

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS REGARDING THE SOUTH BAY SALT POND RFS**  
**Last Updated: October 28, 2003**

*Question 1. Please clarify the role of the Project Management Team and the Center for Collaborative Policy in the public outreach activities. Should submittals include a stakeholder management strategy and detailed information on stakeholder management/relations?*

Answer: Submittals should not include a stakeholder management plan. As described in Section II.A.4 of the RFS, the Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP), with the help of the San Francisco Bay Joint Venture, will be responsible for collaborative public participation and public outreach. The selected Firm/Team will be responsible for public involvement required as part of the CEQA/NEPA process. The firm/team should also be committed to working closely with CCP and should anticipate participating in regular meetings with the Stakeholder Forum and Work Groups, as well as participating in occasional large public meetings. The firm/team will also be expected to provide materials for use at public meetings and on the web site. The firm/team is also expected to assist with integration of comments from stakeholders.

*Question 2. Table A (General Budget Summary) of the RFS does not show the design and cost estimating budget separately. Which budget item includes these tasks?*

Answer: The budget item for Restoration/Access Alternatives includes the design and cost estimating budget. A portion of the design related to flood management is included in the flood management budget.

*Question 3. Table A (General Budget Summary) of the RFS shows time periods for expenditures. How do the actual expenditures relate to the scheduled expenditures? Has any of the work included in the early budget cycles been delayed?*

Answer: The budget periods shown on the table are correct, and expenditures to date are roughly in line with projected expenditures.

*Question 4. How does contracting for the Technical Committee/the Technical Committee RFQ process related to this procurement? What about other contracts?*

Answer: The Technical Committee RFQ was released in the Spring of 2003 and nearly 100 individuals have submitted SOQs. A Lead Scientist and Science Team were selected from the SOQs. Additional members of the Science Team, as well as individuals to conduct peer review, will also be selected from the SOQs. Additional RFQs or RFSs may be issued throughout the project as needed. It is anticipated that the majority of design, planning, modeling, and environmental review work will be done through the contract issued as a result of this RFS.

*Question 5. In the selection process, what is the interview worth relative to the written submittals (what percentage of the overall score will be associated with the interview)?*

Answer: The interview questions and final allocation between submittal and interview will be determined by November 3 by the project management team. The information on the final allocation of points between the interview and the submittal will not be made available. Also, the scoring factors for the interview will not be provided.

*Question 6. If a firm has been working on the salt ponds for Cargill, is that firm precluded from responding to this submittal?*

Answer: No. This is not perceived as a conflict by the Conservancy.

*Question 7. How many alternatives will be evaluated in detail (in the detailed modeling, EIS/R, and Corps FS)?*

Answer: A manageable set of alternatives will be evaluated in detail. For the purposes of the cost estimate, 3-4 alternatives will be evaluated, including the No Action alternative.

*Question 8. How will the sign-in sheet from the pre-submittal meeting be distributed?*

Answer: The sign-in sheet will be posted on the website.

*Question 9. Is it a perceived conflict and/or benefit if a firm is already working for a stakeholder agency (e.g., Alameda County Flood Control District)?*

Answer: It is considered neither a conflict nor a benefit by the Conservancy, except as the work provides relevant project experience.

*Question 10. For many firms, the indemnification language in the proposed contract will conflict with requirements imposed by Professional Liability insurance providers, especially for the detailed design/plans and specifications. Can the Conservancy modify the proposed contract language before submittals are due?*

Answer: No. However, the contract terms and conditions are subject to negotiation and the Conservancy has changed Liability language in past contracts to reflect the actual levels of insurance held by firms.

*Question 11. With regard to the specified page limits: there is no information in the RFS on where information on the good faith effort for 3% DVBE participation should be included. Also, there is no place for providing comments/proposed changes to the contract language. Where should this information be included?*

Answer: Information on a good faith effort to subcontract with DVBE firms should be included in the same appendix as the team/firm utilization form (note that this form provides a column to identify SBE and/or DVBE firms included on the team). Proposed revisions to the contract language can be provided in a separate appendix. Neither of these items will count against the page limit.

*Question 12. The RFS places a great emphasis on the Project Manager. Can you elaborate on the qualifications, skills, and experience desired for the Project Manager?*

Answer: The project team is looking for someone who is organized, a good communicator, has extensive project management experience (this project should not be looked at

as a learning experience), has enough technical background to manage their team, and is available to the project. There is much more information in the RFS on what is requested.

*Question 13. Would it be considered an advantage if the Project Manager were made available to be located in the Conservancy's offices?*

Answer: No. There is no room at the Conservancy to house the consultant's Project Manager. The firm/team should provide all facilities, materials, labor, etc. to complete the work. As the Project Manager may be at the Conservancy frequently, office space may be provided on an ad-hoc basis.

*Question 14. Have you made an estimate of the percent time that the Project Manager is expected to be available for this project?*

Answer: Approximately 60% to 90%. The project manager for this project should not be responsible for other major projects. However, we are also asking you to tell us what you think is required and how your firm/team will be organized to accomplish the work.

*Question 15. How will the input from the Public Work Groups (on the organization chart under the Stakeholder Forum) be factored into alternative development?*

Answer: Work Groups will be chaired by Stakeholder Forum members and will be open to the public. Work Groups will report to the Stakeholder Forum. The Stakeholder Forum will take recommendations from all Work Groups and report in writing to the Project Management Team. The Project Management Team will provide directives to the Stakeholder Forum and will respond in writing to recommendations from the Stakeholder Forum.

*Question 16. Is there a preference for the type of firm that should be the lead firm (e.g., engineering, planning)?*

Answer: No.

*Question 17. How will the Science Team and the consultant retained under this RFS relate to each other? Will the Science Team perform only peer review, or will they be actively engaged?*

Answer: The Science Team will be actively engaged. For example, the consultant should expect that the Science Team will have specific ideas about the alternative selection criteria, process for defining alternatives, and types of alternatives. Currently, the Science Team is developing a conceptual model, identifying extreme ranges of restoration scenarios, identifying monitoring phases, summarizing the major science questions, and beginning to identify selection criteria. The Science Team will also identify project milestones where science input should occur and the science input that is needed at these milestones.

*Question 18. How will information flow from the Science Team/consultant to the Stakeholder Forum/Public Work Groups? How will information on constraints, etc. be communicated to the Stakeholder Forum/Public Work Groups? Will there be a*

*direct connection between the Stakeholder Forum/Public Work Groups and Science Team/consultant?*

Answer: There will be a direct connection between the Science Team/consultant and the Stakeholder Forum and Public Work Groups. Members of the Science Team (and also regulatory agency representatives) will attend Stakeholder Forum and Public Work Groups meetings to provide input and help ensure that recommendations provided by the Stakeholder Forum and Public Work Groups are grounded in scientific and regulatory realities. The consultant will make presentations to these groups, may answer requests for information (in writing or verbal) from these groups, and may also attend some of the meetings. Communication between the Project Management Team and the Stakeholder Forum will be documented in written directives, recommendations, and requests for information.

*Question 19. How will the Moffatt & Nichol work get communicated to the consultant? Will there be on-going involvement from Moffatt & Nichol in the technical work?*

Answer: Work products from the first two tasks (see Attachment A of the RFS) will be available the week of October 13, and will be posted on the website. Work on the third task (preliminary assessment of levee conditions) has just begun; work is scheduled to be completed in January of 2004. The report will be made available to the consultant selected under this RFS, and will also be posted on the website. After that work is completed, the intention is for most technical work to be performed by the consultant selected under this RFS and for the Moffatt and Nichol contract to come to an end.

*Question 20. Data management will be a major challenge/issue in this project. Does the Project Management Team have a preference for a specific software package and/or data management system for management of all the data associated with this project?*

Answer: Data management will be performed by SFEI. The Conservancy does not have the technical capability to conduct the data management, and the goal is to make the data available to the public, and have it remain available in the long-term (i.e., long after this planning effort has been completed). The Project Management Team does not have a preference for a specific package. However, GIS capability is very important, and GIS will likely be an important component of the data management process. The City of San Jose has developed impressive GIS-based information for the baylands within their jurisdiction, and may also participate in the data management effort as an advisor.

*Question 21. Have you thought ahead to construction management and procedures, and how that work would be contracted?*

Answer: No. It's too early in the process.

*Question 22. Who will house the project website? Will the website be tied into the data management system?*

Answer: SFEI is hosting the website on their server, and is also responsible for posting new information, and for technical maintenance of the website. The data

management system will be tied into the website and be housed on a server at SFEI.

*Question 23. The list of tasks for Year 1 (p. 45 of RFS, Section VII.D.1) includes the following item: “9. Recreation and Public Access Planning, including Initial Scenarios and Draft Recreation and Public Access Plan (portions of Task 11)”. The Recreation and Public Access Plan task is Task 12, however. Is this item intended to be a portion of Task 12?*

Answer: Yes.

*Question 24. Can Science Team members be a part of the firm/team’s project team?*

Answer: No. It would be a conflict of interest for Science Team members to be a part of the consulting team.

*Question 25. Is the 10% withholding on the contract negotiable? Will the 10% withholding be paid out upon satisfactory completion of tasks?*

Answer: The 10% withholding is not negotiable, although the Conservancy can negotiate with the selected firm/team to define the tasks in a manner that satisfies both parties. Unless the firm/team does not complete a task to the satisfaction of the Conservancy, they will be paid the 10% withholding upon successful completion of each task and upon receipt at the Conservancy of an invoice requesting the 10% withholding for the task.

*Question 26. Will Joint Ventures be considered (versus a lead firm with subconsultants)?*

Answer: Yes, we will consider contracting with a Joint Venture and will address the legal and contracting issues if the need arises. For example, there needs to be a legal entity that the Conservancy can contract with, who is responsible for the terms of the agreement.

*Question 27. In Table A, it indicates that Flood Management is outside the scope of this RFS? Is this correct?*

Answer: It should actually indicate that the Task is partially the subject of this RFS although the exact division in the budget between this RFS and other work has not been defined. As described under Task 4: Flood Management, Protection, and Enhancement, the firm/team will be responsible for integrate flood management planning into the restoration design.

*Question 28. Much time and money was spent on developing computer-based models of South San Francisco Bay as part of the studies for runway expansion at SFO. These hydrodynamic and sediment-transport models could potentially be used as part of a No Action/Existing Conditions analysis for the South Bay Salt Ponds Restoration Project - and restoration alternatives could be examined by modifying the existing model. This would save time and money. Has the Conservancy, USFWS, or DFG discussed with the City of San Francisco or the FAA the possibility obtaining these models (i.e., the digital input files that contain the bathymetry, boundary data, etc)?*

Answer: The FAA, the agency that contracted the modeling work to study the impacts of the proposed runway project, is not making the model/digital input files available to the public at this point in time. However, the data used to develop the models are publicly available (from USGS and NOAA primarily). The model types are also available for purchase off the shelf. You should assume in your submittal that the models/digital input files used by the consultants to the FAA will not be available. We have also been told that the digital input files, even if available, would need to be updated to reflect more recent data collection efforts. We are investigating this issue further and will add additional information as it becomes available.

*Question 29. For an estimate of the Year 1 (2004) budget, is it reasonable to prorate the budgets for the time periods presented in Table A (9/03-6/04 and 7/04-6/05)? Can this approach also apply to the remaining period (2005-2007)?*

Answer: Yes. Within the yearly budget estimates, it would be reasonable to assume that spending will occur at a relatively even rate for that year.

*Question 30. We have to submit a detailed cost estimate for "Year 1", but I have a question about what exactly is "Year One" . . . According to Table A at the end of the RFS, it looks (to me anyway) like Year One is 9/2003 to 6/2004. But in the text (page 45, section D, Cost Estimate for Year 1) the text states that Year One is 'calendar year 2004'. So my question is: exactly what 12-month period should the proposal reference in the detail cost estimate for Year One?*

Answer: Year 1 for the consultant budget estimate refers to the first full year of consultant services -- i.e., Calendar Year 2004. The project budget is on a different cycle to coordinate with the State budget cycle.

*Question 31. Reference RFS, Section B. Task 2: Information Gathering (page 24): The discussion seems to indicate that the information to be gathered consists of existing data plus any new data (field studies) that would be collected under a separate contract. However, elsewhere in the discussion of tasks and referenced in Table A: General Budget Summary for Restoration Planning Period, line item 3, Data Collection and Management, there are indications that the Technical Consultant will be responsible for the collection of new data. Please clarify whether any new data collection (field studies) is to be preformed under this contract by the Technical Consultant.*

Answer: There may very well be the need for the Technical Consultant to undertake or subcontract for data collection, however, it is not completely known what data collection efforts will be needed and what can be done by other partners in the project. For example, as the modeling proceeds it may become apparent that additional hydrologic data is needed. At that point, we will work with our partner agencies to see whether they can collect any data or if we need to contract out the work. If we need to contract the work, we can decide whether it is most efficient and cost-effective for the Technical Consultants to do the work or if we should contract another consultant. If you have recommendations for data collection that

you feel must be collected as part of the project, feel free to include in the technical approach section.

*Question 32. We understand that this project will involve close collaboration with a number of agencies (e.g., Project Management Team, Science Teams, and regulatory agencies). There are some activities identified as part of the scope of work that will not be under the direct control of the Technical Consultant, such as the amount of time required for document reviews or permit reviews. The project schedule released as part of this RFS does not identify the length of time required for these activities. What amount of time does the Coastal Conservancy anticipate as appropriate for each of these aforementioned types of activities?*

Answer: The Consultant should anticipate that review time will depend upon the complexity and length of the document. Preferably, the consultant will work closely with the Science Team, Regulatory Agency Group, Stakeholder Forum and Work Groups, and Project Management Team to iteratively develop work products, so that most of the findings are already understood. Upon completion of draft reports, at least one month should be anticipated for review, compilation of comments, and resolution of differing comments. See #33 below for more specific information about the Regulatory Agency review.

*Question 33. Due to the aggressive schedule outlined in the RFS for the completion of most of the pre-construction activities, does the Project Management Team anticipate enlisting the participation and cooperation of local Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs) and the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) early in the CEQA permitting process to ensure expeditious document preparation and environmental review processes?*

Answer: An MOU that integrates CEQA/NEPA and permitting with the regulatory agencies has been written and is currently being finalized. The MOU lays out milestones for regulatory agency input and concurrence: pre-scoping/scoping consultation, pre-release of draft EIR/S, selection of preferred alternative for the final EIR/S. The MOU lays out a method for dealing with non-concurrence. In addition, the Conservancy is entering into interagency agreements with both the RWQCB and BCDC to ensure that agency staff are available to work on the South Bay Salt Pond project (the agreements provide funding for agency staff to do work above and beyond permit application review). The staff from each agency who will work on the project and a list of tasks have been identified in the interagency agreements.

*Question 34. Reference RFS, Table A: General Budget Summary for Restoration Planning Period: The RFS indicates that the initial contract duration is for one year. Since the contract award will not be made until mid-December 2003, will the budget allocated for the period from 9/2003 – 6/2004 (second column) carry over to the following fiscal year, which ends June 30, 2004 (i.e., are these committed funds)? Is the duration of the first year contract award essentially from January through December 2004?*

Answer: The budget for the first year of the consultant contract will come partially from the 9/03-6/04 and 6/04-6/05 columns of Table A. The spending for the project is basically on track. The first year of the technical consultant contract will run from January through December of 2004.

*Question 35. There does not appear to be a certainty as to if the PRBO will obtain funding for the habitat conversion modeling relative to birds. Should the Technical Consultant anticipate providing HCM modeling support under this contract?*

Answer: There may be a need for some limited ecological modeling by the technical consultants. If the avian Habitat Conversion Model is going to be conducted, it will be undertaken by PRBO. The Conservancy intends to fund some of the PRBO HCM work and we are working on matching funding.

*Question 36. Would it be acceptable to use fonts other than Tahoma or Times New Roman when creating graphics for the proposal submittal?*

Answer: Other fonts may be used for anything except the body/text of the submittal. You may use other fonts for headings, titles, graphics, tables, etc.

*Question 37. If a Table of Contents were included as part of the Consultant's submittal, would it be considered outside of the 42-page restriction?*

Answer: You may include a table of contents. It will not count against the page limits.

*Question 38. Will the TRIM model and managed pond model used by Cargill be made available to the consultant for the long-term planning?*

Answer: The TRIM model is available to others, but requires seeking permission, paying a licensing fee, and training. Cargill's experience was that it takes some time to get a feel for the TRIM model. The managed pond model is a simple box model. It is not known if this can be made available to the consultants, but it is anticipated that more complex models will be needed anyway.