MARYLAND STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
OFFICE OF PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACT MANAGEMENT
CONSULTANT SERVICES DIVISION
707 NORTH CALVERT STREET
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND 21202

June 11, 2025

Contract No.: BCS 2024-09
Description: Highway Structures Engineering Services for State and Local Governments

REQUEST FOR TECHNICAL PROPOSAL ADDENDUM NO. 2

To All Offerors:

This addendum is being issued on the Request for Technical Proposal for BCS 2024-09. All prospective Offerors must acknowledge the clarifications, revisions, additions and/or deletions listed below for this Addendum No. 2 by signing, dating and attaching this addendum in the front of their submittal. Failure to attach this signed and dated Addendum No. 2 in the submittal may result in rejection.

Please be advised that the Technical Proposal delivery date for this procurement is **12:00 PM (NOON) on July 17, 2025**. Technical Proposals received after the deadline will not be accepted no matter how transmitted.

PEN AND INK CHANGES

Please note the following changes to the BCS 2024-09 Request for Technical Proposal issued May 28, 2025:

O1 Section 10 E – Technical Questions

E. Technical Questions: ~~– compare with previous procurement~~

Technical question responses shall not exceed a total of five (5) pages, limited to one (1) page per question.

Reference the question number at the top of each page and use the remainder of the page for the response to the question (for example, "Question ~~#1~~:"):

a. Your firm has been assigned to a bridge replacement project for a bridge with a poor rated substructure and fair rated deck and superstructure. The existing bridge, built in 1965, is a three span steel beam bridge with spans of 45', 75' and 45', and a clear width of 30 feet which crosses over a very active railroad consisting of two tracks. The approach roadway has two 12-foot lanes, with 3-foot shoulders, and a posted speed of 70 mph. The bridge is located on a heavily traveled interstate highway in an urban industrial area with a mixture of manufacturing and warehouse operations.

Identify the steps you would take in determining and developing the type, size and location of the replacement bridge. Please explain in detail all required steps that should be taken, including the coordination efforts with the associated railroad as well as the constructability of the replacement structure, where the maintenance of traffic alternative analysis study has determined that all lanes must be maintained during construction.

b. Your firm has been requested to develop accelerated rehabilitation plans for a prestressed single-span bridge in a metropolitan area due to exposed and severed strands in various members. This bridge is located over a waterway. The project is accelerated due to an engineering judgment decision to limit the bridge to one lane and issue a temporary weight limit. What actions would be taken, and services provided by your staff to evaluate this defect, address all the associated issues, and submit an accelerated set of plans? Please explain in detail all plausible options and actions that would be pursued by your staff. Also, please explain in detail all the steps needed for your proposed options.

c. The Office of Structures (OOS) is proposing to replace a four span 130' long bridge that crosses MD 500 over Fresh Creek with a single span 100' long bridge. The bridge is located in the Baltimore Metropolitan Region and soil borings obtained from the site indicate a soft top layer of sandy soil followed by a non-scour resistant thick rock layer. The initial scour computation results in a very deep foundation that goes beyond the existing rock layer. Discussions with the structural engineer indicate that this result is unrealistic for both the design and construction of the bridge. To alleviate the concerns, a revision to the Type, Size and Location (TS&L) for the replacement bridge is being considered to reduce the scour depth.

Your firm has been requested to assist in the scour evaluation to understand the extent of scour within the rock layer and use it in developing recommendations for an alternate replacement bridge. The hydrology study and hydraulics report are complete and available for review. In addition, a geomorphology study has been completed that shows that lateral migration at the existing bridge location is minimal and occurs at a relatively slow rate, indicating that additional protection besides typical scour countermeasures (i.e. rip rap) is not recommended. The study also indicates about 3ft of expected long-term bed degradation in the vicinity of the existing bridge. Pebble count indicated a roughly normal distribution with a D50 of 64 mm, which the geomorphology study recommends using it in the scour analysis.

Due to the current condition of the bridge, a replacement needs to be advertised as quickly as possible. To avoid a lengthy permit processing from all external regulatory agencies, such as FEMA, how would you evaluate the scour and guide/support OOS in deciding on a new TS&L for the proposed bridge replacement.

d. Asset Management is a key factor in the selection of structures for inclusion in SHA and Local Government bridge programs. How can you assist SHA and Local Governments with Asset Management to create reports and make informed decisions to improve the condition of structures across the state?

   ~~f.~~ It is understood that engineering firms may have multiple contractual obligations. How would you ensure that an increased workload does not impact on your ability to meet the needs of SHA and Local Governments while

avoiding unnecessary change orders and delays? Please elaborate on how you would ensure proposed schedules and budgets are met while verifying that all submissions are thoroughly checked for quality assurance and quality control.

REPLACE WITH:

C1 Section 10 E – <u>Technical Questions</u>

E. <u>Technical Questions:</u>

Technical question responses shall not exceed a total of five (5) pages, limited to one (1) page per question.

Reference the question number at the top of each page and use the remainder of the page for the response to the question (for example, "Question *a*:"):

a. Your firm has been assigned to a bridge replacement project for a bridge with a poor rated substructure and fair rated deck and superstructure. The existing bridge, built in 1965, is a three span steel beam bridge with spans of 45', 75' and 45', and a clear width of 30 feet which crosses over a very active railroad consisting of two tracks. The approach roadway has two 12-foot lanes, with 3-foot shoulders, and a posted speed of 70 mph. The bridge is located on a heavily traveled interstate highway in an urban industrial area with a mixture of manufacturing and warehouse operations.

Identify the steps you would take in determining and developing the type, size and location of the replacement bridge. Please explain in detail all required steps that should be taken, including the coordination efforts with the associated railroad as well as the constructability of the replacement structure, where the maintenance of traffic alternative analysis study has determined that all lanes must be maintained during construction.

b. Your firm has been requested to develop accelerated rehabilitation plans for a prestressed single-span bridge in a metropolitan area due to exposed and severed strands in various members. This bridge is located over a waterway. The project is accelerated due to an engineering judgment decision to limit the bridge to one lane and issue a temporary weight limit. What actions would be taken, and services provided by your staff to evaluate this defect, address all the associated issues, and submit an accelerated set of plans? Please explain in detail all plausible options and actions that would be pursued by your staff. Also, please explain in detail all the steps needed for your proposed options.

c. The Office of Structures (OOS) is proposing to replace a four span 130' long bridge that crosses MD 500 over Fresh Creek with a single span 100' long bridge. The bridge is located in the Baltimore Metropolitan Region and soil borings obtained from the site indicate a soft top layer of sandy soil followed by a non-scour resistant thick rock layer. The initial scour computation results in a very deep foundation that goes beyond the existing rock layer. Discussions with the structural engineer indicate that this result is unrealistic for both the design and construction of the bridge. To alleviate the concerns, a revision to the Type, Size and Location (TS&L) for the replacement bridge is being considered to reduce the scour depth.

Your firm has been requested to assist in the scour evaluation to understand the extent of scour within the rock layer and use it in developing recommendations for an alternate replacement bridge. The hydrology study and hydraulics report are complete and available for review. In addition, a geomorphology study has been completed that shows that lateral migration at the existing bridge location is minimal and occurs at a relatively slow rate, indicating that additional protection besides typical scour countermeasures (i.e. rip rap) is not recommended. The study also indicates about 3ft of expected long-term bed degradation in the vicinity of the existing bridge. Pebble count indicated a roughly normal distribution with a D50 of 64 mm, which the geomorphology study recommends using it in the scour analysis.

Due to the current condition of the bridge, a replacement needs to be advertised as quickly as possible. To avoid a lengthy permit processing from all external regulatory agencies, such as FEMA, how would you evaluate the scour and guide/support OOS in deciding on a new TS&L for the proposed bridge replacement.

d. Asset Management is a key factor in the selection of structures for inclusion in SHA and Local Government bridge programs. How can you assist SHA and Local Governments with Asset Management to create reports and make informed decisions to improve the condition of structures across the state?

e. It is understood that engineering firms may have multiple contractual obligations. How would you ensure that an increased workload does not impact on your ability to meet the needs of SHA and Local Governments while avoiding unnecessary change orders and delays? Please elaborate on how you would ensure proposed schedules and budgets are met while verifying that all submissions are thoroughly checked for quality assurance and quality control.

O2 Section 2. – <u>Consultant Services Required</u>

g. Structures analysis and design, which may include;
   i. LARS

REPLACE WITH:

C2 Section 2. – <u>Consultant Services Required</u>

g. Structures analysis and design, which may include;
   i. LARS
   ii. Bentley OpenBridge Designer

O3 Section 10. D. 3. – <u>Standard Form 330 Parts I and Parts II – Key Staff</u>

3. **Key Staff 3**: A Professional Engineer (PE) registered in the State of Maryland with a minimum of 10 years of experience with expertise in highway engineering and design; a Bachelor of Science (or higher) in Civil Engineering; employed by the Prime/JV OR employed by ~~the Prime/JV~~;

REPLACE WITH:

O3 Section 10. D. 3. – <u>Standard Form 330 Parts I and Parts II – Key Staff</u>

3. **Key Staff 3**: A Professional Engineer (PE) registered in the State of Maryland with a minimum of 10 years of experience with expertise in highway engineering and design; a Bachelor of Science (or higher) in Civil Engineering; employed by the Prime/JV OR employed by *any of the Subconsultants*;

Questions from Potential Offerors

The deadline for questions for this contract is at <u>12:00 PM (NOON) on June 20, 2025</u>. The following questions are written Request for Technical Proposal Questions received prior to the deadline and submitted through the eMaryland Marketplace (eMMA) Q + A Discussion Board at emma.maryland.gov. The responses are provided for clarification to all prospective offerors in bold after the questions:

Q1 "Would SHA be open to extending the deadline, given its proximity to the July 4th holiday?"

A1 The deadline for submittal of Technical Proposals was extended to July 17, 2025 (NOON) through BCS 2024-09 – RFTP Addendum No. 1 published in eMMA and on the SHA Website www.roads.maryland.gov on June 4, 2025.

Q2 "Please confirm there are 5 questions, and that question f. should be question e."

A2 SHA confirms there is a total of 5 technical questions. Please see Pen and Ink Change C1, above, which corrects editorial errors in Section 10 E – Technical Questions

Q3 "Will SHA accept on-call contracts to be submitted as projects in Section F. of the 330 or tasks only?"

A3 Acceptance will be at the Team's discretion if examples of work performed under an on-call contract can accurately depict relevant experience as noted in the solicitation's requirements for example projects.

Q4 "Does SHA prefer projects shown in Section F. of the 330 to be completed or can they be ongoing?"

A4 **Projects should be substantially complete in the design process (i.e. at Final Review) to be considered as an example project.**

Q5 "For project #4, can we use an SHA administered county bridge project that was used through the local government bridge program?"

A5 **Yes, these are projects that have been developed for a Local Government receiving federal funds and not an SHA project. This request is to illustrate third party projects that have received federal funding – for example, local governments, parks, federal agency, group receiving a federal grant.**

Q6 "Would you be able to share the names of the incumbents?"

A6 **Incumbents on recent contracts for which these services were provided:**
Wallace, Montgomery & Associates, LLP / McCormick Taylor, Inc. JV
Whitman, Requardt and Associates, LLP
KCI Technologies, Inc. / Gannett Fleming, Inc. JV
Jacobs Engineering, Inc. / Century Engineering, LLC JV
AECOM Technical Services, Inc.
Greenman-Pedersen, Inc. / Whitney, Bailey, Cox & Magnani, LLC (now known as TranSystems Corporation) JV
Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson, Inc.
The Wilson T. Ballard Company
Rummel, Klepper & Kahl, LLP
PRIME AE Group, Inc.
Stantec Consulting Services, Inc. / WSP USA, Inc. JV

Q7 "Can you share the list of attendees at the project's Pre-proposal Meeting?"

A7 **The list of attendees is provided as an attachment to BCS 2024-09 RFP Addendum No. 2.**

Q8 "Example Project #3 indicates we "shall illustrate a project with bridge hydrology and hydraulics performed by the prime or subconsultant." Can the project be a BCS contract where multiple examples of this scope can be provided?"

A8 **A "minimum" of one project shall be included to illustrate knowledge and experience with bridge hydrology and hydraulics as noted in the RFTP Section 10.D.iv.**

Q9 "Please verify that the statement "performed by the prime consultant' applies to projects that have been substantially completed in the design phase."

A9 SHA verifies that Example Projects shall include projects that have been substantially completed in the design phase.

Q10 "Please provide a Project Class Classification threshold to differentiate between 'major' and 'minor' projects for the purposes of responding to the RFP for BCS2024-09."

A10 The RFTP at Section 10.D.iv. stipulates that Example Project #1 shall illustrate a major bridge project (replacement, major rehabilitation, etc.) performed by the prime consultant. In the case of a Joint Venture, the project may derive from one of the constituent partners. Examples cited include replacement and major rehabilitation. Major rehabilitation may also include, but are not limited to, bridge deck replacements and bridge widenings. The RFTP at Section 10.D.iv. stipulates that Example Project #2 shall illustrate a bridge minor rehabilitation project performed by the prime consultant. In the case of a Joint Venture, the project may derive from one of the constituent partners. No examples were provided in the RFTP. Minor rehabilitation may include, but are not limited to, structural preservation activities - examples of which are steel and concrete repairs, pier strengthening, joint repairs, small structure retrofits and other repairs.

Q11 "Please verify that the Time Distribution Table can be presented on a single 11" x 17" page."

A11 SHA will accept the Time Distribution Table on a single 11" x 17" page for this Technical Proposal submittal.

Q12 "In past SHA advertisements, SF330 Part I was combined for the entire team, and Form SF330 Part II was required only for the Prime or JV partners. Are SF330 Part II's required to be submitted for subconsultants for this Contract?"

A12 SHA confirms that SF330 Part II is required only for the Prime or JV partners.

Q13. "Please verify that an individual that possesses a Master of Science degree in Transportation coupled with a Maryland registered Professional Engineer of Civil Engineering license will meet the requirements for Key Staff No. 4."

A13 The RFTP at Section 10.D.iv. stipulates the minimum qualifications for Key Staff 4: A Professional Engineer (PE) registered in the State of Maryland with a minimum of 10 years of experience with expertise in complex studies associated with bridge Hydrology/Hydraulics, bridge scour and sediment transport, with an emphasis on Federal and Maryland regulations; a Bachelor of Science (or higher) in Civil Engineering or in a relevant area of Water Resources or related engineering field; employed by the Prime/JV OR employed by any of the Subconsultants.

Q14 "Can you elaborate on the 3-D modeling for bridges listed in the scope?"

A14 **SHA is considering the use of 3-D modeling as an additional tool in project development. Please see Pen and Ink Change C2 wherein Bentley OpenBridge Designer was added to the list of software for structures analysis and design.**

Q15 "During the pre-proposal meeting, it was stated that subconsultants are required to submit their own complete SF 330 Part I. The RFP lists specific requirements in the RFP for what should be included in Part I Section E resumes, Part I Section F projects, and the content of Part I Section H pertaining to Key Staff. The majority of subconsultants on teams would not be able to provide this required information as they are filling supplementary support roles that will not include requested key staff or meet the requirements of example projects in their entirety. Is it acceptable to SHA that subconsultants are incorporated into the prime consultant's Part I in Sections C and D, as well as E, F, G, or H, if at all applicable rather than submitting a completely separate Part I that cannot meet the requested requirements? It is understood that all subconsultants should submit their own Part II."

A15 Sunconsultants are not required to submit a separate SF 330. The entirety of the Offeror's team is included in the one SF 330 submitted with the technical proposal. What was stated at the pre-proposal meeting was that a complete SF 330 – including Part I and Part II - was required for this procurement.

THE SIGNED ADDENDUM MUST BE INCLUDED IN THE SUBMISSION IN FRONT OF THE TRANSMITTAL LETTER.

Jada Wright — June 11, 2025

Ms. Jada J. Wright, Director — Date
Office of Procurement and Contract Management

Acknowledgement of Receipt

Firm Name	Signature-Authorized Official	Title	Date