

Cloverlick Creek Dam Removal and Stream Restoration
Responses to Questions

1. **To allow sufficient time to finalize our team and develop a detailed and competitive proposal, we respectfully request a two-week extension to the current proposal due date.** Clermont SWCD and ODNR are able to grant a one-week extension will proposals due by **4:00 p.m. on Friday, May 1, 2026.**

2. **GEI documents/products requested and shared:**
 - AutoCAD Civil 3D files with existing surfaces, with bathymetric surface as a stand-alone, if possible.
 - Raw .csv of bathymetric and topographic data points in PNEZD format; depth of refusal points and refusal elevations and/or depths.
 - Demolition plan linework and hatches.

3. **Is there asbestos in the pumphouse? Has an asbestos study been conducted?** No study has been conducted, but it appears to be all block. No infrastructure remains inside the pumphouse.

4. **Have there been any pre-application meetings with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)?** No formal meetings or communications have taken place. Clermont Soil & Water has notified the Huntington District to anticipate permit applications in 2026. The project has been assigned the following Department of the Army (DA) file number: Corps File: LRH-2025-253-LMR - Cloverlick Creek Low-head Dam Removal Project.

5. **Should the design-build consultant use the concept plan provided in the Request for Proposals to start the USACE permitting process?** The conceptual design provides a base level restoration approach. As D-B teams develop a design plan with additional information and known/unknown constraints, D-B teams may amend the conceptual plan with rationale to achieve the overall project objectives.

6. **Has there been any communication to date with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO)? Does Clermont Soil & Water anticipate any challenges with SHPO due to the dam being constructed as a Works Progress Administration (WPA) project?** There have been no conversations

with SHPO yet; however, we don't anticipate complications. Clermont Soil & Water has worked with SHPO in the past on the removal of WPA-era dams with little difficulties.

7. **Is there flexibility with the project schedule provided in the Request for Proposals? How should the endangered bat tree clearing restrictions in Ohio be addressed?** After further consultation with the criteria engineer, Clermont Soil & Water has modified the project schedule and updated the RFP. Alternative project schedules may be proposed. If an alternative schedule is proposed, the revised project completion date is July 31, 2027.

Implementation Activities	Date
Notice to Proceed	May 13, 2026
Design, Permitting and Engineering Complete	September 25, 2026
Start of Project Construction	October 1, 2026
Project Construction Substantially Complete; Warranty Starts	July 31, 2027
Post-construction partner meeting	August 23, 2027
Warranty Period Ends	July 31, 2028
Post-construction performance monitoring	July 2027-July 2028

8. **Can concrete be disposed of on site? If so, must it be processed to a certain size? Yes,** there are sites within the project area where concrete can be disposed of if clean (i.e., rebar removed). Clean concrete may also be re-purposed as part of the restoration project. Concrete that is disposed on village property should be processed to ODOT Type-C size rock (~6-18").
9. **Do you anticipate that the design-build team would need to import material for instream habitat?** A complete sediment study has not been done. The limited information on sediment indicates most of the material may be sand

and gravel. No pollutant testing (other than phosphorus) has been done. D-B teams will have to determine the substrate condition and the quantity of material needed for instream habitat material.

10. **Has Clermont Soil & Water had discussions with USACE about the possibility of allowing sediment to wash downstream?** Should dredging be conducted prior to de-watering SWCD has not discussed sediment release with USACE. Sediment must not be allowed to freely wash downstream. D-B teams must develop a sediment management strategy in coordination and with approval of permitting agencies and SWCD.
11. **There is a corrugated metal stormwater pipe downstream from the pumphouse. What area does this drain? Does it need to be maintained?** We're unsure of where the drain originates. We anticipate that this will need to be maintained.
12. **Has there been any study done on threatened and endangered species? Will the design-build team need to address mussel relocation?** ODNR's list of T&E is available. ODNR will handle all mussel studies and if necessary, mussel relocation.
13. **Is it possible for SWCD / GEI to conduct a presence/absence survey to identify mussel beds/assemblages in the work area or impoundment in advance of the project award?** Recon/survey season starts May 1; a recon will not be done prior to the award being announced. Dam removal projects for Group 1 streams the survey/salvage areas are dependent on areas of direct impact and associated salvage buffers i.e. where the equipment will be running and how the sediment will be dealt with.
14. **Is the sediment study conducted by Ohio EPA available?** Clermont Soil & Water has shared the results of the Ohio EPA sediment study.
15. **Could you please clarify what is required for sediment sampling and testing?**
The selected D-B team should perform additional sampling and will need to seek guidance and specific requirements from the permitting agencies.

16. **Will the USACE be involved in project plan review? Does Clermont Soil & Water anticipate that an ARPA permit will be required?** USACE Huntington District will review the engineering plan required for the 404 permit application. The restoration activities included in the final design will determine the required NWPs, which may include NWP 53, NWP 13 and NWP 27. If stream bank conditions require stabilization after the dam is removed and the extent of stabilization exceeds the threshold specified in NWP 13, a waiver will be needed along with an explanation detailing the work required. This should all be a fairly simple, straight-forward process. Consultation with USACE indicated an ARPA permit is not required, as the property to be restored is owned outright by the Village of Bethel and no excavation work is planned outside of village-owned property. USACE Huntington encourages the selected D-B team to initiate the Section 106 review with the State Historical Preservation Office (SHPO) as soon as possible to help expedite the USACE review. USACE Huntington will facilitate permit review with the Section 408 program, which is anticipated to be a cursory review, as USACE-Harsha Lake has been and will be kept apprised of expected outcomes and to date has not anticipated significant downstream impacts. All construction work will be contained to village-owned property. The existing access easement agreement between the USACE and Village of Bethel permits access through the adjacent USACE owned property; initial discussion with USACE Huntington and USACE-Harsha Lake indicate no amendments to the active easement are necessary to complete the dam removal project.
17. **Is it possible for SWCD and GEI to schedule and conduct a pre-application call with USACE to identify the Corps agent and gather guidance, if any, from the agent in advance of the proposal submittal date?** USACE Huntington District has been notified and the project assigned a DA file number: LRH-2025-253-LMR - Cloverlick Creek Low-head Dam Removal Project. SWCD and GEI discussed the project with the Huntington District and Harsha Lake on April 2nd to review the questions and comments included in this Q&A document. Information and guidance gathered during that discussion are included in the responses included in this document.
18. **Is blasting of the dam permitted?** This may be proposed; however, a controlled demolition is preferred.

19. **Is it Clermont Soil & Water's desire to remove the whole width of the dam?** The intent is to fully remove the exposed dam and pump house to grade or slightly below grade. Alternatives may be proposed with remnants left in place for the purpose of bank stability or another state purpose.
20. **Will a boundary survey need to be completed?** Yes, a boundary survey will be required to maintain restoration activities on village-owned property. An aerial of the village-owned properties is included as an attachment. The initial project survey should focus on defining the boundaries adjacent to USACE properties; the area to be approved by the village and SWCD. Post construction, all restored areas must be surveyed and property description recorded with the county per the terms of state funding requirements.
21. **Are there historical photos or plans that can be shared?** There are historical design plans (not as-builts). We have made these plans available.
22. **Will a proposal scoring matrix be made available?** Yes – scoring criteria has been included.
23. **Is Clermont Soil & Water open to either a contractor-led or engineer-led project?** Yes, we are open to either.
24. **Can you share the terms and conditions of the contract?** Clermont Soil & Water is willing to use a contract drafted by the design-build team; however, it will have to be reviewed and approved by the Clermont County Prosecutor's office. A copy of the county's standard contract is included for reference.
25. **Are there public safety issues to consider (walking trails, public access)?** The property is gated and not open to the public. Seasonal hunting is permitted on USACE property adjacent to the project area and D-B team will have to coordinate activities with USACE-Harsha Lake Management & ODNR State Parks-DOW. Prior to demolition, the D-B team should also contact USACE-Harsha Lake and ODNR to coordinate activities that may temporarily impact a downstream boat ramp.

26. **Is the site available for access in the future?** Yes, depending on staff availability. If you wish to access the site, please make arrangements with Clermont Soil & Water beforehand.
27. **Will the selection committee provide the evaluation criteria for how consultants will be scored on their submission?** Yes, the scoring criteria is included.
28. **Can the SWCD provide the grant/funding amounts for each of the partnering agencies? And of those are there any matching funds?** The funding sources and amounts available for Design-Build services are included below. Clermont SWCD manage the documentation of matching funds.
- ODNR-H2Ohio Rivers: \$797,102.00
 - National Fish and Wildlife Foundation: \$1,019,053.11
 - Clean Ohio Funding: \$756,844.89
 - U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service: \$79,000.00
29. **Are there contractual or grant-related requirements associated with the Dec. 1, 2026 completion date?** Please see revised project schedule.
30. **Should it be assumed the consultant will include agency permitting fees in this proposal? Or will the SWCD pay these fees separately when due?** The Design-Build team is responsible for all permitting and recording fees.
31. **During the site visit it was noticed that there are some power poles leading to the site that have fallen. Are these poles energized? Does the SWCD require the consultant to coordinate with the power company to have these poles repaired/removed? Or are these privately owned poles?**
The poles and power lines are not energized. Removal of the poles and lines are not necessary, unless found within the project footprint.
32. **Can the SWCD provide the informal sediment report for the impoundment area?** Yes, the preliminary sediment analysis is included.
33. **Can you please provide the Prevailing Wage Rates for this project?** D-B teams must follow requirements of the Davis-Bacon and Related Acts (DBRA). This applies to all sub-recipients and contractors.

34. **It was mentioned at the pre-proposal meeting that the County believes there are no asbestos containing materials present in the dam and pumphouse. Please confirm.**

The village has no record of asbestos in the dam or pumphouse; however, this must be confirmed by the selected contractor.

35. **Federal land ownership**

a. Which agency owns the property?

b. Anticipated level of effort for coordination?

The village owns the land to be restored. USACE does own adjacent parcels. There is an existing easement agreement between the village and USACE to allow access through USACE properties to the village-owned parcels containing the dam and pumphouse. Regarding coordination, USACE Huntington District has been notified of the project and assigned a DA reference number to the project. Huntington will review required permits. USACE management at Harsha Lake is aware of the project and SWCD will continue to provide progress updates to their office.

36. **Has any coordination been done to assess concerns the Army Corps may have with releasing sediment to the downstream reservoir or general impacts of this project?** There have been no specific discussions with USACE regarding sediment release that may occur during demolition. Per Ohio EPA's preliminary assessment, they did not anticipate issues with excess sediment or nutrient release. The D-B team should consult with USACE Huntington, USACE-Harsha Lake and Ohio EPA once a demolition strategy and restoration approach is decided. Preliminary review of the Cloverlick dam removal by USACE-Harsha Lake and East Fork Cooperative partners/researchers deemed the downstream impacts to Harsha Lake to be negligible. The D-B team will coordinate de-watering activities with permitting agencies and USACE-Harsha Lake. SWCD will assist with communication to keep all local partners updated on project progress, as we did in 2018 for the Williamsburg dam removal project. The Williamsburg dam was located on the main stem of the East Fork Little Miami River approximately 11 miles upstream of the Harsha Lake reservoir.

37. **Has there been any lead or asbestos testing done on the gate house and associated infrastructure? If so, can that information be shared?** No lead or asbestos testing has been done.

38. **Can Clermont SWCD share all the grant applications and agreements for this project?** These documents will be shared with interested D-B teams.
39. **Are there any historical aerials or photos available of the site, upstream and downstream also?** SWCDs have historical aerials for their respective counties (select years between 1938-1985); we will provide aerial images of the general area. The village does not have any historical photos.
40. **What species of fish is of concern for fish passage?** Refer to the ODNR ER and MBI data.
41. **Is there an engineer's opinion of cost? If so, can that estimate be shared?** Yes – it will be shared with interested D-B teams.
42. **Are GEI or any other firms precluded from submitting on the D/B component of the project?** Per Ohio Revised Code, the Criteria Engineer is precluded from receiving any work for Design-Build services.
43. **Is there a date by which the SWCD has to spend the grant money or lose it? Is the project schedule based entirely on preference?** Current grant timelines will be met with the preferred schedule decided by the project team.
44. **Is the budget firm for the entire project?** The budget is firmed; no additional funding is available.
45. **How does any spoil left in designated areas have to be stabilized? Capped with topsoil, etc?** Design-Build teams should propose strategies that leave spoil areas either equivalent to pre-project conditions or improved conditions.
46. **Could soil be excavated from designated spoil areas to use in the project construction/stream restoration?** Design-Build teams may propose strategies believed to be efficient and/or beneficial to the project.
47. **Does existing concrete rubble mixed in with stream substrate on downstream side of dam within channel bed need to be removed?** Design-Build teams should assess the work that is needed to achieve project goals. If existing conditions present any environmental or public hazards (i.e. exposed rebar, etc.), Design-Build teams should address these issues.

48. **Can pumphouse/wall be left in place instead of demo'd and removed?** Full removal of the dam and pumphouse is preferred; however Design-Build teams may propose alternatives.
49. **Who is on the technical advisory review committee?** Representatives of SWCD, ODNR and the Village of Bethel are serving on the technical advisory committee and will score proposals.
50. **Can you please confirm the concrete debris from the dam demolition can be placed in the spoil piles on the village property?**
The village confirmed clean debris can be placed in designated spoil areas.
51. **Is the project site located within the Asian-Long Horned Beetle (ALB) Quarantine Area?**
Yes, the site is located within the ALB area. All hardwood species, logs and other woody materials a half inch or more in diameter must remain on site. The selected D-B Team must consult with the Ohio Department of Agriculture and USDA-Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS).
52. **Does Clermont SWCD expect all soil impounded behind the dam to be hauled and spoiled in the stockpile areas?** The D-B team will have to determine the amount of sediment that should be excavated to achieve project goals. The village has identified areas where soil can be spoiled, including the former retention ponds. There's also potential for soil to be spoiled in the open field; the area should be graded and covered with seed/ mulch.
53. **Given the anticipated timeframe for design and permitting, does Clermont SWCD have any flexibility on the start or end dates for the construction phase?** D-B teams may propose alternative time frames.
54. **Can a comprehensive list of permits required for this project be provided to bidding contractors?** Refer to the RFP materials Q#16 in this document.
55. **The bid form shows a section marked contingency. Is there an amount or percentage that is a contingency on this project to be filled in that blank spot?** There is no set amount required for contingencies.
56. **Are there any liquidated damages for not completing on time?** SWCD and the selected D-B team will negotiate a contract with services and schedules mutually agreed to by the parties. The terms of liquidated damages will be defined at that time.
57. **Please confirm if there are in stream work restrictions from 03-15 to 06-30. They are noted from ODNR.** Yes, there are work restrictions from March 15-June 30th; however, ODNR does grant waivers if best management practices are in place. See the ODNR Policy 56 document.
58. **2 symbols are shown on the drawings that do not appear on the legend. Can these symbols be defined? First one is shown in stream from station (app.) 10 to station 6. It is a solid line with equally spaced single dashes inside the line. Second one is shown in**

stream from station (app.) 4 to station 0. It is a solid line with 2 equally spaced double dashes inside the line. That line that he is asking about is the bottom contour of the surveyed stream surface. Those little dashes are there to indicate that it is the "bottom" contour.

59. **Please clarify the intended frequency for the “periodic” Geomorphic monitoring required for up to one year after construction as reference in the RFP? Specifically should this monitoring be conducted monthly, quarterly, or biannually.** Design-Build teams may propose a schedule to evaluate structural integrity post-construction.
60. **Items affecting Substantial Completion Date: a) Sheet G-02 , General Construction Sequence, note 3 specifies that “water level drawdown should be done in accordance with ODNR dam safety guidelines, which specifies a drawdown of no more than one foot per week.” If the Design-Build team selected to complete the work determines that a drawdown rate exceeding the standard ODNR dam safety guidelines is feasible, will CCSWCD allow a faster drawdown rate? The drawdown rate is a guideline from ODNR. D-B Teams may propose feasible alternatives that will not destabilize structures, slopes or hinder sediment management.**
61. **Conceptual Plan drawings by GEI: a) Could you please confirm or correct the scale bar on sheets EC-01, EC-02, and C-05 as they show 1”=70’.**

The scale shown for EC-01 is correct. For EC-02 it should be 1"=20', and for C-05 it should be 1"=10'.

b) **Could you please confirm on sheet C-02 that the “EXISTING RETAINING WALL TO BE DEMOLISHED. APPROX 1140 CY” is correct or provide a correct volume? That volume seems high compared to the dimensions of the retaining wall shown on sheet C-03. The estimated volume is 42 CY.**

62. **The RFP states we are to submit our final response by creating a private link via Google Drive. As we do not use google accounts/gmail, can we submit using an alternative method, i.e., creating a SharePoint folder or directly emailing the proposal?** Yes, alternative file-sharing platforms may be used. Please be sure to give permission to both John McManus: jmcmanus@clermontcountyohio.gov and Becky McClatchey: rmcclatchey@clermontcountyohio.gov.
63. **The RFP indicates that approximately 14,000 CY of sediment has been identified for removal. CAD files indicate that approximately 23,000 CY of material has been identified for removal as part of the GEI concept plan. The difference in these totals appears to be additional cut into the right descending bank. Can you confirm the GEI concept plan assumes an additional cut of ~9,000 CY of material.** Based on the DOR survey, there is an estimated 14,000 cubic yards of sediment within the impoundment that will need to be managed and/or removed from the stream. The grading shown in the concept plan does show additional cut along the banks. The concept is approximate, as noted in Sheet C-06, and can be modified and refined by the selected design-build team. Any additional material removal or management will be based on the contractor's final grading and restoration plan.

64. **Bid date has been extended to 5/1/2026. Has the deadline for submitting questions been extended as well?** The deadline for questions remains April 17, 2026.