To: Prospective Offerors

Date: April 6th, 2026

From: Michael Bradbury, Issuing Officer
Iowa Department of Administrative Services-Central Procurement
Phone 515-823-9327: e-mail: construction.procurement@iowa.gov

RE: **Addendum No. 1**, to Design RFP953400-01, ATOD Will Call Ramp Replacement

The following additions, changes, and clarifications are hereby made by this Addendum.

Revisions to original scope:

1) There is only **1** required substantial completion/punch list development site visit. See updated site/virtual visits breakdown under Attachments.

Addition to original scope:

1) No Items

Questions:

1) Has there been any consideration in reconfiguring the geometric layout of the will call ramp's current 'L' shape, ramp's slope/flatness ratio, etc?
    a. Not really. L shape is most practical layout operationally. Top area of ramp near overhead door needs to remain flat for loading/unloading (~ 20' length of flat area full width of ramp). Would like ramp to be ~2' wider on 1 side.
2) Does the design need to account for replacement of the threshold between the ramp & the interior slab?
    a. Yes the threshold is deteriorating and needs to be accounted for in this replacement.
3) Does the facility want the ramp widened on both sides or just 1?
    a. Just the 1 side adjacent with the compactors. The loading bay adjacent to the other side of the ramp will remain in operation & can't widen any further on that side of ramp.
4) What is the current operational plan for snow removal on the ramp?
    a. Facility currently utilizes a pickup truck with a plow on the front to plow the majority of the ramp & utilizes hand shovels around the doors & rails.
5) What is the typical traffic classification/sizes that utilize the ramp?
    a. Cargo Vans, Box Trucks if they have clearance, no semi's.
6) Any preference on guard rail material &/or placement methods?
    a. Ideally the guard rail could be anchored into place vs. wet set – facility's #1 preference is structural stability & allowing for proper protection for vehicles not to veer off sides of ramp.
7) Should there be consideration for additional bollards?
    a. Yes, ideally more bollards around the entrance & foundation walls to assist with structural protection of the ramp.

8) Does the design need to account for replacement of the retaining walls on both sides of the ramp?
    a. Yes, both walls are deteriorating. The ramp in it's entirety needs to be removed and replaced.
9) Are there any operational limits from the facility's perspective that would affect/dictate the constructability of this replacement? (i.e. can adjacent bays be shut down if needed?)
    a. There are operational limitations but with proper communication and planning there is flexibility/potential for accommodation.
10) Does the design need to account for any adjacent parking lot paving removal/replacement?
    a. If deemed necessary then yes. It does appear the ramp could potentially be monolithic with adjacent paving & anywhere else that will be affected by the removal of the ramp needs to have repairs/replacement accounted for in this design.
11) Are there any underground utilities in the area that could affect constructability of this replacement?
    a. Yes there is an underground storm drainage system that runs directly beneath the ramp. Any paving replacement needs to be sloped to allow for proper storm drainage & footings/foundations for the ramp may be affected by this system.
12) Are there any existing as builts of the facility?
    a. The State, Samuels Group & ATOD will dig through existing records & supply the awarded firm with any existing as builts available. This is not guaranteed and it should be assumed that field verification will be necessary for all existing utilities, footprints, etc.
13) Has a construction budget been established?
    a. Yes. The anticipated construction cost is $164,109.00. It is the expectation that the awarded firm will formulate their own anticipated cost opinion for construction of their design to further develop the facility's anticipated financial exposure.
14) Is there an existing soils report that can be given to the design team for the ramp structure? If not, is it at all possible, either financially or logistically, to get soil borings for bearing & retainage design.
    a. There is no geotechnical report currently available. Firms who feel soil borings will be necessary for the design should outline in their proposal the need for these borings & ideal locations. It can also be discussed during the design kickoff meeting that will be held on site. DAS will hire the testing/sampling company direct.

Additional Clarifications:

1) Geotechnical costs shall not be part of the design proposal. Information about geotechnical requirements, i.e.: boring locations, depth, quantity, etc., should be provided by the design team and coordinated with the CM.
2) The State of Iowa has adopted the 2024 International Building Code (IBC), 2024 International Fire Code (IFC), 2024 International Residential Code (IRC), and 2024 Uniform Plumbing Code (UPC)

Attachments:

1) See visual aid for reference on operational limits & ramp widening
2) See updated site/virtual visit breakdown below:

Proposed 2"
expansion of ramp
Avoid expansion into
existing delivery bay

	In-Person	Virtual
Design Kickoff/Building Evaluation	1	-
100% Schematic Design	-	-
100% Design Development	-	-
50% Construction Documents	-	1
95% Construction Documents	-	1
100% Construction Documents	-	-
Pre-Bid Meeting	1	-
Construction Field Observation	3	-
Substantial Completion/Punch List Development	1	-
Final Completion/Punch List Verification	1	-
One Year Warranty Correction Period Visit	1	-
	8	2

Please acknowledge this Addendum #1 in your proposals. Thank You

End of Addendum