



Reach 2 Request for Proposals Questions and Answers

Current through March 14, 2024- new questions added starting on page 5.

Question	Response
<i>QUESTIONS FROM WEBINAR</i>	
Does the 18-page limit include both MSA and TO proposals?	<p>Upon further reflection we believe that 15 pages for <i>each</i> of the two-part proposal (MSA and Task Order 1) should be adequate.</p> <p>These are recommendations for each part, but the maximum number of pages for the entire two-part proposal <i>should not exceed 30 pages</i>. The SFCJPA appreciates brevity.</p>
Does the 18 page limit include resumes and sub contractor quals?	<p>No, resumes and any subcontractor qualifications are not included in the page limit.</p> <p>We do not want to see resumes longer than 1-2 pages and it would be better to have team qualifications summarized if possible.</p>
Who performed the design for Reach 1?	<p>The Engineer of Record for the design and as-builts was HDR. The HDR team had GEI as a team member for geotechnical work.</p> <p>Project construction was managed by Mott. Many subcontractors worked on the Reach 1 project, from design through construction.</p> <p>Current contractors include HT Harvey and Hanford ARC.</p>
Who performed the 90% design for Reach 2?	<p>Valley Water contracted with NV5 for design of Pope Chaucer Bridge. Valley Water developed 60 percent designs for widening areas in-house, and contracted with Mark Thomas to take these designs to 90%. Mark Thomas also developed 90% designs for top of bank structures that are part of the SEIR.</p>



Question	Response
	<p>Additional geotechnical work was completed by Kleinfelder on a contract to VW</p> <p>SFCJPA contracted with ESA to develop greener widening designs, particularly for restoration of the large concrete structure in the creek along Woodland Ave. in East Palo Alto. This included hydraulic modeling for fish friendly features.</p> <p>SFCJPA also contracted with HDR for 60% preliminary designs for opening up the fourth bore at East Bayshore Road.</p> <p>It should be noted that none of the designs used the updated 2024 hydrology, and would therefore need to be revisited for applicability.</p>
Can you provide a copy of the 90% design drawings?	Yes, please send a request and a link will be provided.
What level of expertise for public outreach does the JPA envision teams needing to provide?	Public outreach is scoped in the RFP for meetings to identify the preferred alternative. The SFCJPA needs assistance in visual renderings of alternatives and other graphics support, posterboards and the like.
Can you confirm JPA has a CEQA team identified, or should our team include CEQA specialists?	EMC Planning Group, Monterey is under contract to deliver a Supplemental EIR (SEIR). The selected consultant would need to coordinate information with this firm for the Project Description (which is in their scope) and other SEIR needs.
Who was the geotechnical consultant for reach 1 and 2?	The firms that SFCJPA is aware of are GEI (Reach 1) and Kleinfelder (Reach 2). The original 2012 Geotechnical report covers both Reach 1 and Reach 2, and supplemental geotechnical studies were performed by Kleinfelder as the designs progressed.



Question	Response
	Our member cities, Menlo Park and East Palo Alto both developed additional geotechnical studies in 2023 in response to bank erosion issues from winter storms of 2022-2023.
Corps creek widening considered entire area. Should our analysis include the entire creek in our analysis?	The evaluation should focus on flood reduction in Reach 2 that may have solutions in the upper watershed.
The 30% design- is it relevant to only the preferred alternative, or do we cost 5 alternatives?	<p>The alternatives should be fleshed out enough for evaluation and selection, but 30% design is just for the preferred alternative.</p> <p>The alternatives must contain enough detail to determine CEQA and Least Environmental Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA) as defined by Army Corps and SF Water Board.</p>
The proposal is limited to 18 pages. Does this include staff resumes and subconsultant material, or are these excluded from the 18-page limit?	<p>No, the page count limit (now changed/increased) does not include staff resumes and subconsultant material. But please do not load with long resumes- resumes should be limited to 2 pages each. Even a summary of staff with ½ page each is fine.</p> <p>Note that further clarification regarding page limit is provided above.</p>
For cost proposal should fee be separate or included?	<p>Include as a one page of summary costs by task. Assumptions and detailed cost back-up must be available.</p> <p>If necessary, the one-page summary would be part of proposal page limit, and back up could be supporting information and not subject to page limit.</p>
Can deadline for proposal submission be delayed by one week?	No, there are other cascading elements that require this schedule, such as the budget for 2024-2025.
Is the current model available for review?	Yes, the 2024 updated HEC RAS can be made available upon request.



Question	Response
<i>ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL</i>	
<p>The notice lists two RFPs, one for the Master Services Agreement and the second for Task Order #1. Is the intent that the consultant will submit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A single proposal, covering both the MSA (no costs) and TO #1 (scope/ hours/ costs), OR • Submit an SOQ for the MSA (no costs) and a separate proposal for TO #1 (w/ costs). 	<p>Please submit one proposal with 2 parts: MSA and TO1, with a maximum of 30 pages as described above.</p>
<p>Can subconsultants not listed in the MSA be added to future Task Orders if needed?</p>	<p>Yes, but the MSA should identify the main/core team. Other subcontractors, including but not limited to surveyors, drillers may be added later.</p>
<p>Should the fee be provided in a separate document?</p>	<p>No, the cost proposal is part of evaluation criteria.</p>
TO1 Scope of Work	
<p>Task 2.1: The Board will set design criteria for Reach 2 at its' March meeting. Will these criteria, at least in draft form, be available for use in developing the proposal?</p>	<p>The consultant should assume that the design goal will be to contain flows up to 7,200 cubic feet per second (cfs). This is what was specified in the 2019 EIR. If that is not feasible, or does not have community/regulatory acceptance, then the goal will be less than that flow.</p>
<p>Task 2.8: Please confirm correct understanding of the scope: The consultant will develop 5 (maybe more) alternative scenarios, with order-of-magnitude costs. These will be provided to SFCJPA. SFCJPA will hold three public outreach workshops (consultant to be present). Following the public outreach, SFCJPA staff and member agencies will select one (maybe more) of the scenarios for presentation to the Board (will this be one of the two Board meetings the consultant will attend? The Board will select a scenario for further development.</p>	<p>Yes. The consultant should be prepared to attend two board meetings. The consultant will review potential flood reduction options and come up with alternatives (that may be a combination of options) that can accommodate flows of up to 7,200 cfs. We anticipate that this may require up to 3 iterations. The alternatives will need enough detail based on conceptual designs and order of magnitude costs to make an informed decision. This process should be documented in the alternative evaluation, with enough detail to identify the LEDPA.</p>



Question	Response
NEW QUESTIONS as of 3.14	
<p>Task 3: The consultant will prepare ONE 30% design and cost estimate for the scenario selected by the Board. The consultant will present the design (second Board meeting?) to the Board, staff, and member agencies.</p>	<p>Yes, any additional evaluation would be part of a technical request task.</p>
<p>The scope of modeling and alternatives development includes the section of creek downstream of the Pope-Chaucer Bridge that was previously being developed by the Corps of Engineers. Following selection of the preferred alternative, will this portion of the work be included in Task 3, 30% design and cost estimate? Will the COE take back design/ construction, or will this remain under the MSA?</p>	<p>At this time, we believe the ACOE will lead design, permitting and construction of a CAP205 project in Reach 2 for channel widening or other elements. The SFCJPA and ACOE are not certain of the project details since hydrology has changed. TO1 should clearly identify the “With Project Conditions” based on 30% design and work closely with the ACOE to help identify a viable project scope for the CAP205 program.</p>
<p>The schedule presented at the Webinar shows the alternative selection by late Summer 2024. Clarify, is this when the consultant is expected to submit the five or so alternates to SFCJPA for consideration or does this the schedule for the Board to select an alternative (which would push up the consultant delivery of the alternatives to allow for the public workshops and internal SFCJPA review)</p>	<p>This schedule is preliminary and is subject to contractor review and input.</p>
<p>Do you have a list or a map of the residential parcels that were flooding in the January 2023 event? This will be helpful to see the flow path from water exceeding the creek during the storm.</p>	<p>The SFCJPA does not have a detailed list or parcel maps of inundation. The maps of observed inundation are in the model review reports.</p>
<p>We have reviewed standard template and legal has a few comments. We can accept terms and conditions.</p>	<p>The SFCJPA does not accept material changes to the standard template but may be open to clarifications on standard template application to MSA and TO1. Please submit comments for legal review.</p>
<p>In the MSA, one of the requirements is to provide fees for certain scope elements (model runs, exhibits, etc.)</p>	<p>MSA will be rate sheet that can be referred to in TO1. No need to repeat.</p>



Question	Response
<p>Since we need to provide detailed hours/ costs for the various tasks in the TO #1 proposal, do you need this material in the MSA SOQ as well?</p> <p>We can provide standard billing rates in the SOQ if you would like, although these will also be provided in the TO for specific staff assigned to the TO.</p> <p>Also, breaking out products as a unit cost can be challenging, since there a many variables and supporting task involved.</p>	<p>Assumptions should be documented for TO1 as that is the actual cost estimate.</p> <p>We agree that billing rates would be repeated for the specific staff type proposed in TO1, along with estimated hours by task/subtask.</p> <p>Please do your best at selecting items for unit costs.</p>
<p>There is a difference in the way the scope of work is numbered in the RFP vs the pre-bid slides. Can you please clarify which numbering option we should use in our response?</p> <p>RFP version:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Task Order 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Task 1. Project Management/Consultant Team Coordination ○ Task 2. Engineering Design: including conceptual, 30%, 60%, 90% and 100% designs ○ Task 3. Regulatory Agency and Local Jurisdiction Project Permitting ○ Task 4. Public Outreach and Related Support ○ Task 5. Final Design and Bid Support ○ Task 6. Engineering Support during Construction As-builts and Operations & Maintenance (O&M) Plan, <p style="text-align: center;">Master Services Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Task 7. Technical Requests associated with the project work not known at this time, to be defined and documented by SFCJPA and Consultant. ○ Task 8. Optional: Staff Augmentation <p>Pre-bid version:</p>	<p>Thank you for pointing out this error.</p> <p>Tasks 7 and 8 are only needed as part of Task Order 1. They should be addressed as part of your response to Task Order 1, not part of the Master Services Agreement (MSA).</p>



Question	Response
<p style="text-align: center;">Task Order 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Task 1 –Administrative and Project Management ○ Task 2 –Alternatives Analysis ○ Task 3 –30% Designs & Plans, Construction Estimates and Schedules for Preferred Alternative <p style="text-align: center;">Master Services Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Task 4 –Technical Requests ○ Task 5 -Optional Task for staff support for other SFCJPA projects not related to Reach 2 	
<p>Can changes be made to the SFCJPA Standard Agreement Template? (Note: A series of changes were requested/suggested by a potential bidder).</p>	<p>Hypothetically, yes. However, changes to the SFCJPA Standard Agreement Template of the scope and nature requested/suggested are best left to negotiations between the SFCJPA and the selected bidder.</p>

Notes: This list reflects all questions received by 5pm on March 15, 2024.

The Q&A period has now closed.