

LITTLE RAPIDS ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT RFP

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Rich Pfingsten  
Ecosystem Restoration and Management Leader  
EA Engineering, Science, and Technology

1. In Section 1.0 – Overview, it states in the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph that “priority will be given to proposals that demonstrate an ability to complete the scope of services according to the schedule outlined below.” There does not appear to be a clearly defined schedule for this project within the RFP. Please clarify.

**Strike the portion of that sentence that reads "according to the schedule", it should read ..."demonstrate an ability to complete the scope of services outlined below."**

2. Similarly, in Section 6.0 of the RFP (Schedule and Costs), it states that the “proposal should include anticipated schedule and time/material cost estimates, to be completed by January 30, 2012 for the Environmental Assessment activities listed below.” Is a revised schedule for the completion of the project, as well as a detailed schedule for the other anticipated project deliverables available so that we can properly address the “Schedule” section of the proposal and price the work accordingly?

**I apologize for the confusion; we want you to make sure to include a schedule and the time/material as part of your proposal on this project. That sentence will be amended to read: "The proposal should include anticipated schedule and time/material cost estimates, to be submitted by January 31, 2012, for the Environmental Assessment activities listed in the scope of work above."**

3. In Section 3.0 – Scope of Services of the RFP, is the terminology used in Item 3e referring to the “Draft Potential Impacts Report” and in Item 3 under the Other Tasks listing for the “Final Potential Impacts Report” interchangeable with the Draft Environmental Assessment and the Final Environmental Assessment documents that are listed in Section 4.0 Deliverables or are these considered separate submittals?

**The Drafts should be treated as separate from the Final submittals.**

Sanjiv K. Sinha, Ph.D., P.E.  
Vice President  
Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.

1. On Page 4, Section 6, RFP indicates work to be completed by January 30, 2012. Since this date is too near, we assume this is an error. Please advise what the correct end-date is.

**I apologize for the confusion, we want you to make sure to include a schedule and the time/material as part of your proposal on this project. That sentence will be amended to read: "The proposal should include anticipated schedule and time/material cost estimates, to be submitted by January 31, 2012, for the Environmental Assessment activities listed in the scope of work above."**

2. Some clients prefer that engineering aspects of a project be carried out by a consultant that has not assisted with the EA. Does Eastern U.P. Regional Planning & Development see any conflict of interest in bidding for both RFPs?

**No we do not, in fact numerous firms will be included on both RFP issuance listings. Ultimately, the document is a NOAA document and NOAA is responsible for ensuring all sides are shown. In this case,**

**in reviewing the draft(s), NOAA will want to make sure the work we are paying for with our grant meets our needs**

3. We understand a consultant or another agency/organization has been engaged with the modeling aspects of this project. Noting the close tie-in with the tasks outline in the EA, kindly advice about the status of the modeling work. How far along is that modeling project, which model is being used, when you expect to complete, etc.

**The modeling has not yet been started but we anticipate it will be underway early next month and be completed in 90 days, following a timeline similar to the EA.**

James Veenstra, AMEC - Questions/Clarification requests regarding the RFP:

Please clarify the entity that will be performing the anticipated remedy design work and what the scope and detail of that remedy is, or is anticipated to be. If this scope is not yet available, when will it be available?

**The Engineering Design consultant has not yet been selected, that quality based selection will take place in later February 2012. The scope of work that will go into that RFP should be available in early February once it has been agreed upon by the Project Team.**

Please provide the proposed project schedule for the remedy design work and the proposed hydraulic modeling being performed by the USACE as these will need to interface with the EA schedule.

**The HFM will be performed by URS Corporation not the USACE, that work has not yet begun, we anticipate that it will begin in early February and follow a timeline that is similar to the EA work. The project schedule for the Engineering Design work has not yet been established, that RFP will be issued in February 2012.**

Please clarify regarding Section 6.0 Schedule and Costs: the first two lines state that ,”The proposal should include anticipated schedule and time/material cost estimates, to be completed by January 30, 2012, for the ...” Is this date correct? Is the intent to propose a schedule and time/materials cost estimate for activities that will occur through January 30 of 2013?

**I apologize for the confusion, we want you to make sure to include a schedule and the time/material as part of your proposal on this project. That sentence will be amended to read: "The proposal should include anticipated schedule and time/material cost estimates, to be submitted by January 31, 2012, for the Environmental Assessment activities listed in the scope of work above."**

Please confirm that the cost proposal is due January 31, 2012 at 4:00 PM, the same time and date as the qualification based proposal.

**YES**

What sediment quality data is available for the Little Rapids area?

**Attached is the AOC sediment study, with some sampling points in the vicinity of the Little Rapids. I do think that Barb Keller may have another report with more localized sampling, but am not certain. Sediment study can be downloaded at: [http://www.eup-planning.org/LR\\_NOAA/LSSUSedimentStudyFinalReport5709.doc](http://www.eup-planning.org/LR_NOAA/LSSUSedimentStudyFinalReport5709.doc)**

What companies have received this RFP?

**A direct mailing was sent to 35 firms, the RFP was also advertised on our website and an ad was placed in the Sault Evening News.**

Will the successful proposal be selected prior to opening/viewing the cost proposal?

**Yes, the cost proposal for the highest scoring proposal after review by the project team will have its cost proposal opened and any negotiations will take place from that point, all other cost proposals will be returned UNOPENED to the rest of the respondents.**

Christopher Holmes, P.E.  
Project Engineer  
**U.P. Engineers & Architects, Inc**

1. Schedule - Are there any milestone dates that the EUP has? The RFP states priority will be given to proposals that demonstrate an ability to complete the scope of services according to the schedule outlined below, however, I don't see a schedule. Section 6.0 states the proposal should include anticipated schedule and time/material cost estimates. Can you clarify this?

**We are anticipating this phase of the work to be completed within 90 days, you are encouraged to develop a project schedule based on the scope of work. Any cost estimates should be placed in a separate sealed envelope clearly marked cost proposal, therein you could break out cost estimates by task or an overall cost to deliver the project. We have suggested a project period of February 15, 2012 through June 30, 2012 which the project team feels is adequate to complete this phase.**

2. Section 3.0 states at least two meetings will be required with various agencies. Where are these meetings to take place? Is the proposal to include providing a meeting facility?

**These meetings will take place in Sault Ste. Marie, EUP will arrange meeting space, the VENDOR will be responsible for notifying EUP in a timely manner so that meeting arrangements can be made.**

3. Section 3.0 states a Public Workshop to present and solicit comments on the Draft Potential Impacts Report is required. Where will this workshop take place? Is the proposal to include providing a workshop facility?

**The public hearing will be held in Sault Ste. Marie, EUP will arrange meeting space, the VENDOR will be responsible for notifying EUP in a timely manner so that meeting arrangements can be made.**

4. When will a project work plan be available for the engineering design phase? In order to facilitate discussions with the State Historic Preservation Office, a more specific project plan will be required.

**The work plan for the engineering design phase is currently under development, we anticipate that the RFP for that component will be issued in mid-February, once the language is finalized by the Project Team we will provide it to the VENDOR on the Environmental Assessment work.**

**Kelly Rice, PWS**  
Senior Ecological Resource Specialist 3  
**Cardno JFNew**

1. Has a vendor been selected for the Hydraulic Flow Modeling? One portion of the RFP document (Appendix A) references that this work is being done by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and one part (page 4 – section 5.0 #6) references a “vendor” that we will coordinate with during the process.

URS Corporation will be completing the hydraulic flow modeling for this project, the selected vendor for the EA will be provided the contact information to coordinate with them.

2. Page 3 references final and draft “Potential Impacts Reports”. Is this some type of standalone deliverable that you are requesting in addition to the EA? Or is this just an informal collection of potential issues that are identified early on in the EA process?

**The successful bidder should provide for discussion purposes fairly early on in the EA development a comprehensive list of positive and negative potential impacts. Then the planning team can provide comments, additions etc before the consultant fleshes things out too much.**