



Lefthand Watershed Oversight Group

3/17/2016 Pre-proposal meeting for Left Hand Creek Reach 3B Implementation Project

Participants:

Jessie Olson	Lefthand Watershed Oversight Group	
Mickey O'Hara	Lefthand Watershed Oversight Group	
Chris Wiorek	Lefthand Watershed Oversight Group	
Mark Schueneman	Lefthand Watershed Oversight Group	
Scott Aschenbrenner	Left Hand Excavating	scott@lefthandexc.com
Keith Schoeman	RMC Consultants	kschoeman@rmc-consultants.com
John Jankousky	EME Solutions Inc.	John.jankousky@eme-solutions.com
Carl Muir	Youngs General Contractors	youngs@mycitycable.com carl@lsi01.com
Ben Mason	Youngs General Contractors	youngs@mycitycable.com BenMason70460@gmail.com
Daniel Loewen	ICON Engineering Inc.	dloewen@iconeng.com
Kevin Pilgrim	Otak Inc.	kevin.pilgrim@otak.com
Tim Bebo	Territory Unlimited Inc.	tim@territoryunlimited.com
Nathan Werner	S2O Design	nathan@s2odesign.com
Stan Whinnery	Whinnery Construction	whinneryconstruction@icloud.com
Jason Kline	NorthState Environmental/SWCA	jkline@swca.com
Vince Sortman	Biohabitats	vsortman@biohabitats.com
Doug Gawne	Roberts Excavation	dgawne@robertsrx.com
Tom Bail	Energess Services	Tbail@energesservicesllc.com
Byn Roe	Energess Environmental	broe@energessenvironmental.com
Randy Foster	Crossfire LLC	randy.foster@crossfire-llc.com estimating@crossfire-llc.com
Jonathan Stauffer	Eco-Hydro/EQR Team	jws@ecohydro.us
Doug Wenzel	Edge Contracting Inc	dwenzel@edgecontracting.com
Joe Crea	Triton Environmental	joe@tritonenviro.com

Questions and Answers:

Q1: Is there an existing HEC-RAS model for this reach?

A1: Not that LWOG is aware of, contractor can contact Boulder County Engineering.

Q2: Is there a preexisting survey of the project site?

A2: No, however, Pre- and post-flood LiDAR data is available for download here: <https://geodata.co.gov/> as noted in the RFP.

Q3: What are the upstream and downstream bounds of the project?

A3: 300 feet upstream of 87th St. Bridge to the CDOT Diagonal Highway bridge.

Q4: Will the Boulder County Open Space project be happening on a similar timeline?

A4: Yes – they are aiming to go to construction this fall and are using the Resilient Watershed Partner's (or the Colorado Emergency Watershed Protection Program) Design Team and have yet to hire a construction contractor.

Q5: Will work under the 87th St. Bridge be necessary? What does the access situation look like?

A5: Yes, a CDOT access permit will likely be required but the bridge can be accessed from both the upstream and downstream sides.

Q6: What does the project timeline look like?

A6: Please refer to the RFP. Design will need to be completed fairly quickly (by June or July) to allow time for permitting. Construction should start by fall 2016. Revegetation efforts will span into spring 2017.

Q7: What is the status of the environmental review? NEPA?

A7: NEPA, Endangered Species Act and National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Compliance are all complete. Please see the compiled Environmental Review documents (for NEPA, ESA, and NHPA compliance) at our website: <http://lwog.org/wp-content/uploads/Exhibit-IV-C-Lefthand-Creek-010716.pdf>.

Q8: Will the contractor be responsible for soil tests relating to revegetation?

A8: Soil testing would be beneficial to help understand existing conditions and whether topsoil or soil amendments may be needed. Project methods and materials should be determined, as appropriate, by the contractor.

Q9: Is the landowner concerned with losing pasture land?

A9: We want to retain as much pasture as possible, but there is flexibility if it would provide greater flood safety or significantly improved function of the river.

Q10: Do you have a planting density requirement?

A10: No, but revegetation should be considered an integral component to the project, and should not be removed due to budget constraints.

Q11: Do contractors have any responsibility to stabilize historical buildings?

A11: No. However, as specified in the SHPO compliance letter (<http://lwog.org/wp-content/uploads/Exhibit-IV-C-Lefthand-Creek-010716.pdf>) "Project personnel should take great care not to damage or alter the existing structures, nor the ground that immediately supports them, in any way. AGEISS further recommends that temporary orange fencing be erected around the structures with sufficient buffer to ensure they remain avoided and undamaged during the implementation of the project—at least 10 feet. Furthermore, project personnel should be instructed as to their responsibilities for the care of cultural resources and the penalties for not following their obligations during project implementation."

Q12: Is there the potential for partial restoration on some of the vertical banks?

A12: Yes, some of the areas with vertical banks could be addressed with toe treatments or biotechnical bank stabilization/revetments, as appropriate.

Q13: Did the 2013 flood cause overbank flow?

A13: Yes, however the exact extent at the project site is unclear.

Q14: If you are able to remove the large fallen trees that are currently in the channel this Spring, will they be left on site to use during construction?

A14: Yes, trees will be placed on the upper banks out of the floodway and can be used during construction.

Q15: Will the landowner pay for fencing (both construction and revegetation) for their animals?

A15: The cost of establishing fencing during the revegetation establishment period should be considered part of this project and will need to be paid for out of the construction budget. During the design phase, the contractor, landowner, and LWOG will determine whether the fencing will be temporary or permanent.

Q16: As far as designs for the RFP, to what extent do they need to be completed?

A16: This is a design-build project, so design must be developed to the level of degree necessary to construct, assuming many features can be field-fit.

Q17: Where does the CDOT right-of-way border the property?

A17: We assume CDOT's right-of-way follows the fence line near diagonal highway. Please also see Boulder County property viewer for information on property boundaries:
<http://maps.bouldercounty.org/boco/PropertyViewer>

Q18: Should contractors expect to remove gravel bars?

A18: Each one should be assessed individually, it may be beneficial to leave those that provide functional habitat elements and do not cause a flood risk.

Q19: What is the vision regarding connecting the seasonal wetland/ponded wetland features in the pasture land to the stream channel?

A19: This feature may currently function to filter excess nutrients from manure and pasture run-off prior to entering the creek and may function better for this purpose by keeping them disconnected to the creek. However, if the ponds/wetland features could provide dual purpose of improving water quality while also being used as a high flow event corridor, the design-build team could consider this as a potential alternative.

Q20: What is the goal in terms of "soft" vs. hard infrastructure?

A20: Rock reinforcement should be used to protect critical infrastructure, however bio technical bank stabilization can be employed where possible. The appropriate means and methods of restoration should be determined by the design-build team.

Q21: Where did the total project cost come from in the RFP?

A21: We received a cost estimate by a reputable consultant and used that figure in our grant application.

Q22: Is the cost of the project detailed in the Master Plan?

A22: A potential range of costs per project were included in the master plan, however it does not reflect the current scope of the project.

Q23: Does the Grant that will fund the project contain pertinent information?

A23: We've posted our grant application on the LWOG website please see: <http://lwog.org/wp-content/uploads/Reach-3B-CDBG-DR-Implementation-Grant-Application.pdf>

Q24: Which permits will LWOG obtain?

A24: None, all permit applications will be prepared by the design/build team.

Q25: Is there the possibility of planform adjustment?

A25: Yes, with justification (e.g. if it improves the function of the river and makes sense financially).

Q26: What is the culvert that is exposed in the oxbow portion of the reach?

A26: It is LWOG's understanding that the exposed culvert is part of the drainage system for the diagonal highway median.

Q27: What was the original alignment of the creek in the oxbow area?

A27: The channel was continuous and straight pre-flood, the oxbow formed during the 2013 flood

Q28: Has erosion continued in the oxbow area post-flood?

A28: Yes, the property tenant reported erosion during spring runoff events.

Q29: Is fixing the culvert in the oxbow part of the project?

A29: There is room to coordinate with CDOT to address this issue and potentially work it into the project. Our grant cannot provide infrastructure improvements but we could make a recommendation to CDOT to make infrastructure improvements.

Q30: Is there any fisheries data for the project area?

A30: Yes, it can be obtained from CPW.

Q31: Is this project considered a fish habitat project?

A31: This is considered a multi-benefit project. We aim to increase flood safety and reduce risk for landowners, provide bed and bank stability and improve ecological conditions for species that live or have potential to live here.

Q32: Is the CLOMR/LOMR fee waived for this project?

A32: From RFP: "If the consultant is not able to demonstrate no-rise, then a CLOMR/LOMR may be necessary for the project and would be accommodated by amendment to the contract." It is our understanding that if the CLOMR/LOMR is required, the fees are waived for restoration projects.

Q33: Why will trees be removed from the stream before the project starts?

A33: If funding permits, Boulder County Debris removal program will remove trees before runoff to avoid problems with downstream infrastructure – the trees will remain at the property for use in restoration construction.

Q34: Will the contractor need to complete HEC-RAS modeling?

A34: As stated in the RFP, "Hydraulic models of the selected alternative must be prepared to compare the pre-project and post-project condition floodplain models. Consultant will be responsible for developing an "Existing Conditions" model. The consultant will be required to provide a No-Rise certification based on the selected alternative and supporting conditions. The no-rise will be based on the pre-project and post-project conditions, based on the current effective floodplain and using best available hydrology. Consultant will use and reference the hydrology and hydraulic guidance developed by the Colorado Water Conservation Board, available at http://cwcb.state.co.us/water-management/flood/Documents/GuidanceforH_H.pdf. If the consultant is not able to demonstrate no-rise, then a CLOMR/LOMR may be necessary for the project and would be accommodated by amendment to the contract. If FLO-2D is used, the model must be on a non-proprietary platform readily available for distribution and use by others."

Q35: Which project elements will fall on the North side of the stream?

A35: There is possibility of creating an increased floodplain and increased flood capacity by reshaping the north bank. There is also bank erosion and bank repair work. There is the possibility of creating a swale or increasing functionality of the existing wetland to address water quality concerns as described in Q19 above.

Q36: What is the involvement level of the landowner?

A36: Minimal, the landowner does not reside in the United States. The tenant may have greater interest in the project, particularly in relation to access to pasture land for horses.

Q37: Is there the potential to access the project site from the North side of the stream?

A37: Yes, existing pasture access paths can be utilized.

Q38: Can LWOG confirm if the construction contractor can work directly in the stream or if water will need to be pumped around during construction? These two approaches can create significant differences in the project cost.

A38: Means and methods for controlling water in the work area are the responsibility of the contractor, contractor must meet permitting requirements.

Q39: Are any of the existing (standing) cottonwood trees available to be harvested to use in the construction?

A39: No, unless you are referring to young 2-4 year old trees or shoots that can be harvested and used to do live staking.

Q40: Are there expected to be any water rights issues by allowing the offline channel to remain as an oxbow?

A40: No, not that we are aware of.

Q41: At the pre-bid onsite meeting, it was stated that a low water crossing would need to be included into the design. What will this low water crossing need to accommodate?

A41: A standard pickup truck.

Q42: Will the fencing mentioned at the pre-bid meeting be a permanent fencing that will remain or is it only for the duration of the project?

A42: That will be worked out during the design process with the landowner, LWOG and contractor.

Q43: Will a 60% design be sufficient to go to construction?

A43: Yes, we assume many project elements will be field fit.

Q44: As part of the final reclamation process, would the LHWA [sic] consider adding soil testing as a requirement? The soil test results at a minimum should cover: % organic matter; N-P-K; pH; salinity, and soil texture.

A44: At this point, LWOG is open to many possible design methods. The means and methods of restoration should be determined by the design-build team.

Q45: Based on soil test results, organic soil amendments such as 3-6-3 with mycorrhizae and humates (low fertility); Biotic Soil Amendments where there is little to no topsoil and/or % organic matter less than 3%; and sulfur to address high pH; and any other amendments necessary to address areas that may have hard soil structure.

A45: This does not appear to be a question.

Q46: Will the LHWA [sic] consider the use of turf reinforcement mats for revegetation where rip rap can be avoided? Where there are any areas outside of concentrated flow, would the LHWA consider the application of hydraulic mulch in lieu of straw?

A46: As described our answer to question 20 above, rock reinforcement should be used to protect critical infrastructure, however bio technical bank stabilization can be employed where possible. The appropriate means and methods of restoration should be determined by the design-build team.

Q47: If there are areas of the stream where coir matting will be used, would the LHWA [sic] consider filling in the voids of the matting with a Biotic Soil Amendment as an alternative to topsoil?

A47: At this point, LWOG is open to many possible restoration methods. The appropriate means and methods of restoration should be determined by the design-build team.