

Q&A Round 1 (7/1):

1. Is there a fixed budget for design?
 - a. There is no fixed budget for design. We have secured funding which can be used immediately for design.
2. Is stakeholder engagement primarily the responsibility of the Eagle River Coalition (ERC), with contractor support/collaboration? Or is the contractor primarily responsible?
 - a. ERC will be primarily responsible for the stakeholder engagement. BLM and contractor will support/collaborate.
3. Is it safe to assume that permitting will be the full responsibility of the contractor (but with potential support from BLM)?
 - a. BLM will complete NEPA and work to get other permitting done such as 404 permits. The stormwater permit will likely be obtained by the contractor.
4. Has topographic and hydrographic survey been completed recently on the site, and if so could it be made available prior to the due date of the proposal?
 - a. Topographic/hydrographic surveys have not been completed recently on the site. Most recent topographic lidar available is from 2016.
5. Has a budget been determined for the design/planning/NEPA/permitting effort?
 - a. The budget for design will be determined once BLM sees the proposals from contractors. NEPA and other permitting such as 404 permits will be done internally by the BLM.
6. Has a budget been determined for design implementation?
 - a. The budget for design implementation will be determined once BLM sees proposals from contractors.
7. The scope of work discussion on the channel design uses the phrase “Natural Channel Design” (sometimes with capital letters) in several locations. This phrase often refers to a specific approach to stream restoration developed by Wildland Hydrology and Dave Rosgen. Is the project’s selected design team expected to utilize this stream restoration approach or are other methods acceptable?
 - a. Other methods are acceptable, but preference toward Natural Channel Design. It all depends on the proposed methods.

Lower Eagle River RFP Questions

8. Has a haul off/disposal location been identified for the large amount of material potentially generated by the floodplain lowering/re-connections?
 - a. No, however materials could be distributed in other parts of the reach where needed. Not all materials will necessarily need to be hauled off site. TBD.
9. How many project milestones during the design/planning process (i.e. 30%, 60%, 100%, etc) should be assumed for BLM, ERC, and project stakeholder to review and provide input?
 - a. 60% and 100%
10. How many design review meetings should be assumed? Will they be in-person or virtual?
 - a. Virtual most likely. Hard to know how many design review meetings will be assumed. 3-5?
11. Is boundary survey needed that would require a CO licensed Professional Land Surveyor?
 - a. No
12. Is the HEC-RAS model used to develop the Base Flood Elevations, 100-year floodplain and floodway boundaries through the project reach available prior to the due date of the proposal?
 - a. A HEC-RAS model output has not yet been created/obtained for the reach
13. Have the number and locations of sustainable river access points been identified?
 - a. No this can be discussed in the design review process.
14. Related to Q3 above, have BLM, ERC, and project stakeholders considered making this phase of the project design/planning/permitting only and then going out to bid to select a construction contractor?
 - a. Yes. We initially released this RFP as a Design Build request, but have since decided to make this a Design/Planning/Permitting RFP.
15. Has the BLM suggested that this project could potentially require an EIS for NEPA compliance?
 - a. No, EIS's are typically triggered when proposed actions have significant environmental effects that can't be mitigated. There will be short term impacts such as elevated turbidity, however, these impacts are typically mitigated during stream restoration.

Q&A Round 2 (7/5)

Q3&5 Follow Up:

1. Can you please verify that BLM will be completing all NEPA compliance and associated documentation internally, including the Environmental Assessment, facilitation of the public scoping process and associated documentation, collecting and responding to comments, and decision documentation? If so, how much support will the contractor be expected to provide?
 - a. Yes BLM will be completing all NEPA compliance and associated documentation internally.
Unsure how much support from the contractor will be expected. Most likely just clarification regarding design plans or data sets referenced. Or to attend a meeting to field design specific questions.
2. Can you please verify if the BLM be using their staff to complete all necessary resource surveys? i.e. biological, archeological, etc.
 - a. Yes. These will be done internally.
3. Can you please verify that BLM will be completing 404 permitting for the project? If yes, will BLM be using their staff to complete wetland delineation, functional analysis, wetland impact analysis, pre-construction notification preparation/submittal or other necessary field data collection in support of USACE permitting.
 - a. Yes. These will be done internally.
4. Can you please verify that BLM will be completing Endangered Species Act compliance for the project? This includes coordination with the US Fish and Wildlife Service, any required species-specific surveys, and necessary documentation (Biological Assessment).
 - a. Yes.

Lower Eagle River RFP Questions

Additional questions:

1. The coordinates for Figures 6, 7, 8, & 9 are downstream of the project limits presented in the map in the “Case for Support” document and as discussed in the Background paragraph of the RFP. Please confirm the project reach extents.
 - a. Project reach extents are from the eastern BLM property boundary near the Gypsum Campground (approximately 39°39'12.9"N 106°58'19.4"W) to the BLM property boundary downstream (approximately 39°38'53.7"N 106°59'45.6"W). The locations for Figure 6, 7, 8, and 9 are downstream of the project limits. Figure 6 looks upstream into the project area.
2. Will a bid bond be required for the project?
 - a. I believe so.
3. Has a study been completed for contaminated soils and/or hidden tanks? This may be required for the CDPHE construction dewater permits.
 - a. No.

Q&A Round 3 (7/24)

1. The 15-page limit is tight to provide our Team, Quals/past projects, fully describe an approach to a project of this scale, PMP, and rate sheet. Would the ERC be open to revising the RFP to a Quals based w/rates? This may help you find the right contractor that you want to work with, and then develop a scope/fee/schedule together to meet the needs of the project and budget.
 - a. The 15-page limit is just a guideline for the proposal itself, feel free to add any additional information on Team, Quals/past projects etc on top of that 15 page limit. We will not be super strict about this limit so feel free to flex that number within reason to fit your report. I would say it is unlikely we would revise the RFP to a Quals based w/rates, but I think this is something our Executive Director and I will discuss and likely propose to other interested firms to see whether this is a more favorable approach. I agree that may be a better fit and help find the right contractor that we want to work with. The added flexibility to then develop a scope/fee/schedule together to meet the needs of the project and budget would be great. If this route would require less time to construct a proposal then I could see it being more of a possibility.

Lower Eagle River RFP Questions

2. Has this RFP been reissued? Where did the first round of Q&A come from?
 - a. The RFP has been reissued and this is where the first round of Q&A came from. It had originally been released as an all encompassing permitting, planning, design, build RFP which made it even more difficult to estimate scope and costs. The ERC board members suggested it would be best to scale it back as it would likely require phased construction anyway with going out to bid being more suitable for the project.
3. Would the ERC, BLM, and other project partners be interested in a few design alternatives to consider (10% concepts) in order to discuss restoration opportunities, costs, benefits, and develop consensus on the final concept to move forward with the 30%, 60%, 90%?
 - a. I think the ERC, and BLM would certainly be open to design alternatives for consideration in order to discuss all of the different variables that would inform the final concept, but I think having a primary focus/jumping off point for a design plan would be best to start with while offering design alternatives that surround that primary plan.
4. Does the ERC anticipate site assessment and data compilation to follow CSQT procedures to streamline 404 permitting? We would also do additional data collection for aquatic habitat complexity, floodplain connectivity, inventory site materials, assess channel and bank stability for engineering and design purposes, but I ask this because sometimes it streamlines to collect data and to disseminate data in the CSQT spreadsheet format for BLM use.
 - a. If CCSQT procedures do streamline 404 permitting then we would certainly welcome it, but we are open to whatever methods are deemed a best fit for the project and design process. Certainly mention any reasoning behind data collection procedures in the proposal.
5. The River corridor has been mapped in detail by FEMA, with most delineated as Zone AE, and the study effective in 2007. This is outdated and the river has moved since the study. Does the ERC/BLM anticipate updating the hydraulic modeling? I would anticipate that work would require more than a “no raise” letter and coordination at the county level, and we should anticipate FEMA coordination, possibly a LOMR/CLOMR. Has there been discussion with the BLM and project partners regarding this?
 - a. I'm not sure about much of this and to my knowledge a LOMR/CLOMR has not been discussed, but updating the hydraulic modeling would certainly result in the most well informed final design. This would likely be well supported by the ERC and BLM.
6. There may be restoration opportunities outside of BLM lands along the US6 corridor to correct bank/channel instabilities. Is the ERC/BLM interested in collaborating efforts for a more wholistic restoration plan (given there are identified areas/opportunities to coordinate those restoration concepts with CDOT)?
 - a. I think given the potential for restoration opportunities outside of BLM lands along the US6 corridor the ERC would be interested in collaborating with these land managers in the future, but it is unlikely that collaboration would be sought out for

Lower Eagle River RFP Questions

this project. We will take this into consideration over the next couple of weeks. It is more likely that this project will serve as a great example for the bordering land managers and if interest exists to implement similar projects then those collaborations will be pursued.

7. The RFP mentions using Natural Channel Design methodology. Is the ERC/BLM interested in process-based methodologies, such as the use of wood, splays, and other structures that would promote floodplain connectivity though time. Most NCD methodologies rely on structures to form a stable channel and floodplain, rather than process-based methodologies utilize sediment transport/wood recruitment coupled with structures that promote form. Most floodplain restoration projects are both, NCD form based where needed and makes sense, and process-based where its okay to be messy and let the river/floodplain self-form and adjust. Just curious what the consensus is on NCD form based vs. process-based.
 - a. Natural Channel Design methodology is mentioned as a guiding suggestion. We would like to see it included, but there is no expectation to use it exclusively. Process-based methodologies have been implemented in previous projects and shown effective results so these are certainly supported as well.
8. Do you have a range for the design budget that we should scale our approach to?
 - a. In some documents from a while back we had a loose estimate that this design process could cost \$300,000 - \$400,000. We currently have ~\$600,000 secured in funding, but we are looking to use proposals to inform the desired budget for permitting, planning, and design. Excess funds would go towards project implementation or management/monitoring plan. It is hard to offer much guidance here. More than anything we are looking for, "how do you best see this stretch of river being restored."