

Questions & Answers Regarding MHS Stormwater Design Proposals

1. Was any consideration given to the Clean Water Initiative Program, Ecosystem Restoration Grants?
 - a. The design work proposed is funded by a grant from the Lake Champlain Basin Program.
2. Could the above grant (worth \$20,000) be included in our proposal?
 - a. ERP applications are due March 18, prior to the anticipated start of this contract. Another round is scheduled in September, after completion of this contract. The work under this contract should position the project for a successful ERP application, but that application is not part of this contract.
3. Are the “three final engineered designs” alternatives, or three different areas and types of improvements to decrease sediment and phosphorus loads for one complete design package?
 - a. Ideally, each design addresses a different location/opportunity to reduce sediment and phosphorus runoff. The site assessment will inform priorities.
4. The final design plans are normally finalized when permits are in place. Was there any consideration to required permitting? Should this be anticipated and included?
 - a. Permitting is not included in this contract, nor is bidding of construction, which will be dependent on funding.
5. Should we include or exclude wetland efforts and permitting?
 - a. There are no mapped wetlands on the school campus, and the soil survey indicates very sandy loam. If on-site soils evaluation indicates that further investigation is warranted, that will have to be handled in a subsequent phase.
6. What information is available on existing site conditions including subsurface piping (sewer, storm, water, electric, etc.)?
 - a. FWR has reached out to City of Montpelier public works for input on this question
7. Should we include permitting for stormwater?
 - a. Permitting is not included in this contract.
8. Should we include Act 250 permitting if required?
 - a. Permitting is not included in this contract.
9. Should we include any local permitting?
 - a. Permitting is not included in this contract.
10. Can you further define construction ready? If without permits there may have to be limits on readiness?
 - a. The designs must include adequate detail for implementation. We recognize that the permitting process may result in minor modifications to the designs produced under this contract. We expect that good communication with the City and State during design development will minimize the need for changes.
11. Should borings be included to evaluate soil and determine depth to ledge?
 - a. If necessary to determine feasibility/suitability of treatment.
12. Should we include the services of an underground locator to confirm utility locations?
 - a. FWR has reached out to City of Montpelier public works for input on this question
13. Should any consideration or evaluation be given to connection to City Storm System?
 - a. FWR has reached out to City of Montpelier public works for input on this question
14. Should we include runoff calculations?
 - a. Yes

15. Who will the consultant be working for? The Montpelier High School or Friends of the Winooski River?
 - a. Friends of the Winooski River
16. How much funding is available for the engineering effort?
 - a. \$19,500
17. Is there a budget amount for the project that the FWR is willing to share?
 - a. \$19,500
18. Has there been initial conversations with VT DEC to discuss if stormwater management practices will be allowed in the 100-yr floodplain since it seems they are moving away from this?
 - a. Yes, there have been initial conversations with DEC, and we expect that there will be opportunities for stormwater management on the MHS campus. The regional floodplain coordinator and other DEC staff will be included in project team conversations.
19. Are the concept plans for the improvements planned on the leased VSECU parking lot available for review? Are there plans or concept designs available for the two other stormwater improvement areas mentioned in the RFP?
 - a. Yes, a concept plan is available for review. There are not concept plans or designs for the other two spots beyond the profiles in the City of Montpelier Stormwater Master Plan.
20. Are the conceptual plans for paving of the “mud lot” prepared by VSECU and mentioned in the Background section of the RFP (page 2) available for review?
 - a. Yes.
21. Can you share any information about the level of funding FWR anticipates will be available for completion of the scope of work set forth in the RFP?
 - a. \$19,500
22. In conducting this project and preparing plan-related deliverables, will the contractor be required to adhere to all elements of the Vermont Stormwater Master Planning Guidelines (<https://dec.vermont.gov/sites/dec/files/wsm/erp/docs/SWMP%20Final%20Guidelinesrev1-18.pdf>)?
 - a. Not strictly – the model outline in the SWMP Guidelines applies to projects at all levels, whereas this project is a single site, so not all sections are relevant. A SWMP already exists for the City of Montpelier, and can be incorporated by reference as applicable for this project.
23. In conducting this project and preparing design-related deliverables, will the contractor be required to adhere to all elements of the Vermont DEC’s Ecosystem Restoration Program Project Design Terminology and Guidance (<https://dec.vermont.gov/sites/dec/files/documents/ERPDesignTerminologyandGuidance.pdf>)?
 - a. No. This project is not ERP-funded. As answered above, permitting and construction bidding are not included in this contract. ERP is a possible source of implementation funding, so it may be useful for the project team to review ERP expectations to ensure the design work under this contract positions the projects for the next phase.
24. In preparing this RFP and associated Scope of Work, has FWR or have other project partners consulted with the DEC Rivers Program or with ACOE personnel regarding potential work in the floodplain?
 - a. We have consulted with DEC, not with ACOE.
25. Will proposed project schedules that extend contract completion beyond August 16, 2019 be considered “responsive” per #3 of the evaluation criteria (RFP pages 4-5)?

- a. Funding for this project has a limited duration, so FWR has minimal flexibility to accommodate alternative schedules. As the evaluation criteria indicate, responsiveness is evaluated as a matter of degree – farther from the August 16 completion would be less responsive than closer to that date.