



County of Roanoke

FINANCE DEPARTMENT PURCHASING DIVISION

Kate Hoyt, Buyer
5204 Bernard Drive SW, Suite 300 F
Roanoke VA 24018
(540) 283-8149
(540) 561-2829 – Fax
khoyt@roanokecountyva.gov

June 12, 2019

RFP # 2019-136 Playground Renovations for Roanoke County Public Schools

ADDENDUM NO. 1

Answers to Vendor Questions

Due Date & Time:
July 9, 2019, 2:00 PM
(Local Prevailing Time)

RFP # 2019-136
Playground Renovations for RCPS
ADDENDUM NO. 1

- A. Extension of Due Date/Time** – The due date and time for proposals will be extended. Proposals shall now be due to the Roanoke County Purchasing Division (5204 Bernard Drive SW, Suite 300-F, Roanoke VA 24018) no later than the below date and time:

Tuesday, July 9, 2019 at 2:00 PM (EST)

- B. Answers to Vendor Questions** – Please see below for a list of questions received to date regarding the RFP, and the answers provided by the County/Schools as we are able.

1. Several of the areas/equipment being replaced are smaller than the suggested range (45-65 students play capacity); is the offeror required and/or able to increase the site areas?

We do have flexibility to increase the site areas at Back Creek and Glenvar Elementary schools. The site at Burlington Elementary is more limited and must be confined to the existing borders; however, the area does have potential to be used more effectively.

2. Regarding “Site prep as needed, to include gravel, landscape fabric, and drainage”: The equipment being proposed is going into existing areas; is the offeror required/requested to remove ALL existing surfacing etc. down to grade and then rebuild up, or is the offeror simply supplementing the existing surfacing.

It would be helpful to have proposals for beginning at grade and re-establishing borders, if practical for the site. We would also like to have the option to supplement the existing surfaces.

3. Regarding “surfacing, to include options for poured in place rubber surfacing and EWF”: What is the existing depths. Of the EWF for these areas? (Each piece of equipment is installed in accordance with required entry/exit heights, etc., so to add new equipment there is potential to have to redo all surfacing if PIP is desired.

We understand that in order to go to PIP surfacing, new borders will need to be established for the new structures, and the PIP would only be installed around the new structures.

4. Please define ADA access to play area.

Special consideration should be given to providing accessible surfaces in a play area that meets the ASTM Standard Specification for Determination of

Accessibility of Surface Systems Under and Around Playground Equipment, ASTM F1951. Equipment selection and location along with the type of protective surfacing are key components to ensuring the opportunity for children with disabilities to play on the playground. From Public Playground Safety Handbook, USCPSC.

5. Is the ADA access to the play area an accessible ramp, or are you looking for complete ADA access from building to area, to include ADA compliant walkways?

Our goal is to ensure that each new structure is accessible via an ADA compliant walkway.

6. Is the offeror to include the cost of a potential performance bond in their submission, or will the County issue a change order to cover the cost if required?

Cost of performance bonds should NOT be included in the quoted price. Vendors may list the cost of the bonds separately, if desired. If the County/RCPS elects to require such bonds, the cost will be addressed during later contract negotiations.

7. Is there a budgetary number the offeror can use to determine the appropriate equipment selection?

There is no budget information to be offered at this time. RCPS will make a final determination of the scope of work to be contracted, based on updated budget information at a later date.

8. Would the County entertain removal and replacement of the entire areas?

Removal and replacement of the entire areas is not considered to be in the scope of the project, at this time.

9. Is the order of the Evaluation Criteria listed based upon importance?

The evaluation criteria are listed in no particular order. All criteria should be addressed within the proposal document, and all will be taken into consideration during evaluation of the proposals.

10. When quoting surfacing, does RCPS only want the areas where the new equipment is going to be surfaced?

Correct; we understand that in order to go to PIP surfacing, new borders will need to be established for the new structures, and the PIP would only be installed around the new structures.

11. For playground areas to be removed and restored to grass, shall providing seed and straw be included in the bid?

No; restoration of grass will be the responsibility of RCPS. This should not be included in the proposal.

12. Does the County want the contractor to remove and replace the EWF that is needed to go under the new equipment? Or should the vendor propose removing all EWF within playground area, restore drainage, and replace all EWF?

It would be helpful to have proposals for beginning at grade and re-establishing borders, if practical for the site. We would also like to have the option to supplement the existing surfaces.

13. Does the County want a proposal for each site to include Pour in Place rubber for the entire playground area, and another proposal for EWF in the entire playground area? Or is the county asking for Pour in Place rubber only in the area where new equipment will be?

We understand that in order to go to PIP surfacing, new borders will need to be established for the new structures, and the PIP would only be installed around the new structures.

REMAINDER OF PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK