



## QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

### REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

**Project  
PRELIMINARY DESIGN – PATAPSCO REGIONAL GREENWAY  
SYKESVILLE TO MCKELDIN  
21T04**

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. Page 13 of the RFP notes that five (5) paper copies of the technical and price proposals along with a USB are to be submitted while Page 15 expresses that proposals should be emailed via separate PDF files. We kindly request confirmation of which method should be used to submit our proposals.**

*A1. Technical and Cost proposals need only be submitted via email per page 15 of the RFP.*

**Q2. Review of the Patapsco Regional Greenway Plan has shown that JMT and Toole Design Group put together the initial study. Would those firms be excluded due to conflict of interest from participating from the Preliminary Design phase?**

*A2. Firms that have previously worked on the Patapsco Regional Greenway Plan are not excluded from submitting proposals on this preliminary design task.*

**Q3. Page 6, Task 2 states the consultant should conduct a desktop survey and verify existing conditions through GIS data and site visits. The list of items to be identified include wetlands and waterways. Please clarify the level of wetland/WUS verification to be provided during the site visit. Please confirm the site visit to verify existing conditions will be completed for each of the alternative alignments.**

*A3. The goal of the site visit is to conduct field confirmation of GIS desktop data. A formal delineation is not required, however if additional features are located in the field, they should be included on the GIS mapping. Under Task 2, existing conditions should be documented for 2-3*



alignments of the Sykesville to Freedom Park segment and 2 alignments for the Freedom Park to McKeldin segment.

**Q4. Page 6, Task 2 makes no reference to the location of specimen trees (equal or greater than 30 inches DBH). Please confirm whether the consultant should identify the locations of specimen trees for the alternative alignments.**

*A4. It is assumed specimen trees will not be present along the alignment from Sykesville to Freedom Park.*

*For the segment from Freedom Park to Patapsco Valley State Park's McKeldin Area, the goal is to identify potential corridors to host the final trail, typically +/- 30-feet along an identified centerline. Corridors must be ground-truthed for suitability to host trail design and construction that conforms with the conditions of DNR's General Permit for development of natural surface single track trails. Key design elements include rolling contour layout, minimal disruptions to forest canopy, and consistency with DNR trail specifications by way of grade as provided as Attachment 1 of the RFP.*

*As part of corridor evaluation, key control points must be identified in the field including design constraints (e.g. stream crossing locations) and experiential elements (e.g. vista points, historic sites). It is not required to map/identify specimen trees as part of corridor identification unless a particular tree is deemed to be a potential experiential control point (e.g. Maryland Champion Tree candidate - statewide or regional). Offerors must demonstrate in their proposals experience with sustainable natural surface trail principals as enumerated in texts such as the US Forest Service's "Trail Construction and Maintenance Notebook" (2007).*

**Q5. Page 7 – Task 3: level of survey needed. Can you provide an area of extents of topographical survey needed, with expected level of detail.**

*A5. The extents of the topographic survey will depend on the selected alignment from Sykesville to Freedom Park, an approximate distance of 1.1 miles, depending upon the route. The survey should be conducted in MDOT SHA standard and develop 1-foot contours and a DTM.*

**Q6. For Task 5 please confirm that there will be one Preferred Alternative for each segment (Sykesville to Freedom Park, and Freedom Park to McKeldin Area).**

*A6. Yes, there will be one alignment selected to proceed to preliminary design for each segment: Sykesville to Freedom Park and Freedom Park to McKeldin.*



**Q7. Task 6 says that right-of-way information can be based on GIS as long as the alignment remains within or near public right-of-way and park boundaries. If the selected alignment does not meet these conditions, will a task modification be approved if needed for additional surveys?**

*A7. A task modification may be considered if a selected alignment is outside of the right-of-way or park boundaries.*

**Q8. Page 9, Task 6 – Quality Level B subterranean utility exploration – please clarify the expected level B utility features for base mapping.**

*A8. It is anticipated that the segment between Sykesville and Freedom Park includes water and wastewater utilities, electric line, television and internet cables, and stormwater infrastructure.*

**Q9. For Task 6 please define the level of detail for developing conceptual SWM, (e.g., drainage area maps, points of investigation, runoff computations, BMP sizing computations, feasibility/ rough grading, adequate/ stable outfall, etc.).**

*A9. The level of detail for stormwater management should be consistent with the Concept phase as identified in the "Carroll County Supplement to the 2000 Maryland Stormwater Management Manual Volumes I & II" (May 2010), and "Carroll County Supplement to the 2000 Maryland Stormwater Management Manual Volumes I & II, May 2010 Additional/Amended/Alternate Items" (November 2018).*

**Q10. For Task 6 please define the anticipated segments (lengths) for natural surface trail verses hard surface trail. Many jurisdictions will consider crushed stone natural surfaces to be impervious for SWM requirements. Please define acceptable natural surface trail materials that can be considered pervious for evaluation of SWM requirements.**

*A10. Per pages 6 and 7 of the RFP, the Sykesville to Freedom Park segment is approximately 1.1 miles, depending on the selected alignment, and may include a shared-use path and/or on-road bicycle facilities and traffic calming measures. This segment also includes completion of an 800-foot sidewalk gap along Raincliffe Road to provide a direct pedestrian connection between the two points.*

*The natural surface single track segment from Freedom Park to Patapsco Valley State Park's McKeldin Area is approximately 4.7 miles and includes no surface treatment. Offerors must demonstrate in their proposals experience with sustainable natural surface trail principals as enumerated in texts such as the U.S. Forest Service's "Trail Construction and Maintenance Notebook" (2007).*



**Q11. Page 9, Task 6 states that environmental features (wetlands, floodplains, WUS) will be surveyed between Sykesville and Freedom Park for the preferred alignment. Depending on the level of resource identification included for each alignment alternative in Task 2, should the consultant include a formal delineation of wetlands/WUS, and floodplains, within this task in order to provide boundaries of resources to be located with survey in this Task?**

*A11. No, a formal delineation will not be undertaken as part of the preliminary design tasks.*

**Q12. Page 9, Task 6 please confirm survey of environmental features (wetlands, waterways, floodplains) is not required for the Freedom Park to McKeldin segment.**

*A12. Survey of environmental features is not required for the Freedom Park to McKeldin segment. Please refer to responses to Questions 4 and 10.*

**Q13. Page 9, Task 6 includes geotechnical investigations. please define what the preliminary geotechnical investigation is required to include (e.g., borings, infiltration test, lab soil tests, report, etc.).**

*A13. The RFP requires the consultant to "conduct preliminary geotechnical investigation/ borings to more accurately locate stormwater management facilities and identify areas where structures (boardwalks, bridge structures) will be located throughout the project area. Assume up to 8 borings." The consultant should conduct the appropriate analysis for this task that could include borings, laboratory feasibility and infiltration testing, and preparation of a report which provides grading and design recommendations. Consultant should demonstrate expertise in this area and propose an appropriate work plan.*

**Q14. Page 9, Task 6 says that borings are included to more accurately locate SWM facilities. Is this intended to provide a conceptual planning level evaluation of soils at a few locations to evaluate potential BMP feasibility and types? Should the consultant assume no wetlands, waterways, or floodplains will be impacted by the geotechnical borings and therefore no MDE/USACE permit coordination/authorization will be required?**

*A14. Yes, the goal is to evaluate soils at locations identified by the consultant for stormwater management and structure feasibility and type. It is assumed that no wetlands, waterways or floodplains would be impacted by the geotechnical borings in this phase of design.*

**Q15. For Tasks 7 and 8 Preliminary Design - please define in detail the level of design and deliverables for developing 'preliminary location of SWM areas and proposed devices', (e.g., drainage area maps, points of investigation, runoff computations (pre and post), BMP sizing computations, rough grading, adequate/ stable outfall, plan content, SWM reports, etc.).**



*A15. The level of detail for stormwater management should be consistent with the Concept phase as identified in the "Carroll County Supplement to the 2000 Maryland Stormwater Management Manual Volumes I & II" (May 2010) and "Carroll County Supplement to the 2000 Maryland Stormwater Management Manual Volumes I & II, May 2010 Additional/Amended/Alternate Items" (November 2018).*

**Q16. Are the as-built plans for the previous Henryton Road bridge and abutments available now?**

*A16. The bridge washed out in the early 1970s and the plans have not been located per this project to date.*

**Q17. Are the Patapsco Valley State Park's plans for the equestrian-rated single-span timber trail bridge up to 20-foot long available now?**

*A17. The existing timber bridge plans will be shared by Maryland Park Service with the selected preliminary design team. Please assume an abutment at each end using an 8x8 timber resting on undisturbed compacted soil. Plans include a railing option suitable for equestrians if the application requires them. Existing examples are available for inspection at numerous locations within Patapsco Valley State Park, including the Pickall, Hollofield and Avalon areas.*

**Q18. Please confirm ID#s from the Regional Greenway Plan listed on page 5 of the RFP are correct (1, 3, 4, 6, 6B, 7 and 8). Based on approximate lengths and descriptions of work provided in the RFP, it appears the ID#s should be 1, 2, 3, 6A, 6B and 7, with the endpoint being the eastern end of the Piney Run trail terminating at Marriottsville Road.**

*A18. Please note the current project termini do not precisely align with the concepts as described and mapped in the Patapsco Regional Greenway Plan. More detailed descriptions of how the project relates to the Implementation Matrix IDs and Plan mapping follow.*

- *ID #1: Sykesville
  - *Please refer to the corresponding map on page 36. The pedestrian route shown in RED includes the 800-foot sidewalk gap along Raincliffe Road referenced in the RFP.**
- *ID #2: MD 32 Bridge
  - *As described, the route along MD 32 and use of the bridge is not a part of this project. However, that does not preclude use of the MD 32 ROW per the clarification below under ID #3.**
- *ID #3: College Avenue*



- *Please refer to the map on page 36. While not depicted on the concept map as such, a goal of this project is to establish a bicycle or shared-use connection from the Sykesville Historic District to the existing Freedom Park Trail. The alignment alternatives may include the new section, shown in YELLOW, that begins at College Avenue and connects to the Freedom Park Trail, shown in GREEN. However, the selected design team is encouraged to explore multiple options to establish this connection. The 2-3 alternatives developed for consideration may include shared-use paths and/or on-road bicycle facilities and traffic calming measures.*
- *ID #4: Freedom Park Trail*
  - *Please refer to the corresponding map on page 36. Connections to the existing Freedom Park Trail, shown in GREEN, are to be established from both the Sykesville Historic District and the Patapsco Valley State Park McKeldin Area trails, and need not align with the concepts depicted in the Plan. The Freedom Park Trail would then be designated part of the Patapsco Regional Greenway.*
- *ID #6A (referenced incorrectly as ID #6 in the RFP): Henryton Trail*
  - *Please refer to the maps on pages 36, 38 and 40. To the east of the Freedom Park Trail (page 36), shown in YELLOW, begins the Freedom Park to McKeldin segment. Two natural surface single track trail alternatives are to be developed within Patapsco Valley State Park.*
- *ID #6B: Henryton Center Bridge*
  - *Please refer to the map on page 40. This section includes evaluation of the former Henryton Road bridge abutments to establish a connection to the existing Henryton Trail across the Patapsco River in Howard County.*
- *ID #7: Piney Run*
  - *Please refer to the maps on pages 40 and 42. The GREEN section labeled as Piney Run on page 40 will connect the Henryton section (Carroll County) to the existing McKeldin Area trails. While shown in GREEN on the Plan concept mapping, evaluation of whether portions of the abandoned road bed may be suitable for trail use will be required. It is not anticipated a connection to Arrington Road, as shown on page 40, will be included as part of this project. Rather, a continuous segment from Freedom Park to the McKeldin Area is to be established.*
- *ID #8: McKeldin Area Trails*
  - *Please refer to the maps on pages 42 and 44. The Freedom Park to McKeldin segment will connect to the existing trail system, which would then be designated part of the Patapsco Regional Greenway.*

**Q19. Will you clarify in which section you would like us to include resumes for our proposed team for this project – in Experience and Qualifications or Project Management?**





*A19. The resumes of the proposed project manager and key team personnel are to be included in the Experience and Qualifications section of the Technical Proposal, not to exceed 8 pages.*

**Q20. If we are permitted to include resumes in the Project Management section would you consider a six-page maximum while retaining the eight-page maximum for the Experience and Qualification section?**

*A20. A summary of qualifications of the project manager and key staff for each firm is to be included in the Project Management section, which is not to exceed 5 pages. However, Offerors may submit up to 4 pages of additional relevant materials under Other Information.*

**Q21. Per the RFP the single track trail deliverable is noted as 1"=100', per the pre-bid PPT the deliverable was noted as 1" = 20'. Which is the desired final scale for the Freedom Park to McKeldin section final deliverable?**

*A21. The scale for the Freedom Park to McKeldin segment is 1" = 100' per the RFP.*

**Q22. P. 7 (Task 3- Freedom to McKeldon area) - Regarding the 2 centerline alignments to be identified – is it assumed that one will be the existing trail alignment shown in the Patapsco Valley Plan, and the second alignment will be on new alignment north of the River, OR can the second alignment be on the Howard County side as shown in the Patapsco Valley Plan?**

*A22. The two alignments from Freedom Park to the McKeldin Area would be north of the Patapsco River in Carroll County. Please note the current project termini and alignments are not restricted to the concepts as described and mapped in the Patapsco Regional Greenway Plan, and the selected design team is encouraged to explore the best alignments to achieve this connection. Offerors must demonstrate in their proposals experience with sustainable natural surface trail principals as enumerated in texts such as the U.S. Forest Service's "Trail Construction and Maintenance Notebook" (2007). Please also refer to the response to Question 18.*

**Q23. P. 7 (Task 3- Freedom to McKeldon area; Henryton Rd. bridge abutment crossing): Who will be responsible for railroad coordination due to potential impacts at that location. If so, are any fees, permits and training required to access railroad property? Will there be any special insurance requirements imposed by the railroad company to complete any aspect of this pursuit?**

*A23. MD Department of Natural Resources will be responsible for CSX coordination as needed. No required fees, permits or training are anticipated at this phase.*



## Q & A from the 10/19/20 Pre Proposal Conference

**Q1. Can you elaborate a little bit on what should be included in the project management qualifications? Because it seems to me that both sections list the qualifications of the project manager and the key staff. It seems to be duplicated.**

*A1. A firm may have experience with projects that they would like to share in the Experience and Qualifications section of the Technical Proposal, and we understand staff involved in those projects may not currently be available for this preliminary design engagement. While there could be duplication, that's not necessarily the case if different staff are identified in the Project Management section than those who worked on the projects included in the Experience and Qualifications section.*