

## Applicant Questions and Answers for the:

### Request For Proposals: Assessing Socio-Economic Impacts for the National and Emergency Coastal Resilience Funds

2/14/20

#### *Application Process and Contracting Questions*

1. *Would NFWF like to see interim reports and a presentation of results corresponding with each annual report cycle? If a presentation is required does that need to be an in-person meeting or can it be accomplished as a virtual meeting (e.g. webex)?*

NFWF will require a written summary report corresponding to each annual report cycle, with preference towards annual presentations of the results as appropriate. All presentations and regular meetings with NFWF can be accomplished either in person at NFWF's headquarters in D.C. or via a virtual meeting.

2. *Is there a page limit for the entire technical proposal, including contact information, narrative (5 pages), biographies/resumes, and references? Does this page limit include project experience? Are biographies and references outside of this page limit?*

The narrative description of the work plan may not exceed five pages. There is no page limit on the other components of the application package, including the summary of the applicant's expertise and experience, recent accomplishments and previous services, biographies, contact information, references, budget and evidence of financial stability.

3. *Can tables include a font size different from 11pt?*

Embedded tables can use a different font size from 11pt; however, please ensure the size is sufficiently large for readability.

4. *Beyond Q3-Q4 annual deliverables, are there other reporting timelines potential offerors should be aware of for scheduling purposes?*

NFWF does not currently anticipate any other reporting timelines.

#### *Budget Questions*

1. *Should the proposed hourly rates cover the full three-year period, or should the Contractor Budget Tab be replicated to show rates/total costs for each year?*

The proposed hourly rates tab on the contractor budget template should be for the full three-year period.

2. *Is it acceptable to quote labor category rates rather than name all proposed staff on the budget template?*

Yes, it is acceptable to quote labor category rates.

3. *Will this be a Time and Materials Contract?*

Yes, this will be a time and materials contract.

4. *What scale of effort is NFWF planning to support? As this is a multi-year effort, what is the anticipated level of effort over time?*

Offerors should propose the level of effort they estimate is necessary to complete the tasks outlined in the Request for Proposals and as described in the Offeror's technical approach.

5. *Does NFWF anticipate a desire for on-location project engagement and outreach or in-person interim and final briefings? Would reasonable travel expenses be reimbursable?*

NFWF does not anticipate needing on-location project engagement and outreach. Briefings and meetings with NFWF can be either in-person at NFWF's D.C. office or virtual. Any proposed travel expenses should be included and justified in the budget template.

### *Scope of Work Questions*

1. *Please clarify if we should expect 60 projects for review and analysis each year, or if the 60 projects are divided/staggered over the 3-year contract period?*

A total of 60 projects will be staggered over the three-year contract period.

2. *We understand that the number of expected scenarios per project will be determined upon further discussion. Is there a good estimate of number of scenarios for budgeting purposes? Over what time frame is the zone of influence to be evaluated? E.g., should we assume static sea level and historic storm frequency or a sea level rise scenario and potential changes in storm frequency due to climate change?*

In the scope of work, the offeror should propose the number and type of scenarios for accomplishing the outcomes described in the RFP.

3. *How does NFWF define a "significant flood event"? How does NFWF anticipate the additional scope elements of Task 5 being negotiated?*

As events occur throughout the contract period, NFWF will work with the selected contractor to evaluate whether a given flood event is appropriate for additional analysis under Task 5. In their scope of work, the Offeror may propose a definition for "significant flood event."

4. *In terms of a significant flood event, the RFP mentions that there would be no primary data expected to be collected. Please provide what type of secondary data would be provided?*

In terms of a significant flood event, publicly available, secondary data (e.g., map flood extent, properties inundated, road and business closures) will be collected by the selected contractor.

5. *The RFP states that projects are in different stages of development and that each project will begin implementation between 2018 and 2020. What projects in the Appendix are currently in the implementation stage?*

Out of the 40 projects in the Appendix, approximately half have begun restoration activities; the other half will begin in 2020. The remaining 20 projects not listed in the Appendix will not begin restoration activities until the end of 2020 or 2021.

6. *What level of design detail will be provided?*

The selected contractor will collect all design information from the grant recipients. The level of detail will vary across projects.

7. *Are there supporting documentation available for each of these studies (e.g., baseline studies, feasibility studies, etc.)?*

The level of supporting documentation available will vary by project.

8. *Will the contractor have site access, if necessary?*

We do not expect the selected contractor will need access to project sites; however, if it proves critical, NFWF staff can work with the contractor to obtain site access where possible.

9. *The RFP seems to imply that the majority of the work will be done each September through November. After the first year, does NFWF anticipate any work occurring December through August, assuming no extreme events trigger Task 5?*

We anticipate the contractor will work year-round to conduct necessary modeling; however, the annual reports on progress are not required until September through November.

10. *Could NFWF provide any additional relevant background reports or information on the methods (metrics, identifying zone of influence, etc.) being suggested in the RFP? This would include work related to these grant programs, but also relevant items from other projects at NFWF or NOAA.*

The appendices outline the available documentation. After contracting, NFWF will provide all relevant grant project files, including proposals, engineering and design plans, and interim reports where available.

11. *The approach to estimating each project’s “zone of flood risk reduction” will differ by project, depending on the quality of available data and the degree to which previous modeling has already been completed. For budgeting and scoping purposes, approximately how many of the projects are anticipated to have H&H modeling already completed? What code(s) were used for those modeling exercises? Will those modeling inputs/outputs be made available to our team?*

Those projects with H&H modeling available will be provided to the contractor. The number of projects with H&H modeling will be identified by the selected contractor as part of Task 2. In developing the scope of work and budget, the Offeror should clearly state their assumptions regarding H&H modeling availability.

In addition to the information provided in Appendix A, NFWF will provide the selected contractor with additional information on previous modeling efforts.

12. *Appendix A states that “Several of the restoration projects, especially the aquatic connectivity projects, have completed some variation of H&H modeling”. Is a list available detailing which sites already have a working H&H model?*

NOTE: The projects assessed as part of the work that developed Appendix A are NOT the same as the projects to be assessed under Request for Proposals.

See response to question #11 regarding H&H modeling availability.

13. *The RFP implies that a resilience analysis will be completed for each project “for each of the three annual analyses,” using “each project’s most recent restoration specifications available at that time.” For budgeting and scoping purposes, if there is no change in a project’s specifications between year 1 and year 2, and assuming no significant storm events under Task 5, is it required that existing models be each year?*

No, if no change in project specifications has occurred since the previous year’s analysis (assuming no significant storm event), a model will not need to be run again.

14. *Assessing the zone of influence may require high-resolution topographic data, regardless of whether a GIS, H&H or analogue approach is used. Is LiDAR topographic data available for all of the projects?*

No, LiDAR may be available for some projects, but it should not be assumed to be available for all projects.

15. *Is the contractor required to employ all three of the approaches described in Appendix A? For example, due to site-specific differences in bathymetry, topography, vegetation, and infrastructure across sites, it seems unlikely that the analogue approach described in Appendix A of the RFP will provide anything except qualitative information on the benefits of specific project types.*

No, the contractor is not required to employ all three approaches; they should employ the most rigorous approach for which there are available data.

*16. Would NFWF find the adaptation of an existing tool to be amenable for the purpose of hydrological modeling? Or would an original solution be preferred and supported?*

The adaptation of an existing model is acceptable. No preference will be given to either adaption of existing tools or original solutions.

*17. Does NFWF anticipate that the modeling and metrics would be used to support additional projects or greater scopes of work as a part of pre-disaster mitigation grantmaking?*

This contract is to assess the 60 existing grants. Future needs have not been determined at this time.