



**TO:** CONSULTANTS  
**FROM:** EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S OFFICE  
**SUBJECT:** GEOMORPHOLOGY AND VEGETATION RFP – QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS, REV3  
**DATE:** JANUARY 31, 2012

---

Prospective consultant(s) have submitted questions regarding the Platte River Recovery Implementation Program (Program) Request for Proposals (RFP) for Channel Geomorphology and In-Channel Vegetation Monitoring and Data Analysis dated December 7, 2011. The Executive Director's Office (EDO) provides the following summary of questions received from consultants, and Program responses to all prospective consultants. This draft memorandum will be updated as additional questions are received, up to the deadline for respondents to submit questions regarding the RFP (January 30, 2012 at 12:00 p.m. Central Time).

1. Question (submitted to EDO January 18, 2012): pertaining to page 12 of 14, item #7 titled "Conflict of interest statement..." From an initial read of this sentence, I am assuming that consultants that are currently working on this project are not necessarily excluded from pursuing this current RFP. Please confirm if this is a correct assumption.
  - a. Answer: Correct. Consultants currently working on the project are not excluded from pursuing the current RFP.
2. Question (submitted to EDO January 18, 2012): pertaining to page 12 of 14, item #7 titled "Conflict of interest statement..." If this project eventually leads to the design and implementation of a river restoration project, will consulting teams that were involved in the prior monitoring activities be allowed to lead any subsequent design/implementation phase? If possible, please clarify.
  - a. Answer: Any subsequent work will go through a similar competitive bidding process to select consultants to complete the work (i.e., consultant selected for this work will not automatically be selected to lead future work). The consultant selected for the current work will not be conflicted from working on subsequent related Program projects solely as a result of working on the current project.
3. Question (submitted January 20, 2012): Do you desire a Nebraska Firm to be part of the Project Team?
  - a. Answer: We do not necessarily desire a Nebraska firm to be part of the Project Team. Only requirement is that the team is willing and able to travel to central Nebraska for the monitoring, and also for several Program-related meetings.
4. Question (submitted January 20, 2012): Are you proceeding based on information from the previous studies mentioned in the RFP. In particular, are you happy with the information for the project received so far or are you looking for the project team to move in a different direction?
  - a. Answer: No team has an inside track or preference on any Program project, regardless of their prior work with the Program. This is part of the reason why the Governance Committee directed us to re-compete the contract.
5. Question (January 20, 2012): Section III.E of the monitoring protocol – Aerial Photography. This section describes several measurements using aerial photos. Is it expected that this work be included in the SOW?



- a. Answer: Yes, aerial photography work described in Section III.E of the Channel Geomorphology and In-Channel Vegetation monitoring protocol will be part of the data analysis task described in the RFP. However, please do not provide a budget estimate for data analysis task. The data analysis plan is in internal Program draft format, and the level of effort for the analysis is uncertain.
6. Question (January 20, 2012): Section III.H of the monitoring protocol – Sediment Transport Measurement. Please confirm that this work is expected to be included in the SOW?
  - a. Answer: Yes, sediment transport measurements will be included in the SOW, as described in Section III.H of the monitoring protocol. Sediment transport related analyses will be detailed in the pending data analysis plan.
7. Question (January 20, 2012): Have all the permanent metal markers (pins) been set for all anchor points (included pure panel and rotating panels)? Is it anticipated that any of the anchor points will need to be reestablished?
  - a. Answer: Survey marker pins have been set for all pure panel anchor points, and for anchor points in Rotating Panels #1-3. Pins have not been set for anchor points in Rotating Panel #4, and will need to be set as part of the SOW. It is not anticipated that any existing anchor points will need to be reestablished.
8. Question (January 20, 2012): Have access agreements been completed for all anchor points?
  - a. Answer: The ED Office has completed most access agreements, and will complete any remaining access agreements (few anchor points for Rotating Panel #4). The Consultant will need to notify property owners a week in advance of when they will be on the property.
9. Question (submitted January 23, 2012): Do we need to submit a cost estimate to do the Data Analysis task (page 7 in the RFP) or should we leave that out of the estimate we submit with the proposal since that task is not discussed in detail in the RFP? Do we also need to include the costs for preparing for and attending the annual AMP Reporting Sessions? See topic #6 which states “Compensation for services to complete the project for the term of the contract (i.e., 4 years of monitoring, data analysis, and reporting).”
  - a. Answer: To make it fair for all proposals, please do not include a budget estimate for the data analysis task because of the unknown level of effort associated with the task (data analysis plan is currently in draft internal Program format). Please do include a budget estimate for the AMP Reporting Session. You can assume that will require draft and final Executive Summary preparation, preparing/giving your presentation, and attending the full 2 day session in Denver.
10. Question (January 24, 2012): How much detail needs to be provided for data analysis task, considering data analysis plan is being drafted and is not available for preparation of proposals?
  - a. Answer: provide general description of how data should be analyzed to link it to Program hypotheses and Big Questions in the RFP. Do not provide budget estimate for data analysis task or any reporting associated with data analysis.
11. Question (January 24, 2012): How many meeting should be assumed for budgeting purposes?
  - a. Answer: assume Adaptive Management Reporting Session each year of contract (2 days in Denver, prepare Executive Summary of your work, present your work, and interact



- with other Adaptive Management contractors). Assume 2 TAC meetings during first year of contract to finalize data analysis plan. Assume no TAC meetings in years 2 through 4 of the contract.
12. Question (January 24, 2012): Will 2011 monitoring data be available for proposal preparation?
    - a. Answer: no, data report is currently being prepared.
  13. Question (January 24, 2012): What is “GC proposed flow regime” on p. 10 of RFP?
    - a. Answer: includes short-duration high flows (5-8,000 cfs for 3 days in 2 out of 3 years) intended to create/maintain habitat by building sand bars and scouring vegetation. Geomorphology and vegetation monitoring and data analysis is linked to Program hypotheses and Big Questions related to determining whether short-duration high flows affect channel morphology and in-channel vegetation.
  14. Question (January 25, 2012): Is PRRIP open for suggested alternatives to the monitoring protocol?
    - a. Answer: PRRIP encourages proposals to identify suggested revisions to the monitoring protocol, which will show that Consultants have thought through the monitoring task thoroughly.
  15. Question (January 25, 2012): Was the boat purchased by Headwaters or Ayers? Will it be available?
    - a. Answer: Previous Consultant purchased an airboat to complete the survey work. The Consultant selected for this contract will need to purchase their own boat for monitoring. Headwaters also owns an airboat that we use for bird monitoring, so it won't be available for the geomorph/veg Consultant. We purchased ours from American Airboats in TX for about \$50k.
  16. Question (January 25, 2012): Who conducted the original LiDAR survey?
    - a. Answer: Original LiDAR survey was conducted by a team of Optimal Geomatics and Merrick and Co.
  17. Question (January 25, 2012): Who conducted the aerial photography?
    - a. Original aerial photography was completed by Cornerstone Mapping. Kucera now does both LiDAR and aerial photography for the Program.
  18. Question (January 30): For the veg monitoring: do we collect absolute percent cover or relative percent cover?
    - a. Answer: you should estimate species-specific percent cover as the percentage of the total area within the vegetation sample quadrats occupied by a given species.
  19. Question (January 30) P7, line 210 "flow measurements" are discussed but nowhere else do we see the need to measure streamflow. Do we need to collect streamflow measurements or simply apply the USGS shift-adjusted ratings to observed stage? If measurements are required, what is the quantity and frequency?
    - a. Answer: you do not need to collect streamflow measurements. You will need to collect shift-adjusted USGS and NDNR flow data as measured by those agencies.
  20. Question (January 30) P7 states LiDAR will be flown every year, but P6 of the Protocol states it will be flown at beginning and end of first increment. Please clarify. If annual, what is the date of annual LiDAR delivery (line 213 of the RFP)?



- a. Answer: LiDAR will be flown annually in November/December during leaf-off conditions.
- 21. Question (January 30) Have aerial photographs actually been collected twice a year since the beginning of the program? What are the dates that photos were flown? Have the photos been ortho-rectified?
  - a. Answer: Photos were flown once per year (May/June) for 2009 and 2010. Photos were flown twice per year (May/June and November/December) in 2011, and will be twice per year for the remainder of the Program.
- 22. Question (January 30) We assume all analyses performed in the Ayers reports should be budgeted and completed under the terms of the next contract (except the long profile and bank mat'l sampling), however we are unclear as to whether the following should be budgeted in the proposal or left to be discussed under the pending Data Analysis task: annual aerial photo analysis; (presumably) annual LiDAR analysis; numerical modeling (see next question).
  - a. Answer: do not provide budget estimate for any data analysis, other than typical data reduction required to complete annual data monitoring summary reports like the 2009 and 2010 summary reports referenced in the RFP.
- 23. Question (January 30) There is mention of distributing flow into the various channels via numerical modeling prior to computing hydraulic geometry (line 356-361 of Appendix A), etc. It is difficult to see how this could be done based on the 3 XS at each anchor point. Is there any more information available on this topic or is it part of the data analysis plan in preparation?
  - a. Answer: the ED Office will operate the existing 1D hydraulic model that includes flow optimization at important flow splits. Contractors do not need to estimate flow distributions.
- 24. Question (January 30) Could the program provide more information on the 1-d hydraulic model (line 215 of the RFP) that is to be provided to the consultant? Is the hydraulic model intended to be updated by the program as the river channel changes? Otherwise, it is difficult to see how useful it will be after a number of years of channel change.
  - a. Answer: the existing 1D hydraulic model will be updated and/or recalibrated as necessary by the ED Office and/or via contracts separate from the work described in this RFP. Contractors do not need to include discussion of model updates.
- 25. Question (January 30) Please define certified geotechnical lab. Are there exceptions for well qualified labs that are not certified geotechnical labs? For example, our suspended sediment lab has been in operation for 12 years, has processed around 25000 suspended sediment bottles, has participated in the USGS sediment lab quality assurance program (SLQA) for over 10 years, has been reviewed by the USGS, and data from our lab has been approved for publication in USGS records. Would this make our lab qualified? Our coarse sediment lab has been similarly reviewed by the USGS and data from it accepted for USGS publication.
  - a. Answer: the only requirement is that your lab uses standard ASTM and/or USGS protocols for analysis.
- 26. Question (January 30) Appendix A (Line 790) indicates that the draft annual report is due October 1 with a 30 day review period by the program and then a 14 day window for the consultant to prepare the final. It seems, however, that prior data collection efforts have been



submitting final reports in February or March of the following year. Could the program provide clearer guidance on the annual dates of project deliverables?

- a. Answer: contractors should assume deadlines as outlined in the protocol for planning for their proposals.
27. Question (January 30) There is mention in Appendix A (line 807) that a Safety Plan should be developed for the project. Is this a required component? Although we have our own company safety plan, for a project of this magnitude and complexity, it seems reasonable that a project specific safety plan be developed.
- a. Answer: safety plans are not a required component for proposals. However, we will ask you to complete a PRRIP specific safety plan for the actual monitoring.
28. Question (January 30) If anchor points or other control need to be reestablished over the course of the contract (seems likely), is there any requirement that the control be certified by a licensed surveyor in Nebraska?
- a. Answer: No. Work should be supervised by a licensed surveyor (not necessarily licensed in the state of Nebraska).
29. Question (January 30) Are the ground photographs described in Appendix A (line 692-702) required to be taken at the same point every year? The level of rigor of the ground photography is not well defined, i.e. rigorous photo point monitoring requires a substantial level of effort (use of tripod, same camera height, focal length, and orientation each time, etc).
- a. Answer: ground photography should be taken at the same points each year when possible (i.e., if bars haven't migrated downstream). Documentation should include coordinates, transect and point identification, date, and time of photo. Do not need tripod, camera height, etc.

This will be the final version of this document, as the deadline for respondents to submit questions regarding the RFP was January 30, 2012.