

---

**Question:** At several drawings keynote 10 tells us to remove, reflash & replace the stone coping. Please reference detail 10 on drawing AS500. Does this show the extent of “reflash” or should we assume to flash the whole wall?

**Response:** The typical extent of flashing is shown. Provide flashing for the length of the walls indicated, at a width that protects the full area beneath the stone cap and ties in with the vertical EPDM/Roof membrane as specified, following all manufacture recommendations and warranty requirements.

---

**Question:** Reference details 1 & 3 on drawing AS104. These roofs are shaded for no work yet they have note 10 regarding the coping. Is it correct to assume that the scope of work is limited to the coping.

**Question:** Reference details 1, 2, 3 & 5 on drawing AS101. Again, these roofs are shaded for no work yet they have note 10 regarding the coping. Is it correct to assume that the scope of work is limited to the coping.

**Response:** The design intent is to provide alkalinity protection and reflash beneath the stone cap, with a vertical tie-in to existing EPDM where indicate (Such as drawings 1,2,3 & 5 on AS101) or as a component of a provided continuous roof system, where indicated on other drawings. The scope includes cleaning of roof drain and reinstallation of lighting protection system where indicated.

---

**Question:** Reference detail 4 on drawing AS101. This roof is shaded for no work, yet it has code note 3 which tells us to install new walkpads after the roof restoration. This roof also has an alternate 3 note which tells us to eliminate the Fluid Applied Urethane Restoration. Has this roof possibly incorrectly shaded, possibly requiring the shading for roof restoration?

**Response:** Plan Note #3 and Alternate 3 note are incorrect and do not apply to drawing 4 on AS101. The drawing’s hatch correctly indicates the design scope: The low-slope EPDM roof system indicated is not within scope. See above for work on the Stone cap, lighting protection and roof drain.

---

**Question:** Request for product substitution consideration.

**Response:** The Government will not consider any product substitution for this project and request that contractors bid what is specified in the specifications and drawings that were attached to the Invitation for Bids.

---

---

**Question:** Extending bid closing date to allow for the awarded Safety Deficiencies contractor to erect railing and do a second site visit with the changed site conditions.

**Response:** The bid closing date will remain 7/13/2016 at 3pm. The program office needs this project to be awarded due to the immediate needs of the Medical Center.

---

**Question:** Question: Please provide completion dates for the construction safety corrections work (CSCW) project by roof area for review as may impact the approach and pricing for this project.

**Response:** The Government will not provide the previously awarded project's schedule as part of the solicitation. The Safety Deficiencies project will have little to no effect on the roofing project from a scheduling standpoint. The performance period for the Safety Deficiencies project is significantly shorter than the roofing project and the previously mentioned project has been awarded. Performance period for the roofing project is 360 days from the Notice to Proceed, which gives bidders and potential contractors plenty of opportunity to complete work. The intent is for the Roofing Project to follow behind the Safety Deficiencies Project. A sequence of events from the project will be attached.

---

**Question:** The schedule submitted by the incumbent contractor for the CSCW project will contain Float, which only the incumbent prime contractor and subcontractors of that project will know the true completion date for each roof area, and these dates, including the float, will be mirrored in the VAMC's response to question 5(a) of this list (provide completion dates of CSCW work per roof area). This project requires bidders to respond on a third party's schedule and sequencing which has not been released for review and which will impact this project's schedule, access, phasing, duration, supervision, and overall pricing. Considering that the incumbent CSCW prime and subcontractors will have significantly more information regarding the true schedule, access, and sequencing does the VAMC see an unfair competitive advantage in this process and are the incumbent prime and subcontractors from the construction safety corrections work project permitted to bid on this project?

**Response:** The Government does not believe that the current incumbent has any advantage over any other bidder. Contractor has not begun work on the roof at this date. He is not in possession of any additional information/data i.e. site conditions than any other potential bidder. Again, the roofing project has a significantly longer performance period than the Safety Deficiencies project to mitigate any complications regarding scheduling.

---

**Question:** There appears to be discrepancies between the Roof Plan (GI100), the Site Plan (AS100), and the individual Key Plans (AS101 thru AS104) as well as multiple shades of gray indicating what roof areas are and are not included in the project. Please clarify which roof areas are to receive work under this contract.

- a. The Roof Plan (GI100) is labeled as the Life Safety Roof Plan, is this incorrect plan for this project?
- b. Please clarify what areas are to be fully replaced and which areas are to be repaired.

**Response:** Sheet GI100 is for general information and coordination purposes to inform the Contractors of existing conditions, anticipated conditions for coordination of work and moving around the roof. AS100 Site Plan is only exhibited for the recommendation to phasing the work indicated by the technical drawings and specifications in a top-down progression. Schedule, coordination with other work, and proper execution of the Replace Roof work is within the means and methods of construction. The specifications and plans AS101 through AS501 indicate the scope of work.

---

**Question:** Please confirm that the removal of the abandoned cooling tower on AS102 level 3, detail 1 is not included in this project.

**Response:** The abandoned York cooling tower on AS102 shall be removed only as required to perform roof work under and around the area. Any portions or all components removed shall not be reinstalled, but shall be come property of the contractor to salvage and dispose of legally. All work indicated around and underneath the cooling tower and equipment curbs shall be provided as indicated.

---

**Question:** Who is responsible for roof protection if the awarded construction safety correction work contractor or their subcontractors is required to move materials, equipment, or personnel across roof areas under construction or recently completed in order to reach other areas of work?

- a. Who is responsible for damages and the cost to repair them if they occur during that movement of materials, equipment, or personnel across roof areas under construction or recently completed in order to reach other areas of work?

**Response:** The contractor shall coordinate the work, including but not limited to roof access, sequencing and schedule (spec section 01 32 16 project schedule) with the awarded construction safety corrections work, project #540-13-307. The intent of the coordination effort is that construction of the *safety corrections work* is completed on each roof prior to start of reroofing work on same roof. Contractor shall meet all requirements to provide the indicated roof warranty and a complete and unified roof system.

---

**Question:** Please provide the locations of the abandoned louvers?

**Response:** Removal and patching of abandoned Louvers is not indicated as part of the work, as there are no abandoned louvers with the area of work. Remove all unused or abandoned roof curbs, hatches, and penetrations on roof surfaces within the scope of work. Restore roof deck, insulation & membrane system.

---

**Question:** Please confirm that the lightning protection system is not to be certified upon reinstallation. If it is required, please provide details.

**Response:** Incorrect, the re-installation of a complete UL master labeled lightning protection system is required. Additional information can be found by referencing Specification 264100 - FACILITY LIGHTING PROTECTION.