

February 11, 2022

To: All Potential Respondents
From: Michael Gulick, Issuing Officer

Subject: RFP1622542001

Addendum #5

Please amend the subject RFP to include answers to the following timely received questions:

- Q1. The nominated site is noted as 7.08 acres in the National Register Nomination Application. Is this intended to be the HSR's same extent of review?
- A1. Yes, the extent of the area to be addressed in the HSR is the 7.08-acre National Register-listed property.**
- Q2. Is there a current CAD or GIS survey available?
- A2. There is no current CAD or GIS survey available.**
- Q3. Is a CAD or GIS survey expected as part of this report, or are the general plan images already produced in the reports sufficient?
- A3. A CAD or GIS survey would be of benefit to the State in managing the property long-term.**
- Q4. To what degree are the Archeological survey needs? There have been several in-depth surveys from the past, and we do not believe a full survey is again required. We believe a written summary in the report and acknowledgement of the past in-depth surveys is sufficient along with having an archeologist available during site and sub-grade investigation meets the intent of this project. Do you concur? If not, are you looking for an entirely new archeological survey? Will a Phase 1A meet the intent for this report (See description in next bullet)? Is it limited to the areas with structures or the entire 7.08 site? Phase IA - The most basic level of archaeological survey is an assessment of archaeological sensitivity, meaning the potential for intact archaeological resources to be present in a project area, or Area of Potential Effect (APE). This phase involves historical research, environmental context review, and field inspection. If archaeological sensitivity is low, no further archaeological survey is recommended. If the archaeological sensitivity is determined to be moderate or high, a Phase IB survey is recommended.
- A4. The DNR concurs that a full archaeological survey is not required for this project. A written summary in the report and acknowledgement of the past in-depth studies is sufficient along with having an archeologist available during all site and sub-grade investigations. It is essential that archaeological expertise is included in the Response to the current RFP, as the rich archaeological deposits on the property must be taken into account in the development of recommendations.**

- Q5. The Specification List for the Historic Structures Report is not in the same order as Preservation Brief 43, specifically item 4.1.3 Physical Description typically follows the Chronology of spaces. Is the order in the specifications to over-rule the order of Preservation Brief 43, Attachment 8?
- A5. The HSR should follow the same order as Preservation Brief 43, Attachment 8.
- Q6. Item 4.1.3.5 Discussion of proposed adaptive uses in consultation with site management. "Proposed uses" is typically included in Part 2 Treatment and Work Recommendations. Is the order in the specifications to over-rule the order of Preservation Brief 43, Attachment 8?
- A6. The HSR should follow the same order as Preservation Brief 43, Attachment 8.
- Q7. For Attachment #5 Cost Proposal, the box that requests "Add attachment with cost price list" - is this referring to where we attach our hourly billable rates?
- A7. Attachment #5 deliverable "Historic Structures Report and Condition Assessment – Post Final Report and Presentation is for hourly billable rates for all work performed by the successful Contractor after the completion of the Historic Structures Report and Condition Assessment. These hourly billable rates are not for the completion of the Historic Structures Report and Condition Assessment.
- Q8. For the hourly billable rates, is there a maximum indirect rate or any other limits on the hourly wages charged for grant activities?
- A8. According to the Grant Agreement there is a 14.52% indirect cost rate. The resulting contract from this RFP is 100% State Funded and will be used as match to grant funds for the improvements.
- Q9. Is there a specific form we need to submit the hourly billable rates on, or can it be in the format of the respondents choosing?
- A9. Respondents should provide hourly billable rates by position. There is no specific form.
- Q10. The Background section 1.5 notes 'roof and ground surface drainage issues' – have you identified specific areas where drainage is a problem? For example, is it mainly a concern in relation to the areas adjacent to the buildings, or a larger sitewide issue?
- A10. The reference to "roof and ground drainage" is to the immediate areas around each standing structure. No larger, site-wide issues have been identified.
- Q11. Our understanding is, during this phase of work no field archaeological excavations will occur. Instead, the present work will generate, among other things, recommendations for which areas require archaeological fieldwork before construction activities can commence. The actual fieldwork will occur during the "construction and maintenance work" bid out later by the State. Can the State confirm that our

understanding is correct and archeological excavations will not occur during this phase of the work? Will physical archeological excavation be included as part of this phase of work?

A11. The Respondent is correct. No physical archaeological excavation will be included in this stage of the project. Including archaeological expertise during development of the HSR and Condition Assessment is essential, however, so that the rich archaeological deposits on the property are taken into account during the development of recommendations.

Please acknowledge receipt of this addendum by signing in the space provided below, and return this letter with your offer (do not send back separately).

I hereby acknowledge receipt of this addendum.

Signature

Date

Typed or Printed Name