Consultant Support for the Development of Stream and Wetland Restoration Projects
Questions and Answers to Contractor Inquiries
March 29, 2023

• **Question 1:** On page 8 of the RFP in the Subgrantee Scope of Services, it says we must provide 2 conceptual plan alternatives for consideration. What does this mean?

   If consultant proposes that they can develop any conceptual plans as part of their offerings for work on this project, we would like the concept plan(s) to include more than one alternative restoration approach.

• **Question 2:** Will we need to do concept plans for all 12 sites?

   No, number of concept plans depends on the needs of CRWP and CLEB partners and what the consultant can provide within budget.

• **Question 3:** How do you want the budget broken out in our proposal?

   Bidders should show the range of services they can provide at the maximum cost of $15,000, such as number of conceptual plans or number of site visits, etc. If it is easier or makes more sense for the bidder, proposing a rate per hour and estimated hours for each type of service would also be acceptable.

• **Question 4:** Do you have a concept plan in mind?

   We have provided two examples which are included at the end of this document. We are interested in plans that are 10% or less design for a selection of these projects. Concept plans can simply be polygons on an aerial, but what’s most important is that restoration approach and cost estimates are appropriate for the site at the conceptual level.

• **Question 5:** If we support a grant application and it’s awarded, are we precluded from working on future grant funded project?

   Based on guidance that we have received from at least one state agency that deals with federal funding, we understand that consultants can participate in any preliminary planning activities, including watershed planning, project development, design, etc. up until the RFP stage. Consultants intending to bid on future construction implementation cannot be involved in development of an RFQ and RFP or development of specifications for these requests. However, procurement requirements vary by funder and project implementors.
• Question 6: How should we develop the milestones/timeline? The RFP indicates that there is a lot of flexibility. How should this be drafted?

Timeline could include things such as:
  o Lead time needed for concept plans being delivered
  o Kickoff meeting
  o Deadline to perform any field assessments needed
  o Final deliverables delivery date

• Question 7: Are detailed construction quantities needed for cost estimates?

No. We are looking for a basic breakdown of project costs that should at least include design/engineering/permitting, construction, invasives treatment, project management costs, any other major budget itemizations needed for preparing grant applications.

• Question 8: Does the consultant need to be available for in person meetings or will these be held via Zoom?

Meetings will be held virtually in most cases, unless participants need to be on site.

• Question 9: For site visits, can they be consolidated into one day?

Yes, we are open to being most efficient if site visits are needed. We don’t think visits to all of the project sites will be necessary. Any necessary site visits can be consolidated into a single day to reduce the consultant’s need to travel as much as possible.

• Question 10: What counties are these projects in?

All projects are located in either Cuyahoga or Lake County.

• Question 11: Can you please explain the liquidated damages language in Section D.XXIII (Time for Completion)? Is this item an overrun from a previous project’s RFP? Can you please clarify?

Due to the nature of this project, CRWP will adjust the Time for Completion requirement as follows:

The Subgrantee shall achieve substantial completion of the Work by September 15, 2023. If Subgrantee is unable to complete the Work as herein provided within the time fixed, extensions may be granted if mutually agreed upon between both parties in writing and granted by the Ohio Lake Erie Commission. The time set forth for completion of the Work is an essential element of the Contract.
1. 750 LF EMBANKMENT GRADED TO LEVEL OF LAKE BED
2. 750 LF STREAMBANK SHAPED TO MAXIMIZE THE STREAM’S FLOODPLAIN CONNECTIVITY
3. EARTHEN EMBANKMENT SOILS MAY BE INCORPORATED INTO FORMER LAKE AREA TO CREATE HETEROGENEOUS HABITAT CONDITIONS
4. RIPARIAN POCKET WETLANDS AND RIPARIAN FOREST MAY BE INCORPORATED INTO FORMER LAKE BED
5. DEEPWATER HABITAT AREA RETAINED, WITH OUTLET(S) TO RIPARIAN CELL(S) AND ULTIMATELY DISCHARGING TO SMITH CREEK. DESIGN TIED TO SHORELINE FISHING OPPORTUNITIES. NATIVE TREES AND SHRUBS WILL BE INSTALLED TO SHADE AND COOL DISCHARGE BEFORE IT FLOWS TO SMITH CREEK
6. LAKE PARTIALLY DEWATERED AND SEDIMENT ALLOWED TO REMAIN AND OXIDIZE. DEPENDING ON SHAPE OF LAKE BOTTOM, SMALL MEANDERING CHANNELS MAY SELF-FORM AND FURTHER EVALUATION TO DETERMINE DEGREE OF ANY FLOW CONTROL REQUIRED WITHIN THE DEWATERED LAKE BOTTOM
7. RIFFLE AND POOL HABITATS MAY BE INCORPORATED INTO RESTORED STREAM REACH TO IMPROVE HABITAT AND PROVIDE GRADE CONTROL
8. INVASIVE PLANT SPECIES WILL BE TREATED WITHIN AND AROUND THE DEWATERED LAKE AREA
9. NATIVE WOODY PLANT SPECIES INSTALLED ALONG RE-GRDED WESTERN STREAMBANK TO PROVIDE STREAMBANK STABILITY AND STREAM SHADING
10. FOLLOWING A PERIOD AFTER DEWATERING, SEEDING AND SELECTIVE PLANTING OF NATIVE RIPARIAN AND WETLAND SPECIES WILL OCCUR WITHIN THE DEWATERED LAKE
11. WORK ACCESS WILL BE FROM THE CENTERVILLE MILLS PARK GRAVEL PARKING LOT

Note: Restoration design will be finalized during the design and permitting phase of this project.