

WRITTEN QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

SP17-0091, RFP, Extreme Regional Precipitation Study 7/20/17

ANSWERS ARE IN BLUE

1. Question

For a similar study for Colorado and New Mexico, a target budget was provided by the sponsors in the RFP. For this RFP, is a target budget available?

No.

2. Question

Is there a page limit to the technical proposal?

No.

3. Question

Reference Section 2.2 E.5.

Is the purpose of the defining “sub-regions” for purposes of storm transposition?

Yes.

4. Question

Reference Section 2.7 B.4.

Can you provide an example of what is envisioned for the “brief summary report” that will be provided with each basin analysis provided by the “GIS tool?”

No. However, item 2.7.B.4 can be further discussed and detailed during the Negotiation and Kick-off workshop. See RFP item 2.5.D.1.

5. Question

Reference Section 2.1.

Indicates quarterly meetings are requested, which equates to 6 meetings, plus a kickoff meeting during an 18-month project. However, Section 2.4 indicates there will be 4 workshops (1 kickoff and 3 project). Please clarify the number of in-person workshops/meetings required.

See RFP Sections 2.4 through 2.6 for vendor requirements for workshops/meetings.

6. Question

Reference Section 1.13.

How shall we reflect pricing of optional tasks in the Office Price Bid Sheet? Optional tasks would include tasks that are not explicitly asked for in the RFP, but our team might recommend for consideration per Section 2.5

Do not amend or alter any item(s) on the Official Bid Price Sheet. Provide the total project cost per the requirements of the RFP. See RFP item 2.5.B regarding tasks under the scope of work.

7. Question

Reference Section 2.1 and section 2.2 I.

The ultimate goal of the states is to compute PMFs for drainage basins of interest. Who will be conducting the PMF studies and is collaboration anticipated during/following this project?

The primary end user envisioned by this study is the community of dam safety professionals performing work in AR, LA, and MS. The project review board, and in particular, the representatives of the respective state dam safety agencies, will act as the sounding board regarding how the PMP results will be implemented as per their state regulations, and may coordinate with professionals in their respective states to ensure results/methodologies are acceptable. It is not anticipated that there will be an ongoing coordination with end users after project completion.

8. Question

Reference Technical Proposal Packet, E5.

Should the letter of references be sent directly to you or included in our proposal response? If sent to you, who should they be addressed to and what address should they be sent to?

The letters of reference must be included in the proposal response.

9. Question

Reference Technical Proposal Packet, Information for Evaluation.

Are we able to put each of the sections and sub sections into Word format and add the necessary discussion or do we have to use the exact table that is provided?

The Word format is acceptable.

10. Question

Reference RFP, 1.17.

Caution to Vendors, item I., what is "Vendors may submit multiple proposals" referring to? Why would a vendor submit more than one proposal to this specific RFP?

This is standard RFP template language. In some instances, a vendor may have a viable alternative proposal.

11. Question

Reference RFP, 2.2 General Requirement.

Items L and M are exactly the same. Was a different topic meant to be included or can was that just a typo and one can be disregarded?

Disregard Item M which is a duplicate of Item L.

12. Question

Reference RFP, 4.1 Payment and Invoice Provisions, item H.

States that invoicing shall occur at the 30%, 60%, 90%, and 100% project completion. Is there an option to invoice on a monthly basis instead? Vendors may not have significant reserves for overhead and given that the project is scheduled for 18 months, invoicing at 30%, 60%, 90%, and 100% would mean there would be significant time between work completed and when an invoice is submitted. This could put undue/unnecessary financial strain on vendors in paying employees for work completed (i.e. 4-5 months).

For purposes of the proposal, assume the 30, 60, 90, and 100 % submittals delineate points at which deliverables will be submitted and reviewed by the project review board. See Addendum #1 for RFP item 4.1.H.

13. Question

Reference Technical Proposal Packet, Information for Evaluation, E2.

Examples of Work, item A., states that "the sample should identify the client, the project 30%, 60%, and 90% benchmark completion points". In all other similar projects, specific benchmarks at those intervals were NOT explicitly defined. Can vendor examples of work to fulfill this portion of the evaluation WITHOUT explicitly calling out 30%, 60%, and 90% benchmarks?

Yes. See Addendum #1 for Technical Proposal Packet item E.2.A.

14. Question

Reference RFP, 1.22 Equal Opportunity Policy, item D.

What if a vendor does not have an official EO Policy and will be submitting a written statement to that effect. Who specifically do we address that statement letter too?

Address it to the State of Arkansas and include it in the Technical Proposal Packet.