



Fiscal Services Department – Purchasing Division
12220 Fillmore Street - Room 331 - West Olive, Michigan 49460

Phone 616-738-4855
E-mail: purchasing_rfp@miottawa.org

ADDENDUM 1 - RFP 24-055 COASTAL RESILIENCE FEASIBILITY AND PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING SERVICES

MARCH 25, 2024

All Vendors:

The purpose of this addendum is to modify and/or clarify the above project. Information published here becomes part of the solicitation and is official and final. Vendors are to acknowledge the receipt of all addenda in their submission.

ITEM 1: REVISION:

Cover Page: *“RFP Deadline: By 2:00PM (ET) Tuesday, April 2, 2024,”*
and every reference to this due date within all solicitation documents.

Revised to: *“RFP Deadline: By 2:00PM (ET) Tuesday, April 9, 2024.”*

ITEM 2: VENDOR QUESTIONS RECEIVED AND ANSWERED:

- Q1. Will the County be providing topographic surveys for the properties, or will that be part of our scope of services?
- A1. We will provide 1' contours from 2018 GIS data but additional topo may be required.
- Q2. Regarding Ottawa Sands, what level of detail is desired for groundwater analysis? Is it simply gathering survey data of the water level of Grand River, Lake Michigan, and the wetland? Or would it be a full groundwater modeling?
- A2. Analysis related to the work currently being completed at the site will be shared with the chosen consultant. However, additional work as required to assure that future wetlands are successful should be included. It should be noted that the inland lake is several feet above the river and Lake Michigan water levels.
- Q3. Regarding Ottawa Sands, have any topographic surveys been conducted of the property or of the mine lagoon area?
- A3. There is limited additional topo (beyond the 2018 GIS data) that has been completed related to the recent development projects, but not in the lagoon area.

- Q4. Regarding Harbor Island, what are the current findings of contamination on the site? Is the entire island above contamination thresholds? Is capping required for these contamination areas?
- A4. That is still to be determined by the City of Grand Haven's consultant HDR. That is why the Request for Proposal includes language stating that some engineering work would be dependent on the feasibility of working in or around potential contaminated areas.
- Q5. Regarding Harbor Island, have any hydraulic flow studies/models been conducted?
- A5. No
- Q6. Regarding Harbor Island, have any mussel surveys been conducted?
- A6. Not to our knowledge.
- Q7. Regarding Harbor Island, have any topographic surveys been conducted?
- A7. No
- Q8. Would the County be amenable to an extension to the RFP deadline of April 2, 2024?
- A8. Yes. We can extend it to April 9. See Revisions.
- Q9. Can the County offer clarity regarding the budgeted value available to award the selected vendor for the scope of work and objectives? Is the potential award the sum of the total federal funds non-federal match requirement detailed in Exhibit 2?
- A9. The project budget is the total amount of federal funds - \$275,000.
- Q10. Does the County have any recent geotechnical investigation data for any of the proposed shoreline stabilization areas?
- A10. No
- Q11. Does the County have any recent topographic or bathymetric data for any of the proposed restoration areas?
- A11. Only the 2018 1' topo from Ottawa County GIS
- Q12. Could the County confirm the level of design required for each of the structural components (promenade, day docks, etc.)? Are these to the same 60% level of design and permit-ready condition?
- A12. 60% design and permit-ready condition is the minimum desired. However, pricing for full design is also desired.

Q13. Considering the following excerpts from the Scope of Work in the RFP document:

“Recommendations must complement the proposed master plan recreational elements including:

- *Courtesy day docks*
- *Renovated “breasting dolphins”*
- *Upland terracing and Greenway Plaza*
- *Riverfront promenade*
- *Riverfront event facility and associated utilities”*

And

“Based on the recommendations above, design shoreline nature-based solutions and, where applicable, design directly related recreational amenities (e.g. day docks, renovation dolphins, upland terracing, riverfront promenade, and Sag boardwalk), and site planning for indirect elements (Greenway Plaza and event facility). This work should include conceptual design, design development including preliminary grading and planting plans suitable for submission to permitting agencies.”

Can the County clarify if the awarded vendor is responsible for designing the recreational amenities, so simply accounting for them in the design of the overall shoreline stabilization efforts?

A13. The vendor is expected to be responsible for the design of the directly related recreational elements. The indirectly related developments would need to be simply accounted for within the overall site planning.