

Points reiterated by Wendi Hartup:

- This park has events going on all the time so the winning team will need to be mindful and have communication regularly with the Town.
- Sewer easement is most likely travel lane for construction equipment. Access is provided at back of park property near maintenance building (equipment can be locked up there as well).
- Surrounding neighbors are on-board for project and willing to work with us. Bill Tilley & Wendi will do their best to mediate citizen involvement while construction is occurring. We anticipate that surrounding neighbors will be very curious; in particular, those along Reach 4.
- Would like to keep as many trees on citizen properties and push the creek to the Town side (also will make easier for easement).
- Riprap is to be avoided, if possible. This project should be natural channel design and structures should blend into the environment.
- Select NATIVE vegetation with key spots having larger species and bright color like yellow (not just seedlings and seed; the attention on this park warrants providing some larger perennials, shrubs and trees to provide an instant aesthetic appeal to the project). While grasses are lovely, in this instance swaths of massed grasses or flowers should be considered (ex. area of all switchgrass and bluestem but not a chaotic, natural mess of grasses with very little flowers). Think shoreline garden rather than usual natural, wild mix (ex. Wendi used the overgrown fescue in the area surrounding the wetland as an example of unappealing and ugly to those in charge with the Town). We realize this could make seed disbursement a little more complex but flowers, seasonal color and controlled aesthetics are expected by the Town. Wendi will work with winning team on plant choices as well as education of those in charge to compromise.
- We will not begin construction until all easements are platted.
- Team should expect regular on-site meetings with Wendi and/or Bill together to work on issues.
- We'll utilize on-site spoil as much as is feasible. Potential soil dump is in the first part of Reach 1 (after stream determination) as well as some other areas we're working out at the park.
- There are several invasives that we'll need to get rid of: privet, multiflora rose, and stiltgrass with both a hands-on class and the contractor. The Town realizes that Stiltgrass is difficult to eradicate. The maintenance plan should include recommendations/tips on upkeep of management.
- There are several NC State Extension education classes planned that the Teams will be a part of: NCSU stream restoration construction class, livestocking, backyard stream repair, invasive ID/removal. We'll plan those with team input.

- This project provides the total project budget up front. Since this is a Clean Water Management Trust Fund project, the Town is obligated to conduct the grant as approved.

2016 CWMTF Restoration Budget Table - Complete the following tables and submit them with your application.

Organization:	Town of Kernersville, Public Services Department
Project Name:	Ivey Redmon Stream Restoration Project

Item	Requested CWMTF Funds	Matching Funds	Total Cost
A. Design		\$ 60,000.00	\$ 60,000.00
B. Permitting		\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00
C. Value of easements to be donated		\$ 459,384.00	\$ 459,384.00
D. Property or easement Acquisition		\$ 100,000.00	\$ 100,000.00
E. Easement preparation and recordation			\$ -
F. Construction (provide breakout per guidelines)	\$ 400,000.00	\$ 40,000.00	\$ 440,000.00
G. Construction administration and observation		\$ 30,000.00	\$ 30,000.00
H. Construction contingency		\$ 40,000.00	\$ 40,000.00
I. Project Administration		\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000.00
NC Cooperative Extension		\$ 12,000.00	\$ 12,000.00
(additional lines if needed)			\$ -
(additional lines if needed)			\$ -
Totals	\$ 400,000.00	\$ 771,384.00	\$1,171,384.00

- This project is intended to be scalable. The large Spring rains we received may have altered the minor tributaries so we'd like the winning team to reevaluate the other reaches that could compromise the existing plan and should be a higher priority. The team will then need to help Wendi work with Clean Water Management Trust Fund to see if they will allow funds to be shifted to other reaches.
 - Citizens within one of the later planned tributaries are worried about their properties and values currently.
 - An LID development is going in next to another tributary and the winning team will likely have a change order from the Town to work with them on a potential design of Reach 7 because they are developing now and collaboration this year is key (this would be outside the current budget).

FAQ (If in reading this and you were present we have missed a question please let the Town know). Below are the questions asked with the answers as well as some clarifications.

- 1) How is the scope of work supposed to be determined under the Progressive RFQ model?
A: The scope of work is defined in the RFQ, and the details of the scope will be discussed and determined with the Design-Builder during the negotiation phase.
- 2) Will the Design-Build Team be expected to do post-construction monitoring?
A: At this time monitoring is not anticipated other than for purposes of maintenance requirements.
- 3) The proposal is only limited to 12 pages, should the proposer include information about construction ideas, design ideas, etc. in the packet and if so where would this go?
A: Section 3.2.5 of the RFQ requests that proposer provide a project approach, and 3 single printed pages are allowed for this.
- 4) The RFQ references an insurance exhibit, but none could be found. Please identify where this exhibit is.
A: The "insurance exhibit" that is referenced in the draft DBIA agreement was not included in the RFQ. This exhibit will be posted as an addendum.
- 5) Is there a requirement for public involvement?
A: There is the possibility that 1 or 2 meetings might be scheduled at the request of the Board of Aldermen.
- 6) Were any reference reaches identified in the feasibility study?
A: No
- 7) Has there been a jurisdictional determination done on any of the streams that are part of the project?
A: No
- 8) Who will be scoring the points for each proposal during the selection of the contractor?
A: A 6-member selection committee comprised of the Town and their consultants will be making the scoring and selection. Each has up to 25 points to score teams. After combining all the points for each team, the highest scoring team is the winner. If the scores are close for the 2-3 highest teams, we'll have interviews to determine a winner. After a team is selected we'll hash out any details within the contract.
- 9) Are there any stormwater BMP's planned as part of this project?
A: There is the possibility that BMP's could be part of the project, but that would be determined during the design phase with the selected design-builder as best meeting water quality objectives for the project. If there are other areas within the Park that could impair the project, we would expect the Team to inform the Town so we could determine what to do about it.
- 10) Does the Town have a preference for the use of AutoCAD or Microstation software?
A: No
- 11) Are the consultants listed in the RFQ and on the feasibility study precluded from submitting proposals?

A: the consultants listed in the RFQ under Section 2.5.1 are assisting the Town with this procurement process and are therefore precluded from submitting proposals. The feasibility study was a separately contracted task from 2 years ago, not associated with this procurement process, and therefore the feasibility study consultant is not precluded from submitting a proposal.

12) Did you know that CWMTF does not require easements be platted?

A: Yes but the Town intends to manage future maintenance. We do not want citizens maintaining the easements. We also want all future landowners to know when a title search is done that the land is under easement and they cannot disturb the buffer.

13) What if the funds don't cover the planned reaches?

A: This project is intended to be scalable. This is where the team would discuss varying options with the Town to problem-solve.

14) What about brush disposal as there might be quite a lot?

A: If the area by Reach 1 won't work, we can work alternative locations at the park.

Note: There seemed to be a bit of misunderstanding as to whether any part of this included bidding (no, no cost basis selection). **This is a qualification based project.**

Simply put: is your team qualified and can your team do the work for the budget provided with some innovation within the limits we've set forth. The goal is to improve water quality and stop the erosion as best as is possible. There are so many ways to fix a creek. Reshaping and earth work are not always the best approach so try to remember that the Town would like the Team to stay out of the box.

Consultants in attendance:

James Crouse, AMT, jcrouse@amtengineering.com

Russel Barbour, JMT, cbarbour@jmt.com

Tina Sekula, JMT, tsekula@jmt.com

Stephen Joyce, North State Environmental, s.joyce@nserv.com

Jake Byers, Michael Baker Engineering, jbyers@mbakerintl.com

Scott King, Michael Baker Engineering, scott.king@mbakerintl.com

Bill Wright, RiverWorks, bwright@riverwork.com

Rick Wigal, Shamrock Environmental, rwigal@shamrockenviro.com

Joanne Cheatham, Carolina Environmental Contracting, joanne@carolinaenvironmentalcontracting.com

James Poe, Carolina Environmental Contracting, j.poe@carolinaenvironmentalcontracting.com

Greg Jennings, Jennings Environmental, jenningsenv@gmail.com

Jarrold Karl, Hazen and Sawyer, jkarl@hazenandsawyer.com

Kris Bass, Kris Bass Engineering, kbass@kbeng.org