



City of Miami

ADDENDUM NO. 2

March 8, 2016

INVITATION TO BID NO.: 15-16-016

LUMMUS PARK LANDING PROJECT

CITP PROJECT NO.: B- 30643

TO: ALL PROSPECTIVE BIDDERS:

The following changes, additions, clarifications, and/or deletions amend the above-captioned Invitation to Bid and shall become an integral part of the Bids submitted and the Contract to be executed for **Lummus Park Landing Project - Invitation to Bid No.: 15-16-016** (the "Project"). Please note the contents herein and affix same to the documents you have on hand.

All attachments (if any) are available on the Capital Improvements and Transportation Program (CITP) website and are part of this Addendum.

A. The deadline for receipt of bids has been extended to **Wednesday, March 16, 2016 at 2:00PM (Local Time)**.

B. The following are the inquires received and the corresponding responses:

Q1. Pay Item cost breakdown does not contain an item for the GC General Conditions. Can we include such costs as part of the Mobilization item? Or does it need to be distributed among all pay items? Please advise.

A1. General conditions should be included in the mobilization pay item.

Q2. The Pay Item cost breakdown includes a Permitting Allowance to cover all permit fees and impact fees. Do FPL fees fall also under this Allowance? Or do we need to include FPL cost as part of our project cost? Please advise.

A2. FPL fees do not fall under the allowance and should be provided as part of the complete Power System pay item.

Q3. In the documents there is no mention that any special wages apply to this project. Please confirm there are no "Prevailing Wages" or "Davis Bacon Wages" to be included in this project

A3. There are no Prevailing Wage or Davis Bacon Wage requirements for this Project.

Q4. As per your instructions at the pre-bid meeting when asked this question, we would like to know what the budget figure is for this project. Please advise.

A4. CITP's policy prohibits the disclosure of the construction budget.

- Q5.** Plan sheet 2, structural note #12.3 requires the disposal of excavated unsuitable materials as determined by the engineer. Please provide the Geotechnical report and soil borings for this location, so as to determine the existing soil type to be excavated
- A5.** The Geotechnical Report is attached hereto as Exhibit 1.
-
- Q6.** Plan sheet 3, typical section has indicated a Safety Zone and Pay Item #11 description mentions a "Bedding Stone". Please provide details for such material such as type, color, size of stone and thickness of layer.
- A6.** In accordance with Miami 21, Appendix B, the Safety Zone shall be a type of cobble stone with "river rock," approximately $\frac{3}{4}$ to $1\frac{1}{2}$ inches in diameter, set in concrete leaving a relief of $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ inches or similar aggregate pavers with ADA domes.
-
- Q7.** Referring again to the Safety Zone bedding stone area, does this area require any compacted soil base under the stone? If so, please advise as to the type of material, thickness of layer and compaction requirements
- A7.** Refer to Miami 21, Appendix B detail 2 of 2.
-
- Q8.** Does this area of proposed new sidewalks and bedding stone include an existing lawn sprinkler system? Please confirm, so as to determine possible repairs to sprinkler system.
- A8.** Any irrigation that the contractor finds in conflict with the proposed improvements shall be removed and/or cut, capped, and abandoned. Any issues during construction shall be coordinated with the City of Miami construction manager.
-
- Q9.** If there is an existing lawn sprinkler system and repairs/adjustments are needed, where would you like us to include the cost of such repairs, since there is no Pay Item shown for this operation? Please advise.
- A9.** Please refer to Answer No. 10 above.
-
- Q10.** Plan sheet 3, at lighting quantities table shows a quantity of 8 solar marine lanterns but cannot find any proposed locations on plans. Please provide plan with proposed locations
- A10.** Solar Marine light locations are shown on sheet LT-2, refer to legend and boat slips 1, 2 and 3 on top of the eight (8) new wood piles.
-
- Q11.** Pay Item #20 descriptions mention the fire cabinets and it indicates "Includes tap connection to existing main". Due to the plan being unreadable at such level of details, we cannot see where the existing lines are and where the new taps and new proposed lines would be to feed such fire cabinets. Please clarify extent of new proposed fire lines or provide readable plans showing them
- A11.** Connection to and location of the 8" WM is shown on the Paving, Grading, and Drainage Plans (sheets 7 and 8). The City has provided contractors with a more legible copy of the plans attached hereto as Exhibit 2.
-
- Q12.** In reference to the water lines to fire cabinets, we notice there is no Pay Item line for such fire lines. Are they to be included in the fire cabinet's item? Please advise.
- A12.** The fire cabinet pay item includes the connection to the existing main, which includes the pipe to the existing 8" WM.
-
- Q13.** Plan sheet 4 shows some existing trees located within the proposed excavation area for the pre-cast wall to be installed at the WASD easement. Also some existing trees are located closer to water and

within the new sidewalk area. We found no demolition plan showing the removal of any trees, but they clearly need to be removed. Please confirm we are to remove such trees and the mitigation cost associated with such removal will be included in the Permitting Allowance as shown in Pay Item #28

A13. There are no existing trees within the proposed excavation area in the Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Department (WASD) easement. Accordingly, there are no trees designated for removal. There are 7 existing trees in conflict with the proposed walkway. The trees shall be relocated on site to a location to be determined by the City of Miami construction manager. Costs associated with the tree relocations shall be included in the clearing and grubbing pay item.

Q14. Sheet 9, sewer pump-out plans shows an existing ES-2 manhole where the new proposed 6" SDR line will connect. But the plan also shows another existing manhole further north and there is a note saying "core and connect to existing manhole" at this location. Is the plan's intention to stop at the existing ES-2 manhole? Please clarify extent of proposed sewer lines and where do they stop.

A14. The intention is to stop at ES-2. The core and connect call out on the plan view points to the wrong manhole.

Q15. Sheet LT-3 shows proposed new light poles but fail to provide a proposed height to mount fixtures. Please clarify proposed mounting height.

A15. Pole height shall be 15 feet.

Q16. Miami River Greenway Design Criteria for zone 3 requires the use of 8" light bollards at water's edge at 20' on centers. Plan design does not include any such light bollards. Please confirm there are no light bollards required for his project.

A16. There are no Light Bollards proposed under this Project. There will be solar embedded lights along the safety zone.

Q17. Sheet ST-2, due to the poor resolution quality, fails to show the location of the aluminum railings required at the west end of dock. Please clarify extent of railings at this location.

A17. Aluminum railing is shown around the platform and to the bottom of the ramp. The City has provided contractors with a more legible copy of the plans attached hereto as Exhibit 2.

Q18. Sheet ST-3 shows eight (8) new wood piles located south of the wood dock area for future use, we assumed. What are the top elevations required for these piles? Please advise.

A18. The 8 new piles shall have a top of pile elevation of 10.0'.

Q19. Sheet ST-6, section 6/ST-3 shows an aluminum ladder but we cannot find the proposed location on other plans. Please clarify location of proposed ladder.

A19. The quantities call for 2 ladders to be placed in between the first/second and second/third slips.

Q20. Sheet ST-7, detail B shows a 4" x 14" PT joist as a ledger against the existing wall. This contradicts details 4/ST-3, 5/ST-3 and 6/ST-3 which shows 3" x 12" and 3" x 14" PT ledgers. Please clarify which detail takes precedence.

A20. The section details take precedence over the framing plan.

Q21. Sheet ST-7, details A and B calls for the new 2" x 6" PT wood decking to be installed at a 45 degree angle but section details in ST-4, ST-5 and ST-6 do not mention this orientation. Please confirm wood decking is to be installed at a 45 degree angle.

A21. Wood decking shall be installed at 45 degree angle.

Q22. Sheet ST-8, detail D fails to show plan view of new concrete cap piles 30" x 60" x 24" and steel beams. We cannot determine the steel beam length without this missing view. Please provide detail showing plan view of beams and pile caps.

A22. Computer Aided Design (CAD) Layers were not shown. Revised sheet ST-8 has been provided with the missing information within the plans attached hereto as Exhibit 2.

Q23. Sheet ST-8, detail D shows 3 existing wood piles located within the ATT Utility easement and calls for them "to be cut". Please clarify at what elevations are the piles to be cut.

A23. No specific elevation is required. The piles shall be cut to clear new structural components.

Q24. Sheet ST-10 shows a new pre-cast wall/slab combination that will require a large excavation area including the 1.5:1 sloping of excavation sides. Does this area of propose excavation include existing lawn sprinklers? Please confirm, so as to determine possible repairs to sprinkler system.

A24. Please refer to Answer No. 10 above.

Q25. What is color spec for the concrete sidewalk and the concrete cap?

A25. This Project will use Scofield's color C-12 (Mesa Beige).

Q26. Will the concrete sidewalk and the concrete cap be the same elevation for the sidewalk and the seawall's concrete cap?

A26. The concrete cap is 6" above the sidewalk as shown on the plans.

Q27. The plans scale does not match with the drawing at ST-2, ST3, ST-10. Could you tell us what is the correct scale?

A27. ST-2 and ST-3 are in the correct scale, just slightly distorted on the provided prints. On ST-10 the plan scale is 1/8" =1', and the detail is not to scale (N.T.S.).

Q28. The headwall that is to be demolished does not show any elevation detail. Can you give us more information on this area?

A28. The plans provide the most extensive detail available.

Q29. Could you please provide a spec on the stone and concrete that should be used at the safety zone.

A29. Please refer to Answer No. 6 above.

Q30. What is the spec of the crushed stone that should be used to lay the headwall?

A30. The specifications within the plans identify 6" crushed stone.

Q31. If you see sheet S-2 structural note #6, and st-1 note #11.6 there is a discrepancy about the concrete resistance that should be used. Could you please clarify the concrete resistance spec that will be used for the sidewalk, concrete cap, and headwall?

A31. Please disregard structure note 6 on sheet 2. Note 11.6 on sheet ST-1 shall be adhered to regarding concrete resistance specifications.

Q32. Will the seawall in the area of the AT&T utility easement be constructed flush with the existing seawall areas or will it remain with the existing step down at the seawall?

A32. The seawall at the AT&T easement will remain, as well as the existing step down at the seawall.

Q33. Is there a spec for the fire cabinets to be used in the project (Model #, MFG, distributor, etc?)

A33. Contractor shall submit shop drawing for approval that meets plan specifications.

Q34. Is there a Specification Book for Lummus Park Landing Project?

A34. Page 1 of the construction plans states the specifications and standards to be used.

Q35. The work for the Wood Dock is missing from the excel spreadsheet.

A35. Pay item 25 - "Structure System Complete" is a lump sum item for the dock system and all the structural components.

Q36. On Page LT-2 there are SL-15 Marine lanterns, please specify where they will be located and the mounting detail.

A36. Solar Marine light locations are shown on sheet LT-2. Please refer to the legend and boat slips 1, 2 and 3 on top of the eight (8) new wood piles.


Q37. Will the city be covering the fees for the dumping of the contaminated fill?

A37. No, contaminated fill is not anticipated.

Q38. The drawings specify piles at 4'.6" from existing seawall but after field measurement they are at 3'.7". This will change the final look of the design.

A38. Existing pile locations are based upon survey data. Field measurements are unclear as to the relative measurements when compared to the survey. Bidders shall rely on the dimensions in the construction plans.

THIS ADDENDUM IS AN ESSENTIAL PORTION OF THE CONTRACT DOCUMENT AND SHALL BE MADE A PART THEREOF.


for **Annie Perez, CPPO, Director of Procurement
City of Miami Procurement Department**

This Addendum shall be signed and dated by the Bidder and submitted as proof of receipt with the submission of their Bid.

NAME OF FIRM: _____

DATE: _____

SIGNATURE: _____