

# 87 State Street

## Request for Proposals - Design Services

### Responses to questions regarding RFP

**SCOPE CLARIFICATION:** This scope of work is intended to be conceptual in nature. The primary goal of this phase of design work is to understand, at a conceptual level, the flood resilient adaptive reuse options for the building and test fits for redevelopment of the site and adjacent parcels. All deliverables will be at a conceptual level.

1. **Question:** Is the 2,400 page document from the GSA regarding the process for addressing the historic character of the building available? (mentioned by Jon Copans in the June 30th MCRR presentation).

**Response:** The 2,400 page document from the GSA is a [Phase 1 Environmental Assessment](#). The Phase 1 does not address the historic character of the building.

2. **Question:** When/how will access to the building be granted?

**Response:** Access to the building is limited and will need to be coordinated with GSA. We anticipate that we will be able to access the building only one or two times this fall.

3. **Question:** Has the State Historic Preservation Officer been involved in the discussion to date?

**Response:** Yes.

4. **Question:** Are there any indications of archeological sensitivity in the pit?

**Response:** None that we are aware of.

5. **Question:** Are there any structural reports available post 2023 flood that indicate the integrity of the foundation or other major structural components?

**Response:** No.

6. **Question:** Given the importance and complexity of the project, the time between questions due and proposals due is perhaps too short to assemble a responsive and responsible proposal. Would you consider extending the proposal deadline to two weeks after responses to questions are posted?

**Response:** The first part of the project is on a very tight timeline, and we are unable to extend the deadline for proposals. We anticipate the work identified in this proposal will be primarily high-level concepts / test fits to identify the scale of redevelopment opportunity within the existing building and on the site.

7. **Question:** In addition to the plans and studies of the pit listed on page 2 of the RFP, which A/E teams have already been involved in the project and what documents have been produced (and can they be provided)?

**Response:** We are not aware of any additional plans/studies.

8. **Question:** Is it expected that VT DoHP will be involved? Will a 106 Review be required?

**Response:** Not in this phase of design.

9. **Question:** Has the building been tested for any PCBs?

**Response:** No.

10. **Question:** Has any remediation of the building (mold, hazmats, etc.) taken place? Do we need to provide consulting services for any of these disciplines?

**Response:** The building has been stabilized post flood. There is no obvious mold, etc. We do not anticipate the need for hazard mitigation consultants as part of this RFP.

11. **Question:** Is the building safe to be in or require any PPE gear?

**Response:** The building is safe to occupy (no PPE gear required).

12. **Question:** Have any soil borings on-site been conducted?

**Response:** None that we are aware of.

13. **Question:** Have any flood-mitigation measures been investigated? If so, are reports available? If not, do we need to provide for these services?

**Response:** No flood-mitigation measures have been investigated. The adaptive reuse concepts will need to consider flood resiliency/mitigation.

14. **Question:** Should the 2025 City plan also be considered? If yes is, that available? This could provide understanding of what other flood mitigation measures are in place or planned in downtown area to make sure assessment is taking context into consideration.

**Response:** The Montpelier City Plan can be found at: <https://montpelier-city-plan-segroup.hub.arcgis.com/>

15. **Question:** What is the timeline for the local Historic Preservation Commission approval process? Has this review timeline been factored into the proposed schedule?

**Response:** The scope of this work is conceptual in nature and will not require approval by the Historic Preservation Commission.

16. **Question:** Are there any available reports to confirm both active UST's condition meet the regulatory requirements? Is the requested scope to include exploration to confirm this?

**Response:** We do not have available reports to confirm the UST's condition and that is not anticipated to be part of this scope of work.

17. **Question:** Will the selected A/E team have the opportunity to submit additional fees if the scope of work/schedule is increased due to outcome of the redevelopment partner search?

**Response:** Yes. It is possible that additional services/fees will be negotiated.

18. **Question:** Part 2: The "Pit" Task 2a.: What will drive the program targets? Is there a baseline development goal? Housing Only?

**Response:** Program targets for the "pit" will require engagement with adjoining property owners.

19. **Question:** Part 2: The "Pit" Task 2b: Are there site surveys from pre-flooding events that we could compare to?

**Response:** We do not currently have site surveys from pre-flooding events.

20. **Question:** Schedule: What is driving this schedule? Are there funding milestones to meet?

**Response:** The schedule is being driven by GSA's timeline for disposition of the property.

21. **Question:** Task 1a requires an evaluation of the existing building. Please confirm CVRPC's expectations for this evaluation.

We plan to include:

- i. Visual assessment of the structural condition
- ii. Visual assessment of the building envelope condition
- iii. Visual assessment of the flood vulnerabilities
- iv. Visual assessment of the existing roofing system
- v. Code review, particularly for flood resistance

We plan to exclude: (Please indicate if your expectations are different)

- i. Destructive openings to expose the structure and moisture and thermal barriers
- ii. Building envelope air and water leakage testing and infrared scanning
- iii. Calculations to determine the load capacities of the floors (We will rely on the loads shown on the original construction documents.)
- iv. Evaluation of proposed additions or structural modifications to the building
- v. Hazardous materials sampling and testing (e.g., lead-based paint, asbestos-containing materials, PCBs in sealants)
- vi. Seismic hazard evaluation in accordance with ASCE 41-23
- vii. Historic building study
- viii. Existing parking surfaces?

**Response:** The building evaluation in task 1 is intended as a high-level evaluation focused on general reuse potential given the constraints.

22. **Question:** Can you clarify your meaning of "building evaluation" in task 1?

- a) Is it a high-level documentation of existing conditions, study the building for design purposes, and to define the current interior repair scope,
- b) OR, are you expecting the design team to find unknown defects related to age and flooding and to advise on the suitability for buying the building?

**Response:** The building evaluation in task 1 is intended as a high-level evaluation focused on general reuse potential given the constraints.

23. **Question:** Is the GSA building evaluation available for reference before proposals are due? If not, will it be available during the project?

**Response:** No, the GSA building evaluation is not available.

24. **Question:** Will we be inspecting the building for structural flood damage? OR is the statement in the RFP that "the GSA is not aware of any structural damage from the flood" to be taken to mean that the GSA has already evaluated the building and confirmed there wasn't any structural damage from the 2023 flood?

- a) Is the existing building evaluation looking for problems that were not found during the GSA inspections or is it intended to mean review of existing conditions in preparation for the test fit design studies?

**Response:** The building evaluation in task 1 is intended as a high-level evaluation focused on general reuse potential given the constraints.

25. **Question:** What is the final deliverable of this study? A report? Conceptual drawings?

**Response:** The final deliverable will be a combination of written and graphic analysis.

26. **Question:** Confirm "The Pit" includes the parking areas indicated (see picture below)

**Response:** Yes, "The Pit" includes the surface parking lots of the adjacent sites.

27. **Question:** Regarding test fit studies. The RFP indicates commercial, institutional, and residential are the planned future uses. We plan to include 1 test fit study per each use and per task 1c and 1d.

- a) Will more test fits for task 1 be expected than the six described above?
- b) Are you aware of other uses that are expected to be included? For example, residential, commercial office or retail, storage, healthcare, daycare?

**Response:** Test fits for additional development on the site should focus on new residential units.

28. **Question:** Task 2 includes multiple development test fits for redevelopment of the entire site. We plan to include 3 test fit schemes in task 2. Please indicate if more than that is expected.

**Response:** Three test fit schemes will suffice.

- a) Can we include an additional service reimbursable for each additional test fit?

**Response:** Yes.

29. **Question:** Are there specific requirements or deliverables tied to the conditions of the grant funding?

**Response:** See the [sample contract](#).

30. **Question:** Will additional service fees be acceptable if ongoing negotiations with GSA end up adding scope to this project?

**Response:** It is possible for additional services to be negotiated past the base scope of work procured.

31. **Question:** Based on the RFP, we understand that the Task 3 services are NOT included in the \$100,000 fee limit described on page 2 of 7, but that we should prepare our fees for Task 3 and list them as "Additional Services". Please confirm this approach.

**Response:** The \$100,000 identified in the RFP is to cover a range of feasibility and due diligence activities.

32. **Question:** Is Task 3 conditional on building purchase?

**Response:** Task 3 is conditional on budget availability and project progression.

33. **Question:** What is the intended outcome of the Task 3 charettes?

**Response:** Opportunity for public engagement and development of visual materials to support redevelopment activities.

- a) Can you clarify the role of the design team in the charette? Are we advertising it, sending invitations, and acting as principal

facilitators, or are we attending it only in an advisory role to the CVRPC?

**Response:** The design team would be facilitating the Charrette with outreach and logistics provided by the client team.

34. **Question:** The schedule for Part 1 starts on 8/18 and ends on 9/30. What is the expected frequency of design team/owner meetings during that period? Weekly? Two meetings? Four?

**Response:** Meetings will be as needed/proposed to complete the scope of work.

35. **Question:** Confirm cost estimating is not included in the scope of the project.

**Response:** Cost estimating is not included in the scope of the project.

36. **Question:** Do you have targets for flood resilience levels in mind or are we presenting options and helping to make decisions during the project?

**Response:** Flood resilience should meet the current zoning and best practices. We are looking for options for a flood resilient adaptive reuse.

a) Can GSA please provide previous flood mitigation design drawings?

**Response:** No. GSA will not provide previous flood mitigation design drawings.

37. **Question:** Will CVRPC provide a sample contract, or will the agreement between the prime consultant and CVRPC be prepared by the prime consultant? If CVRPC is providing the agreement, can CVRPC please distribute a sample agreement for our review?

**Response:** Yes. See the [sample contract](#).



38. **Question:** Do you have building uses or users in mind that would have specific requirements for redevelopment (Structural load capacities? Mechanical requirements? Special power requirements?)

**Response:** Not at this time.

39. **Question:** What are CVRPC's physical security requirements for this building, if any? For example, are there requirements for blast resistance or progressive collapse resistance?

**Response:** There are no known physical security requirements at this time.

40. **Question:** Anticipated Uses and Program Direction: What types of uses are currently anticipated for the site? Is the goal of the study to explore a wide range of spatial and programmatic possibilities, or will the client team provide specific direction on desired uses?

**Response:** The goal of the study is to explore a wide range of possibilities. The client team has a few potential uses

41. **Building Assessment:** What level of assessment is expected for the existing building? Should the consultant team provide a high-level evaluation focused on general reuse potential given the constraints, or is a more detailed architectural assessment, including structural and mechanical systems, anticipated?

**Response:** A high-level evaluation focused on general reuse potential given the constraints.

42. **Question:** Flood Zone and Elevation Data Clarification: Our initial research indicates that the site falls within the FEMA Flood Zone AE and has a base flood elevation (BFE) of 525.8 feet. Can you confirm if that is the latest FEMA BFE for this area, if FEMA's BFE for this area is in the NAVD88 or NGVD29 vertical datum, and what the ground level elevation of 87 State Street is in the NAVD88 or NGVD29 vertical datum?

**Response:** Per the Vermont Flood Hazard Mapping Coordinator: The BFE is 525.8' NAVD 88. The Design Flood Elevation (DFE) is 527.8' NAVD 88. The Soil Conservation Service study 2/1994 used NGVD29 datum and old FIRM/ Flood Insurance Study to come up with: BFE 529.9; First Floor Elevation: 525.2; Lowest entry: 523.1 (exposed to the 50 year flood per old study); Basement window: 520.4' (exposed to the 25 year flood per old study). We expect to see a draft work map for Montpelier and the Winooski this summer or fall. The map will have the new BFE based on the updated study.

We will likely need to obtain an elevation certificate for the property (the City does not currently have an elevation certificate because it is a Federal Building and exempt from local regulations).

43. **Question:** Project Approach Narrative: One of the evaluation criteria includes "demonstrated understanding of the objectives, project complexity, and scope of services" (20 points), but this doesn't appear to be explicitly called for in the **Response** Format. Would you prefer that this narrative be provided in a standalone section, or should it be incorporated into one of the listed sections, such as the Project Team, Fee Proposal, or Team Performance?

**Response:** This should be included as a standalone section.