

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

for Engineering Services

Engineering Four Winooski River Dams for Removal

Response to Submitted Questions

7/28/23

NOTIFICATION: This project is funded through the Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill and is therefore subject to the Build America Buy America Act. Services, goods, products, and materials purchased under this agreement must be produced and offered in the United States.

-
1. Given the limited time between when question responses will be posted (7/28) and the proposal deadline (8/7) and the fact that a number of the questions factor into teaming arrangements and approach, would you consider an extension of the proposal deadline by one week?

VRC has decided to extend the proposal deadline to allow interested applicants additional time to develop comprehensive proposals and for VRC staff to assess and address flood damage to our conserved lands. Proposals will now be accepted until 11:59pm on August 18, 2023. Proposals will be reviewed, a selection will be made, and applicants will be notified by September 5, 2023.

-
1. Do you anticipate that the current flood conditions will alter the timing and/or content of this RFP?
 2. Do you anticipate any changes to funding or design elements of this project as a result of the recent flooding?

We will be extending the deadline proposal to 11:59pm on August 18th, 2023. Aside from that, we do not expect any changes to project timing, funding, or design elements as a result of the recent flooding. The tasks and deliverables associated with the RFP match our grant requirements. In conjunction with the engineering study and designs in the RFP, VRC will be looking at additional river corridor protections in the Upper Winooski and its tributaries to increase flood storage capacity.

-
1. Do you have an estimated budget for this project or any funding limits that we should be aware of? Is cost a part of the evaluation criteria?
 2. Will VRC share the project budget at this time?
 3. Is there an anticipated or available budget for the requested scope of services?
 4. How will fee be considered in proposal evaluation?

VRC's budget for this project is up to \$274,000. Proposals within this budget amount will be evaluated evenly. Proposals outside the total budget will not be considered.



1. **The RFP states that the consultant should propose a schedule. Is there a proposed date for your selection/notification of a consultant? Is there a known end date for existing project funding?**
2. **Is there an anticipated or required contract period/schedule for the requested scope of services?**
3. **Do you have a schedule in mind? Are there any deadlines related to grant funding to be aware of?**

VRC's current grant contract requires that tasks outlined in this RFP must be completed by March 1, 2025. VRC recognizes this is a tight timeframe for the scope of work and has been in communication with project funders to discuss a contract extension. VRC plans to facilitate a contract extension that would require tasks in this RFP be completed by November 1, 2025. Therefore, VRC will consider applications with timelines that extend until November 1, 2025.

-
1. **Has there been any previous coordination with USACE and/or VT DEC on Section 401/404 permitting re: contaminated sediments and sampling/testing requirements?**
 2. **Is there further information on the level of effort required for sediment sampling and testing? Is it anticipated that significant sediment removal will be required for all four dams?**

There has not been any prior coordination with USACE or VT DEC regarding Section 401/404 permitting. VRC and the selected contractor will coordinate with USACE and VT DEC to understand permitting requirements in advance of sediment probing, sampling, and testing.

The amount of sediment removal for each dam will be estimated during the evaluation and design process. VRC does not expect large impoundments for the Bailey, Trestle, and Pioneer (Montpelier No. 3) Dams because the river corridor in this reach of the Winooski River is constricted and narrow. VRC expects that the impoundment for Hidden Dam (Montpelier No. 5) will require more sediment removal than the other three.

Are there any previous studies regarding the hydraulics or structural character of the dams? The VT Dam Inventory indicates that Bailey Dam had a recent inspection, however that report does not seem to be available.

VRC requested documentation regarding the hydraulics and/or structure of the dams including any inspection reports from the Dam Safety Program. A copy of the most recent inspection reports for the Bailey Dam will be sent to firms upon request and posted to the VRC webpage: <https://vermontriverconservancy.org/our-work/engage-communities/montpeliers-riverfront>.

VRC and the Dam Safety Program do not have inspection reports for Trestle, Pioneer (Montpelier No. 3), or Hidden Dam (Montpelier No. 5).

Is any hydraulic modeling available for this section of the Winooski River? Has the Central Region Floodplain Manager been consulted re: incorporation of existing FEMA modeling? Will we be required to create a duplicate effective model for FEMA?

Vermont River Conservancy is not aware of any existing hydraulic modeling available for the Upper Winooski River (VT08-07). Central Region Floodplain Manager has been contacted regarding existing modeling and if a



duplicate effective model will be necessary for FEMA. However, state resources are being directed toward flood response and VRC has not received a response at this time.

Can you confirm the ownership of each of the dams? The Vermont Dam Inventory lists National Life Group for the Trestle Dam and the City of Montpelier for Bailey Dam. Ownership for Pioneer Street and Hidden Dams is unlisted.

Exact ownership will be determined during data collection and feasibility study.

The Trestle Dam has been listed under National Life insurance company ownership; however, the City of Montpelier has also claimed ownership. Adjacent land is owned by the City of Montpelier, which supports the feasibility study, making the dam accessible for engineering studies and eventual removal.

The Bailey Dam is owned by the City of Montpelier. adjacent land is owned by the City of Montpelier, which supports the feasibility studies, so would be accessible for engineering studies and eventual removal.

Pioneer Street Dam (Montpelier No. 3) exact ownership is unknown, however, adjacent land is owned by the City of Montpelier, which supports the feasibility studies, so would be accessible for engineering studies and eventual removal.

Exact ownership of Hidden Dam (Montpelier No. 5) is unknown but likely owned by one of two adjacent landowners, both public entities: U-32 Middle School and High School (Union School District) on the north bank and Vermont Department of Forests, Parks, and Recreation on the south bank. This publicly owned adjacent land will provide clear access for data collection and feasibility studies.

In Task 4, are deconstruction and construction timelines intended to be separate deliverables?

Construction and deconstruction timelines were not intended to be separate deliverables in Task 4. Please disregard “construction timelines” listed under the second bullet point.

Is a Professional Land Surveyor (PLS) required for the topographic survey?

No, VRC does not anticipate that a PLS will be required for the topographic survey.

Is a formal boundary survey required? Or can existing drawings and/or GIS-based tax parcel linework be used to show approximate property boundaries on the plans?

VRC expects that existing drawing and/or GIS-based tax parcel linework will be sufficient to indicate property boundaries on design plans.

Is a wetland delineation required for permitting purposes? If so, would it be sufficient to limit the field delineation to the areas of anticipated direct construction disturbance in the vicinity of each dam and rely on



statewide wetlands mapping and aerial imagery for wetland boundaries along the lengths of the impoundments?

This will ultimately be determined during the permitting phase of Tasks 5-8. At this time, VRC does not expect that wetland delineation will be required for the Bailey, Trestle, or Pioneer (Montpelier No. 3) dams, however, we do anticipate that a wetland delineation may be required for permitting Hidden Dam (Montpelier No. 5).

For the geomorphic and habitat assessments, are new field studies envisioned, or should existing Phase 2 Stream Geomorphic Assessment and other data be utilized to identify and survey reference reach(es) and cross-section(s) for design purposes?

Existing Phase 2 Stream Geomorphic Assessments, habitat assessments, and other available data may be used to identify and survey reference reach(es) and cross section(s) for design purposes. However, additional field studies may be needed to supplement existing data.

-
- 1. Is the whitewater park intended to be advanced beyond the feasibility study and conceptual design in Task 1 under this contract (i.e., should it be incorporated into the final design plans and permit application packages)?**
 - 2. What level of design is required for the whitewater park as part of this contract? If a whitewater park is determined to be feasible will the design of the park be separate from the dam removal design process?**

The whitewater park does not need to be advanced beyond feasibility study and conceptual design. It does not need to be incorporated into the final design plans or permitting. Further design of the whitewater park will be conducted separately from the dam removal design process.

Is there an anticipated sequencing for the order in which the dams will be removed (e.g., whether any or all dams are proposed to be removed in the same construction season or mobilization effort)?

The order in which the dams will be removed will be informed by the design process. We do not anticipate that all dams will be removed in the same construction season. However, to reduce implementation costs and duplication of mobilization efforts, VRC may consider removing more than one dam in the same construction season.