Response By: Bob Grove, RG Architects Date: 4/1/2020
REQUEST FOR INFORMATION
BID PACK B

TO: BOB GROVE, RG ARCHITECTS

FROM: J.D. BARTLETT, EDiS COMPANY

DATE: 3/25/2020

PROJECT: SILVER LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

DWG. # / DETAIL: A40.3 SPEC. SECTIONS: PAGE:

REQUEST:

Submitted By: EDiS Company Date: 3/25/2020

1.) Please clarify the construction required in order to restore below slab masonry at riser demolition in Music Room are demolished.

RESPONSE:

1.) Refer to sketches A.SK-06 & A.SK-07 for details.

Response By: Bob Grove, RG Architects Date: 4/1/2020
REQUEST FOR INFORMATION
BID PACK B

TO: BOB GROVE, RG ARCHITECTS
FROM: J.D. BARTLETT, EDIS COMPANY
PROJECT: SILVER LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

REQUEST:
Submitted By: Conventional Builders, Inc. Date: 3/27/2020

1.) Please confirm the desired finish indicated in paragraph 2.02.A.1.c. is referring to the "Currents" finish of the "Textural Patterns" series for the Basis of Design Fry Reglet, Model KS.

RESPONSE:

1.) Correct, the finish shall be Currents from the Textural Patterns series.

Response By: Bob Grove, RG Architects Date: 4/1/2020
REQUEST FOR INFORMATION
BID PACK B

TO: EDIS COMPANY
FROM: J.D. BARTLETT, EDIS COMPANY
DATE: 3/27/2020

PROJECT: SILVER LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

REQUEST:

Submitted By: Conventional Builders, Inc. Date: 3/27/2020

1.) Addendum 3, Summary of work, contract B-06, revised paragraph 8 states to install MISC steel. Could you please confirm what MISC Steel there is to be installed?
2.) Addendum 3, Summary of Work, Contract B-08 Revised paragraph 33, calls for 14 window opens and 14 door openings to be temporarily boarded up. Can a drawing be issued showing the materials required to enclose the openings? Also, it says there is an allowance within the base bid, how much money do we need to include in our base bid so all bids are comparable?

RESPONSE:

1.) Loose steel referenced, is specifically referring to angles and plates indicated on details J23/A50.7, J25/A50.7, J26/A50.7, and J27/A50.7.
2.) Temporary protection will consist of 1/2” plywood with (3) 2x4 rails. Door openings should be assumed at an average of 3’-6” x 7’-4”. Window openings should be assumed at an average of 6’-0” x 6’-0”. Allowance shall be determined by bidder and included in base bid.

Response By: J.D. Bartlett, EDIS Company Date: 4/1/2020
REQUEST FOR INFORMATION
BID PACK B

TO: BOB GROVE, RG ARCHITECTS
PRE-BID RFI#: 034

FROM: J.D. BARTLETT, EDIS COMPANY
DATE: 3/27/2020

PROJECT: SILVER LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

DWG. # / DETAIL: S502/A41.4 SPEC. SECTIONS: PAGE:

REQUEST:

Submitted By: Borsello Masonry Date: 3/27/2020

1.) It appears there may be a discrepancy from what is being shown in the Structural Plans on Sheet S502 section 5 where it shows the cmu wall being grouted solid from the top of footing up to at least the 6 courses shown as opposed to what is shown in the Architecturals on Sheet A41.4 section 1 where it shows the below grade cmu grouted solid only to top of interior slab. Please clarify what is/is not getting grouted solid.

RESPONSE:

1.) The entire wall height to be grouted solid.

Response By: Bob Grove, RG Architects Date: 4/1/2020
REQUEST FOR INFORMATION
BID PACK B

TO: BOB GROVE, RG ARCHITECTS
FROM: J.D. BARTLETT, EDIS COMPANY

DATE: 3/27/2020

PROJECT: SILVER LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

DWG. # / DETAIL: SPEC. SECTIONS: PAGE:

REQUEST:

Submitted By: North East Contractors

Date: 3/27/2020

1.) Details #1 & 3/S513 for Area C call for Gable End Trusses Detail 2/41.3 is calling for 6"CFMF which detail would be correct?

2.) Drawing S11.A at the main entrance roof show wall tags for type C walls at the W8x18 steel Details #13 & 14/S513 show CFMF which detail is correct?

3.) Same area as in above question - Overall Roof Plan A20.1 shows 2 different Eave/Soffit details, 7/A42.1 which is brick and block & 1/A21.2 which is CFMF/Z girts/ Spray Foam and Hardie Siding. Is this the intent for the "front half" to be brick and the "back half" on the roof to be Hardie siding? Also detail 1/A21.2 shows trusses in this area and Structural Drawings show J1 type framing. Please Clarify

4.) Detail 1/S514 show 2 trusses on top of walls at Area C dormers and the 3 ply girder truss called out at roof expansion between areas B & C. Our truss designer has stated that these additional trusses are not required per their requirements. Should we include the "additional" trusses or rely on data from truss designer?

5.) Additional to question above - Truss designer typically includes heel blocking in their design which would eliminate the need for the CFMF blocking between the trusses. Should we rely on the truss design for this bracing or is there a need for this CFMF blocking other than bracing?

6.) Detail 13/A21.1 shows new wood blocking being installed and a piece of PVC Fascia that appears to be existing because of shading. Can you confirm that all PVC is existing if shaded?

7.) Do the FRP panels need to be Fire Rated?

8.) There are both Aluminum and Standard Plastic Trims listed in the spec's. Which is to be used?
RESPONSE:

1.) Provide Gable End Truss.
2.) Structurally anticipated CFMF to match rest of new construction in this area.
3.) Detail 7/A42.1, was previously revised and issued in Addendum #3 as A.SK-01, this shows the correct structure, the J1 type framing. Detail 1/A21.2 should not be showing Siding, this has been revised and will be issued in Addendum#4 as A.SK-05. Note: detail 1/A21.2 is only applicable to “Corridor 600” . Refer to Eave Diagram A20.2 as issued in Addendum #3 which identifies where all the eave details apply.
4.) One truss over the wall construction is acceptable.
5.) We can tentatively accept this. Final review of truss manufacturer's detail required to determine if additional blocking is required.
6.) Detail 13/A21.1 has been revised as A.SK-04. All existing rakes should be existing to remain and shaded grey.
7.) No.
8.) All trim referenced in Specification 097720 - Fiberglass Reinforced Wall Panels shall be F560 Stainless Steel, with #4 brushed finish. This shall include inside corners, outside corners, divisions, and edges.

Response By: Bob Grove, RG Architects Date: 4/1/2020
REQUEST FOR INFORMATION
BID PACK B

TO: EDIS COMPANY

PRE-BID RFI#: 036

FROM: J.D. BARTLETT, EDIS COMPANY

DATE: 3/27/2020

PROJECT: SILVER LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

DWG. # / DETAIL: SPEC. SECTIONS: PAGE:

REQUEST:

Submitted By: Brightfields Date: 3/27/2020

1.) The electrical and mechanical demolition plans have notes that say “contractor” and notes that say electrical or mechanical contractor – for the notes that say just contractor are these referring to the demo contractor or the contractor specific to the scope i.e. electrical, mechanical, plumbing?

2.) For the demo of existing footings and the slab in the courtyard who is responsible for backfilling the voids left after the concrete is removed?

3.) Can you verify the items to be submitted with the bid as listed on the revised bid form from Addendum 1 are correct?

4.) The revised bid form under Attachments states to attach “(Others as required by Project Manual)”. Please clarify if any other attachments are required other than those stated on the bid form and if, so, what are they?

RESPONSE:

1.) The plans detail the total scope. Refer to Specification Section 011100 - Summary of Work for delineation between contracts.

2.) The Demolition Contractor. Refer to Specification Section 011100 - Summary of Work, Contract B-01 Demolition, Paragraph 3.

3.) The bid forms were revised and reissued as part of Addendum #3. The list of required attachments is accurate.

4.) This is referring to bidder specific attachments, for example some bidders may elect to submit a bid security in lieu of a bid bond.
REQUEST FOR INFORMATION
BID PACK B

TO:______BOB GROVE, RG ARCHITECTS__________ PRE-BID RFI#: ______037_____

FROM:______J.D. BARTLETT, EDiS COMPANY_______ DATE: 3/30/2020

PROJECT: SILVER LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL____

DWG. # / DETAIL: ________SPEC. SECTIONS: ______088000____ PAGE:________

REQUEST:

Submitted By: ___Zephyr Aluminum______ Date: 3/30/2020

1.) Please confirm that self cleaning glazing indicated in Specification Section 088000 - Glazing, paragraph 3.10.A is not required?

RESPONSE:

1.) Specification Section 08 80 00 – GLAZING – 3.10.A shall read as follows: “Glass Type (IG-1): Pyrolytic-coated, low-maintenance, low-E coated, clear insulating glass.

Response By: __________Bob Grove, RG Architects__________ Date: ______4/1/2020____
REQUEST FOR INFORMATION
BID PACK B

TO: EDIS COMPANY

FROM: J.D. BARTLETT, EDIS COMPANY

DATE: 3/30/2020

PROJECT: SILVER LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

DWG. # / DETAIL: SPEC. SECTIONS: PAGE:

REQUEST:

Submitted By: Brandywine Valley Concrete

Date: 3/30/2020

1.) Are we able to mail our bids to this location or do we have to physically hand deliver?

RESPONSE:

1.) Bids may be hand delivered or mailed/shipped. Refer to Addendum #4, which details bid submission and opening logistics.

Response By: J.D. Bartlett, EDiS Company

Date: 4/1/2020
REQUEST FOR INFORMATION
BID PACK B

TO: EDIS COMPANY

FROM: J.D. BARTLETT, EDIS COMPANY

PROJECT: SILVER LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

REQUEST:

Submitted By: Mid-Atlantic Electrical Services Date: 3/30/2020

1.) Please confirm VFD's shown on schedule are now provided by Electrical Contractor.
2.) Please confirm Electrical Contractor is not providing any special systems components or wiring
3.) Please advise scope of work for Electrical base bid and add alternate for alternate no. 8. Nothing shown on plans.
4.) Please confirm that the Electrical Contractor only owns box and conduit rough-in for alternate 4d. System and wiring by others

RESPONSE:

1.) Correct. The Electrical Contractor shall supply and install VFD's as indicated on the Pump Schedule, drawing M40.3.
2.) The Electrical Contractor is not responsible for special systems equipment, nor wiring. The Electrical Contractor is responsible for conduit/raceways, boxes, rough-in and power circuits as required by the documents to support the Specials Systems Equipment. Refer to Specification Section 011100 - Summary of Work.
3.) Alternate No. 8 does not apply to Contract B-21 - Electrical. Refer to revisions in Addendum #4.
4.) Confirmed. Electrical Contractor is also responsible for power circuits to Special Systems Equipment.

Response By: J.D. Bartlett, EDIS Company Date: 4/1/2020
REQUEST FOR INFORMATION
BID PACK B

TO: BOB GROVE, RG ARCHITECTS
FROM: J.D. BARTLETT, EDiS COMPANY
PROJECT: SILVER LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

DWG. # / DETAIL: A90.A

REQUEST:
Submitted By: North East Contractors
Date: 3/30/2020

1.) Drawing A90.A indicates that the kitchen and kitchen several support spaces have FRP wall panel as the wall finish. Please confirm this applies to all wall types in these spaces, including masonry walls?

RESPONSE:

1.) FRP wall panel shall be applied (floor to ceiling) on all walls in the kitchen and support spaces.

Response By: Bob Grove, RG Architects
Date: 4/1/2020
REQUEST FOR INFORMATION
BID PACK B

TO: BOB GROVE, RG ARCHITECTS

FROM: J.D. BARTLETT, EDIS COMPANY

DATE: 3/30/2020

PROJECT: SILVER LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

REQUEST:

Submitted By: I.D. Griffith Date: 3/30/2020

1.) What is the maximum unit height acceptable for ERU-1,2?
2.) Do ERU-1,2 have an energy recovery wheel mounted perpendicular to the floor with two airstreams in a side by side air tunnel arrangement?

RESPONSE:

1.) Clearance between the mezzanines and structural steel vary between 4’-7” and 6’-0”. Refer to architectural and structural drawings for exact clearance & location of steel.
2.) The energy wheel in ERU-1 & 2 is mounted horizontal, parallel to the floor.

Response By: Bob Grove, RG Architects Date: 4/1/2020
1. What is the maximum unit height acceptable for ERU-1,2?

2. Do ERU-1,2 have an energy recovery wheel mounted perpendicular to the floor with two airstreams in a side by side air tunnel arrangement?
REQUEST FOR INFORMATION  
BID PACK B

TO:  BOB GROVE, RG ARCHITECTS  
PRE-BID RFI#:  042

FROM:  J.D. BARTLETT, EDiS COMPANY  
DATE:  3/30/2020

PROJECT:  SILVER LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

DWG. # / DETAIL:  SPEC. SECTIONS:  PAGE:

REQUEST:

Submitted By:  Old World Tile  
Date:  3/30/2020

1.) Please reference sheet A50.4 elevations T20 and T6. Can you please confirm that the 7 ¾” and 5 ¾” size thresholds are required? After talking to our manufacturer, we were told that only 4” size thresholds are stock items, meaning these size thresholds would need to be fabricated leading to higher cost.

2.) Please reference Addendum 3. We note no finishes were specified for WT-8 and WT-9. Can you please provide these two colors or please specify a color group from which to price material?

RESPONSE:

1.) 4” thresholds are acceptable
2.) WT-8 and WT-9 are to be selected from daltile colorwheel-wall classic accent group 3.

Response By:  Bob Grove, RG Architects  
Date:  4/1/2020