



# UPPER COLORADO RIVER COMMISSION

50 S. 600 E. Ste #100 • Salt Lake City, UT 84102 • 801-531-1150 • [www.ucrccommission.com](http://www.ucrccommission.com)

April 28<sup>th</sup> 2025,

Re: Response to Questions submitted on 2025-02-DT-UCRC RFP

To Whom it May Concern,

Questions regarding the subject Request for Proposals have been submitted to the UCRC Project Team. Please find the questions and corresponding responses outlined below.

1. The RFP states the funding from the project is from IIJA. Is there any indication that this funding may be subject to federal clawbacks or defunding?

Response: Since the IIJA DCP grant has already been awarded, the risk of federal clawbacks or defunding is low.

2. Will being a part of the team selected for this work prevent our firm from being able to compete on potential future RFPs to install and maintain monitoring sites? Would that pose a conflict of interest?

Response: Consultants that develop or draft specifications, requirements, statements of work, or invitations for bids or requests for proposals must be excluded from competing for such procurements.

3. The RFP references a "Prioritization Geodatabase" with detailed information about individual stations. Can we obtain access to this database while developing our proposal? Add clarification on the list?

Response: The identified priority infrastructure was a broad overall look for all IIJA funds and is not specific to this project. We have attached to this posting the Diversion Telemetry needs assessment for your reference. The specific locations to be instrumented will be determined by the consultant in coordination with partner entities and through the application process – the full list of potential locations is not necessary for this RFP as they will be subject to change and will be adapted to the program that is proposed by the proposer.

4. Where can we obtain a copy of Volume 2 of the Gap Analysis referenced in the RFP, that includes the details and locations of the existing and proposed monitoring stations? On the UCRC website, only Volume 1 is available. The link for the Metering and Gaging Gap Analysis is broken. However, we found Volume 1: Report (June 2023) online. Is this the only document available?

Response: Volume 2 does not include details and locations of existing and proposed monitoring stations. Rather, it provides documentation about the methods/ metrics used for prioritization (calculation of metrics, code, etc), details about the interview process, and meeting notes.

5. Who will be responsible for organizing and facilitating meetings—the contractor, UCRC staff, or someone else?

Response: The Consultant

6. Who will be responsible for developing web-based and other IT services for managing the applications and program information – the contractor, UCRC staff, or both?

Response: The Consultant

7. Is our team expected to develop designs for all individual gages/devices to be installed, or will we develop template design options which will be finalized by the construction contractor?

Response: Yes – the contractor will be responsible for developing designs for most individual measurement devices to be installed. However, we are open to different program approaches that can be expressed in your proposal.

8. Should we assume that our team will need to provide licensed engineers for stamped designs, or will designs be reviewed and approved by state agencies or another group? Will you require draft submittals for intermediate review (eg. 30%, 60%, 90%) or only final versions?

Response: Yes, with coordination with state agencies. Likely only 90% review and final will be needed.

9. Will our team be responsible for local permitting, such as floodplain development permits and No-Rise Certifications, for rehab of existing structures or construction of new ones? What about coordination with the US Army Corps of Engineers for installing these gages under Nationwide 7 “Scientific Measurement Structures”?

Response: Yes

10. Does the term "telemetry equipment" encompass all equipment at a monitoring location (PTs, ADCPs, rain gages, etc.)?

Response: Telemetry encompasses the equipment required to take constant readings and store or transmit the data.

11. The RFP says that the contractor will “prepare certification reports” for the gages that are installed or improved. Do versions of these certification reports exist, or will they be developed over the course of the project? Who will be ultimately responsible for approving the content of these certification reports?

Response: Certification reports do not exist and will be developed by the consultant, in coordination with the UCRC and the Authority over the course of the project.

12. The RFP references “design-build, planning, and construction-related services.” Will the contractor be expected to act as a prime for both design and construction, or is the contractor’s role limited to design and construction oversight?

Response: We look forward to the different approaches that you propose for the program.

13. Is the consultant expected to provide costing for gage maintenance and telemetry beyond the period of performance of the contract?

Response: No

14. Are there any required specifications on how measurement data will be stored or accessed once stations are certified and telemetry is operational?

Response: Written standards are not in place, but this will be coordinated with state agencies that will be consuming the data. All data must be compatible with the state agencies database system.

15. For Objective 4, can you share example project sizes or budgets to guide our level-of-effort estimates?

Response: We will post as a reference the UCRC Diversion and Telemetry Needs Assessment.

16. Budget - Do you expect year-over-year rate escalations, or should we hold all rates flat through 2029?

Response: We expect year over year rate escalations.

17. Will the selected consultant have access to the UCRAF model? Or work with those folks?

Response: The UCRAF model is not relevant to the work being done under this program.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Rachel Musil". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large loop at the end.

Rachel Musil, PE  
Deputy Director/Chief Engineer  
Upper Colorado River Commission