

ADDENDUM NUMBER 2

DATE: January 10, 2018

PROJECT: Harbor Bay Community Development District Design Build of Master Seawall Project

OWNER: Harbor Bay Community Development District

MANAGER: Joe Roethke, Rizzetta and Company, Inc.

TO: Prospective Bidders

This Second Addendum to the Harbor Bay Community Development District (“District”) Project Manual - Request for Proposals for Design Build of Master Seawall Project provides the following clarification, addition, deletion and/or modification to the Project Manual for the above referenced project. This Second Addendum has the same force and effect as the Project Manual, and any costs associated with this Second Addendum should also be factored into bid prices.

Please acknowledge receipt of this Second Addendum in the space provided in the Bid/Certification Form and by e-mail to District Engineers and Design Criteria Professionals Greg Woodcock, P.E. at Greg.Woodcock@Cardno.com and Christopher Gamache, P.E. at Christopher.Gamache@Cardno.com, with e-mail copies to District Manager Joseph Roethke at JRoethke@rizzetta.com and District Counsel Michael Eckert at MichaelE@hgslaw.com. Failure to acknowledge receipt may disqualify the Proposer.

1. **Question:** Concerning Design criteria noted in Design-Build RFP Design Criteria Package (7.B.a) which calls for “design of extreme event where water in canals has drained and water has saturated the backfill and overtopped the wall.” Please define what is meant by defining for extreme event. “...water in the canals has been drained...” means water in canal is drained to where bulkhead meets grade (0.0), or to bottom of canal, or level in between?

Answer: *The “extreme event” design criteria refers to load cases representing worst-case scenarios. The safety factors, load/resistance factors, and/or allowable overstresses shall be as defined in the design codes allowed by the RFP as appropriate for extreme conditions. The water elevation in the bottom of the canal for the extreme event load case shall emulate the historic water elevations that occurred during hurricane Irma.*

2. **Question:** Is it the intent to design with saturation to the top of the existing bulkhead (+6), or to the top of the upland retaining wall (+10 or +11)?

Answer: *The intent is to design with the saturation at the top of the existing bulkhead (+6).*

3. **Question:** Many of the reports are in DRAFT form. Are FINAL versions available?

Answer: *The reports provided consist of the current versions available.*

4. **Question:** Summary Report of Rip Rap Test Section (by Langan, Aug 4, 2017) indicates that rip rap slopes were stable based on water level differential of approximately 1'. This is far less than what is required in Design-Build RFP Design Criteria Package (7.B.a) which calls for design of extreme event where water in canals has drained and water has saturated the backfill and overtopped the wall. Therefore, Rip Rap test section design may not be stable under the "extreme criteria" called out in the RFP. Do you want design of rip rap sections to be based on RFP or as suggested in the Rip Rap Test Section?

Answer: *All designs shall be based on the requirements outlined in the RFP.*

5. **Question:** RFP Design Criteria in 7.E states "final design proposed shall neither impair boat navigation in the canals nor impair boat access to docks." Access to docks by boats depends on many variables, including but not limited to size of boat, draft of boat, current speeds. The design criteria established in the RFP will likely have a major impact on the rip rap design section and its ability to provide a large enough mass for stability, yet allow enough space for boats. Is there a minimum criteria for clearance and draft for vessels to gain access to their docks?

Answer: *The existing permits provide limits for the placement of rip rap in the canal. Minimum criteria for clearance and draft have not been defined within the RFP.*

6. **Question:** For purposes of submitting a proposal for the RFP, how much design information should be supplied?

Answer: *Specific design information is not required for the RFP. It should be stated in the proposal that any details presented therein have been checked for viability in accordance with the design criteria provided in the RFP based on the available information provided.*

7. **Question:** Will companies or individuals involved as defendants of the lawsuit of the wall be allowed to bid/participate on the project?

Answer: *There is no current litigation between the district and any contractor regarding the seawall. The only current litigation to which the District is a party was brought by lot owners against the District relating to the seawall. There is no prohibition in the RFP preventing any company or individual from submitting a proposal. However, the District's past experience with a contractor is a factor the District's Board will consider in the evaluation of proposals.*

ANY PROPOSER WISHING TO PROTEST ANY OR ALL OF THE MATTERS CONTAINED OR ADDRESSED IN THIS ADDENDUM SHALL FILE A NOTICE OF PROTEST WITH THE DISTRICT

ENGINEERS AND DESIGN PROFESSIONALS, GREG WOODCOCK AND CHRISTOPHER GAMACHE, C/O CARDNO, 20215 CORTEZ BLVD, BROOKSVILLE, FLORIDA 34601, IN WRITING WITHIN SEVENTY-TWO HOURS (EXCLUDES WEEKENDS AND HOLIDAYS) AFTER POSTING OF THIS ADDENDUM. A FORMAL WRITTEN PROTEST ADEQUATELY DETAILING WITH PARTICULARITY THE FACTS AND LAW UPON WHICH THE PROTEST IS BASED SHALL BE FILED WITHIN SEVEN (7) CALENDAR DAYS AFTER THE NOTICE OF PROTEST IS FILED. FAILURE TO TIMELY FILE A WRITTEN NOTICE OF PROTEST OR FAILURE TO TIMELY FILE A FORMAL WRITTEN PROTEST SHALL CONSTITUTE A WAIVER OF ANY RIGHT TO OBJECT OR PROTEST WITH RESPECT TO THIS ADDENDUM.

END OF ADDENDUM 2