

BID ADDENDUM #5

August 29, 2022

To:
Prospective Bidders/Planholders

**MAGNOLIA MANSION RENEWAL Re-Bid
PROJECT NUMBER ST-1994
California State University Stanislaus
One University Circle, Turlock, CA 95382**

This Addendum forms a part of the contract documents and modifies the original bidding documents. Addendum shall be noted as received and acknowledged on the Bid Proposal Form when submitted as outlined in the Bid Package referenced above.

The following corrections, additions, deletions, and/or modifications to the above package, by this reference, shall be incorporated therein:

Addition/Corrections:

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS

1. For purposes of commenting on the adequacy of the Project Budget (as requested in RFP §9.01, Tab 4-Project Approach, Item A-1) and determining design fees that meet the needs of the project, please clarify the intended project scope in the follow areas:
 - a. Scope of exterior site improvements – should the site improvements described in the 2019 Feasibility Study be considered part of the base project scope?
 - b. Extent of work on the building exterior – should the base project scope be limited to repairs necessary to make the building habitable or include full historic restoration of the building exterior including removal of elastomeric textile finish over existing wood siding which was not recommended in Feasibility Study dated March 2019, however restoration of the wood siding is recommended as a “goal of the project” in Preliminary Report dated 8/17/22 by Architectural Resources Group?

Response:

Bids should include within the base project scope the protection of all primary character-defining features as defined in the August 17, 2022, preliminary report by Architectural Resources Group (ARG), while bringing the building up to current codes to make the building occupiable with a B occupancy. The design should encompass the complete rehabilitation of the mansion, but construction may be phased if the budget is constrained due to the scope of work that needs to be addressed.

Additionally, bids should include within the base project scope plans to address the secondary character-defining features and non-character defining features within the parameters of the budget.

The removal of the elastomeric textile finish and restoration/replacement of the wood siding on the exterior of the mansion in the area where the elastomeric textile finish is removed and as needed to integrate restored/replacement siding into the original siding, must be included as an add alternate scope in all bids.

2. Please confirm the project intent is to change the building's occupancy to 'B' as set forth in the RFP and not 'A' as described in the 2019 Feasibility Study.

Response:

The intent is to change occupancy from R3 to B, as set forth in the RFP.

3. Please clarify whether proposers should assume that interior renovations will be subject to SHPO review and governed by the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. The response to Question #4 issued under Addendum #2 during the Qualifications stage indicates that the building's interior renovation will not have to comply with the Secretary's Standards; however, Footnote 2 in ARG's Preliminary Report provided to bidders suggests that interior alterations may be subject to SHPO review.

Response:

At this time, we are not certain whether interior alterations will be subject to SHPO review. Absent that information, to the extent it is programmatically and cost-feasible, as a best practice, the campus encourages preservation of original interior primary and secondary character-defining features, or alterations that comply with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*, specifically the Standards for Rehabilitation.

4. Was plywood or OSB sheathing installed over the existing roof structure as part of the recent re-roof project?

Response:

Existing (E) 1x diagonal sheathing

5. Was any thermal insulation added to the roof assembly as part of the recent re-roof project?

Response:

No, but there is an attic as well as R3 protection board between the membrane and the diagonal sheathing.

6. The ARG report references the following documents:

- 2001 Feasibility Study by Derivi Construction and Architecture, updated in 2019
- 2021 ARG research / updated evaluation

If available, can these documents be provided to proposers?

Response:

The 2019 feasibility study by Derivi Castellanos Architects was previously provided. The 2001 version is included. The ARG preliminary report was provided previously on August 17, 2022.

7. During our second confidential meeting, it was mentioned that photos of the building featuring a narrower front stairway were found while researching the building at UOP. Can these photos and any other material found during this research be provided to proposers?

Response:

Due to ownership rights, the university is unable to publish photos that are the property of another institution. Respondents will need to contact University of the Pacific for the photographs in their archives.

8. Pages 111-114 of the RFP seems to have encountered PDF compression issues, so the text is distorted and hard to read. Please send a revised file.

Response:

Please see attached.

Attachments:

1. Revised Proposal Form (A-1 bd_bid_proposal_form_cdb Rev 8_25_22 (Please utilize this version for submission. Addition of Alternative Bid for Restoration/Replacement of Wood Siding.)
2. Magnolia Mansion Study May 11, 2001
3. Pages 111-114 (model_db_da_subcontracting)

End of Addenda No. 5