City of Madison – Watershed Studies – Dunn's Marsh and Greentree/McKenna RFP

Questions and Responses – June 6, 2019

Q1: RFP Section 4.1 and 6.1 state that 2D modeling will be performed for "selected areas." Will the Consultant be responsible for recommending / identifying areas to modeled in 2D? Does the City have any estimates on how many areas in each watershed (or what percent of each watershed) are anticipated to require 2d modeling?

Answer: the City considers the use of 2D modeling, and its extent within each model, to be an integral part of each Consultant's unique approach to these studies. As such, the City expects that the Consultant will include a broad discussion of what areas it intends to model in 2D in its proposal, and that the Consultant's proposed budget will reflect its recommended 1D/2D modeling approach.

Q2: Does the City have a maximum budgeted amount or expected budget range for each watershed area, for consulting fees, that you can share?

Answer: Project budgets were estimated around $150,000-$175,000 each, however consultants need to provide their estimates based on the scope provided and not cut services from the proposal to meet this budget. If scope or tasks are eliminated from the proposal consultants should clearly identify where their proposal varies from the requested scope of work outlined in the RFP.

Q3: Are the 10 focus groups / stakeholder meetings in Task 2.2 and 5.2 the same meetings?

Answer: 10 focus group meetings are included with EACH Task 2.2 and Task 5.2, for a total of 20 focus group meetings.

Q4: For the 30% conceptual drawings in Task 6.1, will plan views for each alternative provide an acceptable level of detail? Or will you also require profile views, cross sections, etc.?

Answer: a plan view with all information listed in the RFP Scope of Services, Task 6, Section 1 (Subsection 3) will be considered an acceptable deliverable for the 30% conceptual drawings. Cross-sections and profile views are not required; however, major pipe inverts, grading information and proposed contours will be required with the deliverable to ensure the design is feasible.

Q5: Would you like paper copies of the Draft Existing Conditions Report and Proposed Solutions Report? Or will electronic copies of the draft version be sufficient? In particular, the flooding extents / inundations maps could add up to a large number of maps for all areas, storm events and scenarios, and if electronic copies of these maps would be acceptable, we would propose to deliver those draft maps in electronic form rather than paper printouts.

Answer: electronic copies of the Draft Existing Conditions Report and Proposed Solutions will be considered an acceptable deliverable. Paper copies of the Draft report will not be required.

Q6: Have the watershed monitoring locations already been selected? Will the Consultant have opportunity to provide input on monitoring locations?

Answer: the City has already worked with the USGS to develop a monitoring plan, including monitoring locations, for the watersheds included in this RFP. The Consultant will not have the opportunity or responsibility to provide input on monitoring locations for these watersheds.

Q7: The McKenna / Green Tree watershed overview text in the RFP states that an InfoSWMM model has already been developed for a part of the watershed, primarily for the McKenna / Park Edge project. Can you describe, in text or with a map, the approximate upstream and

downstream extents of this existing InfoSWMM model. Do you know if the Consultant can assume that the level of detail in this existing conditions model is generally adequate for the area it covers (in other words, we shouldn't expect to make many changes for existing conditions modeling), or should we assume that we may need to do significant model revisions / additions for this area?

Answer: the City's existing McKenna/Greentree was extends from approximately the Beltline (US 12/14) to Midtown Rd south of Elver Park. Additionally, the City's McKenna/Greentree model is included as an attachment to this RFP and can be found on the City's FTP site. The City expects that the Consultant will develop a calibrated existing conditions model as described in the RFP Scope of Services, Tasks 3 and 4. The City considers the Consultant's use of none, part or all of its existing model to be part of the Consultant's unique project approach, and expects that the Consultant's proposed budget will include its recommended approach.

Q8: The recent/ongoing reconstruction of HWY 151/18 has made substantial changes to the storm system network which is not currently reflected in the City's GIS data. Will the linework be updated and populated with pertinent attributes (e.g. pipe sizes, materials, inverts, etc)?

Or will the selected consultant be required to update the files based on CAD files/As-Built PDFs? If the latter, will the City be able to provide the DOT CAD files for the construction from Raymond Road and further south?

Is it anticipated that calibration will need to be conducted for an 'existing condition' which may be in flux during the duration of the project, or '2018 conditions' which may no longer be reflective of conditions affecting August 2018 flooding?

Answer: the linework for the ongoing reconstruction of HWY 151/18 will not be updated by the City, and it will be considered part of the Consultant's scope of work to update the files necessary for the construction of the Dunns Marsh model. The City will provide DOT CAD files for the project if available to the City, however the Consultant may be required to obtain these files from DOT or their consultant. The City does not make and representation that the CAD files can be provided. The City expects that the existing conditions model for Dunns Marsh will include the final proposed storm system for the DOT 151/18 reconstruction project. It is the City's opinion that changes in the 151/18 system will not largely affect stormwater and flooding in the City's system, and that calibration to 2019 events (as captured by the City/USGS monitoring equipment installed in the system) should be possible with the future 151/18 system included in the model. However, if the Consultant strongly disagrees with this assessment, they should include an explanation in their proposal as well as a proposed approach to modeling existing conditions.