

Question No.	Date Received	REFERENCE			QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE	Amend No.
		Page	Section	Para.			
1	7-Jul-21	SOW-7	General Req	D-2	Please confirm that all permits and access permission has been acquired and for what duration.	USACE MDSPGP-5 permit valid until September 30 2021 and an extension request is in progress. Expected to be issued before construction begins. MDE Nontidal Wetlands and Waterways permit valid until July 24 2022 and will be extended. E&S plan approval obtained May 18 2020, no expiration date listed. MDE Construction NOI for Stormwater Discharge due to Construction Activity approval obtained June 15 2020, good for 5 years. MDE approval for mitigation plan obtained, no expiration as long as all requirements are met by end of construction.	N/A
2	7-Jul-21	SOW-7	General Req	D-21	Are there any installation specific permits associated with this project? If so what is their status?	No installation specific permits are required. This project takes place on DNR property.	N/A

CEDAR POINT WMA WETLAND CONSTRUCTION, WELCOME MARYLAND

Question No.	Date Received	Page	Section	Para.	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE	Amend No.
3	7-Jul-21	SOW-7	General Req	D-22	Since this project is located a mile off road on DNR property and was previously farmland, will Cooperator be required to hire a private utility location service? Typically, Miss Utility will not go this far back on private property	No, utility location services will not be required for this project.	N/A
4	7-Jul-21	SOW-8	Specific Tasks	5a	Please confirm that the statement in Specific Tasks 5a means that the Navy will not hold the Cooperator responsible for ensuring regulatory and landowner acceptance of the completed project at the end of Maintenance and Monitoring Year 5.	The Cooperator will be held responsible for constructing the wetland as designed. As long as the designs are accurately constructed and the wetland is successful, regulators and landowner should accept the results without issues. If they demand additional effort, then it will be added to the contract as a modification or solicited in a separate contract.	N/A
5	7-Jul-21	SOW 8	Specific Tasks	5a	Is it acceptable for nonsubstantial deviations in wetland type mapping to be demonstrated at the end of Year 1, so long as mitigation requirements for each type were met?	Yes, small deviations are permitted as long as the requirements for at least 3.7 acres (161,173 sf) of forested nontidal wetlands, 1.3 acres (56,628 sf) of emergent nontidal wetlands, and a 0.5 acre (21,780 sf) pond are met.	N/A

Question No.	Date Received	Page	Section	Para.	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE	Amend No.
6	7-Jul-21	SOW8	Specific Tasks	5b	States that the reports must include a description of any necessary remedial actions; and prescribe remedial actions with a time frame for implementing such actions. Can Navy confirm that these actions would be out of scope for the performance of this	Yes, implementing remedial actions and recommendations prescribed in the yearly monitoring reports would be outside of the scope.	N/A
7	7-Jul-21	SOW 8	Specific Tasks	5b	Is the yearly monitoring budget supposed to cover the costs for any remedial action that may be necessary, or should such actions concur with the time and materials basis of this contract and fulfill tasks only until funding has been expended? How does Navy anticipate that Cooperator will speculate on what possible remedial actions will be required at this stage?	No, the yearly monitoring budget is not expected to cover proposed remedial actions. If during the monitoring years, the site becomes compromised or damaged and a need remedial action is identified, the effort to carry out said action will be handled under a separate contract or as a modification to the existing contract.	N/A

Question No.	Date Received	Page	Section	Para.	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE	Amend No.
8	7-Jul-21	SOW 11	Deliverables	Draft Report	Please clarify what is to be provided by Cooperator for the Draft Report, as many of the items have previously been supplied to Navy.	The draft report is meant to be a comprehensive account of the construction effort in order to provide an accurate record of events to the Navy (e.g major milestones, schedule progress, challenges and delays encountered, photographic accounts of evolving conditions throughout construction, etc.). The SOW will be updated accordingly since items such as wetland delineation, topo surveys and permitting packages have already been provided under the design effort.	N/A

CEDAR POINT WMA WETLAND CONSTRUCTION, WELCOME MARYLAND

Question No.	Date Received	Page	Section	Para.	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE	Amend No.
9	7-Jul-21	SOW 12	Deliverables	Final Report	Please clarify what is to be provided by Cooperator for the Final Report. Is a post-construction wetland delineation required? Please verify that Cooperator will limit as-built survey to the constructed wetland, pond, and outfall footprint.	The draft and final report are meant to be a comprehensive account of the construction effort in order to provide an accurate record of events to the Navy (e.g major milestones, schedule progress, challenges and delays encountered, photographic accounts of evolving conditions throughout construction, etc.). The current SOW will be updated accordingly to clarify. The Cooperator should provide an as-built for the full LOD in order to show that the site (aside from the constructed wetland) was returned to original conditions post-construction.	N/A
10	7-Jul-21	NA	NA	NA	Is this a prevailing wage (or similar wage scale) contract?	No, the Davis Bacon Act/Service Contract Act do not apply to Cooperative Agreements.	N/A

CEDAR POINT WMA WETLAND CONSTRUCTION, WELCOME MARYLAND

Question No.	Date Received	Page	Section	Para.	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE	Amend No.
11	7-Jul-21	NA	NA	NA	Since this project is on Maryland DNR property, how will Navy formally convey access privilege to Cooperator? What is the estimated paperwork (including access forms or a separate MOA with MDNR) burden anticipated for Cooperator for site access?	There is no expected paperwork burden on the Cooperator for site access. The Navy already has an MOA in place with DNR, which allows the Navy's contractors access to the site once the cooperative agreement is awarded. The Cooperator must regularly communicate with the Navy PM and DNR site POC (to be announced) via email or phone in order to keep them aware of on-site activities and equipment that is being utilized.	N/A
12	7-Jul-21	NA	NA	NA	Can Cooperator engage with landowner to obtain woody materials from within the boundaries of Cedar Point WMA?	Yes, the Cooperator may use fallen woody material from the vicinity of the project site and access road (no standing live vegetation can be taken). However, the Cooperator may do so in such a manner so as to not cause disturbance outside of the LOD. This would require modification of E&S plans and validation by MDE.	N/A
13	7-Jul-21	RFP p7	IV	2.0 - 2.2	Please confirm which specific documents from the Form 424 family must be provided by cooperators, and confirm that 424a (non-construction) is required for this construction project.	The SF-424 Application for Federal Assistance and SF-424A Budget Information - Non-Construction Program forms, are the only SF-424 forms required.	N/A

CEDAR POINT WMA WETLAND CONSTRUCTION, WELCOME MARYLAND

Question No.	Date Received	Page	Section	Para.	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE	Amend No.
14	7-Jul-21	RFP p10	IV	2.2.3.6	Please confirm that a previously NICRA or other negotiated indirect rate is not required if the Cooperator's indirect rate is below the current federal de minimus rate (10.0%).	Confirming that a previously NICRA or other negotiated indirect rate is not required if the Cooperator's indirect rate is below the current federal de minimus rate (10.0%).	N/A
15	7-Jul-21	SOW p12	G	18	What reporting process (to Navy) should Cooperator anticipate for regulatory recommended and/or required actions that exceed Cooperator scope and fee subsequent to Navy's Year 1 acceptance of construction performance?	They should be noted in the regular monthly progress reports and official notifications of such regulatory requirements/recommendations can be sent via email to the Project Manager and Contract Specialist.	N/A
16	7-Jul-21	SOW p12	G	18	Please provide monitoring protocols, requirements and methods, including regulatory reporting standards that Cooperator will be required to demonstrate annually throughout the maintenance and monitoring performance period (Option Tasks 6-10)	Examples of similar project monitoring reports can be provided. Monitoring protocols available, provided to Navy by MDE.	N/A

Question No.	Date Received	Page	Section	Para.	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE	Amend No.
17	7-Jul-21	Plan Set Requirement Attachment B			Please confirm that landowner and Navy acknowledge that access road, apron to pavement, culverts, and associated slopes are not currently serviceable for heavy equipment access required for this project. This confirmation is important to establishing cost of road stabilization and erosion control during construction, as well as cost of road stabilization for project completion.	The Navy and DNR confirm acknowledge that the access road, apron to pavement, culverts, and associated slopes are not currently serviceable for heavy equipment access required for this project. DNR requires that the road be left in a condition that is equal to or better than original conditions. If the Cooperator needs to stabilize portions of the access road, the stabilization can remain in place indefinitely after completion of construction.	N/A
18	7-Jul-21	Plan Set Requirement			In the event that the designated upland spoil area is not fully utilized per plan, do landowner and Navy confirm that Cooperator does not need to import fill for the upland area?	The design plans indicate that expected cut and fill quantities for this project are equal (E&S Control General Notes #26). The Cooperator may wish to include a line item in the proposal for additional fill to be considered as an option and executed later if it is ever needed. However, the soil on site should be sufficient.	N/A

Question No.	Date Received	Page	Section	Para.	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE	Amend No.
19	7-Jul-21	General			Are there any provisions, requirements or assumptions of responsibility within the existing or any proposed agreement between NAVFAC and any agency of the State of Maryland, and specifically Maryland DNR or any groups therein, that would impact how the Cooperator assesses costs and conducts tasks under this BAA?	None that the Government is aware of.	N/A
20	7-Jul-21	SOW p4	D	7	Please clarify that Cooperator's scientific data is expressly limited to: wetland monitoring data collection as specifically required by permit, and survey data collected by licensed professional surveyor.	Confirmed. The Cooperator's scientific data is limited to what is needed for monitoring, required by permit, required to support data collection in the monitoring protocols provided by MDE (which can be provided to the Cooperator), and/or collected by a licensed professional.	N/A

CEDAR POINT WMA WETLAND CONSTRUCTION, WELCOME MARYLAND

Question No.	Date Received	Page	Section	Para.	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE	Amend No.
21	7-Jul-21	11	G	5	Attachment A: Page 11 of the SOW references a draft report that is to include information related to a wetland delineation, topographic survey, well installation/monitoring, and the draft permitting package. Please confirm if these items are applicable to this scope and if a draft report is a required deliverable.	The draft and final report are meant to be a comprehensive account of the construction effort in order to provide an accurate record of events to the Navy (e.g major milestones, schedule progress, challenges and delays encountered, photographic accounts of evolving conditions throughout construction, etc.). Wetland delineations, topo surveys, hydrology well monitoring, and permitting have already been completed under a previous project. The current SOW will be updated accordingly to clarify.	N/A
22	7-Jul-21	12	G	6	Attachment A: Page 12 of the SOW references a final report. Please confirm that a final wetland delineation report, topographic survey, and well installation/monitoring are to be included in the report.	See answer to question 21.	N/A

CEDAR POINT WMA WETLAND CONSTRUCTION, WELCOME MARYLAND

Question No.	Date Received	Page	Section	Para.	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE	Amend No.
23	7-Jul-21	4	D	2	Attachment A: Please confirm that all required permits and approvals for the construction activity been previously obtained and that they will remain valid during the period of performance for the construction and planting work. If this is not the case, please identify any required permits or approvals that are the responsibility of the Cooperator.	Confirmed. Permit status is as follows: USACE MDSPGP-5 permit valid until September 30 2021 and an extension request is in progress. Expected to be issued before construction begins. MDE Nontidal Wetlands and Waterways permit valid until July 24 2022 and will be extended. E&S plan approval obtained May 18 2020, no expiration date listed. MDE Construction NOI for Stormwater Discharge due to Construction Activity approval obtained June 15 2020, good for 5 years. MDE approval for mitigation plan obtained, no expiration as long as all requirements are met by end of construction.	N/A
24	7-Jul-21	8	E	5	Attachment A: Page 8 of the SOW, item 5a. includes the statement: "The Cooperator shall adjust and change the grading as needed to ensure success of the wetland mitigation". It is understood that minor adjustments may be required. Is the Cooperator responsible if significant changes are required that may be the result of issues with the design?	If significant changes are required as a result of the current design, the Cooperator will need to justify the need for said significant changes to the Navy and the contract may need to be modified for the additional effort required to implement these changes.	N/A

Question No.	Date Received	Page	Section	Para.	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE	Amend No.
25	7-Jul-21	8	E	5	Attachment A: Page 8 item 5a. Is there a contingency plan if the site experiences significantly wetter or drier than normal precipitation during the post-grading monitoring period? Who decides if the site has achieved successful hydrology after the post-grading monitoring period? Will this be based on the best professional judgement of the Cooperator?	The contingency plan will be up to the Cooperator. The successful hydrology assessment will be made by the Cooperator and reviewed/approved by MDE and USACE. The regulatory parties will need to concur with the hydrology assessment before the project can continue past the post-grading monitoring phase and into the planting phase.	N/A
26	7-Jul-21	8	E	5	Attachment A: On page 8 of the SOW, item 5b. states that the annual monitoring reports must include information describing the success or failure of the wetland creation site and a description of any necessary remedial actions with a time frame for implementing such actions. Assuming that the project is successfully installed and planted per the plans, is the Cooperator responsible for implementing remedial actions, including any required maintenance or repairs to the water control structure?	The Cooperator will not be responsible for implementing the remedial actions proposed during the monitoring periods, after construction is complete.	N/A

CEDAR POINT WMA WETLAND CONSTRUCTION, WELCOME MARYLAND

Question No.	Date Received	Page	Section	Para.	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE	Amend No.
27	7-Jul-21	8	E	5	Attachment A: During the duration of the contract, within the growing season, will the Cooperator be able to control the water level in the pond via adjustment of the water control structure?	The Cooperator can access the site and water control structure as often as needed to adequately control the water level.	N/A
28	7-Jul-21	7	D	22	Attachment A: The project site is located on DNR land in a remote field far from the road and any infrastructure. Is the Cooperator responsible to use the services of a private utility locator if Miss Utility will not mark this area?	No, utility location services will not be required for this project.	N/A
29	7-Jul-21	7	D	19	Attachment A: Are access forms required for personnel who will be working on this project?	Access forms are not required. This property is not within a secured perimeter.	N/A
30	7-Jul-21	4	D	4	Attachment A: Is the Davis-Bacon Act applicable to this project?	No, the Davis-Bacon Act is not applicable to this project.	N/A
31	7-Jul-21	12	G	6	Attachment A: Does the as-built survey need to cover the entire LOD (i.e., the spoil area) or just the constructed wetland areas?	As-built should include entire LOD and spoil area in order to show that the site (aside from the constructed wetland) was returned to original conditions post-construction.	N/A

Question No.	Date Received	Page	Section	Para.	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE	Amend No.
32	7-Jul-21	1	S	22	Attachment B: Sheet 1 of the plan set references an invasive treatment. Is this for the wetland areas only or does it include adjacent areas?	Invasives treatments should only address the wetland areas to be constructed in order to ensure that invasives do not invade the desirable seedings/plantings.	N/A
33	7-Jul-21	6			Attachment B Disclaimer: The designer references a disclaimer against the success of the project. What responsibility does the Cooperator have toward the success of the project if the design is followed as designed?	This disclaimer appears to protect the original designer from repercussions if the wetland fails as designed due to extraneous circumstances and factors. The construction Cooperator(s) will have the full responsibility of ensuring that the wetland mitigation is properly constructed and successful in achieving the designed wetland features and habitat. If factors that are outside of the Cooperator's control (e.g. "acts of god") should damage the site, then the contract can be modified to account for the additional required effort for repairs.	N/A

Question No.	Date Received	Page	Section	Para.	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE	Amend No.
34	7-Jul-21				Attachment B, Sequence of Construction, Item #3 introduces a project member referred to as the RESTORATION SPECIALIST. This position is not defined in the RFP. The duties of the RESTORATION SPECIALIST as outlined in the plans are comprehensive in terms of the impact on the flow of information in general execution of the project. Please provide a definition of the RESTORATION SPECIALIST, and whether he/she is a member of the Government Team (Navy), Owner Team (DNR), Contractor Team, or a third-party entity not defined to date in the proposal. <i>Execution of the project and corresponding costs are subject to understanding the respected roles of the project members.</i>	The Restoration Specialist is assumed to be a member of the Cooperator/Contractor team. The roles of said specialist can be defined as needed by the Cooperator's team or can be fulfilled by any other appropriate labor category as deemed necessary by the Cooperator. Presumably, the Restoration Specialist would be a sufficiently experienced individual in an area such as wetland mitigation/design/construction so as to ensure success of the constructed wetland and successful completion of this project.	N/A

Question No.	Date Received	Page	Section	Para.	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE	Amend No.
35	7-Jul-21				We have surmised from a review of the design plans and absence of engineering design calculations that the design plans are not complete and may be missing key elements that are required prior to permit approval and that make this project buildable. We have included a few examples of specific comments related to the incomplete engineering at the bottom of our RFI. Is the Cooperator to account for additional design components that have an unknown costs?	This project is permitted as mitigation, not construction, and the required permits have already been issued. USACE MDSPGP-5 permit valid until September 30 2021 and an extension request is in progress. Expected to be issued before construction begins. MDE Nontidal Wetlands and Waterways permit valid until July 24 2022 and will be extended. E&S plan approval obtained May 18 2020, no expiration date listed. MDE Construction NOI for Stormwater Discharge due to Construction Activity approval obtained June 15 2020, good for 5 years. MDE approval for mitigation plan obtained, no expiration as long as all requirements are met by end of construction. If the Cooperator determines that the current designs lack complete engineering and specifications, then the Cooperator can generate them as needed and must be reviewed by the Navy prior to construction. However, no further regulatory approval should be required as long as designs do not deviate significantly from the permitted plans currently in hand.	N/A

Question No.	Date Received	Page	Section	Para.	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE	Amend No.
36	7-Jul-21				Will the Navy provide the design plan data files (CAD) to the Cooperator & Contract Team?	Yes, CAD files are available.	N/A
37	7-Jul-21				Will the Navy be responsible for stakeout, or will the Cooperator & Contract Team?	The Cooperator and Contract team will be responsible for stakeout.	N/A

Question No.	Date Received	Page	Section	Para.	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE	Amend No.
38	7-Jul-21				Please clarify the roles of the organizations (Soltesz, Versar, & ESA) identified on Attachment B and are those organizations embedded in the BAA?	Soltesz, Versar, & ESA were responsible for conducting the hydrology survey, topographical survey, wetland delineation, generating the mitigation plan and design, and permit applications.	N/A
39	7-Jul-21				The bid suggests that the 5 year monitoring will be awarded as an option contract to be re-assessed or renewed annually. Will the Monitoring be under the same Cooperative Agreement as the construction component or awarded under a separate Cooperative Agreement?	The monitoring years will be under this construction parent contract and individual option years, each with an extended POP, will be awarded as needed.	N/A

Question No.	Date Received	Page	Section	Para.	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE	Amend No.
40	7-Jul-21				During the site visit, the Navy's TPOC informed the site visit attendees that all permits were obtained, but that the MDE General Permit expires in September 2020. He also mentioned that the Navy would extend this permit before it expires. Please provide detail status of the MDE Permit, the Wetland Permits, and any other permits in process / issued.	USACE MDSPGP-5 permit valid until September 30 2021 and an extension request is in progress. Expected to be issued before construction begins. MDE Nontidal Wetlands and Waterways permit valid until July 24 2022 and will be extended. E&S plan approval obtained May 18 2020, no expiration date listed. MDE Construction NOI for Stormwater Discharge due to Construction Activity approval obtained June 15 2020, good for 5 years. MDE approval for mitigation plan obtained, no expiration as long as all requirements are met by end of construction.	N/A
41	7-Jul-21				If Permits have been issued, will they be provided as part of this BAA to be considered during the preparation of our proposal?	Copies of permits can be provided as needed.	N/A

Question No.	Date Received	Page	Section	Para.	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE	Amend No.
42	7-Jul-21	BAA 12	7		BAA Announcement - Page 12 Section 7.0 - Intergovernmental Review Maryland is on the list of states that participates in the Intergovernmental Review Process. Does our proposal need to include verification of submission to the Intergovernmental Review Agency prior to submission to the funding source (olisha.costa@navy.mil)?	Yes, your proposal needs to include verification of submission to the Intergovernmental Review Agency, prior to submission to the funding source (olisha.costa@navy.mil)	N/A
43	7-Jul-21				Please confirm that the statutory authority for award of this Cooperative Agreement is the Sikes Act.	Confirmed.	N/A

Question No.	Date Received	Page	Section	Para.	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE	Amend No.
44	7-Jul-21				Please confirm that this Cooperative Agreement is subject to 32 CFR Part 32 -- Administrative Requirements for Grants and Agreements With Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Other Non-Profit Organizations.	Confirming that this Cooperative Agreement is subject to 32 CFR Part 32 -- Administrative Requirements for Grants and Agreements With Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Other Non-Profit Organizations.	N/A
45	7-Jul-21				Please confirm that this Cooperative Agreement is NOT subject to 32 CFR Part 34 -- Administrative Requirements for Grants and Agreements with for-profit organizations.	Confirming that this Cooperative Agreement is NOT subject to 32 CFR Part 34 -- Administrative Requirements for Grants and Agreements with for-profit organizations.	N/A

Question No.	Date Received	Page	Section	Para.	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE	Amend No.
46	7-Jul-21				Are for-profit organizations eligible for award of this Cooperative Agreement even though Section 2.2.37 states clearly that profit or fees are not allowable?	For profit organizations are not eligible for award of this Cooperative Agreement.	N/A
47	7-Jul-21				In 2017, the Navy's Response to an RFI for BAA #N40080-17-2-0003 cited NAVFAC counsel's opinion was that for-profit organizations are not eligible for grants and agreements solicited by NAVFAC agencies. Has this opinion changed?	It is the Government's position that For-profit organizations are not eligible for grants and agreements solicited by NAVFAC agencies. Pursuant to Sikes Act Section 670c-1(a), States, local governments, Indian tribes, nongovernmental organizations, and individuals are eligible to apply.	N/A

Question No.	Date Received	Page	Section	Para.	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE	Amend No.
48	7-Jul-21				In an email dated December 2, 2020 regarding BAA #N40080-20-0004, Southern Maryland RC&D requested clarification as to whether the Sikes Act permitted award of a Cooperative Agreement to a for-profit entity. In an email dated January 28, 2021, the Navy's Contracting Officer stated that NAVFAC Washington's Counsel was researching the issue, and in an email dated March 4, 2021, the same individual stated that "we do not share your restrictive interpretation of the Sikes Act." Is the current opinion of NAVFAC Washington Counsel that the Sikes Act permits award of a Cooperative Agreement to a for-profit entity?	Pursuant to Sikes Act Section 670c-1(a), States, local governments, Indian tribes, nongovernmental organizations, and individuals are eligible to apply. For-Profit entities are not eligible for award.	N/A

Question No.	Date Received	Page	Section	Para.	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE	Amend No.
49	7-Jul-21				Sheet 13 of 13 notes a requirement administered by the RESTORATION SPECIALIST to establish and install photography stations and a monitoring well. No details of the required construction were included in the plan for the wells or the photography stations. Will these details be provided on the final set of plans?	The Cooperator will be able to determine how to best implement monitoring wells and photography stations in order to satisfy regulatory requirements for yearly monitoring. Additional details will no be provided, the current plans are final.	N/A
50	7-Jul-21				The plans are signed by a Landscape Architect, not a licensed engineer. Is this sufficient for permits to be issued by all required regulatory agencies, or is the Cooperator supposed to include a value to have a licensed engineer review and approve the plan?	Permits have already been obtained from MDE and USACE, details in question #40. The Cooperator is not expected to provide an engineer to review and approve the plan for regulatory purposes or additional permits.	N/A
Question Relating to #35						It is the Government's position that the response to RFI #35 adequately addresses the supplemental questions below.	N/A

Question No.	Date Received	Page	Section	Para.	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE	Amend No.
The hydrology method used in the basis of design reference, sheet 2 of 13, does not meet the standard accepted as the standard engineering practice. The rational method used only applies to exceptionally small drainage areas, usually less than a quarter of an acre. The application method applicable to the design of a pond and its components is TR-55 and/or combination of TR-55 and TR-20. Using the appropriate TR-55 related methods will result extensively higher base flow. This flow will inundate the receiving cells to much higher elevations and more prolong periods than that currently envisioned in the design. With higher backups and more frequent flooding, the survivability of any plantings is questionable and other site component such as the outfall berms may be compromised by overflows.							

Question No.	Date Received	Page	Section	Para.	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE	Amend No.
					The pond proposed is an excavated pond. The generally accepted practices for designing that pond is NRCS Code 378. The embankment and components should meet the TR-55 hydrologic criteria and a 25 year design standard for embankment components.		
					The 10 inch draw down structure is referenced on the plan but no details typical for pond construction are available. From the raw data presented it is very questionable if the pipe, the draw down device, and especially the anti-seep collars can be installed with sufficient cover. The standard practice is to include a specific section through any draw down device. This has not been developed for these plans. Please provide an engineered drawing.		
					As specified an Agri Drain device is proposed for this project. The information available does not address items from the manufacture's literature including specific pipe types, checks for anchoring and checks for anti-floatation.		
					The designation of a system consisting of a controlled device connected to pipes and including anti seep collars and possible base is a practice requiring certification by a Professional Engineer.		
					The standard for pond design, Code 378 would dictate the use of a HDPE pipe material, AASHTO, M-252, Type S for corrugated pipes. This information needs to be pre-approved and included on any plans in order to facilitate ordering of Agri Drain device.		
					The project summary on the Title Sheet 1 of 13 indicates that wetland permits are either approved or in process. Sheet 4 of 13 indicates some values for wetland associated disturbances and timber mats are specified as required in these areas. The plans specifically need to show allowed width required for installation of timber mats in these areas so the limits on wetland disturbances are not compromised.		
					The culvert that exist on the east side Cell C is reference on sheet 2 of 13 but not shown on the grading plans (sheet 5 of 13, et.al.) Changes in elevation to promote adequate drainage from upland areas may negate the grading at proposed elevations for the downstream cells.		
					Elevations are missing on the discharge berm from Cell B and the pond. This is a critical elevation point in that it dictates the volume of water which is subject to draw down in various conditions. Note: all berms should have a top elevation specified.		
					On sheet 6 of 13 the typical earth berm outfall cross section shows soil stabilization matting along the entire constructed berm. The graphic presentation sheets 5 of 13 et.al appears to note a very limited use of the matting at the locations of the outfalls between cells. Please define the intent for use of matting materials for the project and insert dimensions as needed.		
					Sheet 6 of 13 in the description of the Class 1 rip rap apron/Class 1 stone some conflict in describing a readily available product, Class 1 rip rap is a standard MD SHA defined product. The amount on this job is 10 feet X 12 feet (120 sf.) is a sample required as outlined in the notes or will a delivery ticket suffice?		
					The sections on sheet 12 of 13 specify that seedlings are planted at 10 foot, center to center. That 10 feet equates to 1 planting per 100 sf or 436 plants per acre. The planting schedules on sheet 11 of 13 call for 500 plants per acre. Please confirm which is correct.		

Question No.	Date Received	Page	Section	Para.	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE	Amend No.
The cover (Sheet 1 of 13) indicates that the stake out will be performed for the archeological area, limits of construction, etc. Will the Navy be furnishing specific survey file information or performing the initial stakeout for these items?							