

## Amendment #1 to North Beach Campground Pull-through Site Design RFP

**Date:** January 4, 2021  
**To:** All Proposers  
**From:** Burlington Parks, Recreation & Waterfront (BPRW)  
**Re:** BPRW Responses to Questions Received by Deadline

The following questions were received according to the procedures and timeline outlined in the North Beach Campground Pull-Through Site Design RFP, issued by BPRW on Friday, December 16<sup>th</sup>, 2020. Responses are listed below each question in *italicized blue text*.

1. Are you interested in alternate layouts if they maintain or exceed 10 pull-through spaces?

*We would be open to reviewing alternate layouts if they maintain or exceed 10-pull-through spaces and if they fit well with the rest of the conceptual master plan in terms of functionality and aesthetics.*

2. Can you confirm the intended circulation direction for RV's (counter-clockwise from the campground entry)?

*The intended circulation direction is for RV's to enter between the two entry buildings at the "Campers only" entrance, drive southwest along that road, turn left onto one of the crossing roads heading southeast, turn left again to pull onto the gravel pad of a pull-through site. To exit, RV's would then turn right onto a cross-road and then left to exit along the exit road or to access the dump-station. There would be a period of time where RV's exiting from the northernmost cross-road would have trouble accessing the pump station without the road being rebuilt as in add/alt 1.*

3. Has a tree inventory been done of the project area? If not, is one expected?

*Yes, a tree inventory has been completed within the project area. We would work with our City arborist team to evaluate and update the inventory on an as needed basis.*

4. The Scope of Work, item #4 Design, b. Add/Alt 1 states to include a design of a widened main roadway from the park entrance to the Greenway Overpass.

- a. Please confirm that it is anticipated to be a full depth design and reconstruction of this road, including associated stormwater management.

*That is correct, Add/Alt 1 would include a full-depth design and reconstruction of the roadway including stormwater management.*

- b. Are there any existing utilities under that are anticipated to be replaced that should be included in the road widening design scope of work?

*At this point, there are no utilities under the road that are anticipated to be replaced. Most of the known underground utilities in this area still have 1-2 decades of expected lifespan remaining based on City GIS data.. We will double check with our City wastewater department during the course of this project to confirm accuracy of this information, including the age/materials of these pipes and if any replacements might be coming up within the project area.*

- c. [Our firm] understands that this Add/Alt 1 is an alternative and the cost of which should be listed separately in the design RFP response. If BPRW accepts this Add/Alt for additional design services of the entry road, please indicate if the design consultant would be preparing construction documents for both a base bid and Add/Alt construction scenario.

*Add/alternate documents would be required for construction bidding of Add/Alt 1 if we choose to pursue this alternate as part of this design project.*

5. Beyond the minimums listed in the RFP, should the number of additional design submissions, meetings, presentation aids/sketches be structured to target a certain design fee?

*We are anticipating a budget of approximately \$20K for design of the base bid. We do not have a total estimated budget for Add/Alt 1.*

6. Confirm that BPRW will provide a topographic survey of the project area, that has been obtained from photogrammetry, and aerial imagery from the City Assessors office. Additionally, confirm that the design consultant should perform a field survey of the project area to supplement additional information as needed (due to accuracy or changes during demolition that may have occurred).

*All of this information is correct. BPRW will provide topographic contours generated from the 2017 photogrammetric flyover as a GIS shapefile, the 2019 Hi-Res Ortho imagery, and other GIS-based utility and existing conditions information. The consultant should assume that some level of on-site survey will be required to gather higher accuracy points and to update conditions following the demolition work that will be taking place within the project area.*

7. Is the relocation of the dump station currently located near the maintenance/laundry facility to be included in the design?

*No, the relocation of the dump station is a project that is currently on contract and slated to be completed in the Spring of 2021.*

8. [Our firm] understands that there are existing water and sewer utilities that serve the building being demolished by this January or February. The project plans will include demolition of the remainder of these utilities and connect the new water and sewer system to the existing system

within the pull-through site area. Please confirm, water and sewer work extending beyond the pull through site are is not anticipated.

*That is correct. Additional water and sewer work beyond the project area are not expected at this time.*

9. Has a previous Act 250 determination been made on the site? If not, have recent improvements requested Act 250 determinations?

*As far as we are aware, there is no Act 250 determination regarding the site. Recent projects have not requested Act 250 determinations.*

10. Will an Electrical Engineer's Stamp be required on the final design plans?

*We will need to confirm whether this will be required with the City electrical inspector. For this submission, please assume that they will be required. If it is not, we will remove this from the contract amount in negotiation with the selected consultant.*

11. Will evaluation of the existing pump station capacity be required for the alteration of wastewater flows associated with the campground improvements?

*Yes, evaluation of the existing sewer capacity will be required for the alteration of wastewater flows associated with these campground improvements.*

12. Will the designer be required to submit for City Site Plan Review?

*Yes, the designer must submit Site Plans for 3 City reviews at approximately 30% (draft), 75% (permit-ready), and 90-100% (construction-ready) stages of completion.*

## **Environmental/Soils Questions**

13. We are thinking that no Phase 1 ESA has been done, is that correct?

*As far as we are aware, a formal Phase 1 ESA has not been completed. There has been some site assessment and testing done in conjunction with the UST removal. Some initial review was done in as part of the 2017 Siting Study/Master Plan with VHB. We recently celebrated North Beach 100-year anniversary as a public beach in 2018, so we would not expect to find significant contamination related to the campground's past use other than the existing maintenance building.*

14. *Two substantially similar questions from different firms have been combined for this question.*  
-Is there any documentation/data regarding development soils to preclude an assessment of potential associated environmental concerns? Per the Natural Resources Atlas, the site is within an urban soils background area.

-The project is identified within an Urban Soils Background Area. Will site assessment be required to confirm this area is absent of contaminants of concern or will the assessments by KAS Consulting and Waite Heindel be sufficient?

*As we do not represent the Vermont Department of Environmental Conservation (VT DEC) or have jurisdiction over these matters, we cannot confirm that the existing documentation regarding potential environmental concerns would preclude an any additional assessment. We anticipate that, at a minimum, the selected consultant will work with BPRW to correspond with VT DEC to make a determination on whether any additional testing or reporting would be required to advance the design and construction of this project.*

*We have had previous correspondence with VT DEC in which it was suggested that minimal to no further action may be required if the project was only disturbing surficial soils, as many of the known contaminants were between 3-15 fbg. Our hope, would be that through smart design and clear correspondence with VT DEC, this project could be designed to completely avoid or minimize additional testing, handling of contaminated soils, and associated correspondence and reporting.*

15. Is there any documentation/data on the discharge location of the trench drain to preclude an assessment of potential associated environmental concerns?

*Our department attempted to probe one of the drains with a camera several years ago only to discover that this was not possible as it appeared one of the drains had been plugged with concrete, effectively plugging all of the drains upstream from that point. We do not have anything beyond the samples and reporting performed by KAS that were taken from below the buildings slab. These samples would obviously not capture anything that may have been piped to an unknown location well outside the building footprint. More information on the manner of discharge for these drains may become apparent when the building and slab are demolished in late January.*

16. Please confirm if the QEP will use this information to inform design and potential cost implications, but no formal deliverable is being requested (i.e. Corrective Action Plan or Soil Management Plan, or memorandum).

Relevant questions if a more involved QEP task is desired:

- a. Other than the listed soil contaminants in the report, are there any additional soil or groundwater contaminants known on this site?

*No, there are no additional contaminants known on the site at this time.*

- b. As stated in the virtual site walk, VTDEC has not responded to the SMAC letter request submitted, please confirm.

*Yes, that is correct. VTDEC has not yet responded to the SMAC letter request submitted on our departments behalf by Waite Heindel Environmental.*



BURLINGTON  
**PARKS  
RECREATION  
WATERFRONT**  
VERMONT

645 Pine St., Suite B  
Burlington, VT 05401  
(802)864-0123  
enjoyburlington.com

- c. Is BPRW aware of DEC's current position regarding site closure, are they requesting a CAP or SMP to implement this work?

*We are not aware of DEC's current position regarding site closure. See first paragraph of the response to question #14 for a detailed response.*

- d. Should the QEP's scope of services include correspondence, coordination and potential negotiation with DEC?

*Yes. Again, see the more detailed response contained under question #14.*