

#RFP-FY23-RAISE Addendum No. 1

As questions are received from interested contractors, Middle Peninsula Planning District Commission (MPPDC) staff will add them to #RFP-FY23-RAISE Addendum No. 1 that is posted with the solicitation on the MPPDC website ([Bids/RFPs/RFQs \(mppdc.com\)](https://www.mppdc.com)). It will be the responsibility of interested contractors to check the #RFP-FY23-RAISE Addendum No. 1 on a regular basis.

1. Question: Will the selected consulting team or MARAD be preparing the actual NEPA document?
 - Response: the successful offeror will be responsible for preparing the NEPA document in coordination with MARAD as described in the solicitation. The information regarding NEPA in the solicitation includes all of the guidance the MARAD NEPA staff have provided to date. The primary objective for NEPA under the current planning grant is to make as much progress with NEPA as possible for the final project designs so that it puts any future MPPDC grant applications in a more advantageous position when applying for federal funding for construction in the future. It is expected that the successful offeror will coordinate with MARAD to ensure that any NEPA-related activities will be acceptable and be given credit for NEPA compliance once construction funds are attained at some point in the future.

2. Question: Has MARAD made a determination as to whether a Categorical Exclusion or Programmatic Categorical Exclusion is adequate for this program, or whether an Environmental Assessment will be required under NEPA?
 - Response: MARAD has given the current planning/design project a Categorical Exclusion under NEPA. All NEPA-related activities under the current project is intended to make progress towards or attaining compliance with NEPA for when MPPDC is seeking future federal funding for construction. This approach is being utilized since federal funding programs prefer construction projects which have begun or completed NEPA.

3. Question: Is grant administration required by the consultant? If not, is there an existing grant administration firm or is It self-performed?
 - Response: MPPDC is currently and will continue to administer the grant. The successful offeror will coordinate with MPPDC staff regarding reimbursement requests, progress updates and delivery of final deliverables.

4. Question: Do you anticipate one entity being awarded the entire portfolio or can we apply for selected nature-based projects?
 - Response: The RFP is for the entire project which will consist of work at all of the sites listed. Proposals for specific or individual sites would be deemed incomplete with regards to the requirements set forth in the RFP.

5. Question: On what date will MPPDC award the contract? RFP Section II B., Project Timeline shows *Compile all condition assessment and public/stakeholder feedback* with a date of July 31, 2023 (+/-), which appears to be a tight schedule.
 - Response: We hope to move as expeditiously as possible and while a timeline for review and contract award has not been set, I would anticipate at least two weeks. It is recognized that the timelines included in the RFP may be challenging to meet as stated.

If this is the case, then please state such and offer an amended timeline for which you propose completing the work.

6. Question: On what date will MPPDC award the contract? RFP Section II B., Project Timeline shows *Compile all condition assessment and public/stakeholder feedback* with a date of July 31, 2023 (+/-), which appears to be a tight schedule.
 - Response: We hope to move as expeditiously as possible and while a timeline for review and contract award has not been set, I would anticipate at least two weeks. It is recognized that the timelines included in the RFP may be challenging to meet as stated. If this is the case, then please state such and offer an amended timeline for which you propose completing the work.
7. Please confirm if a fee estimate is required as part of this bid. If so, is it considered binding? We believe that MPPDC would be better served by a technical proposal at this stage, with later negotiation on the scope. That would allow us to more accurately price the work for MPPDC's needs.
 - Response: A fee estimate is not required. Section 3 explains that a fee for service contract with a capped amount will be made to the successful offeror. The budgeted amount of funds available is provided in Section 3. Section 4 explains that we are looking for the proposal which can demonstrate the greatest value from the fee for service contract. The activities under Tasks 1, 2, and 4 are expected to be completed in their entirety as described in the RFP. The level of effort for the designs completed under Task 3 is anticipated to be contingent upon the level at which the successful offeror believes it can produce within the fee for service contract amount.
8. Regarding "The Offeror can demonstrate previous successful experience with administering and conducting USDOT RAISE funded projects. 10%", the specific RAISE grant vehicle is relatively new, and many past DOT RAISE projects also are not relevant to the working waterfront. Would offerors with equivalent coastal transportation assessment experience be given similar consideration for scoring similarly to offerors with specific DOT RAISE experience?
 - Response: Points will be awarded to offerors who have specific previous USDOT RAISE experience, even if that RAISE experience does not pertain to working waterfronts. The RAISE program involves many specific and unique federal requirements aka "red tape" and points will be given for proposals which are offered by those with previous specific RAISE project experience.
9. Are we to assume that this is an estimate prepared by the offeror for an approximate "basket" of work that we expect to be completed during the project inclusive of the \$1.85M allocated budget? Given that the site assessments haven't been done, it would be difficult to provide a completely accurate estimate of engineering work needed.
 - Response: Since the final designs selected by the property owners will not be known until the planning processes are completed and specific improvements to be received are selected, it is unknown whether the types of improvements will necessitate a PE stamp or not. We are hoping to gain an understanding from proposals as to 1) you have access to a PE should you not have one and a design were to require a PE stamp and 2) how much would be budgeted to retain a PE should you not have one on staff. The cost estimates in this instance are for what it would cost to retain a PE if you do not

have one.

.