



**Sierra Valley  
Groundwater  
Management District**

**RFP ADDENDUM  
QUESTIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS  
June 12, 2020**

**to RFP for Professional Services for  
Sustainable Groundwater  
Management Act (SGMA) Implementation  
for the Sierra Valley Subbasin (5-012.01)**

**RFP Submission Deadline Date:  
June 26, 2020 at 5:00PM**

**Issued by:**

**Sierra Valley Groundwater Management District  
Board of Directors**

**[sierravalleygmd@sbcglobal.net](mailto:sierravalleygmd@sbcglobal.net)**

## INTRODUCTION

The Sierra Valley Groundwater Management District (District) Board Clerk received the following questions and requests for clarifications by email on or before Friday, June 5, 2020 at 5:00PM. The questions are numbered and grouped by similar topic, and the “Answer” follows.

## RFP CLARIFICATION QUESTIONS

1. Since “\*This RFP pertains only to project Categories (a), (b), and (c),” but has a category (d) described as:

Category (d): GSP Implementation (Monitoring / Assessment). This category develops adaptive management programs and strategies to support GSP implementation with contract completion by October 2022.

with a budget of \$785,000, and a completion date of October 2022, are proposals for this rfp limited to \$1,215,000 of the overall \$2,000,000 grant?

Or, is a proposal for the rfp supposed to include developing the monitoring and assessment program as described in the rfp as “While the scope of work for Category (d) is not part of this RFP, this RFP does include the overall General-PM role (Category (a) responsibilities) for Category (d)?” And if yes, then is part of \$785,000 for Category (d) for developing this program?

*Answer: Category (a) provides overall grant agreement administration. The prime consultant will provide Category (a) labor and will serve as the General Project Manager (General-PM) leading the consultant team. All Category (a) (aka General-PM) labor is to be conducted and billed under Category (a), including all grant agreement administration for Categories (a), (b), (c), and (d).*

*The \$785,000 is reserved for Category (d) programmatic activities, not administration. Category (d) programmatic activities are not part of this RFP.*

*See #3 below for further information.*

2. The RFP (page 5) requests Billing Rates for individuals listed in the Organization Chart. Exhibit B in the draft Professional Services Agreement is titled *Budget and Billing Rate Schedule*. To clarify, a Cost Estimate to prepare the GSP is not being requested as part of our proposal?

*Answer: See RFP Section 4, Item 3 on page 4 for “Budget Justification.” A cost estimate is being requested for Categories (a) – (c), including preparation of the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP).*

3. What portion of grant funds should be assumed to allocated for Agency expenses or recovery of past GSP expenses?

*Answer: The total grant amount is \$2,000,000. This RFP does not include Category (d) in the amount of \$785,000. Of the remaining \$1,215,000, the District and Plumas County as co-Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSAs), anticipate retaining approximately \$200,000 for expenses.*

## RESOURCE AVAILABILITY QUESTIONS

4. What is the status of the groundwater model developed by UC Davis? We are aware of the March 31, 2017 workshop presentation slides. Are the model files available for our review to assist in our proposal preparation? Is it envisioned that revisions to the groundwater model will be needed before it can be used in support of the GSP?

*Answer: Respondents should not consider the UC Davis model available for use in meeting SGMA requirements for developing the GSP. However, the March 31, 2017 UC Davis Groundwater Model Workshop PowerPoint presentation and associated report may inform the development of the GSP and can be found on the District's website at: <https://www.sierravalleygmd.org/reports-and-presentations>*

5. Is the GSP Concept Document available for our review to assist in our proposal preparation? Has the GSP concept document prepared by Greg Hinds (or others) been released to anyone? Our understanding is this document is based on the DWR GSP outline and may contain complete or partially complete portions of the GSP which could greatly inform our scope of work and cost estimates.

*Answer: Greg Hinds will be providing an overview of the GSP Concept Document at the District's Board meeting on Monday, June 15, 2020. The Board agenda and back up materials, including the GSP Concept Document, dated June 1, 2020, can be found on the District's website at: <https://www.sierravalleygmd.org/board-of-directors>*

6. Can we get a copy of the full grant application?

*Answer: A full copy of the DWR Sustainable Groundwater Management Grant Program application can be found on the District's website at:*

*<https://www.sierravalleygmd.org/request-for-proposals-for-professional-services>*

7. Is there a list of interested consultants or a list of consulting firms who you have sent this RFP to?

*Answer: The following consulting firms received the RFP via email distribution on Friday, May 22, 2020: Anthony Brown, Associated Engineering Consultants, Broadbent & Associates, Inc., Brown & Caldwell, Carlton Hydrology,, Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Davids Engineering, GC Environmental, Inc., GEI Consultants, Geosyntec Consultants, Groundwater Strategies, Inc., HDR Engineering, Hydrofocus, Hydrometrics Water Resources, Jacobs Engineering, Joel Kimmelshue, Kennedy Jenks, Kleinfelder, Kronick Moskovitz Tiedeman & Girard, Luhdorff & Scalmanini Consulting Engineers, Matt Zidar, Montgomery & Associates, Provost & Pritchard, RMC Water and Environment, SCS Engineers, Stantec, Tetra Tech, Torben Bach, Tully & Young, Vector Engineering, Weiss Associates, West Yost Assoc., Wood Rodgers, and Woodard + Curran.*

## PROCESS QUESTIONS

8. Are there water rights issues of concern to the GSA or basin stakeholders? Is it intended for the GSP to address those water rights issues (e.g., Feather River water rights)?

*Answer: It is anticipated that the GSP would only address such issues to the degree that the administration of surface water rights influences GSP components, such as basin setting, water budget, etc.*

9. Is there a role for the water master in the process? Are there decree / water right considerations that you envision to be integrated into this particular GSP, given the adjudicated status of the basin?

*Answer: See #8 above.*

10. The Grant Agreement section D.6. Budget Contingency (page 18 of 33) indicates that the funds for the grant are contingent on adequate funds being appropriated by the State. Does the current State budget deficit, and the Governor's reduction of funding for various State activities impact the availability of the grant funds for this project?

*Answer: Not that the District is aware of at this time.*

11. Can you provide more details on the representatives that make up the evaluation panel? What entities / stakeholders make up the "District GSP project team?"

*Answer: See RFP Section 6, page 7 for information regarding the evaluation panel. The District GSP Project Team is an internal planning team principally comprised of staff from the co-GSAs and consultants.*

12. Since SVGMD qualifies as a DAC, could DWR advance the GSA funds so that they could pay their selected consultant monthly and not quarterly?

*Answer: The DWR Final 2019 Guidelines states on Page 12 that "advanced funds will not be provided." The Final Planning – Round 3 Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) states on Page 7 that the "Grantees shall invoice and report on a quarterly basis." These requirements are non-negotiable. There are no special provisions for the Disadvantaged Community status. Invoices are due to DWR no later than 60 days following the end of a calendar quarter. However, Grantees can submit their draft invoices earlier than 60 days. Invoices are typically processed by DWR in 45 to 60 days following receipt of a final invoice.*