

Request for Proposals for Engineering Services Ludlow Economic Resiliency Plan: Dean R. Brown Industrial Park

Summary of RFP Questions and Answers

- (Q1) We are reviewing the Ludlow Industrial Park RFP and had a question from our surveyor regarding schedule. They are wondering if topo could be held off until fall when the leaves are gone. Could you let me know if there are any specific schedule requirements for this project?
- (A1) *The only true deadline is the desire to complete the project by Dec. 15, 2016. I do not believe there are any specific schedule requirements regarding survey or other work elements for this project. I have not physically been there, but I am told that the tree cover at this site is largely rows of white pine. Dufresne-Henry did some work around 2003, including survey. I am not aware that digital files are available, but the plans could be made available to scan, if desired.*
- (Q2) I do not see that the RFP has a bridge design, rather only a preliminary design for a bridge crossing of Soapstone Brook. I want to be clear, the RFP is only for preliminary design and a report, and no bridge design is included in the scope of work. The design of said infrastructure is to be a subsequent work product. Can you please confirm?
- (A2) *I suggest that you prepare a proposal based on what the RFP specifies. You are welcome to make suggestions for additional work that you feel is needed. If you do so, please clearly indicate that it is additional work beyond the RFP scope, both in the technical proposal as well as in the cost proposal.*
- (Q3) Is any information available regarding existing permits for this parcel? The online Act 250 database is incomplete.
- (A3) *I am not sure if the information is comprehensive, but the following documents are available upon request: Jurisdictional Opinion #2-234, Act 250 Permit #2S0232, and Act 250 Permit #2S0467.*
- (Q4) Do you have any topography for the site? The LIDAR does not seem to extend to this property. We can budget a topo survey, but if a survey already exists, this will save time and money. I went to the site today and it is heavily wooded.
- (A4) *Dufresne-Henry did some work at this site around 2003, including topo survey. I am not aware that digital files are available, but the plans could be made available to scan, if desired.*
- (Q5) Is there a budget for this work?

(A5) *This project is funded under a grant from the VT Agency of Commerce and Community Development. As the cost to do this work may not be accurately reflected in the grant award, the Town prefers not to offer that figure at this time. Please consider what your actual costs would be to address the scope of work as proposed in the RFP.*

(Q6) For the preliminary site development plans, what level of detail is envisioned? For example, if it is determined that a wastewater pump station is needed, would it be acceptable to show it on the plans, but not necessarily provide a full design or details.

(A6) *The Town envisions that this project will involve an evaluation of the site and constraints to identify a feasible development site and to develop plans for the infrastructure needed to support it. The constraints include wetlands, streams, flood hazard areas, river corridors and other constraints based upon site conditions and anticipated permitting requirements. The project deliverables should address the elements identified in the scope of work. Key outcomes of this work will include preliminary designs for water and sewer line extensions and a new bridge to access the site. The final work product will include cost estimates for those infrastructure improvements.*

(Q7) Are there any ideas on proposed uses on the new site?

(A7) *There is no predetermined specific use for the site. The intent of this project is to help attract a new business that would provide good paying jobs. I assume that the future use will be based somewhat upon the size and condition of the developable area and the allowable uses for the zoning district in which it is located.*

(Q8) Are there other engineering firms who have shown interest on proposing on this work?

(A8) *Yes, a few other firms have contacted me about this RFP.*

(Q9) When might we see the addendum for the RFP?

(A9) *Questions regarding this RFP are due today (8/11) at 4pm. It is my intent to make available a summary of all questions and related answers tomorrow (8/12).*

(Q10) The VT Community Development Block Grant Disaster Recovery Program has received federal funds. As such, will a NEPA document be required for this project? If so, is this part of the current Scope of Work or will this be done separately?

(A10) *This work is being completed for a planning grant. The consultant for this project will not be required to prepare NEPA documentation.*

(Q11) Has the site been reviewed for Historic or Archeological resources? If not, is this required under the current Scope of Work?

(A11) Historic and archeological assessment is not included in this scope of work.

(Q12) Is a property plat available that clearly defines the boundaries of the property and the Right-of-Way to the undeveloped 20 +/- acre area?

(A12) See A1.

(Q13) Is the expectation, that a base plan suitable for final design will be produced as a product of this study, or is the use of the existing available mapping acceptable?

(A13) See A6.

(Q14) We understand that the CDBG-DR grant was for \$35,000, how much of the grant is apportioned to engineering services?

(A14) See A5.

(Q15) Could you please confirm that your intention to provide "Preliminary Design" is typical standards Schematic Design (SD)? If not, could you elaborate?

(A15) See A2 and A6.

(Q16) Is there any base topographic mapping available?

(A16) See A1 and A4.

(Q17) Is there an existing boundary survey available?

(A17) See A1.

(Q18) Was the subject 20 acre lot part of the subdivision and creation of (3) commercial zoned lots to the west?

(A18) It is unclear to me at this point when the subject lot was created. This may require research in the land records to determine the answer. The future access road appears to have been established at

the time of Act 250 Permit 2S0232. All of the lots (i.e. the subject lot and the three lots referenced above) are now in the Industrial Zoning District.

(Q19) Will potential future lot configuration be part of the preliminary design, in conjunction with road and utility extensions to a logical stopping point?

(A19) I do not envision subdivisions or lot line adjustments to be a component of this effort. The consultant will be asked to evaluate site development possibilities based on the existing lot configurations, constraints and to develop a plan for the infrastructure needed to support it, namely access road stream crossing and water/sewer line extensions.

(Q20) Will coordination with power data cable be required?

(A20) Since this work is being conducted under a planning grant, we do not need to get to the level of detail where coordination with utility companies is necessary. Part of this effort may involve a basic review of bringing power and communications service to the site.

(Q21) Will stormwater collection and treatment be for the road only or the potential full buildout?

(A21) This project will involve an evaluation of stormwater collection and treatment of both the road and likely building site only to the degree so that we can understand the feasibility of developing this site.

(Q22) Do you have available a copy of the original #2S0232 Act 250 Permit and any subsequent amendments, as the access/right of way be attached to this Act 250 permit and/or subject lot itself may be subject to it?

(A22) See A3. I do not presently have copies of the subsequent amendments. Those are available through the District 2 Commission office.

(Q23) Any survey of record or copy of deed to share? Have any test pits or borings been done?

(A23) All information in the municipal land records can be made available. At this time, I do not know if test pits or borings have been done.