

Technical Consultants for Sea Level Rise Adaptation Projects RFP

Questions and Responses #4

June 7, 2023

Question: Exhibit A – How are proposers to document good faith efforts for procurement of services under Consultant's scope? Can you please clarify what is the responsibility as the proposer regarding the DBE program and the Good Faith Efforts?

Response: Consultants are expected to explain how they have reached out to disadvantaged business enterprises and made a good faith effort at incorporating these DBEs into their Consultant team. City staff notified almost 140 companies on the Caltrans DBE list for feasibility studies, environmental, hydrology and structural engineering as well as environmental – biological studies. Caltrans webpage: <https://caltrans.dbesystem.com/>

EPA's FAQ page for DBE information is as follows:

<https://www.epa.gov/grants/frequently-asked-questions-disadvantaged-business-enterprises>

Question: The materials referenced in the RFP and subsequent Q+A documents are not explicitly clear about what the DBE requirements are. Please confirm or correct the following statements:

- The DBE goal for Project A is 10%
- There is no DBE goal for Project B, but proposers must complete the 6-stage good faith effort
- The DBE goal for Project C is 10%?

Additionally, for Project B, do proposers need to complete the 6-stage good faith effort documentation if our team does include a DBE partner?

Response: Parts A and C require a good faith effort whereas Part B does not have a DBE requirement. No DBE goal is mentioned in the good faith effort EPA materials.

Question: Can different billing rates be used for different projects or if, given that FAR is required for B, it should be assumed that a single set of billing rates per firm is expected (i.e., FAR) for all three projects?

Response: Different billing rates are allowed in that these three projects – Parts A, B and C – are being billed separately.

Question: The RFP does not appear to address whether escalation of bill rates will be allowed over the contract term which does exceed 1 financial year. Can the City please confirm whether escalation of rates will be allowed?

Response: Yes, escalation of billing rates is allowed yet it needs to comply with the consultant cap and indirect cost rates as applicable.

Question: Service Provider Agreement, Article 3, Exhibit B - This language suggests Fixed Fee billing rates. Can you confirm the method of compensation? (i.e. Parts A and C Costs plus Fixed Fee subject to not to exceed cap; Part b, through Caltrans, Time and Materials subject to not to exceed cap?)

Response: The City will use a cost plus fixed fee method of compensation, which is described by Caltrans as follows: “The consultant is reimbursed for costs incurred and receives an additional predetermined amount as a fixed fee (profit)...The fixed fee limit applies to the total direct and indirect costs. Fixed fees in excess of 15 percent of the total direct labor and indirect costs of the contract may be justified only when exceptional circumstances exist.”

Question: Exhibit A – How do proposers demonstrate compliance with the consultant fee cap? The fee cap limits compensation to Level IV, Executive Schedule and excludes overhead. Labor billing rates typically include benefits, overhead, margin, and other factors. Does City of Alameda need to see a buildup from the capped compensation limit up to the proposed hourly/daily billing rate for each labor category? If so, does this requirement also apply to subcontractor labor costs (subcontractors may be hesitant to provide raw labor rates)?

Response: City staff asked SFEP funding agency and will provide more information.

Question: Exhibit A – Indirect Cost Rate Agreements - this term states "This term and condition does not govern indirect rates for subrecipients or recipient procurement contractors under EPA assistance agreements." Please confirm, and if this requirement does apply, please clarify how proposers should incorporate this requirement into their cost buildup.

Response: City staff asked SFEP funding agency and will provide more information.

Question: Service Provider Agreement: Deliverables are likely to incorporate data and information provided by the City, thus is it a reasonable assumption that the City will warrant the completeness and accuracy of the materials and allow the Provider to rely upon them without independent verification. Will the city accept contract language saying as much?

Response: The City can add language to Section 2 [Services to be Performed] of the Service Provider Agreement to add the following sentence: “Provider may rely on the data and information provided by the City without independent verification.”

Question: Parts A, B, and C – Please clarify what entities will review work products and how many rounds of review are anticipated. For example, in Part B, it is noted that City Council will review completed deliverables. Should we anticipate receiving written comments from City Council members that will require responses and revisions to completed deliverables? Similarly, can we assume that comments from all reviewers will be reconciled and submitted together in a single document?

Response: The Steering Committee of the Working Group will be reviewing work products. Please expect two rounds of review for most deliverables except for more complicated ones such as the Draft Long-term Plan and draft concepts, which will require more than two round of reviews. For draft concepts and plans, four submittals will be required: 1) administrative review submittal; 2) community stakeholder review submittal; and 3) City Council review submittal; and 4) final deliverable. The reviews will be compiled for the Consultant yet not all the comments are expected to be reconciled because the Consultant will need to determine how to proceed given input received.

Question: Part A Task 1B: The RFP asks the Consultant to co-create a sub-regional organization structure to accelerate and streamline implementation of adaptation projects. Is this structure intended to be used for only the adaptation projects in this RFP (Parts B and C), or is it expected to be utilized by the Working Group for all future projects? Will the organization structure have decision-making authority? How is it expected to interact with the City of Alameda and the Working Group?

Response: The sub-regional organizational structure is intended to be used by the Working Group for future projects. The Working Group is an informal body, which may need to be formalized into a Joint Powers Authority or some other structure to construct, operate and maintain projects throughout the sub-region in the future.

Question: Part A, Task 1C: If BCDC released a final version of the Regional Shoreline Adaptation Plan Guideline while the project is underway, how will that potentially affect Part A (Long-Term

Adaptation Plan)? Would this potentially lead to any changes in scope of work for Part A midway?

Response: It is unclear what BCDC's Regional Shoreline Adaptation Plan Guideline will require, and we are working closely with BCDC to minimize changes in work scope.

Question: Is there an email file size limit when submitting our proposal?

Response: The maximum to receive via email is 25 MB, and please use DropBox or other platform via email instructions if over 25 MB.

Question: Can we review the grant applications for compliance with the requirements?

Response: The grant agreements are on the Consultant RFP webpage:

<https://www.alamedaca.gov/BUSINESS/Bid-on-City-Contracts/Request-for-Proposals-Technical-Consultants-for-Sea-Level-Rise-Adaptation-Projects-1>

Question: Can you clarify what languages that you anticipate toolkit materials to include?

Response: Spanish and Chinese and potentially Vietnamese or Tagalog.

Question: Is translation in Consultant's scope (or in the scope of City of Alameda or Community Partners)? If so, which specific materials require multilingual versions, and which languages?

Response: City staff has access to Google translate and would need Consultants to budget peer review of translations for outreach materials.

Question: Do meetings need to be staffed with real-time interpreters for these languages?

Response: Consultant is not expected to budget for real-time interpreters.

Question: Is there already an existing project website that Consultant would add materials to, or will Consultant have to develop a website/platform for this project?

Response: The existing project webpages would continue to be used for project information.

Question: Can City of Alameda provide additional clarification on the scope split between the Consultant and Community Partner in relation to public outreach meetings? Will Consultant facilitate the meeting? Book the meeting venue?

Response: Consultant will be expected to facilitate meetings and the Community Partners will focus on the community meeting logistics and distribution of information to community members.

Question: Please clarify if the technical consultant will be responsible for producing the public and stakeholder outreach and engagement plan or if those documents will be produced by the Community Partners and/or Working Group members (and the technical consultant will just provide input).

Response: The Community Partners will take the lead on the community engagement plan and communications strategy in partnership with the Consultants and the Project Partners.

Question: Part A, Task 3a – Please clarify if a “communications strategy” is a deliverable under this task. It is mentioned in Task 3a; however, it is not listed as a deliverable in the list of deliverables.

Response: The communications strategy is intended to be included in the community engagement plan.

Question: Part A, Task 3a – Please clarify if the technical consultant will be responsible for producing the “Community Outreach and Engagement Summary and Results” or if that document will be produced by the Community Partners and/or Working Group members (and the technical consultant will just provide input).

Response: The Community Partners will take the lead on the community engagement summary and results in partnership with the Consultants and the Project Partners.

Question: Part A, Task 4a – Can you clarify if the intent is for the consultant to develop the prioritization framework and criteria only, or to also facilitate the prioritization process with the working group?

Response: The Consultant would be the technical lead and would be expected to facilitate this prioritization discussion at meetings.

Question: Could you confirm that the consultant team is responsible for all of the community engagement deliverables listed in Part B3 or is some of this intended to be covered by the community outreach team under a separate contract? “Outreach materials, including multi-lingual versions, presentations, notes/action items, receipts of light snacks, sign-in sheets from in-person events, press releases, social media posts/advertisements, webpage links, tactile maps, email list summary, questionnaires and survey results?”

Response: Community Partners will take the lead in the public outreach deliverables and community engagement logistics including the distribution of information to community members. Consultants will be expected to review the technical components of the community engagement to ensure that outreach materials properly convey the existing conditions, initial ideas and design concepts.

Question: Part B, Task 1 – Task 1c requests the technical consultant to “refine the base maps”. Please clarify if these maps already exist or if they will be produced as part of this task.

Response: Initial base maps were created on the Alameda side of the estuary and would need to be updated for the Alameda side and completed for the Oakland side. Data used for the initial base maps for the Alameda side included data on current ownership and existing easements, including near the Webster and Posey Tubes (Caltrans Right of Way). This information will be important to capture on the Oakland side of the estuary.

Question: Part B, Task 1 – Task 1d requests the technical consultant to “refine and finalize existing conditions memo”. Please clarify if this memo already exists or if it will be produced as part of this task.

Response: The existing conditions memo exists for the Alameda side of the estuary and the work would need to be updated and also completed for the Oakland side. The memo is on the project webpage under schedule – January 2021: www.alamedaca.gov/AdaptationEstuary . Oakland is preparing the Downtown Oakland Specific Plan: <https://www.oaklandca.gov/topics/downtown-oakland-specific-plan>

Question: Part B, Task 2 – Task 2b requests the technical consultant to develop green infrastructure alternatives for the project watershed drainage area. Can you clarify what area is considered to be the project watershed drainage area?

Response: The watershed drainage areas are inland on both the Oakland and Alameda sides of the estuary. The consultant will need to make recommendations on how far upstream to improve water quality discharged into the Bay, as stated in the RFP.

Storm Drain Master Plans:

Oakland: <https://www.oaklandca.gov/topics/storm-drainage-master-plan>

Alameda: <https://www.alamedaca.gov/files/assets/public/publicworks/storm-drain-master-plan-2008-full-set.pdf> Update for Alameda:

<https://www.alamedaca.gov/files/assets/public/publicworks/storm-drain-master-plan-update-memo.pdf>

Green Infrastructure Plan:

Oakland: https://cao-94612.s3.amazonaws.com/documents/Oakland-GSI-Plan-Final-20190930_sm.pdf

Alameda: <https://www.alamedaca.gov/files/sharedassets/public/public-works/key-documents/alameda-gi-plan-with-all-appendicies -electronic-version 12-3-19.pdf>

Question: Part B, Task 2 – Deliverables list Preliminary Concept Drawings and Cost Estimate, but the scope does not include this. Please clarify what is requested for this task.

Response: The Task 2 deliverable focuses on developing alternatives that would be discussed at the first and second rounds of community engagement. The deliverable represents the completed alternatives analysis that compares the alternatives as initial ideas for the first round of community engagement and then with more details including preliminary recommendations for the second round of community engagement. The alternatives analysis would cover order-of-magnitude cost estimates for comparison purposes as well as preliminary sketch drawings and a matrix that help explain the alternatives to community members.

Question: Part B, Task 3 – The scope of work requests the technical consultant to develop a community engagement strategy; however, a community engagement strategy is not listed in the Deliverables box. Please clarify what is requested for this task and if/how the Part B engagement strategy overlaps or complements the Community Outreach and Engagement Plan requested in Part A.

Response: All three projects – Parts A, B and C – are expected to follow the same community engagement plan with two rounds of outreach.

First Round of Outreach:

Long-term Adaptation Plan: The first round will focus on draft vision, goals, preliminary concept ideas and governance options.

Oakland-Alameda Estuary Adaptation: Present existing conditions and preliminary alternative options under consideration to the advisory committee and then to the general public.

Bay Farm Island Adaptation: As a first round of outreach, present existing conditions and preliminary alternative options under consideration.

Second Round of Outreach:

Long-term Adaptation Plan: The second round will focus on the Draft Long-term Adaptation Plan: Consultant will refine the products and plans based on community input.

Oakland-Alameda Estuary Adaptation: Conduct the second round of outreach with Project Partners on the preliminary concepts to the advisory committee and then to the general public.

Bay Farm Island Adaptation: As a second round of outreach, present the preliminary concepts including both short- and long-term concepts.

Question: Part B, Task 3 – The deliverables list includes questionnaires and survey results, but the scope does not include this. Please clarify what is requested for this task.

Response: The exact outreach materials mentioned in Task 3b will be outlined in the community engagement plan for these projects, and is expected to include surveys to community members. The Consultant will be requested to review questionnaires before surveys are distributed to community members and will be expected to incorporate survey results into subsequent deliverables to reflect input received.

Question: Part B, Task 3 – the deliverables list includes five meetings with the full group of stakeholders as well as a subset of the committee to cover Caltrans and regulatory compliance coordination. The scope mentions five advisory group meetings. Please clarify the number of meetings and the intended audience (i.e. five advisory group meetings, one focused Caltrans meeting; 11 meetings, etc.)

Response: Since the community engagement plan still needs to be developed, the exact number of meetings may vary. For budgeting purposes, the following meetings are expected:

- Kick-off: 1 meeting with Project Partners
- First round of outreach: up to 3 meetings with community members
- Second round of outreach: up to 3 meetings with community members
- Advisory meetings: up to 5 meetings with advisory group
- City Council meetings: 2 meetings (cities of Oakland and Alameda)
- Total: 14 total

Question: Part B, Task 4 – Deliverables list mentions ADA accessible electronic formats for the deliverables, is this only applicable to deliverables in Part B Task 4, or all tasks, parts?

Response: ADA accessible electronic formats are required for all three parts.

Question: Part B, Task 6 – Deliverables list meeting minutes with City Council direction. Can the technical consultant assume the meeting minutes are already being recorded and documented by the City’s clerk’s office?

Response: Yes, the meeting minutes will be recorded by the City Clerk’s office.

Question: Part C (northern waterfront design) - Will the City of Alameda (or another single agency) act as lead agency for the review and approval of the detailed design drawings, or will Consultant be responsible for identifying all agencies through which review/approval is required, processing the drawings through multiple agencies, addressing design comments from each agency, and obtaining permits from each agency?

Response: The City will facilitate the review of detailed design drawings by other agencies.

Question: Can we add a task to Part C that covers project management? Part C, Task 1 – We respectfully suggest that the Project Administration task, or a separate task (i.e. Task 0), be opened up as a task for the technical consultant to administer and manage this large and complex project.

Response: The intention is for Consultants to have separate administration tasks under each task to manage this project such as Tasks 2f, 3e and 4c in Part C. Consultants are asked to use the same task numbers as stated in the Consultant RFP to facilitate requests for reimbursements to the funding agencies.

Question: For Part C, Task 2. Existing Conditions, when was the survey taken and what area does it cover? What level of survey detail is included? Part C, Task 2 – Task 2a mentions a topographic survey. Can you confirm if this survey has been completed and provide any additional details (e.g., year completed, method of survey, coverage area, horizontal/vertical accuracy, data deliverable format, etc.)

Response: Please refer to the Geotechnical Recommendations Report, Shoreline Erosion Restoration Project 2905 Sea View Parkway on the RFP website for the project.

Question: Part C, Task 2 – Task 2a mentions initial ideas for the northern waterfront area of Bay Farm Island. Can those be shared at this time?

Response: These initial ideas are on the Bay Farm Island Adaptation webpage under 2023 in the schedule: www.alamedaca.gov/AdaptationBayFarmIsland

Question: Part C, Task 2 – Task 2c requests the technical consultant to “refine the base maps”. Please clarify if these maps already exist or if they will be produced as part of this task.

Response: Please include the base maps to produce as part of this task. The base map will likely include information from existing sources, as identified on the RFP website for the project.

Question: Part C, Task 2 – Task 2d requests the technical consultant to “refine and finalize existing conditions memo”. Please clarify if this memo already exists or if it will be produced as part of this task.

Response: Please assume the existing conditions memo will be produced as part of this task. The memo will likely include information from existing sources, as identified on the RFP website for the project.

Question: For Part C, Is there any available existing geotechnical information from previous investigations or studies including but not limited to geotechnical reports, borehole logs, in situ and laboratory testing, maps, plans, photographs?

Response: EBMUD has geotechnical information for the area west of the Bay Farm Island Bridge due to an underground water pipe that they are upgrading. The EBMUD draft alignment is shown on the Consultant RFP webpage:

<https://www.alamedaca.gov/BUSINESS/Bid-on-City-Contracts/Request-for-Proposals-Technical-Consultants-for-Sea-Level-Rise-Adaptation-Projects-1>

Question: Part C, Task 2e – Can you provide more information on what existing geotechnical site investigations have been performed by EBMUD and if this refers to just the Northern Waterfront project area or the entirety of Bay Farm Island?

Response: Please see the above response. The City of Alameda has not obtained the detailed EBMUD reports at this time.

Question: Part C, Task 3d – Please clarify if the technical consultant will conduct their own independent peer review for the Northern Waterfront Design or if the City will identify and contract separately with an independent 3rd party to conduct this review?

Response: The Working Group will act as the peer review as well as the Scientific Advisor, which is the San Francisco Estuary Institute (SFEI).

Question: Part C, Task 4 – Please clarify what is being requested with respect to EHP and Permitting for the Bay Farm Island Long-term Concept. Permitting documentation would not typically be developed for a long-term concept plan.

Response: It is anticipated that the FEMA EHP will be initiated as part of this project. The design drawings should be permit ready drawings to submit for permit review at 30 percent design, and City staff expects that the effort will include one round of meetings with the permitting agencies.

Question: Could you please confirm the exact project extent for the near-term shoreline design for the northern waterfront area to be addressed in Part C3?

Response: There are several low lying areas along Bay Farm Island's northern shoreline that include Veterans Court, Shoreline Park, the Lagoon Outfall and the wooden bicycle/pedestrian bridge. Technical Consultants will be asked to tie in the short-term project along the northern shoreline at the appropriate extension locations based on the concept that is recommended.

Question: For Part C, What is the purpose and scope of the geotechnical investigation and where should the investigation be targeted? Does it include the northern shoreline repair, Veteran's Court Seawall and lagoon outfall? Any other locations?

Response: The purpose of the geotechnical investigation for Part C is to gather data on the soil properties to make recommendations for potential flood and sea level rise mitigation measures. Data may be available from recent and past studies by the City and other agencies. The geotechnical site investigation will include a file review, review of historic aerial photography, exploratory borings and archeologic investigation. The typical soil condition on Bay Farm Island is shallow fill over Bay Mud. Approximately 20-30 feet of Bay Mud is expected; the boring may need depth of 60 to 80 feet depending on thickness of Bay Mud. The boring locations are to be determined based on available information and could include locations along Veterans Court, the shore line at the end of Veterans Court, the area near the Lagoon Outfall, and at representative points along the length of the northern shoreline of Bay Farm Island. Other area may need borings to determine the consistency of the Bay Farm Island shoreline.

Question: Under C.4.b – Are there any studies in particular that the City/Project Partners/Advisory Committee/Working Group has in mind?

Response: The permitting requirements will depend on input received by permitting agencies after meeting about the 30 percent design drawing, which also will cover the long-term concept for Bay Farm Island.

Question: B3 – Is formal Advisory Committee approval required to progress Part B through the identified project stages (1) kick-off, 2) existing conditions/preliminary alternative options, 3) preliminary concept, 4) draft concept, and 5) final concept)?

Response: Formal approval is not expected by the Advisory Committee.

Question: B5 – Will a draft Basis of Design/Next Steps Report (B.5 Task a) be made available for Advisory Committee/stakeholder review/comment, after which consultant will prepare a final Basis of Design/Next Steps Report?

Response: Yes

Question: Please confirm that task B5.b (10% design/cost estimate/schedule) involves preparation of two sets of submittals, a draft set for stakeholder review, and a final set based on draft review/comment feedback.

Response: Four submittals will be required: 1) administrative review submittal; 2) community stakeholder review submittal; and 3) City Council review submittal; and 4) final deliverable.

Question: How many City Council meetings (for both Alameda and Oakland) will consultant present at? What meeting duration shall Proposers assume for cost development?

Response: A total of two City Council meetings should be budgeted – one in Oakland and one in Alameda – and meeting duration would be four hours per meeting as an estimate.

Question: Exhibit A – Do Native American recruitment requirements apply to this proposal?

Response: Segorea Te' Land Trust is one of the Community Partners.