

Question No.	Date Received	REFERENCE			QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE	Amend No.
		Page	Section	Para.			
1	8/7/2020				If available can you please provide supporting engineering documents that went along with the designs (such as engineering reports, modeling reports or CAD files with topographic and hydrographic data)?	Hard copy CAD drawings are available, but electronic files are not. They can be provided after award. If engineering and modeling reports are available, they will be provided at a later date. Assume that they are not available at this time and that the survey component of this solicitation will include any studies and data gathering to compensate for the lack of engineering/ modeling/ hydrography/ topography data or reports.	0001
2	8/7/2020				Were geotechnical borings taken when performing the initial design? If so, can the results of these be provided?	No geotechnical borings are known to have been taken at this time.	0001
3	8/7/2020				How was it determined that the site conditions are changing and that a new bathymetric survey is required? Can the original bathymetric survey data be provided?	Satellite imagey indicates that they point of Cedar Point has shifted and diminished significantly over time. Original bathymetric data is not know to be available. If any is discovered, it will be provided. Some historical aerial imagery is available in the EA.	0001
4	8/7/2020				Did the original designs account for sea level rise? If not, should the new designs take this into account?	Yes (see file ChesBayPhase1&3.rep2012).	0001
5	8/7/2020				Can you provide the existing approved permits for review for all three Phases?	Yes (see USACE permit PDFs for 60620 and 61059 along with extensions, 4 files total; also see Tidal Wetlands License MDE PDF).	0001
6	8/7/2020				Will the winning team be able to consult with the engineer of record for the Phase 1 and 3 areas for the purpose of ascertaining design assumptions?	The Government has no issue with the awardee contacting the original engineer and designer if they are available to consult.	0001
7	8/7/2020				Can NAVFAC provide the figure that Mr. Dascalu had showing which areas of the shoreline had already been stabilized and which areas still needed stabilization?	Yes, see attachment shoreline_work_needed_Pax2.JPG.	0001

Question No.	Date Received	Page	Section	Para.	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE	Amend No.
8	8/7/2020				Is there any storm or overtopping information for the Cedar Point dune area?	Information not immediately available but the customer operating in the dune area will likely have relevant data. They can be consulted for any available information after award.	0001
9	8/7/2020				Is there a NEPA document for the project? If so, can this be provided?	Yes, see EA from 2007.	0001
10	8/7/2020				Pending the data request our team would require two weeks from the time the additional information is provided to review and respond. Therefore, we respectfully request an extension for the August 24th due date pending a two week window upon receipt of any additional information as noted in the questions above.	The proposal due date has been extended to 2 September 2020; via Amendment 0001	0001
11	8/7/2020	5	BAA		Is the Pre-Bid Site Meeting on 07/29/20 mandatory attendance for bidders?	The Pre-Bid Site Visit held on 7/29/20 was highly encouraged. However, it did not require mandatory attendance for bidders.	0001
12	8/7/2020	5	BAA		If subsequent / other Pre-Bid Site Meetings occur, will we receive notification, invitation to attend, & answers to any questions asked?	The Government will not be holding any additional Pre-Bid Site visit Meetings.	0001
13	8/7/2020				Will list of respondents be made available after bid closing date?	No, a list of respondents will not be provided.	0001
14	8/7/2020	5	BAA		Is a site visit required to be permitted to submit bid?	No, a site visit is not required to be permitted to submit a bid.	0001

Question No.	Date Received	Page	Section	Para.	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE	Amend No.
15	8/7/2020				Will a list of pre-qualified attendees from Site Visit 07.29.20 be made available prior to bid closing date?	A list of the site visit attendees has been provided via Amendment 0001	0001
16	8/7/2020				RE Permit: Is this a whole new permit or a modification to an existing permit? Is the permit still valid / expired? Does it need to be re-activated? Who will be responsible for any future permit / mitigation fees?	The Navy already has permits in place for this project. The Navy intends to extend existing permits. The Cooperator is not expected to be responsible for permit fees. The Cooperator is only responsible for coordination with the Navy, MDE, and USACE to inform them of the updated data and designs, update the permit with the new data, and help ensure that the new design is still within the bounds of the existing permit(s).	0001
17	8/7/2020				RE Permit: Will copies of the approved permits, permit extensions, and executed mitigation agreements be furnished by the Navy to support permitting efforts?	Copies of approved permits and any regulatory agreements will be provided.	0001
18	8/7/2020				Are we required to submit a cost estimate with our proposal?	See revised SECTION IV: APPLICATION AND SUBMISSION INFORMATION in Amendment 0001: For Budget Volume II, the applicant shall ensure that the information submitted in this volume is consistent with and fully supports the amounts set forth in SF 424A. Provide budget details and a narrative to present the breakdown of your estimated costs, by category, needed to accomplish project activities.	0001
19	8/7/2020				If awarded the project - will we be required to submit a cost estimate that matches the revised design as part of the SOW?	An estimate is highly desirable, yes.	0001
20	8/7/2020	3	SOW		SOW: Is Task 3 Title Correct (p.3)?	The title is incorrect, it will be revised in the final SOW to state "Shoreline"	0001
21	8/7/2020				Cedar Pt Breakwaters: Do we make adjustments for shore change?	Yes, the design needs to be updated in order to take into account the change to baseline conditions over the last 10+ years since original design.	0001

Question No.	Date Received	Page	Section	Para.	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE	Amend No.
22	8/7/2020	15	VI	b.	Solicitation: Attachment A-FY20 NAS Pax River Shoreline Bathmetry & Redesign - Award Ceiling & Award Floor: Solicitation states an "Award Floor" and "Award Ceiling" value of \$109,048. Are we to assume that the value for the proposed work under this BAA is set at \$109,048, and that the dispersal/allocation of effort are the Criteria by which cost effectiveness will be evaluated (Criterion B, page 15)?	The Award Ceiling & Award Floor value of \$109,048 is the Government's estimated cost for the work. We anticipate that Offeror's prices may come in at, over, or under this value, depending on the Offeror's technical approach. We just ask that Offeror's provide a price that is reasonable in relation to the Government's estimate and is appropriate for the work proposed to fulfill the requirements of the SOW. The evaluation criteria for this BAA has been revised. See SECTION IV: APPLICATION AND SUBMISSION INFORMATION of Amendment 0001 for further details.	0001
23	8/7/2020				Please identify the acceptable period for the address of Sea Level Rise (e.g. year 2050, etc.).	2050	0001
24	8/7/2020	8	IV		Please clarify the number of pages allowed / required in our proposal. On page 8, in Section IV, the proposal format line vi. limits the Section I response (assumed as the Technical Approach) to a maximum of 20 sheets. However, on page 15 in the Evaluation Criterion A, the Technical Approach is a minimum of two (2) and a maximum of six (6) pages.	SECTION IV: APPLICATION AND SUBMISSION INFORMATION has been replaced in its entirety via Amendment 0001. The technical proposal must be no longer than 20 pages, with a font size no smaller than 11-point and have at least one (1) inch margins on all sides. The 20-page limit includes all text, figures, references, and vitae, but does not include the Budget details and narrative.	0001
25	8/7/2020	7	IV	2nd	BAA: Section IV-2-a, page 7, in the second sentence was the intent to list three sections instead of the two stated?	SECTION IV: APPLICATION AND SUBMISSION INFORMATION has been replaced in its entirety via Amendment 0001	0001

Question No.	Date Received	Page	Section	Para.	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE	Amend No.
26	8/7/2020	23	IX		Please clarify if for-profit entities are eligible for award of this project. If they are eligible, can their cost include fee or profit? Section IX, Article 19, page 23 indicates no fee or profit may be charged to the Cooperative Agreement, per 32 CFR 22.205(b).	This is an Unrestricted Opportunity. SECTION III- ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION has been revised via amendment 0002 to state: "The following types of entities are eligible to apply for award under this BAA: Government Organizations, Education Organizations, Public Housing Organizations, Nonprofit Organizations, For-Profit Organizations, Small Businesses and Individuals." Since the awarding agency determined that this project was appropriate for an assistance award rather than a procurement contract, fee or profit is expressly not allowed at the the prime recipient or sub recipient level.	0002
27	8/7/2020				Will the awardee (Cooperator) of this design/permit component be permitted to bid on any subsequent construction components of the same project, as long as the Cooperator utilizes a different subcontractor for the construction than they used for the design/permit?	This BAA/cooperative agreement does not preclude offerors from proposing on subsequent construction work.	0001
28	8/7/2020	BAA-7	III	1	The BAA states that Eligibility is all responsible sources from academia, industry, and non-governmental organization may submit proposal under this BAA. Confirm that the opportunity is unrestricted and industry for-profit entities are eligible to bid on a non-profit basis?	This is an Unrestricted Opportunity. SECTION III- ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION has been revised via amendment 0002 to state: "The following types of entities are eligible to apply for award under this BAA: Government Organizations, Education Organizations, Public Housing Organizations, Nonprofit Organizations, For-Profit Organizations, Small Businesses and Individuals."	0002

Question No.	Date Received	Page	Section	Para.	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE	Amend No.
29	8/7/2020				In order to work under the existing permits, we assume the redesign would need to stay within the original permit footprint and use the same phases, i.e., Phase I through III. Is this correct?	Yes. Design would need to remain within existing footprint (no further waterward) and should use the same designations for ease of regulator understanding.	0001
30	8/7/2020		General		By providing support to this cooperative agreement, does it exclude the selected offeror from the construction action?	This BAA/cooperative agreement does not preclude offerors from proposing on subsequent construction work.	0001
31	8/7/2020		Task 2 iii and iv	1	The Scope of Work does not require geotechnical boring. Was geotechnical boring conducted to support the original design? If so, would the Navy provide the technical report associated with the original design?	No geotechnical borings are known to have been taken at this time. If any are discovered, they will be provided.	0001
32	8/7/2020		General		Are there any Maryland Historical Trust considerations surrounding Cedar Point? Are the Cultural Resources known?	Yes (see "mht cb comments" and "NAS Patuxent River Shoreline Stabilization May 2012"). These address potential underwater assets	0001
33	8/7/2020	3	Task 3 iii	1	The recreation area (parking lot and freestanding picnic tables) at the south end of Phase I will likely be affected by the design. Do you want the parking area surfacing (pavers) included in the design? If so, does it need to be ADA compliant?	If the parking area will be affected, then it should be taken into account in the design. The parking area only needs to be returned to original conditions, or be kept as close to original conditions as possible. The current conditions don't appear to be ADA compliant, so they would not be expected to be made compliant.	0001
34	8/7/2020	3	Task 3 iii	1	Between phase II and phase III there is an exposed sewer line crossing a creek channel. Should the redesign include a remedy for this situation?	If the exposed sewer line does not have an impact on the shoreline design and construction later on, then no.	0001
35	8/7/2020	3	Task 3 iii	1	Should utility relocation be considered and associated costs included in the redesign?	Utility relocation should not be included unless it poses a significant obstacle to the design and construction later on. The previous design should have accounted for utilities, so they are not expected to be an issue that needs to be addressed.	0001

Question No.	Date Received	Page	Section	Para.	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE	Amend No.
36	8/7/2020	3	Task 3 iv	1	You have indicated that projected sea-level rise should be considered in the redesign. Did the original design incorporate projected sea-level rise? What is the expected service life of the constructed structures?	Yes, sea level rise was accounted for. 50-year service life. (see ChesBayPhase1&3.rep2012).	0001
37	8/7/2020	3	Task 3 iii	1	Do we need to provide specifications of materials? If so, will the Navy provide standard specifications?	Assume specifications will need to be provided to the extent required for the priginal permit. Assume the Navy will not be able to provide standard specifications.	0001
38	8/7/2020	3	Task 3 iii	1	There is a lot of concrete debris along the shoreline. Does this material need to be removed or can it be utilized or built over in the construction?	This would need to be discussed with MDE. MDE may allow reuse of materials as long as they meet state/federal requirements. I don't believe MDE will allow thie current material to simply be built over, but the question can be asked when coordinating the design with the regulators. Please note that this contract does not include construction, only surveys and redesign.	0001
39	8/7/2020	3	Task 3 v	1	It is our understanding that permitting is out of scope for the CA. Is that true? Is the cooperator or the Navy responsible for coordination with MDE and USACE for approval of the redesign?	The Navy already has permits in place for this project. The Navy intends to extend existing permits. The Cooperator is responsible for providing support and assitance, coordination with the Navy, MDE, and USACE to inform them of the updated data and designs, update the permit with the new data, and help ensure that the new design is still within the bounds of the existing permit(s).	0001