

The purpose of this ADDENDUM NO. 6, dated March 31, 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 #6 remain as originally stated.**

1. Questions from Proposers:

Stream Restoration

- 1.1 Question: Please advise as to what takes precedence, the landscape plans starting on page STRM-L501 or the Schedule of Allowances (3.3). The quantities for trees, shrubs, quarts, plugs, live stakes and seeding areas do not match up. Please clarify.

UMBC Response: The revised Schedule of Allowances shall take precedence.

- 1.2 Question: The tree allowance (W) calls out 325 trees without breaking down the 1" caliper opposed to the 2" caliper. The plans call for 309 1" caliper and 32 2" caliper for a total of 341. There is a discernable difference in price between the two sizes which should be addressed with an additional pay item/allowance line. Please clarify.

UMBC Response: The Schedule of Allowances has been revised to differentiate between the 1" and 2" caliper trees and quantities have been updated.

- 1.3 Question: Please confirm that we are to base pricing of the deer cages on the stated quantity of 630 in the Allowances specification and not the actual quantity of trees shown on plans.

UMBC Response: The stated quantity of 630 in the Allowances specification is correct. Deer cages are included to protect tree and shrub plantings.

- 1.4 Question: Confirming the materials and equipment access for the bridge abutment and sitework on the south side of the stream is to come across the culvert bridge between the athletic fields and the Event center?

UMBC Response: Record drawings indicate the pipe culvert which carries the stream is constructed of a 72" Class IV RCP.

- 1.5 Question: What is the load capacity of the culvert bridge?

UMBC Response: UMBC has no loading information for the smaller culvert that spans a tributary to the stream in a roughly southeast/northwest direction. For pricing purposes, firms should assume that the culvert can support repeated traffic of a fully loaded 5-ton dump truck. UMBC will have the structure surveyed, rated, and reinforced, if required, subsequent to contract award.

- 1.6 Question: The MSE wall panel manufacturers have concerns about the restrictions of the strapping for the front MSE walls imposed by the bridge abutment seat. They have described that portion of the design to be non-constructable. Should that prove to be the case will the University consider a cast-in-place retaining wall system with the specified architectural finish to be acceptable?

UMBC Response: Yes, using a cast-in-place retaining wall system will be acceptable with the specified architectural finish.

- 1.7 Question: The riffle mix and the cascade mix gradation tables indicate requirements for cobble that is extremely large. This material is not something that will be readily available (if at all) in the sizes specified (up to 36”), especially for the quantities that are needed to construct the riffles and cascades. Will the owner allow angular riprap of the same sizing to be substituted in place of rounded cobble material?

UMBC Response: A riprap mix of the specified sizing is acceptable for the riffle and cascade mixes. The word cobble is not intended to represent smooth, rounded material in this case.

- 1.8 Question: Section 00700 pg 41 is requesting a Water Appropriations and Water Discharge permit be acquired by the contractor. Is the stream pump around to be considered a withdrawal of water requiring an appropriations permit? None of the stream restoration contractors have ever encountered this as a requirement. The permit application process can take from 6 to 18 months.

UMBC Response: The stream pump around is not to be considered a withdrawal of water requiring an appropriations permit.

- 1.9 Question: What is the daily flow of water in the stream? This will be required for the appropriation permit application.

UMBC Response: The appropriation permit application is not required for the stream pump around.

- 1.10 Question: Please provide a specification for vehicular gates in the construction fence.

UMBC Response: This is contractor’s means and methods. Provide 6’ chain link fence and 12’ wide minimum vehicle gates.

- 1.11 Question: The soil borings taken in the areas of the new bridge abutments do not reference ground elevations and are showing very dense decomposed rock at depths of 5’ to 7.5’. This rock appears to conflict with the bottom of MSE wall leveling pad elevations. Has the current design taken the rock elevations into consideration? How are we to be paid for rock excavation if encountered?

UMBC Response: Rock excavation is unclassified. Should non-rippable rock excavation be encountered it will constitute a differing site condition and will be handled as a change order.

- 1.12 Question: Please confirm our ability to restrict parking spaces along Hilltop Circle. The site access has limited truck access due to the steepness of the slope of the stabilized construction entrances and will require offloading of materials and equipment from Hilltop Circle to be transported into the site.

UMBC Response: The University will work with the selected Contractor to allow for access off Hilltop Circle to the site, including taking parking spaces out of service. Contractor shall propose a plan that minimizes the number of parking spaces to be taken out of service for approval by UMBC.

- 1.13 Question: The riffle mix and the cascade mix gradation tables indicate requirements for cobble that is extremely large. This material is not something that will be readily available (if at all) in the sizes specified (up to 36”), especially for the quantities that are needed to construct the riffles and cascades. Will the owner allow angular riprap of the same sizing to be substituted in place of rounded cobble material?

UMBC Response: A riprap mix of the specified sizing is acceptable for the riffle and cascade mixes. The word cobble is not intended to represent smooth, rounded material in this case.

- 1.14 Question: Can you get confirmation from the bridge or railing contractor that the Type E bridge lighting will be provided with the railings, and that the electrical contractor does not need to furnish or install? We will provide power to the bridge railing but looking to see who will be furnishing and installing the handrail lights.

UMBC Response: The General Contractor is responsible for coordinating the efforts of the GC's subcontractors and suppliers. Furnish and install handrails and lighting as shown.

- 1.15 Question: Per STRM – CD102 drawing, at the existing stream bridge they indicate the removal of one (1) concrete abutment. After our site visit we noted there are actually two (2) concrete abutments. Are both to be removed or only the one indicated on the drawing?

UMBC Response: Both abutments are to be removed.

Tunnel

- 1.16 Question: Please define and identify any additional tunnel access locations available to provide entrance for craft employees to work areas G through Z in the tunnel. This is needed to provide access to the tunnel work beyond sections A, B, D, E, & F which may be constrained by work in process.

UMBC Response: The tunnel access points shown on the drawings are the University's preferred points for use. However, other access points do exist and may be made available on a case by case basis pending the Contractor's request, submission of a safety/access plan, timing, and special approval.

- 1.17 Question: Please identify acceptable staging locations and hose access for powered equipment (i.e., air compressors & water tanks) that are within 300' of the areas of work within the tunnels.

UMBC Response: Ventilation shafts are shown on the structural drawings. Coordinate with UMBC for access to these locations. For pricing purposes assume that hoses cannot be routed through the buildings. There are 120V electric convenience receptacles throughout the tunnel that can be used by the structural contractor. For pricing purposes assume that contractor will need to get water from a hydrant.

- 1.18 Question: The limited ventilation shaft locations identified on the drawings don't appear sufficient to provide proper exhaust ventilation for work in all tunnel areas. Please identify locations of all existing exhaust ventilation shafts for the entire tunnel.

UMBC Response: The work is in a tunnel. There are not more ventilation shafts available.

- 1.19 Question: May the HTHW supply and return lines be bypassed via jumpers at the same time?

UMBC Response: As currently designed, no. As a cost saving measure, the Project is using the bare minimum jumper arrangement. The single jumper will be valved in such a way to only allow flow in one direction. A dual jumper arrangement on the supply and return will be considered in construction, provided there is an overall savings to the Project.

- 1.20 Question: TUN-PH001 shows CHW pipe removal & reinstallation at multiple locations and only one jumper location is identified. Please confirm that additional CHW jumpers are not required for the removal and replacement of the balance of CHW piping.

UMBC Response: The only CHW jumper is on the CHW return from Fine Arts to the header. Otherwise, there are not CHW jumpers required.

- 1.21 Question: There are multiple activities that must take place during the annual May HTHW outage. Is the intention for us to complete all of those activities within the two-day period of time as stated in section 01 11 00-1.7 A.2?

UMBC Response: The annual spring HTHW outage is typically two weeks long. However, work can only be executed after the system cools down and is drained. Work must also conclude in time to allow the system to be re-filled and energized prior to the conclusion of the outage.

- 1.22 Question: Note 2 on TUN-M402 calls for installation of new HTHWS/HTHWR anchors at station A/10+22. Drawings M801 and PH001 show anchor replacements at station A/10+25. Which location is correct?

UMBC Response: The existing anchor is tied into the corner of the tunnel in the area of A/10+22. There is only one anchor at this location.

- 1.23 Question: Anchor locations and quantities shown on TUN-M801 and TUN-PH001 are not in alignment. M801 shows anchor replacements at more locations than are identified in PH001. Which drawing indicates the actual number of anchors to be replaced?

UMBC Response: TUN-M801 is the complete schedule of anchors. Anchors shown in TUN-PH001 are relative to other work in the same areas.

- 1.24 Question: Please confirm that current design and Phasing plan will allow adequate clearance for personnel, tools and equipment to access the structural repairs as listed in IFB drawings.

UMBC Response: The structural access plan includes working above the energized HTHWS and HTHWR, which are selectively getting reinsulated with thin insulation in Phase 1 (by others). The structural access plan also includes selective removal and reinstallation of the CHWR and CHWS, as shown by 'Y' in the must remove column on PH-001. Some areas where the structure and mechanical are in the worst condition, the pipe replacement has to take place at the same time as the structural repairs.

- 1.25 Question: How will we address areas with insufficient clearance to perform the required structural repairs when not addressed in the IFB documents?

UMBC Response: Spalls and delaminations determined to be inaccessible do to energized piping will be noted and repair will be deferred to a future project when the obstructing piping can be temporarily removed. Spalls and delaminations obstructed by conduit or flexible cable will be addressed through unit pricing, refer to Unit Price 41 added in Addendum #6 Section 01 22 00.

- 1.26 Question: During the site visit, other spall locations not identified on the drawings were seen, are we to assume that the area values established for the unit pricing only includes the spall locations identified on the drawings?

UMBC Response: No. The unit pricing will apply to all delaminated and spalled locations. Spalls not identified on the plans shall be repaired if accessible. Spalls determined to be inaccessible do to energized piping will be noted and repair will be deferred to a future project when the obstructing piping can be temporarily removed.

- 1.27 Question: When spall locations require electrical and mechanical work not indicated on the phasing plan in order provide access to repair the spall location, how will these costs be handled?

UMBC Response: Temporary removal and replacement of flexible cable and conduit supports will be covered by the unit price refer to Unit Price 41 added in Addendum #6 Section 01 22 00.

1.28 Question: What is the maximum depth assumed for the concrete repairs?

UMBC Response: 4", refer to Unit Price 42 - 44 added in Addendum #6 Section 01 22 00

1.29 Question: Drawing TUN-S501 states "PROVIDE SUPPLEMENTAL REINFORCING WHENEVER SECTION LOSS EXCEEDS 25%". Is the supplemental reinforcing to be included in the concrete repairs unit pricing?

UMBC Response: No, provide a separate linear foot price for supplemental reinforcing.

1.30 Question: TUN-S501 Note 5 shows placement of anodes evenly spaced in the area of a patch. Some areas of repair are not very large. What is the minimum area of repair that would require an anode?

UMBC Response: Anodes in the area of the patch shall be placed in accordance with the manufacturer's recommendations. Assume moderate corrosion risk and a steel density ratio of 1.5.

1.31 Question: We believe that the plan for structural repairs and the coordination with UMBCs tunnel mechanical requirements of maintaining lines while working and following the strict outage phasing plans listed in the 100% CDs is not achievable as currently outlined. See below for one example that demonstrates one of the many unachievable conditions in the tunnels. Drawing TUN-S102 indicates spalling repairs being required at A/05+10, after getting feedback from concrete trade partners, all overhead pipes would need to be removed 7' each way from the centerline of the spalling in order to properly shore the ceiling to allow for safe Structural repairs to be made which is more than the 10' of pipe that is listed on TUN-PH001. In addition, the Phasing plan at this location indicates that no HTHWR or HTHWS lines are required to be removed to facilitate the structural repairs. In this same location, there is one 6" HTHW jumper to be installed per detail 1 on TUN-M409 so that the HTHWS & HWHTR can be rotated to keep one line active while the decommissioned line can be worked on. In terms of sequence, the concrete restoration would need to occur in conjunction with the ball joint replacement, however since all piping is required to be removed to allow for repair, there is no way to fully decommission the system to allow for the structural repairs without also having both the HTHW and CHW systems off. The only way to create a safe working area and do the repairs as noted would be to install more jumpers to allow the system to bypass the Structural Repair Areas. Please elaborate how the design team designed this work in terms of the mechanical and structural sequence.

UMBC Response: Agreed. There are many tight working areas throughout the Project. Field coordination with UMBC and the design team is going to require work across multiple disciplines and operations. What is shown in the Contract Documents is constructable.

At A/05+10, for example, the CHS and CHR pipe has to be removed as shown by 'Y' on PH-001. It is the Project's position that the HTHWS and HTHWR return can stay in place, with thin insulation provided in Phase 1. There will be a jumper in this area on the HTHWS/HTHWR, which will allow one of those services to be taken off line. The concrete Contractor will have to work around the other energized service.

1.32 Question: Drawing TUN -PH001 show Electrical/Telecomm items that are obstructing structural / mechanical activities. Is the electrical proposal to include removing and reinstalling these items based on the provided footages provided on the matrix?

UMBC Response: Yes. Include electrical relocation work as part of the proposal.

Water Line

1.33 Question: Please confirm our ability to restrict parking in areas where pits are to be excavated and equipment staged for the Waterline scope of work.

UMBC Response: The University will work with the selected Contractor to provide access need to complete water line work, including taking parking spaces out of service. The Contractor shall propose a plan for approval by UMBC that minimizes the number of parking spaces to be taken out of service as well as disruption to University operations.

1.34 Question: Specification details for the CIPP installation process are not consistent with each of the approved manufacturer's installation recommendations. Following the specifications will preclude some of the manufacturers from pricing. We are requesting that the approved manufacturer's installation recommendations be acceptable if in conflict with the specifications.

UMBC Response: It is understood that manufacturer's installation requirements differ from the specifications. The manufacturer's recommended installation process will be reviewed during the submittal process and any conflicts will be accepted or rejected at that time.

1.35 Question: We are requesting that the lateral experience requirement of the manufacturer and installer be removed as there is no lateral scope involved in this project.

UMBC Response: Lateral lining experience is not required, however experience in the process of reinstatement of laterals is required.

1.36 Question: UV liners do not adhere to the host pipe due to the UV-barrier layer on the outside of the liner. We are requesting the requirement for adhesion to the host pipe be removed.

UMBC Response: Adhesion to the host pipe is not required.

1.37 Question: CIPP specification section 3.13.B does not allow internal mechanical end seals. As not all CIPP liners adhere to the host pipe for rehabilitation, many manufacturers require mechanical end seals for their systems. We are requesting that mechanical end seals be permitted as the mechanical seals would still meet the design pressures and loads of the piping system.

UMBC Response: Mechanical end seals are allowed if they are a necessary component of the manufacturer's lining system.

Site Electrical – Building 873

1.38 Question: Drawing SL-EL204 shows electrical source for site lighting in building 873-Patapsco Hall. How long are the electrical pathways from the point of entry to the electrical panel? What are the finishes impacted by this work?

UMBC Response: The run from the electrical room to the exterior wall will be between 100 to 150 or so foot. The electrical room has an open ceiling and block walls. All work in the hallways will be done above the drop ceiling from exiting electrical room to the exterior wall. The exterior wall of Patapsco Hall is brick. Contractor should coordinate new conduit with existing conditions.

1.39 Question: Will Building 873 be occupied during this work? Are there noise restrictions?

UMBC Response: Contractor shall coordinate with University and accommodate University with scheduling work to avoid disruption to students and faculty to the best of their ability.

1.40 Question: How are we to address conflicts with existing construction or obstructions in the concealed ceiling space?

UMBC Response: Contractor shall coordinate with Engineer as needed. Contractor shall field route conduits per code and based on existing field conditions.

General Conditions

1.41 Question: Please provide the anticipated location of the GC office trailer complex and laydown area.

UMBC Response: This location is still to be determined in coordination with the selected Contractor; however, the University anticipates that the trailer shall be located either near the Central Utility Plant or near the Technology Research Park and Parking Lot 25.

1.42 Question: Confirming that the proposed GC office trailer location will have access to electrical, plumbing and sanitary connections.

UMBC Response: Correct.

1.43 Question: Confirming the GC office trailer space required needs to accommodate the owner, engineer and construction personnel office needs.

UMBC Response: Correct.

1.44 Question: Please confirm that is it acceptable to use standard 6' tall chain link temporary fence panels to secure work areas as the pipe size specified for the portable chain-link fencing exceeds the standard temporary fence panels specifications.

UMBC Response: Standard 6' tall chain link temporary fence panels on movable concrete boots are acceptable.

1.45 Question: Section 00700 pg 31 is stating that an adjustment in unit pricing may be requested if the estimated quantities and actual quantities varies by more than 25%. Is the ability to request an increase in time for completion also limited to items that exceed 25% of the estimated quantities or is a request for increase in time due to variation in quantities dependent on submission of supporting evidence to support an increase of time?

UMBC Response: Based on the context for the question, the University believes that the correct reference is actually section 6.17 on page 00700/40, not the reference that was provided. Under this section, the request for adjustment to time also relates to items that exceed 25% of estimated quantities.

1.46 Question: What is the criteria the procurement officer will use to make a determination of an increase in time for unit quantity variations?

UMBC Response: It is not possible to answer this question in the theoretical, as the determination will be based on the facts particular to the situation.

2. **RFP Revisions:**

2.1 Price Proposal Due Dates/Times: The due dates/times for the price proposals issued in Addendum 3 are deleted and replaced with the following:

- Base Price Proposal Due Date/Time: Wednesday, 4/14/21, *on or before 11:59 p.m.*; and,
- Add Alternates Price Proposal Due Date/Time: Friday, 4/16/21, *on or before 4:00 p.m.*

3. **Acknowledgement of Addendum Form**: The Acknowledgement of Addendum is included on the Price Proposal form.

END OF ADDENDUM #6 DATED 3/31/21

This Addendum #6 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: 2nd Revised Base Price Proposal Form
Revised Add Alternates Price Proposal Form
RMF Addendum 6 – Section 01 21 00 – Allowances
RMF Addendum 6 – Section 01 22 00 – Unit Prices