ADDENDUM NO. 2 TO BID DOCUMENTS

FOR

OYSTER BAYOU MARSH RESTORATION PROJECT (CS-59)

CAMERON PARISH, LOUISIANA

STATE OF LOUISIANA
COASTAL PROTECTION AND RESTORATION AUTHORITY

AUGUST 2, 2016
This addendum shall be considered part of the Bid Documents (except as noted otherwise) and is issued to change, amplify, or delete from or otherwise explain these documents where provisions of this addendum differ from those of the original documents. This addendum shall have precedence over the original documents and shall govern.

I. Responses to Questions/Comments Submitted by Contractors:

Contractor Question/Comment (1): In Part III technical specifications TS-2 Pre-Construction Surveys, Section 2.3 Gulf of Mexico Borrow Area will a Teledyne Odom Mark 3 single beam at 200 KHz be classified as equivalent to the Model 449 Innerspace at 209 KHz?

CPRA Response (1): Yes.

Contractor Question/Comment (2): Can you provide the length of primary containment dikes for each individual marsh creation area and pond creation areas?

CPRA Response (2):

Primary Containment:
- Marsh Creation Area 1: 13,336 linear feet
- Marsh Creation Area 2: 8,723 linear feet
- Marsh Creation Area 3: 14,406 linear feet
- Marsh Creation Area 4: 8,576 linear feet

Secondary Containment
- Marsh Creation Area 1:
  - 313 linear feet
  - 308 linear feet
  - 275 linear feet
- Marsh Creation Area 2:
  - 1647 linear feet

Contractor Question/Comment (3): Is it possible to use temporary Traffic Signals in lieu of 24/7 flaggers?

CPRA Response (3): Yes.

Contractor Question/Comment (4): Any site access restrictions during hunting season?

CPRA Response (4): Please refer to the land rights agreements provided at the link listed in Appendix XII.
Contractor Question/Comment (5): 2.1 (Pre-Construction Marsh Survey) states “Drawings of the plan views, cross sections, and calculations of project quantities of materials shall be developed from this survey by the contractor and submitted to the Engineer for review”. Please elaborate on what is to be submitted for this requirement and required format for drawings.

CPRA Response (5): XYZ data, field notes, and PDF drawings (plan view, cross sections) are required. Drawings shall be generated in AutoCAD and shall be 11”x17”. A table providing fill template densities by station shall be provided. Electronic submittals are acceptable.

Contractor Question/Comment (6): 2.1.3 (Grade Stakes) dictates that stakes “shall be composed of cane poles or metal conduit pipe”. It may be more practical to use 3-4” diameter pvc for staking in marsh creation area. Will this be acceptable?

CPRA Response (6): The specification will remain as written; cane poles and metal conduit pipe are acceptable materials for grade stakes.

Contractor Question/Comment (7): 2.2 (Magnetometer Survey) states that “All pipelines located within 150’ of …..dredge pipeline corridor shall be probed for depth and their locations marked….”. Please confirm that any pipelines along pipeline corridor (+20’ of water) shall be probed and marked.

CPRA Response (7): All pipelines within the dredge pipeline corridor shall be probed and marked.

Contractor Question/Comment (8): 3.1.1 (Marsh) states “it is anticipated that the constructed marsh may be in semi-liquid state and conventional surveying may be difficult. Contractor must propose their as-built survey method….”. Will GPS/RTK collection be required with 6” diameter metal rod base plates (as specified in 2.1.1)? If not required, then what survey precision is required? Any particular restriction on transportation equipment (tracked equipment dis-allowed, etc)?

CPRA Response (8): The same precision is required for this survey as that for all other surveys. There are no restrictions on transportation equipment. The survey plan will be evaluated by the Engineer prior to approval.

Contractor Question/Comment (9): 3.1.1 (Marsh) states “The contractor shall collect check profiles in the marsh fill areas as required by the engineer”. With this item being lump sum, please provide anticipated schedule for these check profiles.

CPRA Response (9): Check surveys may be required at any time but will likely be required as fill material approaches the template grade. Check surveys are not required to be certified by a Professional Land Surveyor.
Contractor Question/Comment (10): 3.1.1 (Marsh) states “Two parallel profiles along the length of each fill source shall be collected after construction of containment and prior to marsh fill”. Please clarify where these profiles will be taken.

CPRA Response (10): Primary and secondary dike adjacent fill sources shall be surveyed.

Contractor Question/Comment (11): Reference Technical Specifications, TS-4.7. Are there any known large debris items existing within the marsh fill areas, i.e. boats, appliances, etc.?

CPRA Response (11): Small items may be present that may include but are not limited to tires, barrels, etc. It is not known for certain if large debris items are present within the project limits.

Contractor Question/Comment (12): Reference Technical Specifications, TS-10.1. Please identify specifically and provide points of contact for the “individual controlling agencies”.

CPRA Response (12): Please refer to the landowner agreements located at the link provided in Appendix XII. In addition to the landowners, the Office of Coastal Management may be a stakeholder.

Contractor Question/Comment (13): Reference Technical Specifications, TS-14.4. and project drawings Sheets 18 and 19. The borrow area horizontal limits are represented as vertical slopes. The specification clarifies that material sloughing on the side slopes will not be considered a permit violation. Please also clarify if material that sloughs from the side slopes will be measured and paid at the Hydraulic Dredging unit rate. Please provide this clarification for both the perimeter limits of the borrow area, and also for the slopes between the various subsections within the borrow area.

CPRA Response (13): Material outside of the borrow area limits will not be paid for. Material excavated within the limits of the borrow area may qualify for payment at the Hydraulic Dredging unit rate regardless of the location relative to the subsections within the borrow area.

Contractor Question/Comment (14): Reference Technical Specifications, TS-14.7. Although it’s highly unlikely that unacceptable material will be encountered from the borrow area, the burden of responsibility for remediating unacceptable material is inappropriately being placed on the Contractor. Barring Contractor negligence, the responsibility for payment for remediation of unacceptable material should be with the Owner. Please remove this section or modify the language of this section accordingly.

CPRA Response (14): Please refer to the geotechnical data provided in Appendix IV to assess potential risk of unacceptable material.
Contractor Question/Comment (15): Reference project drawings Sheet 26. The southerly limit of excavation on the south side of the highway does not provide adequate space in which to insert dredge pipeline into the concrete casing pipe and to transition the pipeline to the existing ground surface toward the Gulf. Please investigate whether the excavation could be sloped to the south, over the fiber optic cable, to ease the transition of the pipe from the casing pipe to the ground surface.

CPRA Response (15): This option may be allowed upon agreement between the Contractor and the fiber optic line owner.

Contractor Question/Comment (16): Please provide more detail of how the casing caps should be attached the concrete casing pipe at the highway crossing, after removal of the dredge pipeline from the casing.

CPRA Response (16): Per recommendations from DOTD, the casing pipe caps shall be attached in a manner that is not water-tight. The Contractor shall provide methodology in the Work Plan for approval.

Contractor Question/Comment (17): Reference TS-12.3. The project plans call for a 51” OD concrete casing pipe to be installed under Highway 27/82. The Contractor is having difficulty sourcing the specific casing pipe shown; however, alternates are more readily available. Will CPRA consider alternate LA DOTD approved concrete pipe (i.e. 48” RCP pipe with 8ft joints) that conforms to the dimensions/wall thicknesses/offsets/etc. that are given in the project plans and specifications?

CPRA Response (17): CPRA will consider a request to change the diameter of the reinforced concrete pipe. Alternate pipe dimensions shall be included in the Work Plan for approval by DOTD.

Contractor Question/Comment (18): Sheet 23 of the project plans, Note #2 states that, “During phase 1 of the permanent casing pipe installation, flaggers shall be used (24/7). Portable light plants shall be installed at each flagger station, and if night operations are conducted, portable light plants shall be used at the work site.” Due to safety concerns associated with flagger activity in low visibility, night time operations, inclement weather, etc., will CPRA allow the use of LA DOTD approved temporary traffic signals to control the flow of traffic in the vicinity of the pipe casing installation?

CPRA Response (18): Yes.

Contractor Question/Comment (19): Reference TS-12.3. The Contractor is concerned about the possible long cure times associated with floable fill in the project location. Will CPRA consider LA DOTD approved Class 2 610 limestone (or similar) as a substitute to flowable fill found in the specifications?

CPRA Response (19): Alternates to the specified flowable fill may be considered. The Contractor shall propose alternate materials in the Work Plan for approval by CPRA and DOTD.
Contractor Question/Comment (20): There is no mention of any detail as-built surveys of the containment dikes/borrow canals for Areas 1 through 4. It seems that this would be necessary to calculate accurate volumes pre and post fill construction. Please advise.

CPRA Response (20): Payment volumes are based on the volume of material excavated from the marsh borrow area.

Contractor Question/Comment (21): Will Transect Line limits for Marsh Pre-Construction Surveys be from Station 35+00 to 85+00? The Engineering Plans show Profiles for 0+00 to 90+00 and Terraces have their specific Profiles. Please advise.

CPRA Response (21): Profile lines from Station 35+00 to 85+00 will be required for the marsh pre-construction survey. Survey data along profile lines from Station 0+00 to Station 30+00 are shown in the Construction Plans for informational purposes to show existing conditions.

Contractor Question/Comment (22): Can you please confirm that the project baseline begins at Highway 82 (POB) coordinates on page 2 of the plans and extends north thru Marsh creation site 3 and 2 and ends to the east of Terrace # 31 (POE) coordinates on page 2. We are required to stakeout the baseline as per the specifications 4.6 Layout for Hydraulic Fill Placement paragraph 4.6.5 Site Layout prior to construction. The baseline doesn’t extend all the way to station 0+00 and it appears to stop at station 15+00. We will be required to stake out the remaining 1500’, if so can you provide the coordinates for station 0+00?

CPRA Response (22): Baseline points listed on Sheet 2 are correct. The Contractor will not be required to stake out the length between Station 0+00 and 15+00.

Contractor Question/Comment (23): REF. NO. 20 Flowable Fill: Is this excavatable or non-excavatable?

CPRA Response (23): Flowable fill shall be excavatable.

Contractor Question/Comment (24): Will the JMF be submitted to LADOTD for their approval?

CPRA Response (24): The Job Mix Formula is required and will be submitted to DOTD for approval.
Contractor Question/Comment (25): What defines acceptable borrow area elevations before moving to a new area?

CPRA Response (25): If practicable, the borrow area subsection shall be dredged in its entirety to the Maximum AD Elevation.

Contractor Question/Comment (26): Will the material that sloughs from outside borrow area limits be considered for payment?

CPRA Response (26): Material outside of the borrow area limits will not be paid for.

Contractor Question/Comment (27): Does the engineer have a design pit to fill ratio?

CPRA Response (27): A cut to fill ratio of 1.5:1 was assumed.

Contractor Question/Comment (28): We would like to request the budget estimate for this project.

CPRA Response (28): The Engineer’s Opinion of Probable Cost is $18-20M.

Contractor Question/Comment (29): Please give more specifics on the REF. NO. 24 Casing Pipe Cap. Please give a make and model for reference on this item. Plan sheet 36 and TS-10 are not specific on the anchoring of the cap to the pipe, or to what type of sign or lettering is to be attached to the front of the pipe cap. Please clarify.

CPRA Response (29): TS-10 and Plan Sheet 36 show the requirements for the casing pipe cap. Aside from those specified, the Contractor may propose other specifications in his Work Plan for approval. The Contractor may propose methods for attaching the caps to the casing pipe; the only requirement is that the connection shall not be water tight.