



QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Project
PATAPSCO REGIONAL GREENWAY: ELKRIDGE TO GUINNESS
PLANS, SPECIFICATIONS & ESTIMATE
23A01

The Baltimore Metropolitan Council (BMC) provides written responses to questions regarding requests for proposals (RFPs). The following are questions and answers concerning the above-referenced RFP.

Q1. Are consultants who have previously provided planning and design services for this segment of the project precluded from responding to this RFP?

A1. Consultants who have provided previous design services are not precluded from submitting a proposal for this project.

Q2. Can you provide 30% design plans?

A2. An updated RFP announcement containing a link to the 30% plans was posted on the BMC website on August 2. <https://baltometro.org/requests-for-proposals>

Q3. Will the survey, geotechnical and utility investigations be available in original (CADD) format?

A3. Survey, geotechnical and utility investigation for the 30% design will be provided in CADD format. As stated in the RFP, supplemental surveys may be required to obtain additional data.

Q4. Will any NEPA documentation prepared for the project be provided?

A4. NEPA is underway and will be provided to the selected consultant. The project is anticipated to be a Programmatic Categorical Exclusion.

Q5. Can Section 106 consultation/evaluation documents be shared at this time?



A5. Section 106 consultation is complete; documentation will be provided to the selected consultant.

Q6. Is there any Section 4(f) documentation available to share at this time?

A6. Section 4(f) is underway and documentation will be provided to the selected consultant.

Q7. Please describe what information was used for topographic mapping for the 30% design, and describe in detail the topographic surveys (locations, extents) needed to update the CADD files.

A7. Topographic survey was taken along the preferred alignment at variable widths to accommodate environmental features and relevant terrain.

Q8. Can you provide a listing of firms involved in earlier phases or procurement of the project that will be conflicted out of pursuing this RFP?

A8. Please refer to question 1; no consultant firms are precluded from submitting a proposal at this time.

Q9. Can you provide a map quantifying the anticipated forested floodplain and wetland acreage impacts caused by the proposed boardwalk, as well as the bridge substructure units (abutments and piers) across the Patapsco?

A9. Please refer to Technical Memorandum #1. <https://baltometro.org/requests-for-proposals>

Q10. Please provide all information regarding the proposed 290 foot bridge over the Patapsco River, (e.g., conceptual plans/type, profile, hydrology and hydraulic modeling, FEMA (floodway?), geotechnical, scour, and environmental resource impacts/ mitigation commitments.

A10. Please refer to 30% design plans. <https://baltometro.org/requests-for-proposals>

Q11. Task 3 requires revised 30% E&SC and SWM concept plans to be prepared. Can you provide the comments to the draft 30% submittals of those plans or summarize the comments and revisions needed for development of revised SWM and ESC plans and report.

*A11. Please refer to 30% design plans. <https://baltometro.org/requests-for-proposals>.
A stormwater / E&SC concept report was not prepared previously and will need to be submitted to approving agencies for review.*



Q12. Please describe what information was used for right-of-way information during the 30% design. Is there an estimated right-of-way acquisition mosaic to determine the magnitude of metes and bounds plats needed?

A12. The Existing Right of Way was estimated using GIS Data and consultation with property owners.

Q13. Please describe what information was used to determine wetlands and forest inventories during the 30% design, and describe in detail the scope of work required for wetland and forest delineations for this proposal (e.g., permitting identified, agency coordination, and any mitigation proposed). Many other RFP scope items would be affected depending on the delineations.

A13. Preliminary inventories included GIS data and field survey. Formal delineations will be required in this phase.

Q14. Please describe what information was used for utilities during the 30% design, and describe in detail the scope of work required for utility level B work for this proposal. If utility designating changes the limits/ impacts defined during 30% design - this could affect many other scope items. Please describe the utility impacts, access issues, permitting, utility owner coordination/ approvals, and any relocations proposed from the 30% design.

A14. The topographic and utility locating field survey was completed for the preliminary design. It is anticipated electrical utility modifications will be required. Please refer to Technical Memorandum #3 for a cost estimate of these modifications.

Q15. Can the existing geotechnical report be provided? If not, can you provide the outstanding geotechnical needs (ie. SWM, pavement design, bridge borings, etc.)?

A15. An updated RFP announcement containing a link to the 30% plans was posted on the BMC website on August 2, 2022. <https://baltometro.org/requests-for-proposals>.

Q16. For the trail alignment underneath I-195, it appears to be in floodplain and on boardwalk structure. Has a structure elevation been determined and clearance under the girders?

A16. Please refer to 30% design plans. <https://baltometro.org/requests-for-proposals>.

Q17. On the 30% design Storymap weblink, location no.5 is an existing bridge over an unnamed tributary. Does this scope assume that bridge structure remains in place and be utilized for the trail without any modifications?



A17. Please refer to 30% design plans. <https://baltometro.org/requests-for-proposals>.

Q18. Please describe in detail the locations and extents of drainage computations, details and profiles completed during 30% design, and describe locations where revisions are anticipated.

A18. No drainage details were developed in the 30% design plans – Drainage items are shown in the Engineers Estimate as a Lump Sum item.

Q19. Please describe the criteria, limits, and types of lighting for this project.

A19. Trail lighting is not anticipated, however lighting at trailheads/parking areas are to be evaluated and included if needed.

Q20. Please describe the locations, extents, and types of landscape plans for this project.

A20. Landscaping should be minimal and generally will be limited to tree removal and mitigation and providing green space along the trail.

Q21. Are there any design loadings to consider for the bridge design (emergency or maintenance vehicles) that we should consider in the design over and above the design loads contained in the AASHTO LRFD Guide Specifications for the Design of Pedestrian Structures?

A21. Consideration for emergency access to the bridges has yet to be determined. Access to the trail will be required by BGE.

Q22. Will the use of a prefabricated manufactured bridge be considered for this Patapsco River crossing?

A22. All options for bridges and boardwalks should be considered including prefabricated manufactured bridges, which was included in the preliminary design.

Q23. Is there a preferred construction material for the elevated boardwalk superstructure and deck?

A22. All options for construction materials should be considered for the boardwalk including, but not limited to pressure treated lumber, composites, plastic and concrete. Consideration should be given to slip resistance and future maintenance requirements. The boardwalk should consist of railings on both sides of the boardwalk as well.



Q24. Please describe if MDOT SHA specifications and standard details shall be used, or if multiple sets of specifications and standards will be required by the numerous county, state, and utility entities.

A24. It should be assumed that the trail will be designed using MDOT SHA standards and specifications. Sidewalks within Elkridge should be constructed using Howard County standards including Howard County Complete Streets Design Manual.

Q25. Please describe the status from 30% design for NEPA documents and agency coordination/ approvals. Have you determined the level of NEPA documentation? Can you describe the status of Critical Area Commission coordination? Can you define the level of NEPA/Section 106 and Section 4(f) effort that MDOT SHA will provide?

A25. Agency coordination is underway for NEPA and Section 4(f). It is anticipated the level of NEPA documentation required for this project will be a Categorical Exclusion. Section 106 is complete with a finding of no adverse effects to cultural resources. Critical Area coordination will be initiated prior to contract award.

Q26. The one year schedule from NTP to Completion of Work is a concern given the uncompleted status of the 30% design, extensive field work still needed, right of way acquisition, and especially not knowing anticipated agency review times for permits and approvals listed in Task 8.

A26. BMC will consider schedule modifications when reviewing submitted proposals. BMC will assist the consultant design team wherever possible to ensure the project remains on the agreed upon schedule.