



September 13, 2018

CHAGRIN RIVER WATERSHED PARTNERS
Responses to Contractor Inquiries
Chagrin River Sediment and Nutrient Reduction BMP Program

1. What is the current number of sites?

There are currently over ten sites being considered for the cost-share program. We have received confirmations from 17 landowners that they would be interested in moving forward with a consultant visit. Many of these sites are clustered within very close proximity, which will make site visits easier. CRWP can prepare a schedule for the consultant's review ahead of time (including time limits per site) to maximize efficiency. The contractor will assist CRWP and partner SWCDs with site selection and prioritization.

2. How much of the cost per linear foot is the landowner responsible for?

Per the RFP, "Landowners will deposit their cost share funds with CRWP who will then pay the contractor the total amount (grant funds plus individual landowner cost share funds) for each installed project." The landowner will be responsible for \$50 per linear foot and any additional expenses not coverable by the grant. If an effective stabilization project exceeds \$100 per linear foot, the difference must be paid by the property owner. CRWP will execute formal agreements whereby the landowner will deposit their share for streambank stabilization with CRWP for pavement to the contractor prior to commencement of construction. The landowner will agree to deposit that amount within 30 days of receipt of the agreement. CRWP will present the conceptual plan to the landowner for approval prior to landowner deposit of funds.

3. How will the invoicing be handled?

All invoices should be directed to CRWP. Per the RFP, all work under this contract, including invoices, must be complete and delivered to CRWP by July 31, 2020.

4. Will the landowners have to pay a retainer fee?

No.

5. How many project sites will there be?

The number of project sites will be dependent on the linear feet per property that is stabilized. We expect a minimum of five to seven properties. It is possible that adjacent properties may be selected for the cost-share program. The deliverable for the Great Lakes Commission grant is that a total of 2,000 linear feet be stabilized.

6. How many permits will be needed?

The number of permits will be dependent on the number of selected sites. In certain circumstances, it may be possible to obtain a permit that covers multiple properties if they are adjacent. The consultant will be responsible for acquiring all necessary permits prior to construction. For example, any work performed below the ordinary high-water mark will require authorization from USACE and Ohio EPA. The contractor should comment on their agency coordination and permitting plans.

7. What type of permitting will be needed?

The types of permitting will be dependent on the selected sites. The contractor is responsible for securing all necessary local, state, and federal permits for each project.

8. Will all the sites be awarded to one contractor?

Yes, all the sites for this project will be awarded to one contractor. The selected contractor will provide a conceptual stream restoration layout and costs for the selected sites.

9. Will modeling or headwater habitat evaluations be required?

No. Modified BEHI assessments (forms provided by CRWP) will be required as well as sediment load reduction estimates for reporting to the Great Lakes Commission. The Great Lakes Commission's sediment load reduction spreadsheet will also be provided, which calculates soil saving (tons per year) based on the following parameters: length along stream, average height, lateral recession rate (ft/yr), and soil weight (Sand - .055, Loam - .045, Clay - .037, Organic - .011).

10. In the previous project were landowners involved with project maintenance (i.e. watering)?

In the last project, landowners were not required to conduct any maintenance. The landowner agreements noted that they must allow CRWP and the consultant access to the property for construction, maintenance, monitoring, and educational visits through the end of the grant period. CRWP and the contractor should encourage landowners to engage in key maintenance activities as needed, especially regarding care of newly planted vegetation. The landowner agreement will specify that the private landowners are responsible for maintenance of the project and that the streambank stabilization project area shall not be mowed. CRWP will seek the consultant's input on development of simple maintenance plans for each site.

11. Do you have an initial priority list for these sites? Will you be sharing this list as part of the RFP process?

Initial site visits and modified BEHIs were performed for each site being considered. CRWP and project partners have found sites that may be good fits in Aurora, Chagrin Falls Village, Chardon Township, Kirtland, and Munson Township. The sites have been ranked on these preliminary site visits. This preliminary ranking will not be provided as part of the RFP process, but will be provided along with photos of each site to the selected contractor. The contractors will assist CRWP and the SWCDs in determining the final site priority list.

12. Will it be acceptable to use Lidar data in lieu of standard topographic survey data as the basis for development of the engineering plans for this project? Was Lidar data used on the prior project that was similar to this one or did the design/build team have to complete traditional topographic surveys on each site?

The winning proposal for the previous Great Lakes Commission assumed that no topographic or hydrologic or hydraulic modeling would be required to complete the designs for each project. Lidar data or other methods are acceptable for developing the designs. In the past, plans have been made using GIS mapping and simpler design drawings. The designs must be of sufficient quality and detail for construction and meet the rest of the terms of the RFP and grant agreement with the Great Lakes Commission as well as any permitting requirements.

13. Would our field crews need to complete wetland delineations and HHEI/QHEI data forms for each site? T&E survey, bat habitat, etc.? If so, how many of the initial sites contain potential wetland areas within the assumed project limits?

These assessments are not requirements specified in the RFP but may be required for certain permit applications, which the contractor is responsible for securing. CRWP and project partners did not perform any wetland assessments during initial site visits, but there did not appear to be any wetlands within project limits. If there are wetlands, the consultant should assess the wetland using the Ohio EPA's Ohio Rapid Assessment Method (ORAM). The project areas should also be inspected for potential roosting trees that may be habitat of the endangered Indian Bat and avoid these trees during construction.

14. Are any of the existing sites that were initially screened for this project located within the mapped 100-year floodplain?

All current sites were checked using FEMA's Flood Map Service Center. None of them are mapped within the 100-year floodplain. They are all considered to be in Zone X (area of minimal flood hazard). If any other sites do get added to this project, floodplain permits may be required at those sites.

15. Were the ten to twelve sites that have been initially selected for this project screened for possible buried utilities?

These sites have not yet been screened for possible utilities. The number of sites that have confirmed interest has now increased to seventeen, allowing for more flexibility in site selection. Feasibility of sites, such as regulatory constraints, willingness of the landowner to pay, and ease of access can be used in helping select the final sites for the cost-share program.

16. If initially site screening and evaluation forms were developed for the prior project that CRWP completed that was similar to this one, can an example be shared with us so that we may review to gain a better sense of the level of effort that will be required during the field assessment phase of the project?

A specific rating sheet was not used but CRWP would be happy to help develop this with the consultant. In the past project, some of the factors used in initial consideration included permitting difficulties as a result of having a location in the FEMA-designated 100-year floodplain and designation as a salmonid habitat. Another factor was if a stream was highly incised and had very little area adjacent to the streambanks to rework the stream. Landowner willingness to pay the cost-share may be another factor.

17. Was there a need to complete any hydraulic or hydrologic modeling or extensive floodplain coordination on the previous project that was similar to this project, and if so, was that completed within your original budget or were additional funds secured for this effort?

No. We were able to select sites that did not require extensive floodplain coordination. The landowner is responsible for any costs that exceed the \$100/linear foot. The contractor should work to carefully evaluate potential restoration measures carefully with respect to costs and added benefits to each project. The goal should be to develop a plan that does not exceed the allowable rate of \$100/linear foot.

18. The RFP states that effort should be made to spoil excess soils on site. What is the level of buy-in from property owners regarding this matter? Are they receptive to it?

This has not yet been discussed with the landowners. In some circumstances, the landowner may wish to pay for the material to be removed from their property.



Chagrin River Watershed Partners
MANDATORY PRE-BID MEETING
 Chagrin River Sediment and Nutrient Reduction BMP Program
 September 4, 2018 at 10:00 am

Name (please print)	Organization	Email	Phone number
Hien Pham	Holl	hpham@hollinc.com	440-781-8594
Macks Const Inc	Macks Const Dacey Resource	Macks construction Dacey Resource @ not	330 273-5121
Judith Mitchell	Dacey Resource	judith.mitchell@ dacey.com	330 673 5678
Pat Norfz	NTIT Consultants	PNorfz@ ntitconsultants.com	216-276-6354
Anthony Fazio	NTH consultants,	AFazio@nthconsultants.com	440-344-4024
Erin Mundorf	The Munnick & Smith Group, Inc.	emundorf@ munniksmithgrp.com	330 931 7124

John Kosnier The Munnick & Smith Group jkosnier@munniksmithgrp.com 419-787-4153