

The purpose of this ADDENDUM NO. 5, dated March 29, 2021, is to distribute information in response to questions received from proposers, as well as other revisions to the solicitation documents. This addendum is provided to each proposing firm who remained shortlisted following the second phase technical evaluation and advanced to the Price Proposal Phase. This addendum will also be posted on UMBC's eBid Board at <https://procurement.umbc.edu/bid-board/>. **All other specifications, terms and conditions of this solicitation not expressly amended by this ADDENDUM #5 remain as originally stated.**

1. Questions from Proposers:

Stream Restoration

- 1.1 Question: The detail for the riffle grade control structures on sheet STRM-C501 indicates a 2' placement depth requirement for the riffle mix, however, note 4 on the same sheet says to install riffle mix at a minimum thickness of 32 inches. The profiles also show a 2' placement depth. Please clarify.

UMBC Response: A 2' depth is sufficient. Note 4 on Drawing STRM-C501 has been revised.

- 1.2 Question: There is both a detail and a line item for hardwood mats, however, there is only mulch access path outlined in the erosion and sediment control plans. Are stockpile areas intended to be protected with hardwood mats, or is this line item only intended to establish unit pricing in the event that field conditions necessitate the use of wetland mats? Please clarify.

UMBC Response: The hardwood mats line item is only intended to establish unit pricing in the event they are needed during construction. As such hardwood mats are not shown on the plans.

- 1.3 Question: The detail and specifications for the mulch access path do not indicate a requirement for any sort of geotextile or matting placement beneath the mulch. Please confirm.

UMBC Response: No geotextile is required with the mulch access path.

- 1.4 Question: Is the material requirement for the permanent mulch path the same as the temporary mulch access road?

UMBC Response: Yes, the material for the permanent mulch path is the same as the temporary mulch access road but width is different as shown on the detail.

- 1.5 Question: Please verify the quantity in the schedule of prices for line item 3, mulch access road. The quantity measured on the plans is much larger than 240 SY.

UMBC Response: The quantity should read 2,400 SY to match what is shown in the Allowances Specification.

- 1.6 Question: Are the "Floodplain Forest Enhancement and Invasive Vegetation Removal and Treatment Areas" noted on the plans intended to be seeded with the Forested Floodplain seed mix? If so, please correct the quantity for line item 14, Forested Floodplain Seed Mix, to include these areas, as the quantity only currently reflects the Forested Floodplain Buffer areas on the plans.

UMBC Response: No seeding is currently associated with the Floodplain Forest Enhancement and Invasive Vegetation Removal and Treatment Areas.

1.7 Question: Please verify the quantity for line item 16, Meadow Area Seed Mix, as the measured quantity is significantly less than the line-item quantity.

UMBC Response: The quantity for Meadow Area Seed Mix should read 3,000 SY. The Allowances Specification has been revised.

1.8 Question: Please verify the quantity for line item 17, Turf Re-Establishment Seed Mix, as the measured quantity is significantly larger than the line-item quantity.

UMBC Response: The quantity for Turf Re-Establishment Seed mix should read 7,200 SY. The Allowances Specification has been revised.

1.9 Question: Please verify the quantity for line item 19, Herbaceous Plants (Quarts), as the quantities outlined in the planting schedules on sheet STRM-L501 are significantly larger than the line-item quantity.

UMBC Response: The quantity for line item 19 should read 745 EA per the plant schedules on the plans. Allowances Specification has been revised.

1.10 Question:

A. Page 01 22 00-5 of the specifications indicates that Riffle Grade Control Structures will be measured and paid per linear foot of structure, measured in the direction of stream flow, however, Page 35 43 01-1 of the specifications indicates that Riffle Grade Control Structures will be measured and paid as a square foot item. Additionally, the schedule of prices has a quantity of 1800 LF for line item 23, Riffle Grade Control Structures, however, Page 01 21 00-6 of the specifications says to include 8100 square feet for this line item. Please clarify.

UMBC Response: The Riffle Grade Control Structure shall be measured and paid per SF. The estimated quantity on page 01 21 00-6 is correct.

B. The details for the riffle on sheet STRM-C501 of the plans indicates a requirement to extend the riffle mix into the bottoms of both the upstream and downstream pools on either end of the riffle structure. Will additional quantities of these glide and run transitions be measured and paid along with the main riffle structure as shown on the plan views?

UMBC Response: The SF measurement is based only on the shown riffle portion (or portion that has rock hatching on plans). The required glide and run shown on the riffle detail should be considered incidental to the riffle SF quantities.

1.11 Question:

A. Page 01 22 00-5 of the specifications indicates that Cascade Grade Control will be measured and paid per linear foot of structure, measured in the direction of stream flow, however, Page 35 43 02-1 of the specifications indicates that Cascade Grade Control will be measured and paid as a square foot item. Additionally, the schedule of prices has a quantity of 575 LF for line item 24, Cascade Grade Control, however, Page 01 21 00-6 of the specifications says to include 575 square feet for this line item. Please clarify.

UMBC Response: Cascade Grade Control will be measured and paid per SF.

B. If line item 24, Cascade Grade Control, is intended to be measured and paid per SF, please verify the quantity, as the measured quantity is much larger than the line-item quantity.

UMBC Response: The quantity for Cascade Grade Control should read 1,130 SF. Allowances Specification has been revised.

1.12 Question: According to the detail for the cascade structures on sheet STRM-C502 of the plans, the cascade structures are constructed using imbricated boulders. Do the widths shown on the plan views (sheets STRM-C101 and STRM C-102) correspond with the “width” indicated in the cascade cross section (i.e., do we need to account for tie out boulders beyond the widths shown on the plan views)?

UMBC Response: The symbology on the plans does not include tie-out boulders. The required tie boulders as shown on the detail and as indicated in the corresponding specification should be considered incidental to the cascade item.

1.13 Question: Note 5 on sheet STRM-C502 of the plans indicates that contractors are to “install cascade mix with minimum thickness of two times the specified d50 material or 2 ft, whichever is larger”. To what extents is the cascade mix intended to be placed for these structures (as the main structure of the cascades will be boulders)? Additionally, the d50 of the cobble shown in the cascade mix gradation table on the same plan sheet is 23”, which would require a 46” depth placement (nearly 4’) for this material according to note 5 – boulder depths shown in the profiles and boulder dimension chart are only ~2’. Please clarify installation requirements for these structures.

UMBC Response: Placing the cascade mix to a depth/thickness of 24” is sufficient. Note 5 on Drawing STRM-C502 has been revised.

1.14 Question: Please verify the quantity for line item 26, Imbricated Boulder Wall, as the measured quantity is significantly larger than the line-item quantity.

UMBC Response: The quantity for Imbricated Boulder Wall should read 120 LF. Allowances Specification has been revised.

1.15 Question: Please verify the quantity for line item 29, Rootwad Bank Protection, as the measured quantity is less than the line-item quantity.

UMBC Response: The quantity for Rootwad Bank Protection should remain as shown for the allowance under line item 26. It is understood that this quantity may be greater than what was measured.

1.16 Question: Please verify the quantity for line item 30, Large Woody Debris Deflector, as the measured quantity is less than the line-item quantity.

UMBC Response: The quantity for Large Woody Debris Deflector should remain as shown for the allowance under line item 30. It is understood that this quantity may be greater than what was measured.

1.17 Question: Please verify the quantity for line item 33, Silt Fence, as the measured quantity is significantly larger than the line-item quantity.

UMBC Response: The quantity for Silt Fence should read 2,800 LF.

Water Line

1.18 Question: The T-liner required for the lateral-main interface does not seem to be pressure rated or NSF approved. Please provide clarification.

UMBC Response: Refer to the latest (100% Construction Documents) specifications for CIPP liner requirements.

1.19 Question: CIPP manufacturers do not recommend internally reinstating lateral openings in a high pressure CIPP. It is requested that we be allowed to follow the manufacturers recommendations and provide additional pits for an external reinstatement at these locations. Please confirm that additional pits will be acceptable.

UMBC Response: Additional pits may be provided as required. Price Proposal shall include all costs associated with additional pits.

1.20 Question: The manufacturer has limitations on the length of CIPP that can be installed in one run. What is currently shown exceeds those limitations. Please confirm additional pits will be acceptable.

UMBC Response: Additional pits may be provided as required. Price Proposal shall include all costs associated with additional pits.

1.21 Question: Please confirm the type of valves that are needing to be abandoned are gate valves as they appear in the details.

UMBC Response: It is believed that all existing valves to be abandoned in place are gate valves. This will be confirmed during the pre-lining CCTV inspection. Variation from this understanding would constitute a differing existing site condition.

1.22 Question: The CIPP specs require adhesion to the host pipe, however, the specs call for a class IV (fully deteriorated) design. Class IV is an independent, fully structural lining that does not require adhesion to the host pipe. Adhesion would only be required for internal reinstatement of laterals. As we are providing external reinstatement of laterals, please confirm that a class IV lining that does not adhere to the host pipe is acceptable.

UMBC Response: Adhesion to the host pipe is not required as the liner is fully structural, however the liner must conform to and match the interior surface of the host pipe so as to not restrict flow. Additional pits may be provided as required. Price Proposal shall include all costs associated with additional pits.

1.23 Question: It is requested that internal end seals be permitted if the lining will not adhere to the host pipe as mentioned in the above question. These end seals will be rated to the design pressures.

UMBC Response: Internal end seals, if required by the manufacturer and meeting the design requirements, are acceptable.

Site Lighting

1.24 Question: Conduit sizes shown on civil drawings SL-C101 through SL-C104 are conflicting with sizes shown on electrical drawings SL-EL201 through SL-EL204 at the same locations. Please confirm what conduit sizes are correct.

UMBC Response: Drawings SL-EL201 through SL-EL204 are correct. Drawings SL-C101 through SL-C104 have been reissued to coordinate. STRM-EL201 updated circuit #15 conduits size after handhole down to bridge to 1.25 inch conduit.

1.25 Question: Drawings notes, on electrical drawings SL-EL201 through SL-EL204, for fixture types do not match the fixture types shown on the lighting photometric drawings, SL-LC201 through SL-LC204. Please confirm fixture types.

UMBC Response: The fixtures designations shown on drawings SL-LC201 to SL-LC204 are coordinated so no change will be made to these drawings. The lighting fixtures are labeled in the SL-LC drawings and match the SL-EL series drawings.

Tunnel

1.26 Question: Drawing M503 detail SB-4 lists CHW sizes as 12" and HTHW as 8", however; Location B/04+80 on drawing M403 appears to be CHW 14" and HTHW 10". Which sizing is correct for this location?

UMBC Response: Good observation. Price it based on the most expensive combination. Pipe it in the field based on field conditions.

1.27 Question: Drawing M403 notes 8 & 15 locations B/05+10 & B/06+50 shows HTHW sizes to be 10", however; detail A-2 lists them as 8". Which sizing is correct?

UMBC Response: Good observation. Price it based on the most expensive combination. Pipe it in the field based on field conditions.

1.28 Question: Drawing M403 at location B/05+30 sizes appear to be CHW 12" & HTHW 8", however; by location B/06+00, on the other side on the matchline, these sizes appear as CHW 16" & HTHW 10". Is this correct?

UMBC Response: Good observation. Price it based on the larger diameter pipe. Pipe it in the field based on field conditions.

1.29 Question: Drawing M404 notes 1 & 2 state to replace supports, yet they reference guide detail G-1. Please advise.

UMBC Response: Price it as shown in Detail G1. During construction, submit an RFI for verification of the detail to be used.

1.30 Question: Drawing M405 notes 14, 17, 18, 20, 21, & 22 call out detail SB-2, however; they only state to replace the support base similar to detail SB-1 and not the bottom roller. Do these get bottom roller replacements per detail SB-2/SR-1 or just the base support feet per SB-1?

UMBC Response: At the time of observation, the rollers were in acceptable condition. Price based on the instructions at each location. If during construction a field condition is noticed that may require additional work, bring it to UMBC's attention.

1.31 Question: Drawing M406 notes 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, & 12 call out detail SB-2, however; they only state to replace the support base similar to detail SB-1 and not the bottom roller. Do these get bottom roller replacements per detail SB-2/SR-1 or just the base support feet per SB-1?

UMBC Response: At the time of observation, the rollers were in acceptable condition. Price based on the instructions at each location. If during construction a field condition is noticed that may require additional work, bring it to UMBC's attention.

1.32 Question: Drawing M406 note 23 calls for detail SB-1, but also says to replace HTHWS roller. Is this correct?

UMBC Response: Yes. It is a Unistrut style support, consistent with SB-1 and the roller also needs to be replaced.

1.33 Question: Drawing M407 note 1 calls for anchor detail A-3, but does not state to be done during the HTHW outage. Is this correct?

UMBC Response: Provide the anchor at D/01+97 during a HTHW outage.

1.34 Question: Drawing M402 note 2 call for HTHWS/R pipes to be removed for structural repairs, however; PH001 does not list the HTHW to need to be removed. Which is correct?

UMBC Response: The HTHWS and HTHWR pipes need to be removed at A/10+25 to provide access for the structural contractor to repair concrete. The anchor is a floor to ceiling anchor, to avoid concrete cure time requirements.

1.35 Question: Please confirm UMBC will be responsible for shutdowns & re-energize of systems for the outage, including drain down and refilling of systems.

UMBC Response: UMBC is responsible for shutdowns and re-energize of systems. The Contractor shall be available during re-energizing for leaks or problems that manifest themselves during re-energizing.

1.36 Question: Are there any glycol requirements for the systems and if so, whose responsibility is it for re-charging them?

UMBC Response: There is not glycol in the chilled water system.

END OF ADDENDUM #5 DATED 3/29/21

This Addendum #5 on RFP #BC-21210-C and its attachments are provided to those proposing firms who have remained shortlisted following the Second Phase Technical Evaluation on this procurement.

Attachments: Revised Base Price Proposal Form
RMF Addendum 5, including Specifications and Drawings