

Integrated Planning RFQ Questions and Responses

As of 1/29/2016

- Q: The deadline says Tuesday February 29. February 29 is a Monday. Which is it?
 - The deadline is February 29 – that is a MONDAY not a Tuesday. We will make that correction to the RFQ. Sorry.
- Q: Is the budget for the project expected to remain below the “budget” page in the grant in Appendix B?
 - No! The “budget” page in the grant is not a budget, but rather a schedule of performance payments related only to the grant. The grant will provide \$100,000 which will go towards what is anticipated to be a larger budget. The grant requires a match of at least \$100,000, so the minimum overall budget is \$200,000, but could be higher. Again, cost/fees/price will not be discussed until the proposals have been ranked and negotiations start with the top ranked consultant.
- Clarification on the RFQ’s indicated preference for local firms: While there are a handful of firms with a local presence who may be able to, through partnerships with other local firms, meet the breadth and depth of technical expertise and EXPERIENCE on similar projects, the City understands and expects that this RFQ may require local firms to partner with larger, national scale firms that do not often work in Vermont municipalities. We encourage potential proposers to review the scoring criteria to understand the various levels of importance of local presence vs. other criteria for selection. We do strongly prefer that any firms that do not have experience working in Vermont and specifically Burlington do partner with firms who can provide that context and potential cost savings from minimal travel for the anticipated field work. Moreover, since this is an innovative approach in Vermont, as a secondary benefit of this project we hope to improve local capacity for this type of planning in the Vermont consulting community.

As of 2/11/2016:

Q: Would Burlington consider extending the deadline since the last week of February is school vacation?

- Given that this is the only request for an extension that we have received, at this time we would like to maintain the currently proposed schedule since we don’t know how long final scope and fee negotiation will take, and we will also have to go through local approvals (Board of Finance and City Council) before submitting our loan application. Moreover, we want to provide the project with as much of the CY 16 field season as possible.

Q: The submission requirements include "Contact information for references from relevant projects." Does this mean you want contact information/references for all of the project descriptions we include or just the "key" ones for each skill area?

- The City would prefer that contact information be provided for every product description provided by the proposer as evidence of their expertise in the various skill sets. A SOQ will not be considered un-responsive and ineligible for consideration if there are a "few" project descriptions here or there that do not have contact information as long as the proposer has provided project descriptions for that same area of expertise that do have contact information. However, proposer should be prepared to provide that contact information if requested by the City.

Q: Does the City wish to see resumes for every member of the project team?

- Concise and relevant resumes should be included as part of the SOQ. However, we envision that the information requested in the SOQ requirements for the list of team members will be summarized in some way in the body of the SOQ for efficiency of review – with the resumes available for cross-reference.

Q: Is there a copy of the WWTP Optimization Report referenced in the RFQ available?

- There is no report for the WWTP Optimization efforts. If you have specific questions regarding those efforts, please submit them and we can try to provide a response. However, our preference would be to wait until we are in the scope development phase for documentation of our findings to date.

Q: In the case where our proposal includes members and projects from your existing WRTAP (Water Resources Technical Assistance Program) SOQs – would you prefer that we reference the projects and resumes in the WRTAP SOQ to save paper, or include everything in this SOQ?

- We'd love to save paper, but in this instance we would like proposers to submit a complete package that does not rely on our referencing other previous proposals.

As of 2/15/2016 (deadline for questions)

Q: Is Sewer Watershed Model calibration already being done?

- If you mean the Main Plant WWTP H/H model: Our modeling consultants originally tried to set the model up for what we view as the "typical" method – using wet weather flow subwatersheds and modifying DCIA (directly connected impervious area) for the calibration. Per our consultants, they were having challenges with calibrating the model using this method and switched to using an RTK method. Once we learned more about RTK and were frustrated as to how we would use the model calibrated in this way as a planning tool - we learned about the calibration challenges (essentially the model was greatly over-predicting flow compared to the monitored flow requiring a significant dialing down of DCIA – which didn't make a lot of sense given that one of the most "tricky" sewershed for calibration was an area covering downtown

Burlington, which we would imagine should have fairly high and predictable DCIA vs a residential area. So, calibration attempts have been made, but we suspect that additional work, including additional monitoring may be necessary.

Q: Can we get a copy of the WWTP Optimization Report? If not, what did the WWTP achieve in total Phosphorus reduction in mg/L?

- There is no report. Two point chemical injection (Ferric Chloride) has been occurring at Main Plant since June 2015 and monthly average effluent concentrations up to December have ranged between 0.18 mg/L -0.33 mg/L, with an average of 0.217 mg/L. Two point chemical injection (Ferric Chloride) has been occurring at North Plant since August 2015 and monthly average effluent concentrations up to December have ranged between 0.13 – 0.46 mg/L with an average of 0.226 mg/L (the averages are not flow weighted). We have also compiled a fair amount of data regarding WWTP flows at the 3 plants for 2001-2015 which may be helpful in predicting the P load at the plants at realistic optimization rates.

Q: If we have submitted projects and resumes for team members in the WRTAP selection do you want us to leave them out of this document?

- No, see above. Please include them.

Q: Does the City anticipate the that SWAT model used to develop the revised Lake Champlain Phosphorus TMDL will be available to consult teams for review and to support alternatives evaluation?

- We don't see why it and other tools shouldn't be available from the State. We are already in possession of a potential tool for looking at optimization of scenarios and also implementation modeling called Opti-Tool (developed by TetraTech for the Charles River TMDL).

Q: What is driving the Chloride issue?

- Winter salting. There is now a new Vermont Water Quality Chloride Standard and the data suggest that many urban streams (like Centennial Brook and Englesby) may not meet that standard – thus, we anticipate that at some point there will be Chloride TMDLs/salt management plan requirements.

Q: Are the water quality solutions summary sheets expected to be all inclusive or will you consider other innovative solutions?

- They are not all inclusive – they are just the ones we have thought of to date. We will welcome all other cost-effective and community beneficial solutions.