Addenda #1
Date of RFQ Issue: January 23, 2026
Date of Addenda #1 Issue: February 2, 2026

LUMBERTON LOOP: SCOTTISH PACKING STRUCTURAL ASSESSMENT AND ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES

ADDENDA #1

The following questions were received prior to the close of the Questions period on January 30, 2026 at 1:00pm EST.

- **Question #1:** Will an Opinion of Probable Cost be appropriate and can you clarify what is meant by the term "itemized"?
- **Answer:** Yes, an Opinion of Probable Cost (OPC) is appropriate. Itemization of the OPC is desired to show, at minimum, estimated construction cost ranges for individual components / facilities (e.g., bathrooms vs. shade structure vs. boardwalk, etc.) of the proposed design. A single line item / lump sum OPC without specificity does not fully capture the goals of the project relating to future grant-writing and fundraising efforts.

- **Question #2:** Is there an existing survey based on previous work done on the site? What information is represented on the survey?
- **Answer:** Yes, surveys and engineering plans from previous work will be made available to the selected consultant. In general, survey data represented in these maps include the following:
    - Parcel Boundaries
    - Easements / Encroachments
    - Existing Topography (1’ contours)
    - Overhead Utilities
    - Existing Tree Canopy
    - Regulatory Flood Zones (floodway, 100-year floodplain, etc.)
    - Impervious Surfaces (roads, concrete pads, etc.)
    - Building Footprints
    - Fencing

    - Notes: (i) survey data for Impervious Surfaces, Building Footprints, and Fencing was captured prior to the selective demolition of the buildings and structures on the site, however, post-demolition aerial photography, field measurements, and CAD drawings have been gathered and generated by the City and CDDL (as illustrated in the RFQ Appendix) and will be made available to the selected consultant; and (ii) the selected consultant may be responsible for generating

additional ‘as-is’ information (e.g., wall elevations) necessary to complete the requested Services in the RFQ.

- **Question #3:** Is the design work from previous projects on the site, as noted in the RFQ, available for review / use as base files?
- **Answer:** Yes, this information will be made available to the selected consultant.

- **Question #4:** Is the rendering presented in the Lumberton Community Flood Print: Phase 2 document indicative of the level that is expected for the scope item "illustrative graphic"?
- **Answer:** Not necessarily. Illustrative graphic material to be produced under the requested Services can be negotiated between the City and selected consultant during the contracting phase.

- **Question #5:** Some of the background information presented in the Lumberton Community Flood Print: Phase 2 appears to align with the programming mentioned in the RFQ. Can we assume that these are the aspirational goals of the project?
- **Answer:** Programmatic desires for the site have remained largely consistent with the goals and objectives outlined in the “Lumberton Community Floodprint: Phase Two” document, however, the City understands that damages sustained to the remaining relic of the original structure may compromise the feasibility and/or practicality of all original aspirations.

- **Question #6:** Has any environmental testing been done on the site (and ESA Phase 1)? Will any documents be made available to the selected design team?
- **Answer:** Yes, a Phase 1 ESA was previously completed and can be made available to the selected consultant.