

CITY OF GASTONIA, NORTH CAROLINA
LINWOOD PARK POND RESTORATION RFP
ADDENDUM NO. 1 – QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Issued for clarification of the Request for Proposals

NOTICE TO PROPOSERS: The following questions were received regarding the City of Gastonia's Linwood Park Pond Restoration RFP. The City's responses below are provided as official clarifications to the RFP. Where applicable, proposers shall rely on this Addendum in conjunction with the original RFP and any other issued addenda.

Question 1: With anticipated NTP in December 2026 and substantial completion February 15, 2027, roughly 10 weeks for assessment/survey/design/permitting and approximately 52,500 CY of dredging. Has the City requested or does it intend to request an OSBM extension? What are the controlling grant expenditure, completion, and closeout deadlines?

City Response: February 15, 2027 should not be interpreted as the OSBM grant expenditure deadline. The OSBM grant agreement requires grant funds to be expended within the applicable grant period, currently extending through 2030. The City is evaluating the project schedule and intends to use a phased approach that prioritizes dredging and sediment removal. The final schedule will account for permitting, site conditions, weather, water levels, environmental restrictions, and seasonal limitations. The City will administer the project in accordance with the OSBM grant agreement and applicable City requirements.

Question 2: Does the February 15, 2027 date apply to the full scope, including permanent seeding/stabilization, or to dredging/sediment removal only? Are winter vegetation conditions a concern?

City Response: Winter conditions may limit the effectiveness of permanent vegetation establishment. The City intends to prioritize dredging and sediment removal and will allow permanent seeding, planting, and final stabilization to occur during an appropriate planting season when necessary. Temporary stabilization and erosion-control measures shall be maintained as required. Proposers should identify their proposed sequencing and anticipated completion dates for dredging, temporary stabilization, permanent stabilization, and final closeout.

Question 3: Section 12.2 provides for phased Notices to Proceed. What phasing does the City anticipate, and if later phases are not authorized, how will the proposer be compensated?

City Response: The City anticipates the project may generally be phased as follows: (1) assessment, surveying, engineering/design, environmental review, and permitting; (2) mobilization and dredging/sediment removal; (3) pond/site restoration; and (4) final completion and grant closeout. The City may issue a Notice to Proceed for the entire project or for individual phases, tasks, or components at its discretion. The City is not obligated to authorize all phases. The proposer will be compensated for authorized work satisfactorily completed in accordance with the contract. No compensation will be provided for unauthorized work. Proposers shall clearly identify costs, assumptions, and pricing by phase where applicable.

Question 4: Please identify the location, acreage, and capacity of designated on-site disposal/stockpile areas, and any restrictions on placement height, final grading, setbacks, or FEMA floodplain/floodway location.

City Response: The City intends for dredged material disposal/stockpile areas to be located outside FEMA-designated floodplain and floodway areas. Specific final limits and locations will be identified and approved by the City in coordination with the selected proposer during planning, assessment, and design. More than one area may be utilized. Proposers shall account for on-site handling, movement, placement, grading, erosion controls, drainage, and stabilization. Final placement elevations, slopes, setbacks, and related requirements shall be based on site assessment, engineering, applicable regulations, and City direction.

Question 5: If on-site disposal areas are insufficient, including for bulking, should proposers price an alternate for additional/off-site disposal?

City Response: Yes. The base proposal shall be based on use of City-approved on-site disposal/stockpile areas. Proposers shall provide a separately identified alternate unit price for additional or off-site disposal if the verified quantity, including applicable bulking, exceeds available on-site capacity. The alternate should identify applicable transportation, tipping/disposal, loading, handling, dewatering, testing/material characterization, and other associated costs. The City may authorize use of the alternate by written authorization or change order. Off-site disposal costs shall not be included in the base proposal unless otherwise required.

Question 6: Does the City have sediment analytical data? Is testing required before on-site placement, and should testing be included in the base price or as an allowance?

City Response: The City does not currently have sediment analytical data for the project. The selected proposer shall identify and perform sampling and analytical testing reasonably necessary to evaluate handling, placement, disposal, reuse, and regulatory requirements. Such testing shall be separately identified in the proposal as an allowance and/or unit-priced item, as specified in the final pricing form, rather than included as an undefined base cost. Additional testing beyond the authorized allowance or unit quantities shall be subject to City authorization. The City will consider testing results and applicable regulatory requirements when determining appropriate on-site placement and management.

Question 7: If hydraulic dredging is proposed, will the City permit geotextile tube dewatering in the disposal areas?

City Response: Yes. The City will consider geotextile tubes and other dewatering systems within approved on-site disposal areas, subject to City approval and all applicable environmental, erosion and sedimentation, stormwater, and other regulatory requirements. The proposer shall select and propose a method appropriate for the site conditions, sediment characteristics, disposal area, schedule, and applicable permits. The proposal shall address footprint, capacity, containment, filtrate management, discharge controls, and final handling of dewatered material. City approval of a proposed method does not relieve the proposer of responsibility for complying with applicable permits and regulations.

Question 8: How were the preliminary dredging quantities derived? Can the City provide supporting surveys, reports, or calculations?

City Response: The preliminary quantities were developed from a preliminary proposal provided by Pond Lake Management. The preliminary total is approximately 52,500 cubic yards across the nine pond areas. These quantities are provided for proposal and planning purposes only and are not based on a formal bathymetric survey or final engineering quantity determination. The selected proposer shall verify existing conditions, perform required surveying/investigation, and establish final quantities as

part of its work. Proposers shall not assume that the preliminary quantities constitute a guaranteed quantity.

Question 9: Does the City have existing topographic or bathymetric surveys, pond/spillway as-builts, utility information, geotechnical information, Hurricane Helene damage assessments, or wetland delineations?

City Response: The City does not currently have formal topographic or bathymetric surveys, pond/spillway as-built drawings, geotechnical information, wetland delineations, or other formal existing-condition information of the type identified in the question readily available for the project. The City may provide other relevant information in its possession if available. Proposers shall not rely upon the existence of surveys, engineering, geotechnical, environmental, utility, or as-built information unless specifically provided by the City. The selected proposer shall be responsible for the investigations, surveying, assessment, design, and coordination necessary to complete the authorized work.

Question 10: Has the City made a preliminary jurisdictional determination under Sections 404/401, including whether the ponds are jurisdictional or connected to Crowders Creek or an unnamed tributary?

City Response: The City has not obtained or made a formal jurisdictional determination under Sections 404/401 for the pond areas. The City has not made a formal determination as to whether any pond is jurisdictional or whether any pond is considered on-line with Crowders Creek or an unnamed tributary. The selected proposer shall evaluate applicable environmental and regulatory requirements and coordinate with the appropriate regulatory agencies to determine jurisdiction, permitting requirements, and applicable limitations.

Question 11: Will the City or the selected proposer be the named permit applicant for the erosion and sedimentation control plan and any USACE/NCDWR authorizations?

City Response: The selected proposer shall be responsible for preparing, coordinating, submitting, and obtaining applicable permits and regulatory approvals where the applicable regulatory agency allows the proposer to serve as the permit applicant. Where a permit, authorization, certification, or other regulatory approval must be obtained or held by the property owner or the City, the City will serve as the applicant or permit holder as required. In those circumstances, the selected proposer shall provide all necessary plans, technical information, applications, certifications, supporting documentation, and other assistance required by the City. The selected proposer shall identify applicable permitting requirements, coordinate with regulatory agencies, respond to agency comments, revise permit documents as necessary, and comply with all applicable permit conditions.

Question 12: If hydraulic dredging is proposed, will controlled dewatering discharge to Crowders Creek or the unnamed tributary be acceptable if properly permitted, or must all dewatering water be retained onsite?

City Response: The City's preferred approach is to retain and manage dredged water within the Linwood Park pond system, including transfer of water from one pond to another as described in the preliminary Pond Lake Management proposal, where feasible and approved by the City. Proposers should evaluate and incorporate practical water-management and dewatering methods that minimize off-site discharge and utilize the existing pond system to the greatest extent practicable. Any transfer between ponds shall be conducted in a manner that does not adversely impact other ponds, downstream resources, aquatic life, park facilities, or surrounding property. Discharge to Crowders Creek, an unnamed tributary, or another off-site receiving water is not the City's preferred method.

Any proposed off-site discharge would require City approval and compliance with all applicable environmental, stormwater, water-quality, erosion and sedimentation, and other regulatory requirements and permits.

Question 13: Will the City provide a specific price proposal form, and should proposers submit a lump-sum price, unit prices based on cubic yards of dredged material, or a combination? Should assessment, survey, engineering, and permitting costs be priced separately from construction/dredging?

City Response: The City intends to use a combination of lump-sum and unit pricing. Proposers shall provide a lump-sum price for professional and project-related services necessary to complete the project, including assessment, surveying, engineering/design, permitting and regulatory coordination, project management, and other services that can reasonably be priced on a lump-sum basis. Dredging and sediment removal shall be priced using unit prices based on cubic yards of material removed. Proposers shall provide unit pricing that clearly identifies applicable dredging, dewatering, handling, movement, placement, and disposal costs. The City may also request separate unit pricing for other work where quantities may reasonably vary. Final quantities will be verified through the selected proposer's assessment, surveying, engineering, and field operations, and payment for unit-priced dredging shall be based on actual quantities authorized and completed.

Question 14: What is the total grant amount available for the project, and is there a specific construction or project budget that proposers should use when developing their proposals?

City Response: There is not a specific grant amount or dedicated construction budget established for this portion of the Linwood Park pond restoration project. Proposers shall develop their proposals based on the full scope of services described in the RFP and their professional assessment of the work necessary to successfully complete the project. The City will evaluate proposals using the evaluation criteria established in the RFP, including qualifications, experience, technical approach, team, schedule, cost, and overall value. Proposers should not limit their proposed scope or pricing based on an assumed available grant amount.

Question 15: What are the required performance and payment bond amounts, insurance limits for general liability, professional liability, and pollution liability, and may professional liability coverage be provided through an engineering subconsultant?

City Response: The selected proposer will be required to comply with the bonding and insurance requirements established by the City and included in the final contract documents. Performance and payment bonds shall be provided in accordance with applicable North Carolina law and the City's requirements for the resulting contract. The selected proposer shall maintain applicable commercial general liability, automobile liability, workers' compensation, and other insurance required by the City. Professional services requiring professional liability coverage may be covered through an appropriately licensed and insured engineering or other professional subconsultant performing those services, provided the selected proposer remains responsible for the work performed under the contract.

Question 16: What are the City's requirements regarding retainage and payment frequency? May mobilization be included as a separate line item?

City Response: The project will be subject to the City's standard contract and payment procedures, including applicable requirements for retainage and payment frequency. Mobilization may be identified as a

separate line item in the proposal and pricing schedule. Proposers shall clearly identify mobilization costs and any assumptions associated with payment for mobilization.

Question 17: Can the City provide a copy of the OSBM grant agreement and identify any applicable flow-down requirements, such as prevailing wage, E-Verify, HUB participation goals, federal requirements, or other grant-specific requirements?

City Response: The City will administer this procurement and the resulting contract in accordance with the City of Gastonia's applicable procurement policies and procedures. Proposers shall comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws, regulations, and requirements identified in the RFP and resulting contract. Any requirements applicable to the OSBM grant will be administered by the City in accordance with the grant agreement and applicable City policies and procedures. Proposers should not assume additional grant-specific requirements beyond those identified in the RFP, addenda, or resulting contract.

Question 18: Will the City conduct a pre-proposal site visit, or will individual site visits be available to proposers?

City Response: The City will not conduct a scheduled pre-proposal site visit. Proposers may request an individual site visit, as needed, to review existing site conditions. Individual site visits must be coordinated in advance with the City and are subject to staff availability and applicable park access requirements. Proposers are responsible for becoming familiar with existing site conditions and shall base their proposals on their own observations, investigations, and professional assessment of the project site.

Question 19: Will the park remain open during construction, and are there restrictions on work hours, weekend work, or contractor access?

City Response: Linwood Park is currently closed to the public and is not anticipated to be open to the public during the initial phases of this project. The City is planning a grand opening of Linwood Park in March 2027. Proposers shall consider the anticipated opening schedule when developing their project schedule, sequencing, site access, restoration, and final cleanup activities. The selected proposer shall coordinate construction access, work areas, staging, equipment, and other site activities with the City. The City may establish reasonable restrictions on work hours, access routes, staging areas, or other activities as necessary to protect the site and accommodate park opening activities.

Question 20: Does the 20-page proposal limit include the organizational chart, project schedule, required forms, resumes, tab dividers, and back cover?

City Response: The 20-page limit applies to the substantive proposal narrative and is intended to provide a consistent basis for evaluating proposals. The following items will not count toward the 20-page limit: cover page; required forms, certifications, and signature documents; resumes of key personnel; tab dividers, provided they contain no substantive proposal information; and back cover. The organizational chart and project schedule shall count toward the 20-page limit because they are components of the proposed project approach. Proposers shall not use appendices or other supplemental materials to circumvent the 20-page limitation. Substantive proposal information provided outside the allowable 20 pages may not be considered in the evaluation.

END OF ADDENDUM NO. 1