

Cedar Avenue Stormwater and Restoration Project

Pre-Submittal Questions and Answers

The following questions were received in writing prior to the 8.25.2026 RFP pre-submittal informational meeting or verbally during the meeting. Some questions have been lightly edited for clarity and grouped with related questions.

Schedule

Question 1: The project schedule is our biggest question mark. We can attempt to define a schedule within our proposal, but the 30% pause will be a big variable. It seems like there is some flexibility to the schedule due to the pause, but do you have milestone dates in mind? 30-, 60-, 90%, final design, permitting, bidding / construction, etc.?

Question 2: The RFP states Tasks 1-6 as being 10 months. Might MCWD consider an amendment to clarify that timeline is related to Tasks 1-5, with Task 6 being completed during the construction window?

Question 3: Should the approximately 10-month duration be read as running through the 30% submittal, through Task 5, or as design duration exclusive of the post-30% pause and of construction?

Answer 1-3: The RFP's stated approximate 10-month duration is a rough estimate of working months based on the partners' past project experience and is for design efforts in Tasks 1-5. It does not include Task 6 (Construction Observation and Administration), which will be carried out during a separate construction period, or the pause at the completion of 30% design for the partners to draft and approve the supplemental project agreement (SPA).

Proposers should provide a realistic project schedule based on their best estimate of the time each task will take to accomplish, accounting for community engagement, permitting, and bidding the project. The goal is to have a biddable, permitted project by winter 2027/2028, but the consultant will not be responsible for making up time due to the partners' SPA approval process. Proposers can assume 60-90 days for the SPA process, although the partners plan to advance this effort in parallel to early design work.

Shared-Use Path Tunnel and Moses Bridge

Question 4: Is the shared-use path tunnel discussed in the Minnehaha Parkway Regional Trail Plan and Phase I feasibility study anticipated to be part of the design scope for this project, or should we assume it is excluded from the project limits and budget?

Answer 4: The tunnel will not be part of the present design scope, as it was found to be infeasible due to present grades, groundwater levels, and Cedar Avenue elevations.

Question 5: You referred to the tunnel under Cedar Avenue. Does that include the Moses bridge in the RFP?

Answer 5: The Moses Bridge discussed in the RFP is separate from the tunnel under Cedar Avenue (see Answer 4). The Moses Bridge was included as an example of a creative design solution to bringing visitors into and through the site, as an alternative to a boardwalk. Proposers are encouraged to think creatively about how to integrate the functional, recreational, and aesthetic components of the site while bringing users closer to Minnehaha Creek.

Construction Observation and Administration

Question 6: In “Task 6: Construction Observation and Administration”, the RFP states the consultant will provide “...onsite construction observation with sufficient site presence, ...” Can you provide the approximate level of site presence provided by consultants on recent MCWD construction projects (i.e., full-time, ½ time)?

Question 7: Can the partners provide an assumed construction season, construction duration, and anticipated level of onsite observation, so that Task 6 is priced on a common basis?

Answer 6-7: The level of onsite presence has been project-dependent for recent MCWD-led projects. For this partnership project, the level of onsite presence will be based on the engineer’s judgement as to the project’s complexity and what is necessary to ensure the project is built according to plans and specifications. Similarly, construction duration and season should be estimated by proposers based on their experience with projects of this scale, and if they anticipate the need for construction to encompass a winter season for stream, storm main, or sanitary main work.

Hours, rates, number of construction administration and observation personnel, and any other relevant assumptions should be provided so proposals can be compared accurately to each other.

CSO 055

Question 8: Task 2 references additional analysis regarding CSO 055. Will the additional analysis specific to the CSO 055 include modeling files and if so, what type of model has been used for this analysis?

Answer 8: The City has concluded that only a portion of the CSO drainage area can likely be separated using a gravity drain routed to the proposed BMP. This was based on surveyed elevations and standard pipe capacity calculations (i.e., using Manning's equation). The consultant will be expected to verify pipe slope and use the H&H models for the pond design to confirm that the pond tailwater does not cause surcharging onto the county road. It is anticipated that the consultant will need to use both the City's PCSWMM model of the public storm drain system and the District's XPSWMM model of Minnehaha Creek to understand potential hydraulic impacts to any upstream systems.

Question 9: Can the City indicate approximately when during the 30% design period its CSO 055 analysis would be available, and whether any results would be available at contract execution?

Answer 9: The City's investigation is complete (see Answer 8). The final memorandum can be provided to the selected consultant team at contract execution.

Question 10: We understand the \$550,000 to \$650,000 range to apply to Tasks 1 through 6, with Optional Task 1 priced separately. Is there an overall contract ceiling that Optional Task 1 would count against, or would it be authorized outside that amount?

Answer 10: There is not a ceiling for Optional Task 1, which would be authorized outside the base Task 1-6 budget and be based on the recommendations resulting from the 30% design.

Survey

Question 11: Is a full ALTA/NSPS land title survey with title commitment required, or would a boundary and topographic survey meeting the listed content requirements be sufficient?

Answer 11: A full ALTA/NSPS land title survey, including all listed requirements, will be required.

Question 12: Can the existing survey information listed under Available Resources and Data, including the MPRB topographic and boundary survey and the City planning-level survey for CSO separation, be released during the RFP period to support scope development and fee estimation? Do the partners hold any existing geotechnical, boring, or groundwater information for the project area beyond the items listed?

Answer 12: The existing surveys are considered either incomplete, planning-level, or imprecise at this project location, so the partners will not be releasing this information until a consultant is selected. The partners do not have any existing geotechnical, boring, or groundwater information beyond what has been listed.

Budget

Question 13: For pricing the base fee, should proposers carry sanitary relocation design at 60% through 100% within the not-to-exceed, exclude it, or include it as a stated allowance?

Answer 13: Sanitary relocation should be carried through final design within the not-to-exceed amount. The consultant, in coordination with the project partners, may determine that in situ replacement is preferable, but the possibility of relocation should be accounted for in the base bid.

Proposal Requirements and Review

Question 14: Are there any DBE or other participation requirements for the project, and can the partners provide the anticipated weighting of the proposal evaluation criteria?

Answer 14: There are no specific DBE or other participation requirements for this design contract.

Anticipated proposal evaluation criteria weighting: (1) Methodology = 40%, (2) Experience = 50%, (3) Cost = 10%