

Project: **Battery Park City Site 23/24
Community Center Leak
Remediation/Waterproofing
Project: General Contractor
(the “Project”)**

Date: **March 8, 2019**

RE: **Addendum #5**
of Pages: **2**

The following responses (the “Responses”) are provided to questions the Battery Park City Authority (“BPCA”) received in writing in follow up to information provided in Addendum #3. The Responses are provided in bold print immediately following the questions.

1. We plan to assume the following for salvaged plant material. Can you please confirm if there should be any adjustments to this list?
 - Planter 1: (3) Multi Stem Trees and (2) Single Stem Trees
 - Planter 2: Remove and Dispose everything
 - Planter 3: (5) Large Evergreen Shrubs
 - Planter 4: (1) Multi Stem Tree
 - Planter 5: (3) Multi Stem Trees
 - Planter 6 and 7: Remove and Dispose Everything

RESPONSE: For bidding purposes, Proposers should use this list.

2. In regards to RFI Response #8, there could be a significant cost difference if the larger trees are boxed up on site and moved by BPCA, as opposed to us moving them to a separate location. Is there a general idea of where they will be staged? This is particularly important when considering the size of the trees in Planter #1.

RESPONSE: For bidding purposes, assume BPCA staff will move and store the trees.

3. Can the depths of the planters be verified? Cannot be figured off drawings.

RESPONSE: Planter beds are approximately four (4) feet deep.

4. EXP. JOINT 03 calls to look at detail 1/A403, there is no such drawing. Please confirm

RESPONSE: The reference to detail 1/A403 in this instance was an error; the correct detail drawing is 1/A402.

5. Addendum 1 – Please confirm Quantity. Section B, Item 3 – 29,000 SF

RESPONSE: The correct quantity is 20,000 square feet.

6. There are concerns that the removal and salvage of the asphalt pavers would not be very feasible. Concerns about breakage, loss, and time during removals. Pavers also need to be cleaned and palletized. If 100% replacement proves a cheaper alternative, would that be accepted?

RESPONSE: Proposers should prepare their Proposals based on the scope of work set forth in the Construction Documents, which provides for removal and salvage of the asphalt pavers.

7. Due to the concrete toppings slab design, there are concerns about the concrete material loss due to it curing to fast. The concrete also cannot be pumped, making it difficult to install. The new pervious concrete topping slab would be effected by the bituminous setting bed. Are there alternate concrete designs that could be looked at?

RESPONSE: The selected Proposer should use moist curing methods, as noted in the Construction Documents.

8. In regards to Questions #'s 5 & 6, we will figure that the use of some light weight machinery is accepted.

RESPONSE: Although the exact weight-bearing capacity of the terrace is not available, it is noted that the BPCA Parks Department uses a Bobcat S220 Skid Steer to do snow removal on the terrace. This machine weighs approximately 7,500 lbs.

9. Is the due date for the bid going to be extended due the delay in the returned RFI's (addendum #3), some subs have requested extensions?

RESPONSE: The Proposal due date has been extended to 3/12/19 @ 5:00 PM.

By signing below, I am acknowledging that all pages of this Addendum have been received, reviewed, and understood, and will be incorporated into the submitted Proposal. This document must be attached to the Proposal for its consideration.

Print Name

Signature

Date

Number of pages received: _____ <fill in>

Distributed to: All prospective Proposers.