



Responses to Waterbury Flood Study Request for Proposals Questions

1. On page 8, Section IV requires the firm to describe its "experience with similar traffic calming and pedestrian focused projects", whereas the core scope of work involves hydrologic and hydraulic (H&H) modeling and flood mitigation alternatives analysis. Could CVRPC clarify whether past project experience should focus on H&H modeling and flood mitigation rather than traffic calming and pedestrian projects? **Please respond on past H&H modeling and flood mitigation projects. Apologize for missing that in coping text over from a previous RFP.**
2. Could CVRPC provide additional information on the expected resolution of H&H modeling and survey work for the tributaries within the project extent (i.e., Little River, Thatcher Brook, Graves Brook)? Will Green LiDAR data acquisition be required for the tributaries? **If you can get a resolution that you believe will meet the needs of the modeling without Green LIDAR, we are willing to support that. Any explanation on your reasoning for where to use differing methods in your proposal would be appreciated. Such as depth being less of an issue with tributaries that Green Lidar was deemed unnecessary and we are able to model these areas with the State's QL1 LIDAR data.**
3. Does CVRPC have an established grant budget or maximum not-to-exceed fee for this project to assist consultants in sizing field data collection, modeling, and design efforts?
Budget is \$130,000.
4. For the existing data review tasks, is CVRPC and The Town of Waterbury able to provide results, reports, or meeting notes from recent and concurrent flood mitigation projects and outreach and engagement efforts in Waterbury (i.e., Randall Meadow project, flood resilience visioning sessions, Town Plan development) to minimize duplication of these efforts and ensure they are considered as part of the alternatives analysis? **We will share any files that we have and coordinate with the town to get access to any files they may to minimize duplication of effort.**
5. Can CVRPC clarify in Item Number 6 under "Project Initiation and Data Collection" on page 3 is meant to be a feasibility-level desktop resource evaluation for all alternatives considered or detailed evaluation including field data collection (i.e., wetland delineation) for the project(s) selected for conceptual (30%) design?
Feasibility level desktop resource evaluation for alternatives.
6. What level of archaeological and historic review be included in the project scope and budget for the projects selected for conceptual (30%) design?



Desktop review

7. Will CVRPC and/or the Town provide existing HEC-RAS models from prior flood studies? **We have Graves and Thatcher Brook 2017 HEC-RAS files and will share. Currently unaware of any others but will share any we have access to.**
8. Can CVRPC clarify the number of public meetings/presentations desired for the project and when in the project timeline the meeting(s) should occur?
Yes, we are expecting 2 public meetings, the first meeting for the alternatives presentation and selection and the second meeting to present the final deliverables and designs.
9. On pages 9–10, the narrative lists evaluation percentages (Scope of Work: 10%, Qualifications and Responsiveness: 70%, Cost Proposal: 10%, Schedule: 10%) that differ from the evaluation points specified in the Evaluation Table (Firm's Qualifications: 30%, Project Team: 25%, Technical Approach: 20%, Past Performance: 10%, Cost: 10%, Knowledge of Project Area: 5%). Which scoring system and criteria weight distribution will the selection committee use?
We will use the evaluation table.
10. In Section IV Proposals, should the Scope of Services and Cost Proposal be submitted in one PDF or separate PDFs? **Please submit whichever way is easiest for your staff.**