



Department of Property & Procurement

Government of the United States Virgin Islands

3274 ESTATE RICHMOND, CHRISTIANSTED, U. S. VIRGIN ISLANDS 00820

8201 SUB BASE, 3RD FLOOR, ST. THOMAS, U. S. VIRGIN ISLANDS 00802

ST. CROIX MAIN OFFICE: 340.773.1561 | ST. THOMAS MAIN OFFICE: 340.774.0828

ST. CROIX FAX: 340.773.0986 | ST. THOMAS FAX: 340.774.9587

HTTP://DPP.VI.GOV



July 28, 2020

AMENDMENT THREE (3)

RFP-23-C-2020 (P)- Professional Services for Design related to Phase 1 Drainage Improvements to Mahogany Rd, St. Croix, VI, Project no. 4340-0024

Insert: Questions and Answers

Question: The RFP includes existing condition plans and proposed roadway plans for Mahogany Road; will these plans be available in CAD format to the selected firm?

Answer: DPW will provide PDF's of the plans to the selected firm.

Question: Can you please provide existing plans for the roadway within project limits?

Answer: Existing plans are not available.

3. Question: Can you please provide any prior studies completed which identified the issues within the project limits?

Answer: DPW does not have existing studies completed for the area within the project limits.

Question: The link provided in the RFP does not work. Can you please provide a working link? Below is the link that was provided in the RFP:

<https://stcroixsource.com/2010/11/11/body-st-croix-flood-victimrecovered/>

Answer: <https://stcroixsource.com/2010/11/11/body-st-croix-flood-victimrecovered/>

Question: In case existing utilities needs to be relocated due to proposed improvements then in that case are we required to include utility relocation in Construction plans that will be part of PS&E package?

Answer: There is an existing underground communications line located on Hams Bluff Rd (AT&T) and Mahogany Rd (VIYA). The exact location and depth are not known. The selected firm will be required to identify any conflicts. If a relocation is required, the PS&E package shall include the location of the existing line and new conduit.

Question: What is the length of the channel to be “reshaped and protected” along No Name Road referenced in the provided RFP, “Attachment 1”? Also, what is the width of this channel?

Answer: The approximate length is 200 feet and the approximate width is 20 feet.

Question: Please confirm the slope stabilization referenced in the provided RFP, “Attachment 1”, is for the existing Gut

located adjacent to Mahogany Road and not for the roadway itself.

Answer: Confirmed.

Question: What are the begin and end project limits and/or length of the slope to be stabilized?

Answer: The approximate length is 200 feet.

Question: If the slope stabilization referenced in the provided RFP, “Attachment 1”, is for the existing Gut located adjacent to Mahogany Road, what is the width of this existing Gut?

Answer: The approximate width is 20 feet.

Question: Will the flood control project referenced in the 2nd page of the RFP (2nd paragraph, 2nd to last sentence) currently being designed by USACE include the last 1,800 of channel improvements to the ocean?

Answer: This portion is not included in this scope.

Question: Please confirm that the red box shown in the provided RFP, “Attachment 1”, along Hams Bluff Road is desired to be a low water road crossing discharging runoff to the ocean in lieu of a culvert.

Answer: The assumed improvement is a culvert.

Question: Would it be possible to obtain a .KMZ file of the “Attachment 1” referenced in the RFP?

Answer: A KZM file is not available.

Question: Does the Project Location limits specified in Attachment 1 represent the project submitted to FEMA for Public Assistance?

Answer: This project does not involve FEMA public assistance.

Question: Has FEMA performed a damage assessment of the site, including dimensions? If so, can these reports be provided to the proposers?

Answer: FEMA has not performed a damage assessment for this site or project.

Question: Has a Site Inspection Report and Hazard Mitigation Report been provided by FEMA? If so, can these reports be provided to the proposers?

Answer: A Site Inspection Report and Hazard Mitigation Report have not been provided by FEMA.

Question: How many mitigation alternatives are anticipated or will be required to be evaluated by the selected Consultant?

Answer: One additional alternative and a no-build alternative are anticipated to be evaluated.

Question: Please clarify that the Final Benefit Cost Analysis will be for the preferred mitigation alternative only.

Answer: Confirmed.

Question: Does the Government anticipate a request for FEMA funding under the Section 404 Hazard Mitigation Grant Program for mitigation measures to undamaged portions of the road corridor?

Answer: No.

Question: Who prepared the topographic survey provided as Attachment 2? How old is the survey and can we rely on the on the accuracy of the survey? Is it anticipated our proposal includes survey services for additional area only, as required, or to resurvey the areas shown in Attachment 2?

Answer: The survey was performed by Javier E Bidot & Associates in 2018 and is being provided by DPW. The consultant shall be responsible to verify the accuracy of the survey. The complete survey, including electronic file, will be made available to the successful offeror. The consultant shall be responsible for all survey required to design and implement the selected mitigation features.

Question: Who prepared the Draft proposed Roadway Plans provided as Attachment 3. Is the firm who prepared those plans restricted from proposing on this RFP?

Answer: The plans were prepared by Stanley Consultants, Inc. for the Department of Public Works. The complete final plans (PDF) will be made available to the successful offeror. Stanly Consultants is not restricted from proposing on this RFP.

Question: Were the proposed roadway plans prepared with the intent of addressing the flooding conditions identified in this RFP?

Answer: The roadway plans were not prepared with the intent to mitigate the flooding issues identified in this project/RFP.

Question: Is there an available certified USVI M/WBE list where we can look for firms to include on our proposal and show a good faith effort?

Answer: DPW maintains a list of Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBE) for USDOT related projects. The Directory can be found on DPW's Website at dpw.vi.gov

Question: Is there available soils information? Or should we be including a geotechnical study as part of our proposed work?

Answer: The proposal should include a geotech report as required for the proposed structures.

Question: Is there a list available of the people/firms that attended the preproposal meeting.

Answer: DPW has no objections to DPP providing the list of attendees who were on the Tele-Conference.

**All other terms and conditions remain the same.
A copy of this amendment must be returned with your bid.**