

Bid Number: 269-207

Title: State of Iowa's Programmatic Archaeological Review for CDBG-National Disaster Resiliency CDBG-NDR for Watershed Projects

Addendum 2

The IEDA has revised "Proposals Due Date". Proposals in response to the "State of Iowa's Programmatic Archaeological Review for CDBG-National Disaster Resiliency CDBG-NDR for Watershed Projects" RFP shall be due **"Wednesday, April 5, 2017 / 4:00 PM local time"**.

The IEDA has received the following questions to the "State of Iowa's Programmatic Archaeological Review for CDBG-National Disaster Resiliency CDBG-NDR for Watershed Projects" RFP. Each question is posted first then followed by IEDA's response in *italics and underlined*.

Q1. Section 2.1 (p. 4) states that "Additional information and deliverables based on Contractor's experience with similar projects are encouraged." Among the deliverables we might recommend would be a comprehensive report of the methods, data, and summary of results of the project. This, however, would be costly. Would IEDA consider this a useful or necessary deliverable?

A1. It is expected that the archaeologists responding to this RFP would provide a description of their methodology and approach to comply with section 3.2.3.2 "an overview of the Contractor's plans for complying with the requirements of this RFP." It is not IEDA's intent to create an infeasible hurdle to submittal, however documentation is expected to minimally convey the Contractor's ability to comply with the RFP.

Q2. Please clarify the maximum number of sites to be given site specific reviews. Different parts of the proposal say there will be "as many as 700" (Site Specific Review, p. 5), or "approximately 700" practices (Attachment 3, p. 20). "As many as" suggests 700 is a maximum, but "approximately" leaves the maximum number ambiguous.

A2. It is impossible at this time to identify an exact number of sites. As the Iowa Flood Center works with each individual watershed and identifies the specific HUC 12s, then identifies practices beneficial to the HUC 12 and further identifies property owners willing to participate in the program, more specific number of practices and sites will be determined. At this time, IEDA is assuming that there will not be more than 700 practices. These practices may be located in close proximity to each other, therefore reducing the number of "sites" to be reviewed, but until sites are identified it is impossible to identify an exact number.

Q3. Also please clarify the number of HUC-12s. Attachment 3 (p. 20) and "Scope of work and deliverables include (p. 4) says "approximately 38 HUC-12s" but "Programmatic Archaeological Modeling" and Site Specific Review (both on p. 5) appear to state that 38 is the exact number the contractor will deal with, as does "Areas that will be included in the reviews" (p. 5), a list that totals to 38 HUCs.

A3. The RFP is based on current, best available data. While the RFP outlines 38 possible HUC 12s, at this time, 26 of those are unidentified. This means that through analysis and evaluation it may be determined that some areas are not conducive to the estimated number of HUC 12s while other areas may end up being more advantageous for the installation of practices. Again, 38 HUC 12s is presumed to be the most that will be considered, but exact numbers are impossible at this time.

Q4. Can IEDA provide an estimate of the maximum acreage of individual practices? Pond sizes of 0.25-5 acres are mentioned, but other listed practices could conceivably cover larger areas.

A4. IEDA is anticipating site sizes as stated, 0.25 – 5 acres, but again, until specific practices are identified and exact sites are located, no maximum or minimum sizes can be determined.

Q5. Is it possible that flood control impoundments might exceed 5 ac, as has been the case in earlier HUD/IEDA/IIHR collaborations, such as in Floyd County?

A5. These projects are modeled more closely to the other two watersheds that were piloted with 2008 Iowa Flood Disaster funds. While it is not anticipated that the participating watersheds will implement large scale practices, it is possible that such practices may be considered in a few areas.

Q6. "Collaborative partners" (p. 6) mentions "County Responsible Entities" and "Programmatic Arch. Review Responsibilities...." (p. 5) mentions "partner entities." Who are these entities, and will the Contractor ever work directly with them?

A6. The National Disaster Resiliency (NDR) Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) was a two-year long application with dozens of partners with various roles and responsibilities. The Contractor will most directly work with IEDA, however they may communicate directly with the Grant Administrators assisting the County Responsible Entities on the federal requirements of these grants. There will also be a Watershed Coordinator (not yet identified) for each of the watersheds. This person may act as a valuable point of contact for all partner entities. Other partner entities include but are not limited to: the Iowa Flood Center, Iowa Homeland Security and Emergency Management, Iowa Department of Natural Resources, and Iowa Department of Agriculture and Land Stewardship.

Q7. When a project is submitted to us for review, will this be a best-and-final siting, accompanied by either a shapefile and/or a easily deciphered map? The time required to conduct a site specific review depends heavily on the kind of locational information provided. For example, A shapefile can be immediately brought into a model and evaluated. By contrast, a poor quality Xerox of a zoomed-out aerial photo, with the practice marked by a big yellow X cannot. The latter can lead to a prolonged back and forth to get a better map out of a "partner entity."

A7. IEDA will work to coordinate initial communication with all partners to strive for an efficient sharing of information. Without knowing at this time who will be finalizing site engineering details and who will be the Consulting Archaeologist, it is premature to determine a specific file type, however all effort will be made up-front to ensure an efficient and cost effective method is in place.

Q8. For the Site Specific Reviews, will IEDA require a complete Phase IA report per AIA and Sec'y of Interior guidelines, or can results be provided in a contractor-designed, short-format, standardized form with accompanying figures?

A8. As long as all necessary information is provided, a contractor-designed, short-format is acceptable.

Q9. The RFP specifically mentions model results as information included in the Specific Site Review but is vague on what other information should be included. Does the Site Specific Review also need to include a desktop records search of previous surveys, historic atlases, HADB structures, geomorphic buried site potential, etc?

A9. It is the expectation of this RFP that the modeling would take into consideration previous surveys, known historic sites, existing inventory data, etc. Through the work of the consultant and assistance from IEDA, the Responsible Entity must be able to document full compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, therefore the site-specific reviews must be sufficient to document the potential for the federally funded action to affect historic/cultural resources.