



# 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)

May 7<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.

**Question:** Budget accounts for 25% of the overall proposal evaluation. Will points be awarded strictly based on total cost (e.g., the lowest-cost proposal receiving the highest score), or will other factors—such as overall value, hourly rates, and cost-effectiveness—also be considered? Some subtasks do not specify quantities, so proposers may make different assumptions about the level of effort required, potentially leading to wide cost variations.

**Answer:** Proposals will first be evaluated based on qualifications and project approach. Cost will be considered only after those evaluations are complete. When cost is evaluated (weighted at 25%), it will not be assessed strictly on total price alone. The evaluation will also consider overall value, hourly rates, and cost-effectiveness. We recognize that undefined quantities in some subtasks may lead to varying assumptions; evaluators will take this into account.

**Question:** Many of the subtasks do not have a defined quantity or level of effort until the program is developed. For example, subtask 4 under Objective 2 functions more as an “on-call” service with no clearly defined expectations. How should we build these subtasks into our cost proposal, considering the importance of cost in the evaluation?

**Answer:** For subtasks with undefined quantities or “on-call” characteristics, proposers should provide hourly rates categorized by role or service type, aligned with each subtask. This allows evaluators to assess cost-effectiveness even in the absence of precise quantities. These cost rates will be reviewed only after the initial evaluation of qualifications and project approach is complete.

**Question:** Will the selected firm be responsible for upfront equipment costs and future replacements? Or will UCRC/CRA pay for the equipment and construction contractors directly? Do you prefer the program manager to handle all associated costs and include them in their invoices?

**Answer:** We are open to different strategies for managing equipment and construction costs, and this may be determined later as the program framework is finalized. Initially, it may be smoothest for the selected contractor to cover equipment and construction costs upfront and then be reimbursed by UCRC. However, there is also a possibility that individual water users may become sub-awardees and take on certain purchasing responsibilities themselves. The final approach will be coordinated based on what ensures efficiency, accountability, and compliance with funding requirements.

**Question:** The RFP references “design-build,” which typically implies a CMGC or design-build delivery model. However, the April 28th responses to questions suggest some openness to alternative delivery methods. Question 2 suggests a more traditional approach where a consultant prepares a bid package and helps with the public bidding process. Could you clarify if the intended delivery method is a traditional design-bid-build?

**Answer:** We are open to different project delivery methods, and the approach may be refined as the program progresses. Initially, the most straightforward approach may be for the consultant to prepare a bid package and assist with the public bidding process, which would align with a traditional design-bid-build model. However, we are also considering the possibility of alternative methods, such as design-build or CMGC, depending on the needs of the project and the involved stakeholders. The final delivery method will be determined as the program evolves to ensure the most effective and efficient approach.

**Question:** Will the selected firm be expected to provide legal review for Project Implementation Agreements, or will UCRC/CRA rely on in-house legal counsel for this?

**Answer:** Legal review will be provided through UCRC and CRAU legal counsel.

**Question:** Will the application process be open to all water users statewide, or limited to a specific group?

**Answer:** Applications will be open to water users within the Upper Colorado River system in Utah. They will be limited to direct diversions, inflow/outflow from reservoirs, and return flows.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Rachel Musil".

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