



**Monday, April 02, 2019**

## **RFP 19CRDLWBNHOOG-004 Questions & Answers**

---

**Question:** Is there a page limit for the proposal?

**Answer:** There is no page limit however section 3.1.1 specifies that the Bid Proposal shall be typewritten on 8.5" x 11" paper (one side only).

---

**Question:** The goals of the project summarized in Section 4.2 do not specifically mention the pool upstream of the dam. Is it assumed that the pool will be maintained at its current elevation or is it anticipated that some modification to the pool level will occur? Or will the impacts on the pool level in different concept designs be one of the criteria stakeholders consider for selecting an option?

**Answer:** What many firms would do is look at a "no dam, no dike" scenario first. We expect an initial investigation of flood impacts for infrastructure at Pine Ridge Park to be the first technical cut on optimal pool level, in conjunction with stakeholder input, cost considerations, permitting conditions, and other factors. The range of concepts may include more than one pool level option, yes.

---

**Question:** What materials were used to construct the dam? Is it concrete or another material?

**Answer:** Concrete.

---

**Question:** For Task 4, is there an existing hydraulic model available for the Iowa River for the project area; or will the consultant need to build an original hydraulic model?

**Answer:** No model that includes channel survey exists. The LiDAR-based Iowa Flood Center model may be used as a baseline model.

---

**Question:** For Task 5, have the project partners been identified? Has a location for the in-person partner meetings been identified, or is there an assumed location?

**Answer:** Most partners have been identified, including Iowa DNR River Programs, Fisheries, Law Enforcement, and State Parks staff, Hardin County Conservation staff, City of Steamboat Rock mayor, Iowa SHPO, US Army Corps of Engineers (for gage station effects). Additional stakeholders may be added, for instance, if other funders such as U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service become involved at later stages. Meetings will be held in the Steamboat Rock and or Pine Lake State Park vicinity.

---

**Question:** For Task 6, who will lead the public meetings? Will the DNR lead the meetings with the consultant providing support and information? Or will the consultant be expected to lead the public meetings? Has a location for the public meetings been identified, or is there an assumed location?

**Answer:** Iowa DNR will lead the meetings with consultant providing support, presentations, and information. Public meetings will be held in the Steamboat Rock and or Pine Lake State Park vicinity.

---

**Question:** For Task 7, will sediment cores be required to characterize the impounded sediment? Will laboratory testing of the sediment be required?

**Answer:** No. Characterization of particle size may be determined by Wolman Pebble Count of surface particles or comparable method. Volume estimates may be augmented with depth of refusal probing. See page 3 of the dam mitigation guide under Iowa's River Restoration Toolbox here:

[https://www.iowadnr.gov/Portals/idnr/uploads/RiverRestoration/toolbox/dam-mitigation/Practice%2010\\_Dam\\_Mitigation\\_Full\\_Chapter.pdf](https://www.iowadnr.gov/Portals/idnr/uploads/RiverRestoration/toolbox/dam-mitigation/Practice%2010_Dam_Mitigation_Full_Chapter.pdf).

---

**Question:** For Task 9, does the DNR have an assumed APE to help determine the level of effort for the Phase 1 effort? Will the architectural historian's scope of work be limited to the structure(s) in the immediate vicinity of the dam? Or are there additional structures further upstream and downstream of the dam that are assumed to be included in the scope of work?

**Answer:** The APE must reflect the entire potential project area, which may or may not include only the dam. Any other structures in the vicinity should also be inventoried, and excavation limits that could affect archaeological resources should also be investigated. Often, a consultant will develop a grading plan for initial concepts, and these can be used as the basis for the APE.

---

**Question:** For Task 13, does the IA DNR expect that a separate NEPA document (EA, EIS) will be prepared or is it instead expected that the consultant will provide supporting documentation (i.e. threatened and endangered species review, cultural resources investigations, etc.) to the USACE to assist them with NEPA compliance as part of project permitting?

**Answer:** No federal entities have required an EIS for Iowa dam mitigation projects to date. In two cases, an EA has been required. The Scope has been developed in an order we hope can satisfy EA criteria, if needed, and for Section 106 compliance. In practice, when an EA is necessary, that has typically been written by a federal partner.

---

**Question:** Task 16 includes only the architectural historian, and does not include an archeological survey. Can you please confirm that the Phase 2 Cultural Review will be limited to the architectural historian?

**Answer:** We anticipate further archaeological review will be unnecessary in a Phase 2, as avoidance can usually be the remedy. Many times, affects to structures, namely the dam, cannot be avoided.

---

**Question:** Since the project will span multiple years, will the consultant be allowed to modify hourly billing rates on an annual basis? Or will billing rates be locked in at the time of contract development?

**Answer:** The cost proposal has been broken into 21 tasks to provide adequate identification of effort needed to complete these tasks. An additional services task has been included as Task 22 to allow for billing rates for efforts needed to successfully complete this Contract that may have not been adequately identified or known at

the time of the Request for Proposal. Cost Proposals must include fixed cost proposals for Tasks 1 through 21. Billing rates for Task 22 must be for the term on the Contract including any billing rate adjustments.

---

**Question:** We suggest modifying Task 11 to remove the grading-surface level of effort from the concept plans. In our experience, the concepts can be communicated well in Auto-CAD and cost estimates can be completed with reasonable accuracy at that the concept level without carrying the plans to a grading level of accuracy. If that level of accuracy is reduced, then there will be less effort to develop three concept plans, and cost for developing the concept plans can be reduced.

**Answer:** AutoCAD cross sections, profile, and plan view would be acceptable in lieu of grading plans adjusted in Civil 3D or comparable software. Make sure to include examples of renderings of a similar level to what is expected to be produced under this item.

---

**Question:** Should the RFP Number in the first full paragraph of Attachment 2 (19DIRPIOAMURP-004) body match the proposal number in the top of the letter (19CRDLWBNHOOG-004)?

**Answer:** Yes. The RFP will be amended to correct. RFP Amendment Two will be sent to all known Bidders and publicly posted on Bid Opportunities.

---

**Question:** Section 3.3, Cost Proposal. To properly assess the scope and magnitude of professional effort, the size of the project is very important. At this stage, the design/construction concepts to meet project goals, including the array of potential concepts offered in the Iowa River Restoration Toolbox and the 2010 Iowa DNR Plan for Dam Mitigation, have a wide range of potential costs, required effort, and construction duration. At this time the alternatives/concepts to be developed and implemented are unknown. Is a single fee estimate required or should a range of costs be submitted that reflect multiple possible scenarios?

**Answer:** The cost proposal has been broken into 21 tasks to provide adequate identification of effort needed to complete these tasks. An additional services task has been included as Task 22 to allow billing rates for efforts needed to successfully complete this Contract that may have not been adequately identified or known at the time of the Request for Proposal.

---

**Question:** Section 4.2, Task 2 and Task 7: Does any historical or as-built bathymetry data exist at the project site (dam location) for use with newly collected data to estimate sediment volume?

**Answer:** No.

---

**Question:** Section 4.2, Task 8: Mussel Reconnaissance. Does this task require a physical, in-stream, quantitative survey (by the consulting team) of all mussel species found within the project footprint in 2019, or is a review of previous surveys (by DNR and/or USFWS) and limited site reconnaissance?

**Answer:** No. Qualitative survey is sufficient within the potential project footprint.

---

**Question:** Section 4.2, Task 11: Is there a desire to maintain upstream water levels under normal flow conditions, or is that not one of the desirable project features/outcomes?

**Answer:** Investigating “no dam” should be one alternative that can be used to test other concepts against. No one alternative is considered better than the others until the analysis is complete.

---

**Question:** Section 4.2, Task 12 and Task 16: Contractor is to develop an APE for three potential options and then develop a Phase 2 review for the selected option. What assumption should contractors make in terms of the Phase 2 area of potential effects (APE) for estimating fees/costs to be included in the Cost Proposal?

**Answer:** Assuming the “no dam” is the Phase 2 option would be the most impactful from a Section 106 standpoint. Contractors may assume that option requires the most communication and potential development of mitigation alternatives.

---