

City of Westminster

Addendum #1

RFB # 21-03

Minutes Pre-Bid Meeting for Phase 3 Sewer I&I, August 12, 2020 at 10:00 a.m.

1. City of Westminster officials attending: Jeff Glass, John Dick, Mike Matov, Mike Zechman, Cory Stouffer, Steve Owens, Ralph McElhinney
2. Bidders attending: Refer to attached sign-in sheets
3. Bids are due on September 9, 2020, no later than 2:00pm local time. Bid forms being submitted in response to the solicitation must be delivered as original signed documents, within a sealed envelope, to the City of Westminster Administrative Offices located at 56 West Main Street, Suite 1, Westminster, Maryland. Electronic transmission of Bids will **not** be accepted through the State of Maryland eMMA-electronic bid website.
4. Bidders must use the bid forms provided. All pricing must be provided including the base bid, unit prices, and alternate prices.
5. The total base bid must include the unit prices enumerated on the bid form in the total lump sum base bid figure.
6. Bids must be accompanied by an executed Bid Bond in the amount of 10%.
7. Contract time for completion is June 30, 2021, with \$150.00 per consecutive calendar day as liquidated damages.
8. Award will be based on understanding of RFB, completeness of bid package, total bid price, bidder qualification, references, bid work schedule.
9. Any bid addenda will be posted on the City website at <http://www.westminstermd.gov/bids.aspx>.
10. Prospective bidders who have questions regarding this Request for Bids should email their questions to Bids.Phase3II@westgov.com. The closing time for submission of questions is 4:30 p.m. on August 24, 2020. All questions and the associated answers will be posted on the City website at <http://www.westminstermd.gov/bids.aspx>.
11. To receive notification that information regarding this Request for Proposals has been posted to the City website, bidders are encouraged to register with the City by providing their firm name, name of firm representative, and email address for the firm's point of contact to MMatov@westgov.com

12. Bid bond is 10%

13. A second addendum will be issued with more questions and answers.

Specifications Changes/Additions:

1. Replace Price Bid Schedule (Pages 12 and 13) with Revised Price Bid Schedule (attached).
2. Add Address Layout Document (attached).
3. Add City Standard Details-Sewer (attached).

Questions Submitted by Bidders:

1. Question: Has the City notified property owners?
Answer: Yes
2. Question: If the stream is to be relocated, how is the stream to be restored?
Answer: This will be dictated by design and permits by MDE.
3. Question: How will the cost of moving or restoration of stream be shown on bid?
Answer: A Revised Price Bid is included in this addendum.
4. Question: Does the stream crossing need to be concrete encased?
Answer: It's likely, but the design portion of project will dictate it.
5. Question: Are construction easements expected?
Answer: This will be determined by engineering firm.
6. Question: Is video available of the existing line conditions?
Answer: Yes, the City has provided a URL to all attendees.
7. Question: Is a liner considered as an acceptable solution for the job?
Answer: Yes, but some parts of the line are too bad for liner.
8. Question: Are there GIS layouts of adjoining properties to the sewer line?
Answer: Yes, attached in this addendum, titled Address Layout.
9. Question: Are the total flows for sewer line available to size bypass pumping?
Answer: Yes, they are provided in this addendum.
10. Question: Getting 14 construction easements will delay past 6/30 deadline.
Answer: Any delays caused by such events will be confirmed and new date will be agreed on.
11. Question: Is there prevailing wage rate?
Answer: No

12. Question: Is boring expected on both ends of line to crossroads?
Answer: No, only the RT. 27 end of the line.
13. Question: Does the City have a dump site for use of job?
Answer: No.
14. Question: There is a soil classification conflict in specs and bid form.
Answer: A Revised Price Bid is included in this addendum.
15. Question: can ex. Can the line be removed and new put in same place?
Answer: This will be determined by the engineering and design.
16. Question: Are 45 degree vertical bends allowed?
Answer: They are not desired, but can be discussed in design phase, an outside drop is preferred.
17. Question: Is the layout area on-site or adjacent properties and will the City help with acquiring?
Answer: There are none on-site and we can help with possible sites.
18. Question: Does City expect blasting is needed?
Answer: We do not know, there is a section in the specifications just in case it's needed.
19. Question: Does the City have standard manholes?
Answer: See attached document titled City Standard Details-Sewer in this addendum.
20. Question: Is geotechnical needed?
Answer: No, it will be dealt with during construction.
21. Question: Can dirt be taken out and put back in?
Answer: Yes, no slop and line item has been added for base in Revised Price Bid Schedule.
22. Question: Is there a local tax?
Answer: There is no City sales tax, only Maryland State.
23. Question: Will bids be combined from different firms?
Answer: No, complete bid is design and construction as a team.
24. Question: Is permit time to be shown in bid?
Answer: Yes.
25. Question: Is easement surveying covered in this bid?
Answer: Yes, for any surveying.

26. Question: Is a link for inspection video available?
Answer: The link has been provided to all in attendance at the Pre-bid Meeting.
27. Question: Is there a weight on criteria for awarding the bid?
Answer: No.
28. Question: What is the liquidated damages amount?
Answer: \$150 a day.
29. Question: What manhole size is to be used?
Answer: This will be determined by engineer and design.
30. Question: Is the contractor responsible for the site the entire time?
Answer: Yes, responsibility starts at mobilization and ends at project completion.
31. Question: What's expected for site restoration?
Answer: Leave open and grubbing removed with typical grass replacement.

Questions Submitted by Bidders After Pre-Bid Meeting:

32. Question: Are there any scoring systems or other factors that will permit award based on "Best Value" rather than simply awarding to the lowest bid pricing received? Please confirm the method of award for this project.
Answer: There is no formal scoring system. The City will act at its best interests (See Instruction to Bidders Paragraph 6.)
33. Question: Traditionally, the intent of a Design/Build project is to make a "Best Value" project award that protects the project owner from unnecessary and frivolous change order requests. While there are bid items provided, the inherent nature of a "Design/Build" project is to include all work required to complete the project as presented. For example, if a temporary access road is needed through the right-of-way to construct the project, the installation/removal costs associated should be included regardless of the presence of a bid item for each specific task. Please confirm the owner's intent for this project is to have a complete and "turn-key" price for a "complete" project based on the project parameters set by the bid documents.
Answer: Confirmed.
34. Question: There are several locations in the specifications that indicate the owner's ability to award all or a portion of the project at their discretion. This language could imply the potential for an award of the design phase to one TEAM and the construction phase to another TEAM simply based on the lowest

bid pricing received. Please confirm this project will only be awarded as a single contract for both design and construction to the selected Design/Build TEAM.

Answer: Confirmed that the design and construction of the project will be awarded to the selected Design/Build Team.

35. Question: The required bid submission includes a “Phased Project Work Schedule”. Clearly each TEAM must be responsible for developing and assigning the amount of time they need to complete the design deliverables for each permit application, easement, plan submission, etc. as well as the construction efforts themselves. Unfortunately, there are several radicals and unknowns with regard to the award process as well as the various permit applications and review times for each agency. If all schedules submitted by competing TEAMS do not use the same criteria for the review/approval of each step in the design process, it will be impossible to make any reasonable comparison to the completion dates illustrated on each. Additionally, considering the current challenges at hand due to COVID, there are no guarantees with regard to what we have seen as a “normal” review/response time on previous projects for each of these efforts. It would extremely beneficial to the owner’s review and ability to make an award recommendation if there were some additional information provided to establish/outline the scheduling parameters everyone uses. Please provide the dates and/or number of calendar days that each bidder should incorporate into their schedule as a baseline for the various agency interactions outlined below:

a. *Anticipated Project NTP?

Answer: 10 days after signing Agreement with the City

b. *MDE Construction Permit (from time of permit application)?

Answer: 180 days

c. *MDE/USACE Stream Impact Permitting (from time of permit application)?

Answer: Same package

d. *Carroll County Erosion & Sediment Control Permitting (from time of plan submission)?

Answer: 45 days

e. *Easement/right-of-way acquisitions (from project NTP)?

Answer: 120 days from 100% ready easement plots and Legal documents.

f. *City of Westminster plan reviews (from time of submission)?

Answer: 15 days

36. Question: Our research to date has identified the stream impacts will have a Use-IV designation which prohibits work between March 1 and May 31 inclusive

of any year. As discussed at the pre-bid meeting, the easement acquisition and permitting efforts alone on this project will likely take much longer than anyone anticipates. The sum of the design, permitting, easements and stream restrictions make it quite clear that a June 30, 2021 completion date as stated in the sample agreement is not possible. Please consider simply removing the stated completion date from the solicitation and allow each bidder to state their own completion date, which can be used by the owner to score proposals during the award process.

Answer: The City understands that the project can't be complete by June 30, 2021.

37. Question: Based on the above information and some opinions presented at the pre-bid meeting, it should be clear that the June 30, 2021 completion date is not reasonable or possible. Additional clarification is needed with regard to the pre-bid liquidated damages discussion or all bidders will be forced to include them within their bid pricing. Please consider establishment of revised contract language that would start liquidated damages based on the completion date illustrated on the awarded D/B TEAM's bid schedule.

Answer: Liquidated damaged will stay but will be based on accepted by the both parties and noted in the contract completion date.

38. Question: A significant concern regarding the stream impacts and permitting process, is our inability to anticipate the permit requirements that will be issued at this time. There is a chance that simple culvert crossings and rip-rap bank protection is all that will be needed but there is also potential for other types of mitigation such as vegetation planting (live stakes) and/or imbricated rip-rap which could significantly drive up the cost of this work. Please provide the type of stream crossings and level of stream restoration efforts that each bidder should include in the bid pricing submitted. To assure all bidders are pricing the same scope of work, we strongly suggest that a set of parameters/assumptions are set at this time to assure bid pricing is comparable and consistent. We believe the most efficient way to convey this information would be to extract the appropriate details from MDE's detail manual to set these parameters.

Answer: Please see the link below:

https://mde.maryland.gov/programs/Water/StormwaterManagementProgram/Pages/2011_ESC_details.aspx. Stream/ culvert crossings and rip-rap details should be provided by Engineer in the B/D Team and approved by the MDE. The City provided line items in the Price Bid Schedule which should cover these works.

39. Question: Will geotechnical investigations, soil borings and/or a project specific geotechnical report be required as part of the design efforts on this project?

Answer: No. This is unnecessary.

40. Question: Please provide the available flow data for the existing 24" line. Has this line ever been under surcharge conditions during high flow conditions or experienced flow that was ever enough to push off any frame and covers on the existing manholes? What is the low/average/max flow data on record and at what location was this information gathered?

Answer: Average total flow for 3 months 696,000 gal/day.

41. Question: Conversations during the pre-bid meeting eluded to the fact that the contractor should be prepared/equipped to perform sewer bypass pumping operations should the construction activities cause damage or collapse of the existing line. Please provide an outline of the bypass pumping capabilities (GPM capacity, standby pump(s) and number of manhole runs at one time) that must be on site during the construction efforts and included in all bid pricing.

Answer: It will be contractor's responsibility to determine.

42. Question: It was implied at the pre-bid meeting that the contractor may be required to take over responsibility for the maintenance/repair of the existing 24" main. One statement was made that the responsibility period may begin at project award which seems a bit unreasonable considering the contractor will not mobilize to the site until after the design is completed. If the intent of this provision would be to protect the owner from damages due to contractor negligence, it would seem more practical to start the responsibility for maintenance (point repairs) upon mobilization for construction. Please confirm if the contractor will be responsible for maintenance/repair of the existing 24" line and at what milestone(s) during the project this period will begin/end.

Answer: Contractor is responsible for the condition of the existing 24" sewer line from beginning construction activities on the project through project substantial completion.

43. Question: It is customary to use ductile iron piping at stream crossings, jack and bore locations, road crossings and when in excess of a certain depth on some sewer installations. Should we anticipate the need for any ductile iron piping installations on this project? If so, should we assume these installations will be required for the entire run between manholes?

Answer: Ductile iron should be anticipated at stream crossing and jack and bore location.

44. Question: Please confirm the minimum number of locations all bidders should anticipate the need for jack & bore installations of the new 24" piping. Based on the drawings provided for the existing piping, the Rt. 27 crossing is the only location where steel casing is currently present. Should we assume that all crossings other than Rt. 27 will be permitted as "open-cut" crossings?

Answer: Just Rt. 27 crossing. Line Item for this work is provided in the Bid Price Schedule.

45. Question: Please confirm that any mill/overlay requirements associated with open-cut roadway crossings should be anticipated and included in the bid pricing submitted.

Answer: Trench restoration in the open cut of the Gist Rd is included in the Revised Price Bid Schedule.

46. Question: Does the owner have a spoils area for excess excavated material disposal?

Answer: No.

47. The bid description for item 1E – 24” PVC SDR 35 indicates “unclassified excavation” which would imply that rock excavation encountered would be incidental and not payable. This appears to be in conflict with item 1K – Rock Excavation which seems to imply that excavation on the project is “classified” which would make any rock encountered payable and not incidental. Please confirm that all rock encountered/removed during the installation of the new 24” piping/appurtenances will be measured and paid under item 1K – Rock Excavation.

Answer: The word “unclassified” has been removed from 1E on the Revised Price Bid Schedule.

48. Is this project grant funded?

Answer: No.

49. Question: Is there a wage decision or any prevailing wage requirements that must be met on this project?

Answer: No.

50. Question: Are there any specific minority and/or good faith effort requirements on this project with regard to subcontracting?

Answer: There is no MBE/ WBE requirement for this project.

51. Question: In some jurisdictions, sewer manhole covers in right-of-way locations are installed 12”-18” above grade for ease of access and to minimize silt/sediment/water from entering the cover during wet conditions. Should bid pricing be based on frame and covers within the right-of way locations being flush with grade or above grade?

Answer: Frame and Covers should be flush with grade.

52. Question: The pre-bid description of the project outlined the new piping shall be a parallel alignment with the same number of manholes at the same line and grade as the existing line that currently exists. Additional pre-bid conversations indicated the possible presence of vertical bends and/or drop connections which may require adjustments to line & grade. Please confirm the minimum/maximum grade that will be permitted on the new 24" piping.

Answer: This will be determined by the Engineer.

53. Question: Are drop manholes permitted on this project? If so, please confirm the owner's preference with regard to inside/outside drop connections.

Answer: Standard outside drop is preferred.

54. Question: How many existing sewer house connections and/or manhole connections that are not shown on the as-built drawings provided are present within the proposed work area. This information will help bidders identify additional manhole penetrations or wye branch connections that must be accounted for as well as potential conflicts with regard to line/grade adjustments. In the case of sewer house connections, are bidders required to replace to the cleanout or simply reconnect to any sewer house connections encountered?

Answer: The City does not have information on not shown sewer house connections.

55. Question: The existing drawings show several locations with "stone cradles" which may imply poor soils for piping subgrade. The pre-bid conversations on this topic seems to push toward a contingent bid item for both over-excavation/refill due to unsuitable subgrade as well as removal/replacement of unsuitable excavated material with off-site borrow backfill. Please confirm that contingent items will be created to address these conditions.

Answer: This has been addressed in a new line item in the Revised Price Bid Schedule.

56. Question: SC05-A indicates the owner will acquire easements/rights-of-way/written permission to enter private property needed for the construction on this project. The drawings provided in the bid package show a right-of-way that is 20' wide which appears to be centered on the existing piping. Considering the overall disturbance, depth of excavation and construction equipment required for the piping/structure installations on this project; it will be very difficult to manage within the existing right-of-way shown. Additionally, it's presumed that we will need to install, protect and maintain temporary bypass piping within the right-of-way to handle sewer flows to permit the piping installations. Are there additional construction easements or access agreements in place with the property owners

adjacent to this project? If so, please provide this information at your earliest convenience.

Answer: The City does not have agreements with the owners of adjacent properties.

57. Question: Please clarify the efforts each Design/Build TEAM should include in their proposal pricing with regard to the number of easements, plats, right-of-way acquisitions, title opinions, etc. anticipated for this project. It would be reasonable to assume that the Design/Build TEAM should be responsible for all field surveys and development of easement/right-of-way plats which will be turned over to the project owner for the negotiation/acquisition of each. To help identify the cost each bidder should include in their proposal, please identify the party responsible (Owner or B/D TEAM) for each of the following items normally associated with the easement acquisition process:

a. *Field surveys of subject properties?

Answer: Build/Design Team

b. *Development of easement/right-of-way plats?

Answer: Build/Design Team

c. *Title opinion letters of subject properties?

Answer: Build/Design Team

d. *Drafting easement documents and language?

Answer: City

e. *Negotiations with property owner of each subject property?

Answer: City

f. *Payments to private property owner for easement acquisition?

Answer: City

g. *Final recording of easements?

Answer: City

58. Question: If a bid item for the easement efforts is desired, we would suggest a lump sum item for the project rather than pricing per each as the efforts from one property to the next will vary drastically.

Answer: This has been added to the Revised Price Bid Schedule.

59. Question: Please confirm the project owner will provide a project staging area which will be acquired and paid for as part of the easement/right-of-way acquisition process.

Answer: The City does not have a staging area at close proximity to the project.

60. Question: It was conveyed at the pre-bid meeting that all bidders should assume that a portion of the additional easement/right-of-way acquired may be revertible and not permanent. As a result, please confirm how bidders should approach clearing/grubbing and removal/disposal of trees, brush, chippings, etc. Will these items need to be removed and disposed off-site?

Answer: Chipped wood could be spread and remain on the site. All other debris to be removed.

61. Question: SC-38 indicates that explosives will be permitted. It appears that the consensus at the pre-bid meeting was that explosives would be prohibited when considering the close proximity to the existing sewer line. To assure pricing provided is consistent and accurate, please confirm that no explosives are permitted on this project and all rock removal shall be performed by mechanical means with a hydraulic breaker.

Answer: Confirmed

62. Question: Does the City of Westminster have an engineer they work with on a regular basis?

Answer: The City works with few engineering firms on regular basis but it is a Bidder responsibility to solicit engineering services for this project.

63. Question: With this being phase 3, who provided design/engineering services on the first 2 phases?

Answer: GHD, Inc provided engineering services for first two phase of the project.

64. Question: Are there any union contract requirements or estimated values?

Answer: No.

REVISED PRICE BID SCHEDULE
DESIGN/BUILD of Sewer Line Replacement
Between MHs 13-01-1971 and 13-19-1971

CONTRACTOR will provide all equipment, materials and labor required to complete the project at the prices outlined below:

ITEM (SCOPE TASK INDICATED NUMERICALLY)	ESTIMATED QUANTITY	BID COST PER UNIT	EXTENDED PRICE
PLANNING AND DESIGN PHASE			
1. Organize and Attend the Project Startup Meeting	LUMP SUM (1)		
2. Survey	LUMP SUM (1)		
3. Design according to the Project Scope of Work and City Standards (providing 75% and 100% submittals of the Project Specifications and Drawings)	LUMP SUM (1)		
4. Site Controls (including development of SEC Drawings)	LUMP SUM (1)		
5. Obtaining Permits from the State and County Regulatory Agencies	LUMP SUM (1)		
6. Engineering Support During Construction Phase	LUMP Sum (1)		
7. As- Builts (see requirements in the Attachment #1)	LUMP SUM (1)		
8. Easement acquisition process	LUMP SUM (1)		
CONSTRUCTION PHASE			
1A. Mobilization	LUMP SUM (1)		
1B. Clearing and mulching of Easement	PER SQ. YD./ 12,000 ASSUMED		
1C. Stabilized Construction Entrances	EA/ ASSUMED 6		
1D. Installation of silt fence	PER LINEAR FOOT/ 4000 LF ASSUMED		
1E. Construction of 24" PVC SDR 35 Sewer Main (excavation all depths including all incidental works)	PER LINEAR FOOT/ 5236 LF ASSUMED		
1F. Installation of Sanitary Sewer Manholes (Including all incidental works)	EA/ ASSUMED 18		
1G. Installation of manhole connectors	EA/ASSUMED 2		
1H. Abandonment of the existing 24" sewer line and manholes with flowable fill	Per C. Y./		
1 J. Site Restoration and Final Cleanup	LS		
1K. Rock Excavation (definition of rock excavation should be in the Project Specifications)	C. Y. /assumed 100 C.Y.		
1L. Borrow backfill	C.Y./assumed 250 C.Y.		
1M. Concrete Encasement of pipe with all incidentals	C.Y./assumed 45 C.Y.		
1N. For Utility Stream Crossing, As Specified, Complete in Place including DIP pipe and all incidentals	LF/ 100		

1O. Rip-Rap (installed Complete in place)	SY/ 300		
1P Imbricated Rip-Rap (installed Complete in place)	SY/ 300		
1P. For Jack and Bore Crossing, as Specified, Complete in Place DIP pipe and all incidentals	LF/ 50		
1R. Trench Restoration in paved area of Gist Rd. per Carroll County Standard Specifications	Sq. YD/ 100		
1S. Overexcavation including #2 stone backfill and placement	C. YD/ 100		
SUBTOTAL FOR PLANNING & DESIGN PHASE: ROWS 1 THROUGH 7			\$
SUBTOTAL FOR CONSTRUCTION PHASE: ROWS 1A THROUGH 1K)			\$
TOTAL BID (DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION)			\$
COMPANY:			
CONTACT:		PHONE:	
SIGNATURE:		DATE:	
NOTE: It is understood unit quantities and prices shown are for bid evaluation only. Actual work executed will be measured and paid for based upon the work actually performed and the associated unit prices for said work. Should changes from the requirements (estimates) of the contract result in an increase or decrease in the quantity of work performed, CONTRACTOR shall accept payment in full based on the accepted Unit Prices.			

Legend

- Address Points
- Sewer Manhole
- Sewer Mains
- Property Boundaries



Address Layout



City of Westminster, Maryland
 [Project Name]
 [Bid/RFP Number]

Pre-bid meeting: [date] at [time]
 [Location]

Name & Title	Company Name & Address	Phone Number	Email Address
JUSTIN SCARWELER PROJECT MANAGER	11011 MCCORMICK RD HUNT VALLEY, MD 21031 BRAUNER BUILDERS	443-934-8006	justinscarweler@braunerbuilders.com
Kevin Geyer Owner	1481 Salemville Rd. New Enterprise, PA 16664	814-766-3774	Kevin.Geyer@GeyerBrothers.com
MARK CLITES BOB JANKINS	MID-ATLANTIC UTILITIES, INC P.O. Box 700 Boiling Springs, PA 17007	717-258-1044 717-418-5111 (cell)	MARKC@MAUTILITIES.COM
MICHAEL BELANSON DEPARTMENT MANAGER	PRIME AE GROUP 5521 RESEARCH PARK DRIVE BALTIMORE MD 21228	443-632-5958	MBELANSON@PRIMEENG.COM
JOE BURNS VICE PRESIDENT	PRIME AE GROUP 5521 RESEARCH PARK DRIVE BALTIMORE, MD 21228	410-654-3790	jburns@primeeng.com
Josiah Hankins Estimator	Stella May, Contracting 1512 Edgewood Pk #2 Abingdon, MD 21010	443-619-9891	josiah.hankins@stellamay.com
David Berkheimer Sr. Proj. Manager	Brauner Builders, Inc. 11011 McCormick Rd, Ste 300 Hunt Valley, MD 21031	443-895-1350	dberkheimer@braunerbuilders.com

Pre-bid meeting: [date] at [time]
 [Location]

Name & Title	Company Name & Address	Phone Number	Email Address
David J. Kerr Sr. Managing Eng	Barton & Loguidice 116 Defense Hwy Suite 309 Annapolis MD 21401	410-353 -8195	dKerr@bartonand Loguidice.com
Steve Tarallo Sr. Project Mgr.	Barton & Loguidice 116 Defense Hwy, Suite 309 Annapolis, MD 21401	804-426-8356	sttarallo@ bartonandloguidice.com
Chris Billak Senior Project Manager	Spiniello Companies 3500 E Biddle Street Baltimore MD 21218	443-250-6038	cbillak@spinielloco.com
Brice Foxwell Sr. Vice President	GEORGE, MILES & BUTZ, LLC 984 RIDGEBROOK RD, SUITE 230 SPARKS, MD 21157	(410) 329-5005	bfoxwell@gymbnd.com
BRIAN MEYER ENVIRONMENTAL PM	CONEWAGO ENTERPRISES, INC 660 EDGEGRIVE RD HANOVER, PA 17331	430-1113 717- 851	bmeyer@conewago.com
Matt Scarff Estimator	Comer Construction, Inc. 2100 Slade Lane Forest Hill, MD 21050	410-879-6094	mscarff@comerconstruction.com
Rodger Burkins Estimator	Comer Construction, Inc 2100 Slade Lane Forest Hill, MD 21050	410-879-6094	rburkins@comerconstruction.com

City of Westminster, Maryland
 [Project Name]
 [Bid/RFP Number]

Pre-bid meeting: [date] at [time]
 [Location]

Name & Title	Company Name & Address	Phone Number	Email Address
Steve Pickel Project Manager	JMT 40 Wight Ave Hunt Valley, MD 21030	(410) 316-2496	spickel@jmt.com
Cassie Hays marketing/BD coordinator	5 S. Mam St. Bel Air, MD 21014	410-838-7900	chays@fredward.com
Eric Habel Charles Morris + Assoc	11111 Center Way Westminster, MD	410-935-3257	Ehabel@ Council.net
JOHN ROMAN THE EADS GROUP, INC	50 N MECHANIC STREET CUPPERBERLAND MD 21502	301-777-7878	jroman@eadsgroup.com
Brandon Duriez Project Manager Snyder Environmental Services	270 Industrial Blvd Kearneysville, WV 25430	681-242-8427	bduriez@snyderenv.com