

Addendum No. 1. 3rd Party Special Inspections – Smoke Control Systems.

March 16, 2015

This Addendum forms a part of the Proposal Documents as issued on February 26, 2015. Acknowledge receipt of this Addendum in the proposal. Failure to do so may subject Proposer to disqualification.

This Addendum consists of 2 pages.

Questions from Proposers:

1. The Building Code requires Power Available Monitoring of available smoke control equipment (fans, critical equipment, doors, louvers, controls, etc.) in Section 909.12. This requirement is not specifically addressed in the code analysis summary or in the sequence. Generally the special inspections scope includes verification and testing of power monitoring. Is power monitoring of all critical equipment provided? **Yes.** If so, we are assuming that this verification is required within the Special Inspections scope of services? **Yes, section 230903 should be referenced for more information on scope of monitoring.**
2. The Minnesota amendments to the Building Code require Post Fire Smoke control for structures classified as high-rise buildings. The code report appears to classify the stadium as a high-rise, but does not appear to mention whether and where post fire smoke control is provided. Are there any post fire systems within the building? If so, where are they located and is there verification included within the Special Inspections Scope of Services? **The code requires a means for post fire smoke control, not a particular sequence. Verification of the smoke control sequences should be utilized for verification of post fire smoke control.**
3. The RFP appears to indicate that the contractor's test and balance subcontractor will be taking all measurements and the special inspector will be verifying. Is there any expectation that that special inspector will carry their own independent T&B contractor or whether we can rely on accuracy of contractor's measurements/T&B subcontractor? **Proposer can rely on Mortenson's subcontractors T&B measurements. If there needs to be added review, Proposer can provide added cost to perform.**
4. The code requires all smoke control ductwork to be inspected prior to concealment. Since the schedule for completion is rapid we want to ensure this requirement can be met. What the current status of ductwork installation and pressure testing is? Has any of the smoke control ductwork already been concealed and enclosed within building construction? **We will provide to successful firm Mortenson's schedule for the building of this ductwork. 3rd party inspector will be notified of all smoke control ductwork testing so they can be present prior to concealment. At this point we are not aware of any concealed ductwork.**
5. The RFP indicates that the Special Inspector will review and provide comments on the smoke control panel. Typically these panels are long lead time items and require several reviews of the design and construction team to get all required elements incorporated. Based on the construction schedule it would appear that this panel may have already been submitted,

reviewed and approved. Has the panel already been ordered and/or installed? Our goal would be to ensure all comments have a chance to be incorporated before the panel is manufacturers since it will affect testing methodology. **Special inspector will be expected to have input into the panel layout. That panel has not been developed at this time.**

6. The RFP indicates that the contractor will pretest all systems to ensure they are passing before having the special inspector witness. We agree with this approach and it is our opinion that this is the best practice. However the RFP also requires that the Special Inspector conduct retesting "if necessary". This is very difficult to quantify while maintaining competitive pricing. Typically for buildings of this size, complexity we have this addressed this factor in a number of site visits required to complete with a limited number of retests. Most owners would prefer this approach rather than an all-inclusive value in the event there are multiple failures of already pretested items during the testing. Can you please confirm your preference? **Proposer shall propose number of site visits to complete with limited number of retests. Proposer shall include as unit cost any added or decreased number of visits for retests beyond (or less than) what is proposed.**