



**WASHTENAW COUNTY
FINANCE DEPARTMENT**

Purchasing Division

P. O. Box 8645, 220 N. Main, Ann Arbor, MI 48107-8645
Phone (734) 222-6760, Fax (734) 222-6764
www.purchasing.ewashtenaw.org

December 10, 2010

Addendum #1

RFP No. 6587

Title: Rehabilitation Master Plan for Gordon Hall Local
Historic District

Due Date: Monday, December 13, 2010 at 3:00PM

Frequently Asked Questions

1. *Will Washtenaw County be adding funds to the grant amount? Do you know what the total funds available are for funding this study?*

Washtenaw County has a CLG Grant of Federal pass-through dollar with a 60/40 match requirement. The total amount of funds available for the RMP is **\$20,500**. The Dexter Area Historical Society & Museum has contributed a substantial portion of this amount as the grant match. A portion of the total grant value has been allocated for administrative costs. No additional dollars are allocated for this project.

2. *How will the Architect be selected? What is the selection criteria?*

See Pages 11 and 12 of the RFP for Proposal Selection and Evaluation criteria. It is the priority of the County and Federal regulators to obtain the best value for this project. All bidders will be evaluated by both points and price.

3. *What is 36 CFR 61? Am I qualified?*

These qualifications are listed on the last page of the RFP. The successful bidder will state clearly and concisely how they meet the standards for 36 CFR 61:

HISTORIC ARCHITECTURE

The minimum professional qualifications are a professional degree in architecture or a State license to practice architecture, plus one of the following:

1. At least one year of graduate study in architectural preservation, American architectural history, preservation planning or a closely related field; or
2. At least one year of full time professional experience on preservation projects. Such graduate study or experience shall include detailed investigation of historic structures, preparation of historic structures, research reports, and preparation of plans and specifications for preservation projects.

A list of many qualified architects is kept by the State Historic Preservation Office (www.michigan.gov/shpo), although others not on that list may also qualify. You can find out more about this set of qualifications by going to the National Park Service website (<http://www.nps.gov>).

4. *Are you specifically REQUIRING that we use OUTSIDE consultants for masonry, etc. Or, are you simply stating that that such expertise needs to be shown by the team, whether by outside experts, or by one or more architectural team members who may also specialize in one of those disciplines? Please clarify.*

The Architect must demonstrate their ability to utilize in-house expertise or contract out for necessary experts. State as clearly and concisely as possible that these qualifications or levels of expertise are met by one or more members of your team or sub-contractors.

5. *Do original and/or recent drawings of Gordon Hall exist and will they be available? Are there any existing drawings of the building available? If not, are we expected to produce measured drawings?*

It is now our understanding that Dexter Area Historical Society & Museum has interior demolition conditions and existing conditions drawings completed by the University of Michigan. Those drawings will be made available to the selected Architect. Additional information may be on file at the University of Michigan.

HABS drawings were completed in 1934. These drawings depict the conditions at Gordon Hall at the time of recordation, including a landscape plan. The property has been substantially altered since that time. These drawings and several photographs have been digitized and filed under the title of “Judge Samuel Dexter Country House” at the Library of Congress, <http://memory.loc.gov/>.

Additional schematic drawings were completed in the 1940s by University of Michigan faculty member Emil Lorch. The Emil Lorch Papers are held at the Bentley Historical Library at the University of Michigan.

According to Page 8 of the RFP, *Section x. Conceptual Space Rehabilitations*, “the Architect will test the fit of the Space Program within the existing facility in order to evaluate functional, programmatic, economic and architectural impact. Conceptual sketch drawings will be prepared to illustrate the suitability of rehabilitating the building along with potential building additions and/or rehabilitation of existing attached structures.”

Furthermore, Page 10 of the RFP, *VII. Part 3. Treatment and Use*, states that “emphasis is on preserving extant historic material and resolving conflicts that might result from a structure’s reuse and treatment. Design work will typically not go beyond schematics.” Further discussion in this section, in the Ultimate Treatment and Use narrative, states that “measured drawings of relevant building specifications used to determine project needs and costs should be included in the appendix.”

6. *Is there a site survey? What other documentation already exists for Gordon Hall?*

A site survey was done in 2006 for the Cedars of Dexter development on the property. It differs slightly from existing conditions. That survey will be made available to the selected Architect.

Gordon Hall is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The NR nomination was completed in 1972, and is on file at Washtenaw County.

Some information on the site may be found in the *Gordon Hall Local Historic District Study Committee Report*, which was published in 2001 by the Washtenaw County Historic District Commission as part of the local historic district designation process. It is available at <http://preservation.ewashtenaw.org> – scroll down and click on “Washtenaw County's Local Historic Districts” then choose Gordon Hall.

Additionally, the Architect may choose to check for the existence of a baseline study that may be held by Scio Township and Webster Township. Both townships hold open space preservation easements on portions of the Gordon Hall property (the district is bisected by municipal boundaries). Scio Township is accessible at <http://www.twp.scio.mi.us/> and Webster Township is accessible at <http://www.twp.webster.mi.us/>.

7. *Is it expected that all 70 acres of the site/landscape will be assessed?*

The local historic district boundaries for Gordon Hall include land area covering 67.68 acres. A portion of that district, containing 15.6 acres, has been developed into the Cedars of Dexter Retirement Community. The entire district should be taken into consideration as part of the RMP.

8. *Is it the intent to make the entire building ADA accessible?*

ADA accessibility is a long-term consideration. It would enhance the RMP to include projections on estimated costs and steps to take for ADA accessibility. Page 8 of the RFP, viii. Code Analysis, states that “The Architect will analyze the ~~school~~ site and its support spaces relative to Life Safety and ADA issues.”

9. *Page 7, Task vii. Refers to “theater systems” and I am not aware of any theater spaces in the Gordon Hall campus. Can you confirm your need and intentions for this? Also, Page 8, Task viii. Refers to a school. I am not aware of any school facility or function at Gordon Hall. Can you confirm your need and intentions for this task?*

The brief mention of theater systems and a school in the RFP were errors on our part. We have patterned this RFP after a substantially similar document we released last year for the Chelsea Center for the Arts RMP. That site had special needs for theater systems and school use. This site does not.

10. *Page 7, Task v. Refers to “Future Known Development and Location of Existing Complementary Facilities” and I wondered if this refers to the adjacent senior housing. What kind of a roll will the housing folks have in this project?*

We are unaware at this time of the DAHSM’s position on the involvement of the United Methodist Retirement Communities development on the site (Cedars of Dexter).

11. *Do the County and/or Dexter Area Historical Society & Museum have an expressed interest in energy efficiency recommendations as part of the RMP?*

We are unaware at this time of the DAHSM’s position on this matter. Having said that, common sense would dictate that as this entity is a non-profit operating on a tight budget, energy efficiency recommendations would be welcomed as a cost-cutting measure as part of the overall RMP recommendations.

12. *Hazardous materials are mentioned as part of the Requirements for Treatment in the final document specifications (Page 9, Section VII, Part 3b). What are we being asked to do with regard to hazardous materials?*

We are not asking for a formal Environmental Assessment. If hazardous materials are known to be present on site, a discussion of their abatement and applicable laws should be included in the RMP.

13. *Please clarify the historic research portion of the RMP. Since the property is already National Register listed and designated as a Local Historic District, what ADDITIONAL research are you looking for from the Architect?*

To eliminate redundant research effort, the County will share with the selected Architect all research and documentation that is known to us. Additionally, DAHSM will grant the Architect access to their archive. The Architect will be expected to use the existing documentation, and augment it with additional research as necessary for purposes of the RMP. A summary of the site's historic significance should be included in the RMP, but no exhaustive research is necessary, thus making efficient use of our funding and the Architect's time.

14. *What is the plan to maintain access to the building during this project?*

We have arranged to gain access to the building and maintain communication with DAHSM through its President, Gil Campbell. In the event that Mr. Campbell is unavailable on specific dates, an alternative contact will be provided. Contact information and County assistance in facilitating site visits, access to records, etc., will be provided to the selected Architect.

15. *Are there any known issues with structural, mechanical, plumbing or HVAC systems? What about hazardous materials?*

At this time, we are unaware of any significant systems issues or hazardous materials beyond those normally found in a building of this age.

16. *Please clarify the deliverables schedule. When is the 75% draft due?*

As stated on page 5 of the RFP (Section III. Timing), the 75% draft is due on April 15, 2011. This date may be adjusted at the County's discretion, during the creation of the contract, if other unforeseen delays occur. This April 15 date differs from that which is given in the Performance Schedule shown in the CLG grant application in Appendix A (originally March 15). The reason for this difference is because of a lag in contract execution between the SHPO and the County – we added a month to the deadline to allow for a fair amount of time to complete the project.

All dates for deliverables will be confirmed with the selected Architect upon the creation of their contract with the County.

17. *Please clarify the Certification of Debarment, Indemnification, and Key Persons forms. What exactly is necessary to include in the proposal packet?*

As stated on page 11 of the RFP (Section IV. Proposal Content):

The proposal submitted by the Architect to Washtenaw County shall consist of at least, but is not limited to the following elements:

- a. A firm, fixed-price bid for the entire scope of services outlined in this RFP.
- b. Completed, signed copy of the federal debarment form called Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility Matters, Drug-Free Workplace Requirements and Lobbying.
See Attachment C. [These forms are found on the last four pages of the RFP document. Please be sure to fill them out and include them in your proposal packet.]
- c. **Work Plan:** What specific data the Architect intends to include in the completed project and the sources of that information.
- d. **Meetings:** Estimate how many meetings and site inspections will be required to complete the project.
- e. **Timing:** Prepare a chart showing the timing of the work intended on the project, including, but not limited to meetings, inspections, and reports.
- f. **Budget:** A maximum total cost of the project broken down by elements, with meetings, site visits, printing costs, travel and any other disbursements listed separately. Estimate the number of project days that the staff or subcontractors will spend in the development of the Rehabilitation Master Plan.
- g. **References:** Provide a list of previous clients that the Architect has worked with to provide services that would be comparable to those requested in this RFP, along with a brief description of the services provided, and contact information for the clients.

This addendum **MUST** be included in the submission of the Request for Proposal #6587. Failure to do so could result in disqualification.

Any questions, contact Anne Strieter at (734) 222-6749
strietera@ewashtenaw.org

Anne Strieter, B.S., C.P.M.
Senior Buyer

cc: RFP 6587