



Sammy H. Rich, *City Manager*
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SERVICES
W. Kirk Milam, P.E., *Manager*
Public Works Division
Chris Jenkins, *Director*
Water and Sewer Division
Michael Hackett, *Director*
Engineering Services Department
Aaron Carroll, R.L.S., P.E., *Director*
Rome Transit Department
Kathy Shealy, *Director*

ADDENDUM NO. 1
UNITY POINT REHABILITATION AND RECONSTRUCTION
DESIGN/BUILD SERVICES
(RFP No. 005-18)

Proceedings of Pre-Proposal Conference

February 22, 2018, 10:00 AM
Sam King Room, City Hall

Staff Present: Mr. Kirk Milam, P.E., Public Services Manager
Mr. Chris Jenkins, Public Works Division Director
Mr. Mike Hackett, Water and Sewer Division Director
Ms. Johnna Allen, Purchasing Director
Ms. Margaret Hollingsworth, Public Works Division Office Manager

Attendees: Register attached

Mr. Milam welcomed everyone and introduced himself and staff members to the attendees present. He noted that the presentation would highlight various portions of the Request For Proposals as it was published and advertised on the City's website as well as showing some pictures of the job sites. Questions would be taken and addressed at the end of the presentation. Both the PowerPoint presentation and questions addressed are to be incorporated into Addendum No.1 and made available for viewing and download on the City's website.

Background: The project is being funded through the City of Rome's 2013 SPLOST and has an allocation of \$1.8 million.

It is contemplated as a singular contract for the two project sites. Although the sites are close in geographical proximity to one another the projects are very different in scope.

Mr. Milam noted that if the Proposal is made jointly by more than one company as through some partnership, then the form of the partnership must be disclosed along with the qualifications of each of the parties.

Site No.1 - Unity Point

PowerPoint slides were shown depicting Unity Point located at the confluence of the Oostanaula and Etowah Rivers. It is accessed through a private gravel lot through which the City has access rights for maintenance purposes. Mr. Milam presented photos of different views of the site noting that improvements were originally constructed by the Rome-Floyd Recreation Department in conjunction with the 1996 Olympics. The site was originally terraced and landscaped but has been fenced-off from public access due to safety concerns.

Mr. Milam noted there is a sewer siphon box within the site that is a critical part of our sanitary sewer system. It is the point where sewer collection from the east and north sides of the rivers comes before the wastewater is siphoned across the Etowah River. The box must be entirely preserved throughout the project and must remain accessible for maintenance purposes and its operation upon completion.

The original landscape design had pavers on top of this box which were a little problematic to performing repairs and maintenance to the siphon box, although the City has no objection to the public walking on top of this box. The City will need to be able to get small cranes in there as well as large trucks to access the hatch cover of the box.

Access to Site No.1 for project construction by way of the gravel lot, which is private property, will be up to the contractor to negotiate with the property owner at this point. Alternative access across public property is available by passing under the Robert Redden Bridge from the street on the opposite side.

The City's objective for the project is to 1) stabilize this site's riverbank and prevent the loss of any more of the footprint as well as to 2) restore safe public access to this location.

Site No.2 - The Center Pier of the Robert Redden Bridge

PowerPoint slides were shown depicting the second site which is the center pier of the Robert Redden Bridge. It was constructed in the early 1900's as a railroad bridge. The center pier was a pivot for the bridge above to allow for river traffic but has not been operational for many years. The City wants to make sure the bridge continues to be functional and stable for years to come. There is a good deal of deterioration around the center pier. The City requires that the design be prepared by a Professional Engineer licensed in the state of Georgia and someone who is qualified to do bridge work for the Georgia DOT even though this is not a DOT project nor a DOT structure.

General Proposal Requirements:

Mr. Milam highlighted the following Proposal requirements:

- The Proposal must include items listed in the RFP.
- Major tasks should be broken down by project site.
- Milestones for monitoring the project progress should be identified in the schedule.
- The schedule should be relatable to the cost proposal particularly as it may pertain to when billing will take place and what will be accomplished for certain billing triggers.
- Site specific differences in the schedule are permissible but both sites must progress throughout the contract time.
- The Proposal must include a cost proposal itemized by phase of activities (i.e. preconstruction and construction), and breaking out the cost by major tasks including those for sub-contractors. This itemized cost should also correlate with the anticipated basis for invoicing.
- The Bid Form contains a singular space for entering a total cost which is the aggregate of the broken down costs.

Mr. Milam noted that the City has not prescribed the form of the Contract Agreement, so the RFP is requesting that the Proposal suggest what form of agreement is being anticipated and to include a sample of it. The form of the Contract Agreement will not enter into the weighting of the elements of the Proposal nor affect the ranking of the proposals.

Proposal Evaluation Process:

The Evaluation Team is made-up of staff in attendance that will be looking at the Proposals. The initial evaluation will result in a short list of Proposals based on a ranking from the weighting of the components in them. The short list will identify those to be interviewed to clarify our understanding of the Proposal and give the bidders and contractors an opportunity to explain the content of their Proposals more fully. The City will not be revealing the short list until a final recommendation of award is ready for the City Commission. At that time all information about the short list and ranking of Proposals will be made public.

The Proposals will be opened on Thursday March 15th in this room (the Sam King Room) at 10:00 AM. The Bid Form will be opened and read but the other details will not be made available until the end of the entire process. Mr. Milam instructed that any questions or interpretations should be made to his attention at the postal address provided in the RFP or the email address shown on the PowerPoint slide.

This concluded the presentation.

Mr. Milam opened the floor for questions, which are detailed as follows:

Questions and Answers:

1. **Q:** What route can you take to access Site No.1?

A: City crews can access the site through the gravel lot and enter through a gate along the chain link fence currently around the siphon box. The current gate and fence was installed for safety and is not intended to remain. There is also a safety fence along the steep embankment on the Etowah River side.

The Contractor can freely access the site from the public street east of the site and under the Robert Redden Bridge. The Contractor may be able to negotiate with the property owner for access to the site through the gravel lot.

2. **Q:** Can you clarify what you mean by “ensuring the structural integrity” of the Robert Redden Bridge? Are there known problems?

A: There has been no structural analysis of the bridge or center pier. The City’s assessment has been based on visual inspection such as the loss of metal at the base of the pier. The use of that bridge has changed dramatically in that it no longer carries the load of a train and is used by pedestrians only. There have been no other issues to report. The City’s desire is that the center pier be qualified structurally to continue in its role to support the pedestrian bridge for a reasonable future period of time (say 30 years).

3. **Q:** Are there surveys available?

A: The RFP showed a property survey of Unity Point (Site No.1) and the City will provide a detailed topographic survey for that site, as well as elevation control for Site No.2, at the beginning of the engineering phase. The City doesn’t have any design drawings for the bridge at all.

4. **Q:** Is it up to bidders to evaluate the whole center pier since there appears to be leakage all the way up the pier? Do you want the whole thing encased?

A: The City is not expecting that the entire height of the pier will be encased. However, if there is an assessment that the City must address some particular defect in the pier or a significant structural failure will result, in 30 years for example, then the City desires to include those repairs in the scope of the project. Right now, the visual inspection of the base of the pier’s steel cylinder wall is a condition that the City particularly wants to address at this time.

5. **Q:** Does the City envision the siphon box at Unity Point to be completely open for pedestrians or to have a security fence around the box?

A: The City doesn't mind if the public gets on top of the box and removal of the majority of fencing currently on the site is expected. The City will maintain and/or replace the siphon box hatch as appropriate and outside the scope of this project to preserve functionality of the facility in a public environment. The landscaping design for the site previously had pavers on top of the box that couldn't stand up to the heavy trucks that occasionally must access the box. Consequently, any new design must consider the nature of post construction maintenance activities as much as the pedestrian access.

The most likely post construction, heavy maintenance activity will be on the three siphon lines that leave the box to cross the river. The City needs access for a boom truck or an excavator on the Etowah River side of the box for that purpose. Leaving the existing embankment largely undisturbed is the main reason to consider the long term provision of a safety fence on that side of the siphon box if the box is accessible to the public. Similarly, if there is any landscaping to be done along that side or slope then it should utilize relatively low cost, easily replaceable materials.

6. **Q:** Does the City want a pedestrian access feature at Unity Point that goes down to the water?

A: The City has no objection to a new feature going closer to the water level, but a principal objective is not to lose any more of the point by way of erosion. Providing access to the edge of the water is not a required feature. Bidders are reminded that the Corps of Engineers may regulate changes along the existing embankment in the permitting process. The City also desires the site design be attractive from the river since the recreational use of the rivers is a very important aspect of life in Rome. The City is open to design alternatives for the Site as long as the budget is maintained.

7. **Q:** Will there be any extension of the bid opening date?

A: At this time the bid opening date remains as advertised. Proposals should be prepared and submitted using the Bidder's best understanding of the services requested. Any limitations on what the Bidder can provide or accomplish pertaining to the work that has been requested should be fully described in the Proposal.

8. **Q:** Will there be any additional funds available for the work contemplated?

A: The funding that is available through SPLOST has been described in the RFP.
No additional funding has been otherwise dedicated at this time.

Attachments incorporated by reference: Register of Attendees
PowerPoint Presentation (30 slides, 23MB)

**The Proposal must acknowledge the receipt
of this Addendum on the Bid Form.
(Amended Bid Form attached)**

Pre-Proposal Conference Register

Unity Point Rehabilitation and Reconstruction
Design/Build Services
(RFP No. 005-18)

1. Mr. Mark Cochran
Cevian Design Lab
202 Broad St., Suite 200
Rome, GA 30161
(706) 512-6312
mark@civiandesign.com
2. Mr. D. Aubrey Harper
Crown
1849 Morrison Campground Rd.
Rome, GA 30161
(706) 528-7716
aubharper@gmail.com
3. Ms. Audrey Kendrick
Cevian Design Lab
202 Broad St., Suite 200
Rome, GA 30161
(828) 773-9775
audrey@ceviandesign.com
4. Mr. Michael Terrell
Scott Bridge Co. Inc.
2641 Interstate Dr.
Opelika, AL 36803
(334) 749-5045
mterrell@scottbridge.com
5. Mr. Derek Westfall
S&ME, Inc.
4350 River Glen Parkway, Bldg. 200
Duluth, GA 30096
(770) 476-5045
dwestfall@smeinc.com

BID FORM

TO: City of Rome – Purchasing Department
ATTN: JOHNNNA M. ALLEN
P.O. Box 1433
601 Broad Street
Rome, Georgia 30162-1433

RFP No. 005-18 –“Unity Point Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Design/Build Services”

Quantity	Description	Unit Price
1	Design/Build Services	\$ _____

Expected Completion Date: _____

All bids submitted shall be subject to acceptance or rejection and the City of Rome specifically reserves the right to accept or reject any or all bids, to waive any technicalities and formalities in the bidding.

The undersigned understands that any conditions stated above, clarifications made to the above or information other than that requested should be under separate cover and to be considered only at the discretion of the Purchasing Department.

The Bidder acknowledges receipt of Addendum _____ (List all received.)

_____	_____
Name of Individual, Partner Or Corporation	Company
_____	_____
Title	Address
_____	_____
Authorized Signature	City, State, Zip Code

	Company phone number

Please Attach Bidder’s Contact Business Card