



ENGINEERING

ENVIRONMENTAL

INSPECTION

LAND SURVEYING

LAND ACQUISITION

PLANNING

WATER &
WASTEWATER

SINCE 1965

OFFICERS

- Steven W. Jones
- Christopher R. Pope, PE
- B. Keith Bryant, PE
- Michael A. Rowe, PE
- Jon E. Clodfelter, PE
- Paul D. Glotzbach, PE

PROFESSIONAL STAFF

- Andrew T. Wolka, PE
- Devin L. Stettler, AICP
- Michael S. Oliphant, AICP
- Timothy J. Coomes, PLS
- Steven R. Passey, PE
- Brian J. Pierson, PE
- Christopher L. Hammond, PE
- Brian S. Frederick, PE
- Jay N. Ridens, PE
- Christopher J. Dyer, PE
- Jeromy A. Richardson, PE
- Heather E. Kilgour, PE
- Adam J. Greulich, PLS
- Caleb C. Ross, PE
- Dann C. Barrett, PE
- Scott G. Minnich, PE
- Michael D. Farrell, CPA
- Kelton S. Cunningham, PE
- Braun S. Rodgers, PE
- Chris J. Andrzejewski, PE
- Eric S. Harned, PE
- Andrew J. Allison, PE
- Abigail I. Godsey, PE
- Gretchen A. Meyer, PE
- Brian S. Haefliger, PE
- Ricardo J. Paredes Aronsohn, PE
- Corbin A. Schwiebert, PE
- Tim B. Leemhuis, PE
- Hogan W. Sills, PE
- Kyle D. Kent, PE
- Bradley M. Salpietro, PE
- Steven D. Zehr, PE
- John D. SanGiorgio, PE
- Marcus A. Gahagen, PE
- Troy A. Casey, PE
- Mitchell D. Lankford, PE
- Joy L. Bosse, PE
- Melissa A. Stone, PE
- Tony Fadoul, PE

www.ucindy.com
(317) 895-2585
8440 Allison Pointe Blvd., Suite 200, Indianapolis, IN 46250

August 28, 2024

RE: Montgomery County Bridge Scour Maintenance Project
Addendum No. 1

To All Bidders:

This Addendum, issued prior to bidding, alters, amends, corrects, or clarifies the proposal documents to the extent stated herein and does thereby become a part of the proposal documents and will become a part of the Contract Documents of the successful bidder.

Response to Questions

- Q: The Notice to Bidders states bids are due on September 6, 2024 at 4:00 PM and read on September 9, 2024 at 8:00 AM. This is normal for Montgomery County, but on page 75 of the General Provisions it states questions are to be submitted by September 6, 2024 by 4:00 PM and bid are due by September 9, 2024 by 8:00 AM. Can you please clarify which is correct?

A: Bids are due as stated in the Notice to Bidders on September 6, 2024 at 4:00 PM. GP8 should read:

“Bids will be opened publicly and read aloud at 8:00 a.m. local time, September 9, 2024, at the Montgomery County Commissioner’s Meeting. Bidders, or their authorized agents, are invited to be present. Any Bids received after 8:00 a.m. local time, September 9, 2024 4:00 p.m. local time, September 6, 2024 will be returned to the bidder unopened.

- Q: Each bridge has a Stormwater Management Budget pay item and references an INDOT specification number. On INDOT projects, a budget dollar amount is established based on the proposed erosion control plan, and INDOT pays for any erosion control work that falls under this spec with established unit prices (listed under 205.11 in the 2024 INDOT Spec book). Will a budget for each bridge be established and the pay item for each bridge adjust to reflect the new budget?

A: See SP6. The intent of the Stormwater Management Budget pay item for this project is to capture the cost of all items related to access and dewatering, and should pay for all items shown in the erosion control plans that do not have a separate pay item. This Special Provision supersedes the typical INDOT use of the pay item (See GP1). A budget for each bridge and additional pay items for each bridge will not be established.

- Q: A couple bridges (bridges 136 & 174, I believe) have farm fence in the way. One also had some pieces of wood hanging from a conduit with some farm fence. How will the removal of this be handled? Bridge 25 has a large log jam on the south side of the bridge. How will the removal for this be handled?

A: Farm fences located on bridges should either be left in place, or removed during the project and replaced upon completion. The cost of

removing and replacing any farm fences should be included in the incidental cost of Mobilization and Demobilization.

Any log jams and debris impacting the project, including Bridge 25, will be removed by the Owner prior to contractor mobilization.

4. Q: According to INDOT specifications, contractors can replace Class 1 Riprap with Grouted Revetment Riprap, which will still be paid under the Class 1 Riprap pay item. Would this be an acceptable alternative for bridges with low clearance where equipment access is limited or not possible?

A: The Owner has stated that Grouted Revetment Riprap will not be an acceptable alternative on this project.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact me at your convenience.

Sincerely,
UNITED CONSULTING, INC.



John SanGiorgio, P.E.
Project Team Leader

c: Jake Lough, Montgomery County
Steve Jones, UNITED
File 21-302-07