



### ADDENDUM NO. 3

|                                |                        |
|--------------------------------|------------------------|
| <b>Issue Date:</b>             | October 2, 2025        |
| <b>School / Facility Name:</b> | University High School |
| <b>Project Name:</b>           | Extend Parent Loop     |
| <b>Owner's Project No.:</b>    | 2548185                |

|                                    |                                                                                     |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Owner:</b>                      | School Board of Volusia County Florida<br>200 N. Clara Avenue, DeLand Florida 32720 |
| <b>Owner's Project Manager:</b>    | Tim Moore                                                                           |
| <b>Project Manager's Location:</b> | 3750 Olson Drive, Daytona Beach Florida 32124                                       |

|                                    |                |
|------------------------------------|----------------|
| <b>Architect's Representative:</b> | Ben Buencamino |
| <b>Architect's Project No.:</b>    | 2400653        |

The following clarifications shall be incorporated into the previously distributed construction documents.

- I. **Question:** Can you confirm the size of the PIV to be relocated?  
**Response:** We have no information on the size of the existing PIV. The survey only shows the location. If it helps, the original plans call out the fire lines as 6".
- II. **Question:** It was mentioned during the site walk that a double temporary fence is required during construction.  
**Response:** Yes, with 10' separation between fences.
- III. **Question:** Drawings show fence posts being reused along the perimeter. Subcontractor has notified that the cost reusing the posts is the same as installing new since reusing posts is more labor intensive with chipping away concrete.  
**Response:** If the same price, use new post.
- IV. **Question:** The existing FDC and fire department access is currently located within the construction zone. With construction occurring during an occupied school campus, in the case of an emergency, the fire department's access is impeded.  
**Response:** MOT note on the plan sheet C101, requires the contractor to submit a MOT plan for approval that will show the most efficient plans for the construction activity while allowing normal school operation. This includes fire safety.
- V. **Question:** A Post Indicator Valve (PIV) exists in the fence enclosure that is being shortened to make space for the new pavement road located south. This PIV is not shown to be relocated within the shortened fence enclosure and is on the new road.  
**Response:** PIV is designated to be relocated as called out (designation item "G") on plan sheet C100.
- VI. **Question:** A geotechnical report has not been given but is mentioned with Note (12) on Sheet C100.  
**Response:** No geotechnical report done on this project.

- VII. **Question:** Fiber Flocculent Tubes is shown in the legend on sheet C100, but none if found on the site plan.  
**Response:** Tubes are for curb inlets. If there are no curb inlets, the tubes do not apply.
- VIII. **Question:** A new light pole is shown to be installed in the location below and overlaps with some existing trees.  
**Response:** Remove trees.
- IX. **Question:** Sheet E100, the north light pole with note (1) says the pole is to be removed and a new pole is shown installed adjacent to it on Sheet E101. Photometrics Sheet E200 shows this light pole in it's existing location. The south light pole with note (5) says the pole remains existing in its location, but Photometrics Sheet E200 shows the pole in a different location.  
**Response:** The light pole remain at their existing locations shown on E100 rather than the locations shown on E101 that were from incorrect record drawings. Photometrics were rerun with the "south light pole" at its existing location, with little overall change in the photometrics.
- X. **Question:** Sheet E100, Note (5) says the pole and fixture is to remain, but this light pole isn't shown on the new work plans Sheet E101.  
**Response:** The light pole is to remain, which fixture type LL installed as shown in the Photometric Site Plan E200.
- XI. **Question:** Kindly provide details, photos on the location of the electrical room where panel 1H1B is present. We would like to confirm the availability of spaces in the panel for new connections and also confirm the distance of the panel 1H1B from the nearest connection point.  
**Response:** The Electrical Room is in Building 1 First Floor and Panel 1H1B is in Room 1A-190B per record drawings.
- XII. **Question:** In upcoming addendum can you confirm the count for Lights per E101(Renovation) or E200(Photometrics)? There is a difference of one Type LL in this Base Bid.  
**Response:** Quantities are shown in Luminaire Schedule on E300.
- XIII. **Question:** The MPH for Wind Load listed in Fixture schedule is 140 mph, should this be 155 mph to match VCS Standard?  
**Response:** 140mph wind speed shown is per ASCE7 for Risk Category 2, but agree should conform to VCS standards. The Seminole SP373TII pole has an EPA capacity of 5sf @ 155mph, while the light fixtures have EPAs of 1.28sf or less.
- XIV. **Question:** Kindly confirm if all Wiring Connections/Joints be required in Light Pole Handhole.  
**Response:** Pullbox shown in Pole Detail on E300.
- XV. **Question:** Is Lightning Protection Required for new Poles and Fixtures? No mention of this on Pole Detail(E300).  
**Response:** Surge Suppressor per Concrete Pole Note 14 is the only lightning protection.

---

**END OF ADDENDUM NO. 3**

---