

Clarification Question(s)	Customer Response
I am interested in submitting a tender for the proposed de-silting of Mearley Brook at Primrose Lodge in Clitheroe. Although the business has the experience, capability and financial standing to successfully deliver the required outputs of the proposed contract there is one element of the scoring which I would like to seek clarification on? Smithson Contracts is a new business which started in July 2018 and as such does not have the accounts to provide as evidence as detailed in PLDSCO-1 Invitation to Tender Part 13.2 Item D "Annual Turnover proportionate with contract value (company accounts or accountant approved turnover statement)" however having read the Procurement Policy Note – Supplier Financial Risk Issues 2013 as detailed on Gov.UK it does state Procurement Policy Note 01/12 which states that "Contracting Authorities should not impose arbitrary minimum requirements which may have the unintended effect of barring new business from bidding" and that in the spirit of encouraging supplier growth, the supplier evaluation process should not rule out a potential provider unless there is clear evidence that the supplier's financial position places public money or services at unacceptable risk. Please can you confirm whether you will be taking this statement into consideration when evaluating the tender submissions? Additionally please can you advise what evidence is needed to satisfy this criteria.	Our assessment will be to ascertain if public money will be placed at unacceptable risk. This will largely be possible by assessment of company accounts or accountant approved turnover statement (for companies with less than a years trading). However, if you wish to submit further evidence, we will take this into consideration.
- The method of work describes installing temporary dams and then de-watering the working areas, but then mentions using Truxor (or similar) to carry out the de-silting works. Truxors require water present to work most efficiently and would not be suitable if the area is de-watered. Can you confirm if it is necessary for the area to be de-watered, or can the works be carried out with water present?	We refer to amphibious excavator or Truxor. We believe that both maybe required, and certainly an Amphibious excavator, but it is for the contractor to determine if both are required. We believe that some elements of the work will require dewatering irrespective of plant used, and as such have included the need for dewatering in the contract.
- Can you confirm the size of areas A, B & C that are to be used for depositing removed silt. As the method states 4,000m <sup>3</sup> of silt to be removed and I have only had a very rough measure based off the drawings but these areas potentially do not look large enough to hold this volume of silt behind Nicospan.	The size of Areas A, B & C is over 3378 metres square. With the expected reduction in sediments expected once dry (25%) we believe sufficient area will available in these areas.
The areas of detail A and B to be implemented are not clear, please clarify	Please see revised drawing DPLDSCO1.
Pre-seeded coir matting come in differing grades and seed mixes, do you have a proposed specification for these items?	The specification does not require pre-seeded matting, it requires coir matting to then be seeded with Environment Agency specification flood bank seed mix post installation.
Given the limited access to the de-silting section, is it possible to give further detail / extent with regard to the clay wall repair that is required?	A photo of the area of damage is shown, a clay bund should be installed in front of this (Lodge side) to prevent water ingress. We believe that this will be 2m wide, and to the levels indicated on the drawing, a photo has been provided as part of tender documents.
The geocell "temporary" trackway, can this be left insitu or does it require removing?	Removal should be included in the tender submission
A note on Drawing DPLDSCO1 states "draw down culvert to be fully exposed to invert (if at hard bed level) or 300mm below invert", please could you clarify?	The draw down culvert invert level is 66.51m, we expect the culvert to be exposed to this level as a minimum. Immediately upstream we expect additional material to be removed to expose the culvert entrance further, by 300mm, however if the hard bed upstream is at 66.51 then no further. This should be to a width of 300mm either side of the culvert and a distance of 2m upstream.
Brash Bundles; Detail A and B; please clarify the length of the posts – states 3m, yet driven not less than 300mm into the bed?	The posts should be driven into the bed to a level which provides the necessary levels set out in the drawings for Detail A and B.
Who is undertaking the fish rescue between the two indicated points; the desilting method of works documents suggest; Method of Work, 1. Carried out by RRT, please clarify?	The contractor will need to procure/undertake the fish rescue as part of the contract sum
Details A and B include the product "Vertadex". This product is not something we have encountered before and it does not appear to be readily available using an internet search. Please can you clarify what this product is ?	Vertadex is a product from Verdant solutions. The specification required is - SG 18/18b, or a physically equivalent product.
The Price List for the works includes item 4 – "Clay retaining wall repair" however we can find no reference to this activity on the drawings. Please can you clarify ?	There is a note on the Drawing DPLDSCO1. Please see other clarification.
The Price List does not include items for construction of Detail A and Detail B brush bundles, nor for other essential items such as welfare facilities and Supervision. Is it acceptable for the tenderers to amend the Price List items as we see fit ?	The materials for brush bundles are specified to be reused brush from the coping work in areas A, B and C, as well as access into site. Some additional materials will be required and we assume these will be included as part of the de-silting costs. The welfare provision we expect to be included in site compound and access. We would like costs presented in the format as set out in the NEC short contract. If you wish to provide a separate more detailed breakdown that is optional.
Please can you clarify the extent of the pre-seeded coir matting to the rear of Detail A ?	Please see revised drawing DPLDSCO1.
The extents of Details A and B are not clear on the general arrangement drawing. (Particularly the perimeter of Area A – is this detail A or B ?, and the front face (lakeside) of Area B, is this Detail A ? Both detail A and B seem to be marked the same on the drawing (in heavy red line)	Please see revised drawing DPLDSCO1. Detail A perimeter approximately 600m, Detail B 140m.
Following on from the query above, the extent of marginal planting is similarly not clear, as there are no plan areas marked on the drawing to measure the planting area.	Please see revised drawing DPLDSCO1.
We have previously queried the extent of coir matting required...please can you clarify the plan area(s) where this is to be installed ?	Please see revised drawing DPLDSCO1.
Do you have a preferred specification for the coir matting ?	Verdamat 900g erosion control matting or equivalent