



## Strategy to Advance Flood protection, Ecosystems and Recreation along the Bay (SAFER Bay) Project

### Frequently Asked Questions regarding the RFP

August 5, 2013

1. Is the itemized fee schedule to be bound in the proposal document or included in a separate sealed envelope? If in a sealed envelope, does it count toward the number of pages allowed?

*Answer: The itemized fee schedule should be included in a separate sealed envelope, delivered with the proposal by 4:00 p.m. on August 13. The fee schedule does not count towards the page count.*

2. Are Task 18 and Task 19 related to Bidding and Construction Support Services one task?

*Answer: Yes, these should be considered one task in the scope of work. Proposals may re-order or change task numbers based on the proposing consultant's recommendation.*

3. What is the anticipated budget for the project as described in the RFP? Has funding been secured for construction of this project?

*Answer: The SFCJPA has secured over \$1.8 million to cover the costs of all non-Optional Task Services included within the RFP. Our ability to proceed with Optional Task Services will depend on additional funding that is under consideration. Funding has not been secured for construction.*

4. Does the 30-page proposal limit include all requested information, including the title page?

*Answer: Yes, all requested information, except for the fee schedule as noted in Question 1 above.*

5. Can pages larger than 8½ x 11 be included in the proposal, and do they count as one page?

*Answer: Yes and yes, as long as larger pages are used only for maps, images, schedule or budget.*

6. Are two references required per previous project or per individual on the proposed team?

*Answer: Per individual.*

7. Should resumes be included as part of the proposal?

*Answer: Resumes are not required; see page 2 of the RFP.*

8. The RFP notes that suggestions are welcome for modifications to the tasks. Does this include a different sequence or approach to the tasks, or additional Optional Task Services?

*Answer: Yes. Suggestions are welcome related to all aspects of this project.*

9. Can Task 1 and Task 6 for Project Management in Phases 1 & 2 be combined into one task in order to simplify the estimation of the level of effort?

*Answer: Yes. Obviously, clarity within the proposal is very important.*

10. Is there a target contingency percentage for the construction cost estimate in Task 4.3?

*Answer: We will work with the selected consultant to establish an appropriate construction contingency.*

11. Should the proposal assume that Task 5's Additional Alignment Alternatives will be taken to the same level of evaluation, design and environmental documentation as the Baseline Alignment?

*Answer: Yes, the level of work for Phases 1 & 2 on the Additional Alignment Alternatives should be considered the same as the Baseline Alignment. We anticipate selecting a preferred alignment at the end of Phase 1.*

12. Will the design of the levees be informed by criteria from the State Department of Water Resources or the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers?

*Answer: For the purposes of completing the proposal, assume that levee design will be informed by Corps of Engineers guidelines, as the SFCJPA will seek Corps certification of the levees once built.*

13. In addition to CEQA documentation required for the project, will NEPA-related services be required?

*Answer: No.*

14. Will DWR's right-of-way acquisition requirement to include current Phase 1 Site Assessments for each acquired parcel be included in the services?

*Answer: The SFCJPA is looking into this issue. For the proposal, assume that Site Assessments are necessary and describe this work and include the associated fees.*

15. Do this project's assumptions regarding build-out conditions differ from existing conditions?

*Answer: The Project's assumption is that no new development will occur on the Bay side of the chosen alignment. On the land side of the alignment, the consultant will have access to the plans of the relevant cities.*

16. Is Redwood City's May 2013 Bayfront Canal and Atherton Channel Feasibility Study mentioned in the RFP available at this time?

*Answer: This report is not available at this time, but it will be available to the selected consultant.*

17. Is a fully developed hydrologic and hydraulic model for the baseline alignment study area expected as part of the Task 3.5 drainage hydrology study (i.e. HEC-HMS and HEC-RAS) or would a simpler evaluation methodology such as application of the Rational Method combined with assessments of existing studies be acceptable? How would this scope potentially differ for the proposed optional tasks associated with the potential southern alignment?

*Answer: Our desire is to develop a contract scope of work to produce plans, specs, cost estimates, and CEQA documentation that can result in regulatory permits for, and construction of, this project. We encourage prospective consultants to recommend within their proposal the most efficient strategy to meet that objective.*

18. Would the proposed project design need to address the need for improvements to existing drainage infrastructure?

*Answer: No. This project is not intended to assess or improve local stormdrain systems or overland drainage issues. If it is determined that improvements to drainage infrastructure should be considered to alleviate potential impacts caused by this project, we would likely seek to negotiate a contract amendment with the selected consultant to design those improvements.*

19. Will the proposed scope of work need to include evaluation and design recommendations to prevent inflow seepage through gravity outfalls or other sub-standard storm drain system components?

*Answer: Yes, in as much as these components may need to be improved to insure the functionality of the project, and allow us to secure a Letter of Map Revision for the floodplain area to be protected.*

20. Does the SFCJPA have an estimate of the approximate extent of jurisdictional wetland area that could be impacted by the project? Might the project establish a partnership with the South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project to address project wetland mitigation responsibilities?

*Answer: No and yes. We would expect that the impacts (and/or potential improvements) to coastal marshlands resulting from the project would depend on the types of structures recommended. We do anticipate establishing a partnership with the South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project in this regard.*

21. The RFP contains a textual description of a possible Baseline Alignment, as well as a map showing the start and end points of this alignment. What is known about the specifics of this alignment? For example, will it be placed along the current Bay Trail along the western edge of the Ravenswood Open Space Preserve or to the east or west of the Bay Trail alignment? And where will it cross over from the Bay Trail alignment to the Dumbarton Rail Corridor?

*Answer: The Baseline Alignment in the RFP should be considered conceptual at this time. We plan to develop a preferred alignment with our consultant as part of Phase 1 of the project.*

22. What topographic and aerial data exists in the project area?

*Answer: County-wide LiDAR is available for both San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties. Recent orthographic aerial imagery and land survey data is available for the area near San Francisquito Creek downstream of Highway 101. Proposals should include researching, obtaining, and reviewing existing topographic data from other local agencies/projects that could inform this project, and limit new data collection needs as part of Task 3.1.*

23. Does the JPA have any existing geotechnical information such as geotechnical reports and boring logs of the proposed study area and if so, can the agency provide it?

*Answer: We will make available all geotechnical information collected as part of the JPA's project along San Francisquito Creek downstream of Highway 101. Additionally, the City of East Palo Alto has geotechnical information regarding the land side of the levee that runs from the O'Connor Pump Station to Runnymede Street. Proposals should include researching, obtaining, and reviewing existing geotechnical data from other local agencies/projects that could inform the project, and limit new data collection needs as part of Task 3.2.*