



City of Miami

ADDENDUM NO. 8

February 26, 2016

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS NO.: 15-16-010

**DESIGN-BUILD SERVICES FOR THE WAGNER
CREEK/SEYBOLD CANAL RESTORATION PROJECT**

CITP PROJECT NO.: B-50643

TO ALL PROSPECTIVE BIDDERS:

The following changes, additions, clarifications and/or deletions amend the above-captioned Request for Proposals and shall become an integral part of the Proposals submitted and the Professional Services Agreement to be executed for Design-Build Services for the Wagner Creek/Seybold Canal Restoration Project – Request for Proposals No.: 15-16-010 (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 CITP website and are part of this Addendum.

- A.** The deadline for receipt of proposals for RFP 15-16-010 has been extended until March 16, 2016, at 3:00 PM (local time).
- B.** Attachment B, State Revolving Fund Program Supplementary Conditions, revised February 2014, is being replaced in its entirety with the attached revised document dated July 2015.
- C. The following are the inquiries received and the corresponding responses**
 - Q1.** Addendum 5, answer 6 provides clarification that the “Letter of Bonding Surety” is to be included in Section B. #9. Addendum 6, Section D, provides the revised content of Section B, however, no longer including the “Letter of Bonding Surety” requirement in Section B.9. Will the City please confirm that the “Letter of Bonding Surety” is no longer required at the time of submittal?
 - A1.** As stated in Section 4.1.A.4.i, Proposer shall provide letters from the bonding surety, stating that the Proposer is capable of meeting the bonding requirements contained in Attachment D, the draft Design/Build Contract. Addendum 5, answer 6 is correct. Addendum No. 6, Section D, inadvertently left off the “Letter of Bonding Surety”.

Section 4.1.C, Section B, is hereby amended to reflect the revision; addition of “Letter of Bonding Surety”.

Section B

1. RFP-QP Qualifications of the Proposer
2. Resume of the Principal-In-Charge
3. Organizational Chart of the Proposer
4. RFP-QC – Workload Capacity
5. Professional Licenses
6. State of Florida Corporate Certificate
7. Business Tax Receipt(s)
8. Insurance of Capability Letter
9. Letter from Bonding Surety
10. Joint Venture Form (if applicable)
11. RFP-RR Reporting Requirements (Listing of governmental projects requiring funding and reporting requirements for loan and grant funded projects. (Maximum 1 page for this listing)

Q2. Addendum 5, answer 6 provides clarification that form RFP-RR Reporting Requirements is to be included in Section B #11 of our response. Will the City please provide a copy of the RFP-RR form as it is not currently available on the City's website?

A2. The form RFP-RR is now available on the website at the following link:

http://www.miamigov.com/CapitalImprovements/pages/ProcurementOpportunities/ProjectPages/RFP_Forms_Wagner.asp

Q3. Addendum 5, answer 6 provides clarification that the "RFP-RR form" is to be included in Section B. #11. Addendum 6, Section D, provides the revised content of Section B, however, no longer including the "RFP-RR form" requirement in Section B.11. Will the City please confirm that the "RFP-RR form" is no longer required at the time of submittal?

A3. See response to Question No. 1.

Q4. Addendum 6, Answer #2 indicates form RFP-PI is the correct form to use in response to Section D. Page 50 of the RFP, Section 6, Qualifications of Key Personnel indicates that "3 completed projects" are required for key personnel." This section also references Form RFP-PI to be completed for the Public Information Manager. Three completed projects utilizing form RFP-PI are required. Please note, the RFP-PI form is substantially different than the required "Qualifications" forms for the other Key Personnel categories. The RFP-PI form allows for a 1 page summary of qualifications. Will the City please confirm that this is the correct form to use in response to Section D for the Qualifications of the Public Information Manager?

A4. This question has been addressed. Please refer to Addendum 7, Question 9.

Q5. Addendum 6, Answer # 25: In addition to the City's required project and reference forms, will the City permit a 1-page summary for each project which will allow respondent the opportunity to elaborate on our past the details of our experience, including similarities to the proposed scope of work? There is currently limited space on the required forms to do so.

A5. Yes.

Q6. RFP Page 57, Section F indicates that forms RFP-DB-PP-R are to be used to provide "Proposer's Project Experience Reference Form" per the minimum requirements of the RFP. Review of these required forms reveals they are more suited for Design Services with questions requesting "Value of Design Fees" and "Was the Design Completed on Time." The reference forms allow for the inclusion of minimal details regarding a Construction Project of similar scope and complexity. Would the City please modify the forms to allow for more of relevant details to be included, or as an alternative, allow for an additional page of pertinent information to be included?

A6. Proposer may use up to one additional page for pertinent information to be included.

Q7. Will the City please consider an extension to the response deadline to allow for an additional week once responses to all of inquiries have been provided?

A7. Yes. A one week extension is allowed; see Item A. above.

Q8. Addendum 5, Question 8 asked about dredging underneath all fixed structures. The answer from the City directs the contractor to Volume 2, CAP2 for the answer without further explanation. Volume 1 CAP2, page 3-5, discusses directional drilling, vacuuming, divers, etc. to remove sediment under roadway bridges and culverts. Drawings in Volume 3, CAP2 shows that dredging will not be performed under roadways based on a hatch pattern on the drawings. Please confirm that the dredging limits are anticipated to be the hatched areas on Drawings 1 through 23 shown in Volume 3 of CAP2?

A8. Previously responded to in Addendum No. 7 (Question No. 42).

For the eight bridges/culverts along the Wagner Creek/Seybold Canal dredging shall not occur within 10-feet of these structures. In addition; The Design-Build Team is required to assess structures that are within, or close to, the limits of dredging prior to the start of removal activities and recommend modifications (if needed) to the dredge prisms to avoid compromising structures. The anticipated dredging limits are indicated by the hatched areas on Drawings 2 through 23 (Volume 3 of CAP2) with the following two exceptions:

- Drawing 9 of 23 (Volume 3 of CAP2) – The area under the "Covered Concrete Bridge" is indicated as a hatched area, this is incorrect and should not be included in the dredging limits. The 10-foot offset applies to both ends of this structure.
- Drawing 10 of 23 (Volume 3 of CAP2) – The area under the "Concrete Entrance and Exit Ramps" is indicated as a hatched area, this is incorrect and should not be included in the dredging limits. The 10-foot offset applies to both ends of this structure.

Q9. Have treatability studies been performed on the material using the Super Absorbent Polymer? If so, please provide the data or provide a mix ratio/recipe to use for estimating purposes. Have treatability studies been performed with any of the reagents? Please provide a mix ratio/design to equalize pricing between contractors.

A9. Previously responded to in Addendum No. 7 (Question No. 44).

The reagents and/or amendments required for treatment of the dredged sediments are part of the Design/Build components of the solicitation. No treatability studies have been performed with any reagents and/or amendments.

Q10. Section 3.5.2.1, bullet 4, page 3-18 of the CAP Volume 1 requires "Constantly check turbidity levels". Most turbidity instruments are programmed to collect data at specified intervals. Could this be changed to every hour or other appropriate interval?

A10. Previously responded to in Addendum No. 7 (Question No. 45).

Section 3.5.2.1, bullet, page 3-18 of CAP Volume 1 is hereby changed to read; A Hach® 2100P (or equivalent) Portable Turbidity Meter will be utilized onsite to check turbidity levels at a minimum of once per hour during all work activities within Wagner Creek and Seybold Canal.

Q11. Figure 3-15 of the CAP Volume 1 shows a cartridge filter "if necessary". What is the purpose? What size does it need to be? Is this for bypass pumping? What flow rate is required? Please provide more detail or specifications.

A11. Previously responded to in Addendum No. 7 (Question No. 46).

Section 3.5.2.1, page 3-19 of Cap Volume 1 requires; "In areas where TEQ is elevated (Areas 1-2 and 1-4 of OS-1) three barriers will be used at a minimum. The compliance barrier will be placed at the endpoint of the section. In addition, a pump and filter system will be onsite to collect, filter, and return highly turbid water to the active dredging area as shown in Figures 3-15 and 3-16." This bypass pump/filter system is part of the Design/Build components of the solicitation. Additional details and specifications are not available.

Q12. Figure 3-18 of the CAP Volume 1 shows an air curtain. No other detail is provide when to use. Is it required at the confluence of the Miami River and the Canal? Is it required when dredging is occurring at the most northern part of the project area (Wagner Creek)? Please provide more detail on the design requirements.

A12. Previously responded to in Addendum No. 7 (Question No. 47).

Seybold Canal varies from approximately 60 ft. to 90 ft. wide. Seybold Canal is navigable and must remain at least partially open during the dredging process. For this reason, installation of turbidity controls spanning the canal width will not be possible. It was anticipated that the Air Curtain would be required (at a minimum) at the confluence of the Miami River and Seybold Canal. However, as stated in previous responses the Design/Build Contractor is responsible for meeting all permit requirements.

Q13. Please provide current Davis Bacon wages. The ones provided were last updated in 1990.

A13. Davis Bacon Wages were provided as an attachment to Addendum No. 7.

Q14. Cap 2, Volume 3, Section 8 provides figures that identify areas that need access agreements. Will the areas owned by the City require access agreements? Is there any cost associated with the access to be paid to the City?

A14. Previously responded to in Addendum No. 7 (Question 49).

Q15. Cap 2, Volume 3, Section 8 provides figures that identify areas that need access agreements. Will the areas owned by the City/GSA require access agreements? Is there any cost associated with the access to be paid to the CITY/GSA?

A15. Previously responded to in Addendum No. 7.

Q16. The project RFP allows for Alternative pricing and approach. Will the same point system be used for evaluation of the alternate proposal?

A16. Yes.

Q17. Attachment D, Draft Contract, Section 7.6 states: "Builder's Risk/Installation Floater (if applicable)". This is not typically required for projects of similar scope. Please confirm if this requirement is applicable for this project? If yes, does this need to be referenced in the Insurance Capability Letter required as part of Section B of the Proposal?

A17. The Builder's Risk/Installation Floater requirement is not applicable for this project.

Q18. Addendum No. 6, Answer 16 (A16.) states: "As shown in Figure 3-4 (in the CAP2), only two reaches in Wagner Creek OS-1 exhibited TEQs above the FDEP guideline set for local Class 1 non-hazardous waste landfill disposal of > 1 ppb as follows:

1. The second sub-section of OS-1 (designated as Section 1-2) is approximately 588 ft. in length and extends from sample location CES-3 (station 2+76) down to CH-02-04 (station 8+64)
2. The fourth sub-section of OS-1 (designated as Section 1-4) is approximately 178 ft. in length and extends from sample location CH-02-06 (station 11 +52) down to CH-08 (station 13+30)."

The dredged sediments from portions of the canal with TEO levels \leq 1 part per billion (ppb) will be sent to the closest Subtitle D non-hazardous landfills. The dredged material from "hot" areas will be segregated for disposal at a designated disposal facility outside the State of Florida when estimated TEO concentrations are above 1 ppb ("hot"). These dredged sediments will be sent to a designated landfill in Emelle, Alabama (or similar).

The quantities listed in Table 2-4 are to be used for cost estimating purposes." AND The CAP2, Section 2.10 also states that > 1ppb sediments are located in OS-2.

Question: Is the Price Proposal Form going to be modified to reflect this? The current Price Proposal Form has TEQ > 1 ppb in OS-2. If no, how should Proposer's bid?

A18. The response to Addendum No. 6, Answer 16 was incomplete. In reviewing sample results within OS-2 there is one additional reach within OS-2 that exhibited TEQs marginally above the FDEP guideline set for local Class 1 non-hazardous waste landfill disposal of > 1 part per billion (ppb) as follows:

- The third subsection of OS-2 (designated as Section 2-3) is approximately 265 ft. in length and extends from sample location CH-02-09 (station 19+10) down to CH-02-10 (station 21+27)

The dredged sediments from portions of the canal with TEO levels \leq 1 ppb will be sent to the closest Subtitle D non-hazardous landfill. The dredged material from "hot" areas will be segregated for disposal at a designated disposal facility outside the State of Florida when estimated TEO concentrations are above 1 ppb ("hot"). These dredged sediments will be sent to a designated landfill in Emelle, Alabama (or similar).

The quantities listed in the Attachment C: Price Proposal Forms are to be used for cost estimating purposes. **"Transportation and Disposal a – TEQ > 1 μ g/kg 1,684 TONS"** is correct.

- Q19.** RFP Addendum No. 6, Answer to Question number 22 (A22) states: "In the event that a property owner refuses to sign or even discuss or dispute survey results, the City will utilize an adjudication process to resolve the dispute and allow the Design Build Firm to proceed."
a) What timeframe should the contractor assume for the City to initiate and finalize their adjudication process and give Notice to Proceed to the Contractor for each property that meets this criteria? **b)** Would you allow the awarded bidder to propose adjustments to the price for delays associated with this process?
- A19.** **a)** This project is a priority to the City. The City will expedite all actions pertaining to this project to the extent possible. **b)** Pursuant to Section 15 of the draft Contract, titles, Design-Build Firm's Responsibility for Damages and Accidents, the Design-Build Firm shall accept full responsibility for Work against losses or damages of whatever nature sustained until Final Acceptance by the City. If there is a provision in the contract that the Proposer would like to suggest to the City to consider, please follow the procedure for doing so in the Solicitation.
- Q20.** RFP Addendum No. 6 introduced Section 01 29 00, Payment Procedures. Should all of this Section be considered by bidders or were only the referenced Subsections (1.02, Schedule of Values; 1.03, Estimated Progress Payments; and 1.04, Application for Payment) intended for consideration?
- A20.** All of Section 01 29 00, Payment Procedures shall be considered by Proposers to be incorporated in the solicitation.
- Q21.** Section 01 29 00, Payment Procedures, Section 1.06 D states: "Disposal cost for the sediment shall be paid by the Owner. Design-Builder shall be responsible for the cost, scheduling, and coordination of transportation. What specific landfills does the city want the contractor to price transportation to for each type of sediment (TEQ > 1ppb and TEQ < 1ppb) that the City will be paying the disposal for? Please provide the following for each landfill named in the answer to the above:
- a. All Acceptance Criteria for Disposal Acceptance (geotechnical, analytical, and frequency of testing to be performed)
 - b. Who is responsible for performing the required testing? (Owner or contractor)
 - c. Acceptable reagents and their allowed dosing
 - d. Daily tonnage schedules allowed for this project (including Saturdays)
 - e. Contact Name, Address, Office Phone, Cell Phone and Email
 - f. Any specific transportation routes that have to be used
 - g. Who will be performing the approval of the waste streams to the landfill
 - h. Who is responsible for getting/preparing the manifests

- i. Who will be signing the manifests on behalf of the Owner? What will their availability be?

A21. The Design-Build Firm is responsible for the cost, scheduling and coordination of transportation. In addition, the Design-Build Firm is responsible for identifying and contracting with the appropriate landfills, meeting or exceeding all acceptance criteria required, performing the required sampling/testing for disposal approval, identifying the acceptable reagents and dosing amounts, preparing and maintaining the waste manifests and signing the manifests on behalf of the Owner.

Q22. With regard to sediment testing: What physical and chemical analyses are required for the pre-dredge sediment testing? Only dioxins to determine TEQ, or tests such as Metals, VOCs, SVOCs, etc. which were tested previously? Where is the pre dredge sediment testing required? The entire canal or only OS-1 and OS-2? Will sediment testing be conducted at the same locations as conducted by CH2M Hill in 2008/2009? Will three (3) samples be needed at each testing location?

A22. The June and July 2008 sediment samples for chemical analysis (for the sole purpose of determining waste classification for disposal) and physical characterization were collected at 45 locations (see Volume 3, Section 6) along the entire project length of Wagner Creek and Seybold Canal (8,850 ± ft), and distributed as follows:

- 33 sample transects spaced at 200-ft intervals along Wagner Creek
- 11 sample transects spaced at 200-ft intervals along Seybold Canal
- 1 additional sample taken north of the NW 15th St Bridge (Sample 45)

In addition to the 45 primary locations, 5 field duplicate (quality control) samples were collected for a total of 50 samples. To facilitate pre-dredge sediment testing for waste classification, samples will be collected by the Design-Builder from, and analysis performed on, 23 sample locations (odd numbered transects identified in the CAP 2, Volume 3, Section 6) to determine the disposal characteristics. The sample from each location will be a single composite sample produced from the full dredge depth.

All sediment samples will be analyzed for chemical properties and physical characteristics as follows:

- Dioxins/Furans
- Metals
- Volatile organic compounds (VOCs)
- Semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs)
- Pesticides/Herbicides
- Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs)
- Florida Petroleum Range Organics (FLPRO)
- Ignitability
- Corrosivity
- Paint Filter

Q23. The RFP, Addendum 5, and Addendum 6 provide differing requirements for Section B (Section 4.1.C, Section B) and Section C (Section 4.1.C, Section C). The differences are provided in the table below:

RFP, Section B:	Addendum 5, Section B:	Addendum 6, Section B:
1. RFP-QP Qualifications of the Proposer 2. Resume of the Principal-In-Charge 3. Organizational Chart of the Proposer 4. RFP-WC – Workload Capacity 5. Professional Licenses 6. State of Florida Corporate Certificate 7. Business Tax Receipt(s) 8. Insurance of Capability Letter 9. Joint Venture Form (if applicable)	1. RFP-QP Qualifications of the Proposer 2. Resume of the Principal-In-Charge 3. Organizational Chart of the Proposer 4. RFP-QC - Workload Capacity 5. Professional Licenses 6. State of Florida Corporate Certificate 7. Business Tax Receipt(s) 8. Insurance of Capability Letter 9. <u>Letter from Bonding Surety</u> 10. Joint Venture Form (if applicable) 11. <u>RFP-RR Reporting Requirements</u>	1. RFP-QP Qualifications of the Proposer 2. Resume of the Principal-In-Charge 3. Organizational Chart of the Proposer 4. RFP-QC - Workload Capacity 5. Professional Licenses 6. State of Florida Corporate Certificate 7. Business Tax Receipt(s) 8. Insurance of Capability Letter 9. Joint Venture Form (if applicable) 10. <u>Listing of governmental projects requiring funding and reporting requirements for loan and grant funded projects. (Maximum 1 page for this listing)</u>
RFP, Section C:	Addendum 5, Section C:	Addendum 6, Section C:
1. RFP-QT – Qualifications of Team 2. <i>4a-4c from Section 4.1A .4 – Qualifications of the Team (excluding resumes for Project & Construction Manager)</i> 3. Organizational Chart of the Team 4. List of similar projects where Key Personnel have worked together previously	A4. a) Section 4.1 .C, Section C2, is hereby revised to read "4a-4c, Section 4.1 .A.5, Qualifications of the Team (excluding resumes for Project and Construction Manager)."	1. RFP-QT - Qualifications of Team. 2. <i>4a-4c from Section 4.1A .4 - Qualifications of the Team (excluding resumes for Project & Construction Manager).</i> 3. Organizational Chart of the Team. 4. List of similar projects where Key Personnel have worked together previously. 5. <u>Listing of governmental projects requiring funding and reporting compliance (e.g., grants, loans, etc.) (Maximum 1 page for this listing)</u>

- a) Please confirm what documents are required in the proposal and their order for Section B and Section C?
- b) We wonder if the correction to Section C in Addendum 5 (A4) should have been corrected to read: 5a, Section 4.1.A.5 vice 4a-4c, Section 4.1A.5. There are no subparagraphs 4a-4c in 4.1.A.5 and paragraphs 5b and 5c correspond to items 3 and 4 already in the list. So essentially, the second line item of Section C is a resume for each of the Key Personnel with the exception of the Project Manager and Construction Manager. Please confirm?

A23. a) Refer to Response to Question No. 1, as the Section 4.1.C has been revised to reflect the forms needed. b) Section 4.1.c, Section 2, is hereby revised as follows: "Section

4.1.A.5, Section 5a, Qualifications of the Team (excluding resumes for Project and Construction Managers)".

Q24. Question: If vegetation/trees need to be removed to get proper access, will a tree survey be required?

A24. Yes a tree survey will be required. A tree permit is also required for the planting, alterations or removal of trees, shrubs or other planting.

Q25. What physical and chemical analyses are required to comply with Miami Dade's DERM's post dredge quarterly surface water testing (specific condition #9)?

A25. At a minimum, physical and chemical analyses including total suspended solids, total dissolved solids, Dioxins/furans, PCBs, SVOCs, VOCs, trace elements, organics, metals, minerals, nutrients, bacteria, major inorganics, pH, oxidation-reduction potential, dissolved oxygen, conductivity, fecal coliform, turbidity, temperature and salinity shall be performed consistent with the Project Permits. Sampling shall include upgradient and downgradient locations as appropriate and as approved by DERM.

Q26. How often is noise sampling required?

A26. The noise sampling is required consistent with the permits.

Q27. a) Given this project is receiving federal funds, is the awarded contractor able to have employees providing professional services more than 40 hours a week given the work effort required? b) If yes, does this require payment of time and half for work performed beyond 40 hours a week? c) Will the County provide authorization in writing?

A27. a) The awarded Design-Build Firm is able to have employees providing professional services more than 40 hours a week. b) Any compensation has to be consistent with the applicable funding sources' laws, rules and regulations. c) This response is included in the solicitation and is legally binding subject to the negotiation of the agreement.

Q28. RFP Section 1.14 identifies major sub-consultants but this definition does not include the definition of major subcontractors. Please provide the definition of major subcontractor.

A28. The term "major sub-consultants" can be used interchangeably to describe "major subcontractors".

Q29. Which subcontractors must sign 6.3 Debarment and Suspension affidavit?

A29. The Debarment and Suspension Affidavit is required to be signed by all subcontractors and subconsultants listed in the Design-Build Firm's proposal.

Q30. Form RFP-C (file name RFP_C_Contract_Financial_Compliance_Capabilities2015) which is required in Section F Design and Construction Approach does not allow more than one line of text in the narrative block. Will you provide a file that allows text entered in the narrative area?

A30. The file that allows text entered in the narrative area is now online at the following link:

http://www.miamigov.com/CapitalImprovements/pages/ProcurementOpportunities/ProjectPages/RFP_Forms_Wagner.asp

- Q31.** RFP Page 74 gives a form for the Proposer to sign certifying compliance with Ordinance 13331. Please confirm this is not required as a result of waiving of CBE/CSBE requirements.
- A31.** As a result of waiving the CBE/CSBE requirements, this form is no longer required.
- Q32.** Can Proposers add page numbers and a header with their name and RFP reference to the final technical proposal volume? This is needed in order to provide the required TOC in Section A (RFP page 48, 4.1.A).
- A32.** Yes
- Q33.** Form RFP-QP Qualifications of the Proposer has two fields that are linked so that when one field is populated, it populates the other field. The two fields are page one, Type of Firm: Other and page two, Number of Employees: Other (list). Is this auto-populate feature intended? If no, will a new form be provided?
- A33.** Yes.
- Q34.** Form RFP-WC forms include a table to identify projects as well as a section for identifying availability of the key person for this effort. There is no direction on how the table is to be completed. Do we list current workload/projects or expected workload/projects at the time of this work starting? a) Will you allow the forms availability section to be completed only and skipping completion of the table? b) If no, please provide more guidance on how you want the table completed.
- A34.** Please complete Form RFP-WC – Workload Capacity for Key Personnel’s current workload.
- Q35.** The requirement for the RFP-WC forms falls within the “Qualifications of the Proposer” section of the proposal. If a Key Person is being supplied by a subcontractor, is a form for that person still required?
- A35.** Form RFP-WC is required for all Key Personnel listed in the Design-Build Firm’s proposal response to the RFP.
- Q36.** The Alternate Technical Concept Proposal requires we bold text to distinguish new information from the Base Technical Proposal. The RFP-DAP form does not allow text to be bolded. Will you allow the ATC to start on a blank page where formatting will allow us to bold text?
- A36.** Yes.
- Q37.** Price Proposal Form, Attachment C includes “Permit Fee Allowance”, Bid Item 4. Please provide direction as to what amount should be entered (if any) for this item number.
- A37.** Please utilize a quantity of \$10,000 for Bid Item 4, Permit Fee Allowance.

- Q38.** Can the City please provide a more detailed version of the Measurement and Payment Specifications Section that explains what costs the City would like to see included in the various line items?
- A38.** The City provided examples of the reporting requirements under each funding source in the RFP. The Design-Build Firm is expected to provide sufficient detail to enable the City to verify and comply with all reimbursement requirements.
- Q39.** Price Proposal Forms, all line items labeled Dredge Water Treatment and Drying reagent (e.g., 19 and 20) throughout the bid. Is the contractor responsible for additional quantities above the amount entered on the bid form? Or will the City treat it like Bid items 16, 17 and 18 and pay for additional quantities above those stated?
- A39.** Estimated quantities for both Dredge Water Treatment and Drying Reagent(s), along with the appropriate unit pricing should be entered onto the Price Proposal Forms. During the proposal evaluations (pre-award), the quantities and prices shall be evaluated for reasonableness. Additional quantities in excess of the quantities entered on the Price Proposal Forms (during execution of the project) will be paid for at the unit rate provided.

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



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

This Addendum shall be signed by an authorized representative and dated by the Proposer and submitted as proof of receipt with the submission of the Proposal.

NAME OF FIRM: _____

DATE: _____

SIGNATURE: _____