

**WAYNE COUNTY DRAIN COMMISSIONER**  
**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**  
**FOR**  
**PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR THE**  
**ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES/REPORTS PORTION OF THE**  
**GENERAL REEVALUATION REPORT FOR THE**  
**NORTH BRANCH ECORSE CREEK DRAIN**  
**FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT**  
**WAYNE COUNTY, MICHIGAN**

**Questions and Answers received prior to**  
**Pre-Proposal Meeting on**  
**April 27, 2010**

Question 1. Regarding potential Phase II ESA activities – Task 9.3 requests “a unit price for this subtask”. Because the scope of this activity is undefined, on what basis should this cost be estimated? What units should be included in the costing?

Answer 1. Task 9.3 is an extension of Task 9.2. The response for this task is a unit price for additional borings and laboratory analyses sufficient to identify sediments that may require special disposal. Describe all assumptions associated with the unit price.

Question 2. Are NEPA 451; Part 301 and 303 permit applications expected to be completed under this contract?

Answer 2. Part 301 of the Clean Water Act - Ocean Regulatory Program - would not apply here in the Great Lakes. Part 303 of the Clean Water Act is also not required. However, refer to Task 8 regarding the requirement of a 401 Water Quality Certification from the State of Michigan. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) have stated that the 451 Directive of NEPA applies to the Department of Energy, not the USACE. See:

[http://gc.energy.gov/NEPA/nepa\\_documents/TOOLS/ORDERS/o4511b.html](http://gc.energy.gov/NEPA/nepa_documents/TOOLS/ORDERS/o4511b.html)

Question 3. Will the engineer be selected for the North Branch Ecorse Creek Flood Control Project before May 14<sup>th</sup>? If so, will the name of the engineer selected be made known for coordination of this proposal?

Answer 3. The selection of the consultant for the Engineering and Design Analyses project will not be completed prior to the May 14<sup>th</sup> due date of this proposal.

Question 4. Who will be taking the lead on the overall project schedule, project meetings and public informational meetings – Engineer for EIS, Engineer for Flood Control Project, Engineer for Corps, Wayne County or USACE?

Answer 4. The overall lead for schedules and meetings will be Wayne County and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE).

Question 5. Page 8, 2c - What are the “Key Personnel” listed by the Proposer that must be professionals licensed in the State of Michigan? Can key personnel have a Ph.D. (or MS) but not necessarily be licensed if, for instance, there is no licensing board for a particular discipline (such as biology or natural resources)?

Answer 5. “Key Personnel” are the people who are submitted by the proposer for the evaluation criteria section “Key Personnel.” Any professional categories associated with the proposed team that are licensed within the State of Michigan must have team members who are also licensed in the State of Michigan. If no licensing is required for a particular discipline, the makeup of the team for that discipline is the choice of the proposer.

Question 6. Page 12, Task 1.1 - The first sentence indicates that “It is anticipated that data must be collected.....and then the second sentence indicates that “All data will come from existing sources”. Can we assume that all data will come from existing sources and that no raw data will be collected as part of this scope?

Answer 6. The scope of Task 1.1 assumes that existing databases will be utilized to fulfill part of the deliverable for this task. Other portions of this project (Task 9, JDH00, HTRW) and other on-going projects (Engineering and Design Analyses Project and the General Reevaluation Report under the USACE) will also be used to fulfill this deliverable. However, the proposer should use their best judgment and experience to develop their work plan. All assumptions should be stated in the response.

Question 7. Page 15, Task 2.3 - Use of website and documents mailed to public/libraries on CD would substantially lower costs and would save perhaps three to four weeks total for the Draft and Final EIS. Can this be assumed?

Answer 7. Any assumptions used to develop the schedule, work plan and/or costs associated with the response must be presented in the response.

Question 8. Page 18, Task 6 - How much time in the schedule has been allocated to contracting with the National Academy of Science (NAS) and for them to conduct their review and provide comments?

Answer 8. The Independent External Peer Review (IEPR) performed by the NAS has been scheduled for October/November 2011. Refer to the schedule provided in the Engineering and Design Analyses RFP, Attachment G for the preliminary schedule for this and other tasks:

<http://www.waynecounty.com/mygovt/doe/depts/fmd/library.aspx>

This schedule will also be available on the North Branch Ecorse Creek site with these Q&As, the sign in sheet and a copy of the presentation:

<http://www.nbecorsecreek.com/rfp.php>

Question 9. Page 20, Task 9.3 - Given that the alternatives are not yet developed, it will be difficult to scope an appropriate Phase II effort. Can assumptions be given by Wayne County with regards to number of borings, samples, depth, analytical, etc. or should we provide assumptions and an approach in our proposal?

Answer 9. See answer to Question 1 above.

### **Questions and Answers from the Pre-Proposal Meeting April 27, 2010**

Question A. Please clarify what is expected of the “submerged” reference to cultural resources on page 10. This usually refers to shipwrecks.

Answer A. There may be historically significant bridges in the area. Their footings may be submerged. There may be building foundations found in a submerged excavation area.

Question B. Is there an architectural map of historically significant buildings?

Answer B. A map was not created as part of the 1988 or 2008 studies. There is only limited information available at this time from the previous studies associated with the North Branch Ecorse Creek.

Question C. When will the alternatives be defined? When will they be narrowed down?

Answer C. It is expected that the final alternatives will be defined by this time next year (2011). This will be an iterative process involving Wayne County, the USACE and all three projects’ consultants.

Question D. Under Task 9, the Environmental Site Assessment, Phase I, what is meant by “the consultant will assist Wayne County”?

Answer D. The County is ultimately responsible for getting information (data, model results, reports, etc.) to the USACE. The selected consultant will prepare draft documents for the County to review and then the County will pass along to the USACE. Any questions/comments associated with the documents and/or data/results may require response from the consultant.

Question E. The project schedule from November 2009 shows the EIS starting in May 2010. Is this still realistic?

Answer E. The overall schedule for the General Reevaluation Report (GRR) is governed by funding from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). The overall GRR schedule will remain generally the same; individual components may be altered slightly. See answer to Question F below.

Question F. When will the County’s contracts be awarded?

Answer F. It is anticipated that the contracts will be awarded by early June.

Question G. What is the relationship between the Economic Analysis and the draft EIS? Will interim products (drafts) of the Economic Analysis be available to the EIS consultant?

Answer G. The Draft EIS will include information not only from the Economic Analysis but also the Engineering and Design Analysis project. Interim products will be shared amongst the consultant and government team members.

Question H. Who is on the selection committee?

Answer H. That information will not be made public.

Question I. Will the selection be made from the proposal submittal or will an interview also take place?

Answer I. Section III describes the selection process, which includes the criteria detailed in III.1 through III.6. An interview may be required of the shortlisted firms as described in Section III.12.