

We are looking over the proposal and would like to suggest that you let the potential applicants know what your budget is for the project. This is similar to publishing an “engineer’s estimate” of cost when bidding a construction project. It doesn’t compromise the RFP process and will greatly assist you when evaluating the proposals. As it stands now, you will likely receive proposals with widely varying scopes and associated costs. This will make it difficult to perform a meaningful comparison between the proposals. It might be easier for you if we all knew that you can’t spend more than \$100,000 so we shouldn’t prepare a cost estimate for two years of flow monitoring and stream sampling to verify and calibrate our models—a service you simply can’t afford to consider.

Because the RFP was unclear about the level of modeling desired, the response to Question #6 was intended to partially address your concern (see 6315_questions103006). A calibrated model is being developed in Allen’s Creek but will not be available to us any time soon.

The S2 program is available now. We are looking for a feasibility study to determine our best options given the information that we currently have, and the limited areas of opportunity in the Creekshed. Knowing what we know now, what project(s) make the most sense to pursue? If the current level of information is insufficient, can we gather a limited amount of new information to make informed decisions about whether a project or projects are cost effective, technically feasible and acceptable to the community?

We are looking for the best approach to answering these questions? We do not want to spend more than is necessary, but we don’t want to limit your ability to provide a reasonable analysis. However, we will not have the benefit of a 2 year monitoring program and a calibrated model.

I would say \$100,000 is getting to the high end of what would be expected, but if that budget represents what you think would be required, so be it. Please note that the fee proposal represents 10% of the evaluation.