

## Questions and Answers

### **WCWCD RFP for amendment to the Arizona Strip Field Office Record of Decision, Approved Resource Management Plan (2008) in Coconino and Mohave Counties, Arizona**

#### **RFP, Page 2, Agreement**

- As the 3rd party NEPA contractor, we would take direction from BLM and therefore would not be in complete control of the schedule. We can commit to meeting our assignments, but cannot do so for others participating in the project. With that in mind, how does WCWCD envision compliance with Section 2.d of the sample contract? Is there room to negotiate on this point so it speaks to only items for which the contractor would be wholly-responsible?

*BLM has developed the schedule set forth in the SOW. Therefore, we think it is reasonable to incorporate the schedule into the terms. We recognize the challenges that might arise under these circumstances and will be reasonable with regard to schedule changes. If the contractor is delayed for reasons outside of the contractor's control, that would be a valid consideration in addressing potential delays. The burden will be on the contractor to keep the district informed when schedule issues arise to ensure an opportunity to address them before the contract clause might be triggered.*

#### **RFP, Page 3, Submission Due Date, Time, Location and Manner**

- SWCA is very interested in partnering with the WCWCD and BLM on the proposed work. To prepare a submission that adequately addresses the required information in a manner we deem appropriate for the effort, we respectfully request an extension of the due date to March 23, 2018.

*The due date has been extended to March 23.*

#### **RFP, Page 4, Section 3.e.ix, Knowledge and Experience of Offeror Regarding:**

- What is the anticipated level of data collection anticipated to meet data adequacy for this planning level analysis? Has a data adequacy standard been developed by the lead agency for this effort?

*Specific data adequacy standards have not been developed. No field surveys of resources will need to be conducted. All data to be analyzed will be obtained from research of existing BLM planning and other agency documents, as well as GIS datasets and documents related to the proposed Lake Powell Pipeline Project. Most reference information documents (other than BLM GIS data) will be available on an FTP site for immediate contractor use upon execution of the contract. As identified in the SOW: "The Plan Amendment Content will therefore be limited to analyzing the direct, indirect and cumulative effects of the amendment's Proposed Action and alternatives on the management of the ACEC and utility corridor." The key resource values for which the ACEC was established include: cultural resources, endangered bird species (i.e., southwestern willow flycatcher), riparian areas, and scenic values.*

#### **RFP, Page 5, Section 5. Time, manner, and schedule of delivery.**

- Requirements 5b, c, d, and e. Is the BLM looking for the requested work/project information specific to the company, office, team, or PM?

*BLM Response: All of the above. What we are most interested in is the team that would specifically be assigned to this particular project.*

#### **RFP, Page 6, Cost Proposal for Scope of Work**

- What scope and change management considerations have the BLM and WCWCD put into place to minimize process and regulatory driven changes to the project schedule. Is a preliminary EIS Preparation Plan in development that can be shared with potential

contractors that provides an understanding of the change management controls that the agencies will follow?

*BLM Response: While the prep plan is being worked on, it will not be far enough along in the process to be available for this RFP process.*

- Furthermore, page 3 of the MOU describes the RMP Amendment Contractor preparing a Preparation Plan, though this is not in the statement of work. Will it be a component of the work required of the contractor?

*The reference to the Preparation Plan in the MOU is no longer valid. We can address that when we finalize the contract.*

**RFP, Page 6, Method of Award**

- It is noted that the award will be based upon the proposal; that the evaluation committee composed of BLM personnel gives the highest score. Please describe how BLM will evaluate lowest cost relative to cost-based assumptions which are not specified in Section 2.0 Scope of Services? For example, if one respondent assumes 4 people will attend the workshop under 2.4 whereas another respondent assumes only 1 person will attend the workshop, how will BLM balance the cost difference between the two?

*BLM Response: Proposals should be submitted based upon the descriptions of tasks outlined in the SOW. For example, the BLM will make the assumption that all proposals are based upon the number of representatives (for meetings) given in the SOW.*

- **Table 1. Evaluation Criteria.**

It appears the Maximum Points may be incorrectly calculated. Should this read as follows:

*Yes. The Evaluation criteria are modified as follows:*

No.	Evaluation Criteria	Score	Weight	Maximum Points
1.	Qualifications	10	1.0	10
2.	Knowledge and Experience	10	1.5	15
3.	Suitability for Particular Project	10	2.0	20
4.	Quality of Proposal	10	1.0	10
5.	Time, Manner, Schedule of Delivery	10	1.0	10
6.	References	10	0.5	5
7	Cost	See Below*		30

**Scope of Work**

- Please confirm that we are not required to submit a technical scope at this time and that this will be negotiated during contract negotiations.

*The requirements for submittal are set forth in the RFP and attachments.*

- How many plan amendment alternatives does BLM plan for?

*BLM Response: A preliminary estimate is for two alternatives. However, based upon scoping, this number could slightly increase.*