

**Responses to Questions  
Related to  
OCWCOG's RFP for Industrial Wetlands Regional General Permit Proposal**

<b>Date Posted</b>	
10/3/11	<p>Q #1: At what point in the process will the consultants' responsibilities be completed?</p> <p>A #1: <i>Consultants will be expected to submit a draft deliverable for review by the CWCOG and Tech Team (USACE will be invited to participate in review). Based on the CWCOG and Tech Team's review, the consultant will be provided with a list of revisions and/or additional detail that is needed to fulfill the contracted scope of work. The consultant's response (second draft) will again be reviewed by the Tech Team, and CWCOG will make a final determination as to whether the scope of work and the consultant's contract responsibilities have been completed.</i></p>
10/3/11	<p>Q #2: With what version(s) of Arc software do the geo databases need to be compatible?</p> <p>A #2: <i>The GIS-based ledger system and any other GIS related products required from the consultant must be prepared in a format that is compatible with ArcGIS version 10.</i></p>
10/3/11	<p>Q #3: What types of geo layers can OCWCOG provide to the selected consultant?</p> <p>A #3: <i>OCWCOG can provide the following geo layers:</i>  <i>Tax Parcels</i>  <i>Waterways</i>  <i>Floodplain</i>  <i>Transportation systems</i>  <i>Zoning (as available)</i>  <i>Soils</i>  <i>Topographic lines (as available)</i></p>
10/3/11	<p>Q #4: (Submitted by Stacy Benjamin following the 9/28/11 pre-proposal meeting) What level of detail of DSL review will the LWI report and maps be subject to?</p> <p>A #4: <i>DSL response: DSL's review will not be for the purposes of approving a Local Wetland Inventory. DSL's review will be limited to ensuring that: 1) the standards of work indicated in the RFP were reasonably adhered to; and 2) no obvious features or site conditions were missed that would lead to substantial over- or under-estimation of wetland area.</i></p>
10/3/11	<p>Q #5: (Submitted by Stacy Benjamin following the 9/28/11 pre-proposal meeting) We are assuming that the consultant would not need to budget for site visits w/DSL, please confirm.</p> <p>A #5: <i>DSL response: The consultant will not need to budget for site visits with DSL. DSL staff may be made available for site visits (as resources allow) if requested by the</i></p>

	<i>consultant.</i>
10/3/11	<p>Q #6: (Submitted by Stacy Benjamin following the 9/28/11 pre-proposal meeting) We understand that the LWI OARs require one sample plot that best characterizes the wetland, and if the LWI will be used for a WCP a minimum of one sample plot must be provided that best characterizes each dominant wetland plant community. As an example, suppose a site contains one large contiguous PEM wetland, and we document the required sample plot near the center of the wetland. There is a concurred delineation on the site; however, we determine that a wetland boundary revision is warranted based on the obvious presence or absence of wetland hydrology. We've already documented a sample plot for the wetland, will DSL also want to see a sample plot for the area where the boundary has been revised?</p> <p>A #6: <i>DSL response: That is a correct interpretation of the administrative rule. In this example, and consistent with administrative rule, the contractor would not be required to establish a sample plot for the area where the boundary has been rived. The contractor will, however, need to document what their observations/rationale was for making that boundary adjustment.</i></p>
10/3/11	<p>Q #7: The RFP requires wetland boundaries to be mapped to the LWI standard which requires a horizontal accuracy of 5 meters. It appears that the RFP requires a greater level of accuracy for waterways identification by requiring OHW to be mapped. Would it be acceptable to map <u>approximate</u> OHW or top of bank to be more consistent with the LWI standard?</p> <p>A #7: <i>DSL response: It was not the intent to require a greater level of accuracy for waterways identification than that stipulated in the administrative rule for LWI preparation. To clarify RGP Element #4 (3)(a.): the contractor should start by using the National Hydrography Dataset to identify potential waterway locations. Those locations (<u>centerlines</u>) will then be field checked and adjusted where necessary to accurately represent the centerline location. <u>Ordinary high water elevation does not need to be delineated.</u> RGP Element #4 (3)(b) remains as is.</i></p>
10/3/11	<p>Q #8: Is a Transaction Screen Assessment (ASTM E1528-06) acceptable to meet the requirements for the scope of work task "Environmental Site Assessment" as detailed in Section VII.O?</p> <p>A #8: <i>The requirement to complete a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment for each site has been deleted from the RFP through Amendment #1, issued 10/5/2011.</i></p>
10/5/11	<p>Q #9: Will OCWCOG accept a proposal that requires billing and payment upon completion of each RGP element? Say for example for element "O" the phase 1 studies.</p> <p>A #9: <i>Exhibit C to the RFP is a draft of the professional services contract that will be executed between OCWCOG and the selected consultant. Attachment B to that draft contract indicates that the schedule of payments will be negotiated based on the consultant's proposed work schedule. However, it would be our preference to base</i></p>

	<i>payments on completion and/or partial completion of deliverables and no more than one billing to OCWCOG per month. If your firm has a preferred schedule for payments include it in the proposal along with a rationale for the schedule.</i>
10/5/11	<p>Q #10: Will OCWCOG accept a proposal that requires billing and payment upon completion of sub-RGP elements? For example Element #4 Deliverables requires a draft and final summary report for each site. Could each site be billed separately?</p> <p>A #10: <i>As noted above in Answer #9, the schedule of payment will be negotiated. If your firm has a preferred schedule of payment, include it in your proposal along with a rationale for the schedule.</i></p>
10/5/11	<p>Q #11: The RGP Element #4 deliverable states “draft and final summary report for each site including the information collected in #1 through #3 above...” which equates to the preparation of 20 separate reports. Cost efficiencies in the preparation of the Element #4 deliverable could be realized by combining multiple sites into one report. Would it be acceptable to combine all sites within one city or within one subbasin into a single report?</p> <p>A #11: <i>The consultant may group sites for report preparation purposes. Such grouping must still provide discrete information collected in Element #4 for each site. Proposers should indicate in the proposal what level of “grouping” is assumed in their proposal.</i></p>
10/7/11	<p>Q #12: Will OCWCOG be attempting to contact the property owners that have had delineations done in the past to inquire about receiving electronic files of the wetland maps? If not, I assume that tracing the polygons would be an acceptable method for including those delineated boundaries in our final mapping. Please confirm.</p> <p>A #12: <i>Neither CWCOCG nor DSL have access to electronic files of wetland delineation maps. Digital tracing of delineated polygons will be an acceptable method for including those delineated boundaries in the final mapping.</i></p>
10/7/11	<p>Q #13: Can you elaborate why the 20 sites were selected for this RFP? It seems that some sites have more potential than others -- the more sites there are, the fewer dollars can be spent on any particular site, yes?</p> <p>A #13: <i>The OCWCOG facilitated an extensive process to determine the number of sites and the amount of acreage that was needed for future industrial development. During the past several months the OCWCOG facilitated the process to select the specific sites to be included in the RFP. There are several documents posted on the OCWCOG website that provide the background on how the sites were determined. Those documents are at: <a href="http://www.ocwcog.org/sectionindex.asp?sectionid=106">http://www.ocwcog.org/sectionindex.asp?sectionid=106</a></i></p>
10/7/11	<p>Q #14: Is the COG looking for a ranking of the sites to prioritize where to distribute time and money toward the most probable sites?</p> <p>A #14: <i>The OCWCOG is not asking for a ranking or prioritization of sites by the consultant.</i></p>

10/7/11	<p>Q #15: At the meeting last week, it seemed to be communicated that the submittal at the end of the project was something similar to a joint fill application, minus the site plan, final wetland delineation, mitigation arrangement, and stormwater plan. I did not see this in the written RFP -- any clarification is appreciated.</p>
	<p>A #15: <i>Preliminary communications with the Corps have indicated that they would prefer that the information developed from this scope of work be submitted to them in the form of an annotated JPA. The COG will invite the consultant's input on how best to present the information to the Corps in light of this broad guidance. The submittal would not include site development plans, final wetland delineations, or stormwater plans. Mitigation information and preferred strategy by site (e.g, on-site mitigation, bank credits) would be described to the level of work specified in Element #6.</i></p>
10/7/11	<p>Q #16: To verify what is stated in the RFP: The consultant is expected to supply site information to SHPO and tribes, who in turn will provide a response. No site investigation of archeological or cultural resources is needed for this RFP.</p>
	<p>A #16: <i>We are asking the consultant to review and comment on <u>site information that COG prepares and sends to SHPO/Tribes</u>. The consultant will be responsible for incorporating our info into the RGP proposal. If there is need to do on-site archeology work the consultant will be asked to give us a separate scope and cost proposal.</i></p>
10/13/11	<p>Q #17: Under Part “B” Proposals, item 6. Price, it states that “All proposers shall provide a description of the cost to complete the project that includes for each task: staff person(s) identified in B.3, above, proposed hours by person, their billing rates, overhead rate and overhead on direct costs”. B.3 requests the “identification of the wetland assessment experience of the team members”.</p> <p>Our firm has administrative/secretarial staff that offer support to our Environmental section. The administrative/secretarial staff does not have specific wetland experience other than offering support to the Environmental section with previous wetland projects. Will it be acceptable to include administrative staff hours on our cost proposal ?</p>
	<p>A #17: <i>It is acceptable to include admin/secretarial staff hours on the proposal if those costs are not already built into your overhead costs.</i></p>
10/13/11	<p>Q #18: Is it necessary to include resumes for the administrative support staff if they do not have wetland assessment experience ?</p>
	<p>A #18: <i>It is not necessary to include resumes for the administrative support staff.</i></p>
10/13/11	<p>Q #19: We wish to include a subcontractor in our proposal. This subcontractor is the sole proprietor of a wetland consulting firm. This subcontractor bills out at a flat rate and does not have a built rate that includes base wage plus overhead. Will it be acceptable to list this subcontractor’s flat rate on our fee spreadsheet or will you want to see a breakdown of the wage being used ?</p>

	<i>A #19: You need to include a breakdown of rates for subcontractors as well as prime contractors.</i>
--	---