

**Addendum No. 1, RFP 20-57**



**CITY OF SOMERVILLE, MASSACHUSETTS**  
**Department of Purchasing**  
**JOSEPH A. CURTATONE**  
**MAYOR**

**To:** Prospective Bidders RFP 20-57, Regional Climate Assessment

**From:** Angela M. Allen, Director of Purchasing

**Date:** March 5, 2020

**Re:** Responses to Questions from Prospective Applicants

**Addendum No. 1 to IFB 20-57**

---

**\*\*ACKNOWLEDGE THIS ADDENDUM\*\***

**Please sign below and include this form in your application package.**

**X**

---

Name of Authorized Signatory  
Title of Authorized Signatory

## Addendum No. 1, RFP 20-57

### General questions

1. Does the area of study include all of the Mystic River Watershed or only those municipalities listed here?

**It only includes the saltwater portion of the Mystic Watershed between the Amelia Earhart Dam and Winthrop/Revere. Boston, Chelsea, Everett, Revere, Somerville, and Winthrop received the MVP grant; and Medford is participating as well.**

2. Is the area of study expected to be different for Task A and Task B?

**The study areas are the same for Task A and Task B.**

3. Are travel expense for stakeholder meetings or other project briefings reimbursable?

**Yes. Travel expenses must be included in the proposed budget, and actual costs cannot exceed the budgeted amount.**

4. Will the consultants be responsible for MVP grant reporting?

**No, the City will be responsible for monthly reports and other grant requirements. Consultant deliverables, as well as invoices with descriptions of work completed, will be the consultants' contribution to reporting.**

5. Does the RMC envision adding any deliverables in addition to what is in the grant application?

**No; however, the consultant is free to propose additional deliverables within the budget limit.**

6. Who is the "client" for this project?

**The consultants' day-to-day communication will be with two project manager contacts: Julie Wormser of MyRWA for Task A and Carri Hulet of CBI for Task B. The other members of the project management team are Stephen Estes-Smargiassi of MWRA, Zoe Davis of Boston, and Oliver Sellers-Garcia of Somerville. Representatives from the other five municipalities will serve on a steering committee.**

7. What climate change impacts will be included in this project? Is heat included?

**The focus of the project is extreme coastal storms/flooding events. Heat is not a climate impact that will be assessed.**

### Task A: Infrastructure Vulnerability Assessment

8. Is the contractor for Task A involved in the Phase 1 convening of the resilient working group?

## Addendum No. 1, RFP 20-57

**The RMC is in charge of convening the infrastructure asset manager working group (Sub-task 1A.1). The primary role of the consultant will be to support infrastructure managers and DHS in preparing for the TTX. Some of this work may involve preparing working group materials.**

9. Does the consultant have a participant/leadership role in running the Task A table top workshop, or is it intended to be an observer?

**The consultant's primary role is to help the RMC, DHS, and infrastructure asset managers prepare for the TTX. As mentioned above, the consultant will modify the decision support tool and, as needed, help asset managers identify and input data in preparation for the TTX. Consultants may be needed to support the exercise, but their day-of role is not expected to be extensive.**

10. What is the extent of technical support to infrastructure operators anticipated in Phase 2 Task A2? What sort of professional advice and liability limitations are expected?

**The NYC Office of Resilience and Recovery has provided us with the Excel workbook they ask area infrastructure managers to fill out in order to identify and decrease their climate vulnerabilities. First, the consultant will modify this tool for local conditions. Second, the consultant will support facility managers in using the tool to prepare for the TTX involving a major coastal storm. This might include tasks, such as performing a site tour with an altimeter to identify flood-prone resources, or reviewing relevant site maps or hazard mitigation plans. The consultants are not expected to assume liability for feedback given to infrastructure operators during this process.**

11. What will be the consultant's expected role, if any, in developing the data layer in Task 2A.1? Will the consultant have access to the data layer for the purposes of the assessment (e.g., for developing geospatial data of at-risk assets in Task 2A.2)?

**The consultant will be responsible for modifying a pre-existing tool (an Excel workbook) and then helping each facility fill out the tool in Task 2A.1. For the purposes of confidentiality, none of these data will be centrally gathered or stored. Instead, they will be incorporated into data layers for use by individual facilities by DHS, facility staff, and/or the consultant, depending on available resources and GIS expertise.**

12. Could the City clarify the reference to security clearances in Phase 2 Task A2? If data for analysis is For Official Use Only (FOUO) or Protected Critical Infrastructure Information (PCII) how should the level of sensitivity of the TTX be targeted?

**Security clearances are not needed to respond to this RFP. If contractors have pre-existing security clearance, there are relevant DHS data that would potentially be available to them for review. No sensitive, confidential, or classified information will be shared among facilities, much less publicly. To the extent that consultants have pre-**

## Addendum No. 1, RFP 20-57

**existing security clearance, there may be useful facility-specific data that would be provided only to that facility in preparing for the TTX.**

13. Is there an anticipated methodology, format, or set of deliverables for the table top workshop, or are they to be determined in consultation?

**DHS has a well-vetted format for its TTX and will be providing GIS support and day-of staffing. Depending on the resource requirements needed to directly prepare facility managers for the TTX, the consultant, DHS and the RMC will determine whether additional deliverables will be developed and by whom.**

14. Should consultants include the Woods Hole Group's time for Task 1A.2 in their budget?

**No, WHG's time for this task is not the consultants' responsibility, and it will not be paid for with MVP grant funds.**

### **Task B: Social Vulnerability Assessment**

15. Tasks 2B.1 and 2B.4 identify various community engagement activities that the consultant will be responsible for conducting in cooperation with community partner organizations. The Budget included in the MVP Application includes direct costs for such events, including food, translation services, childcare and participants stipends that exceed the contract values stated in the RFP. Should proposers exclude all the direct costs identified in the MVP Application Budget (except for printing, which is not noted in the Application) from the price proposal? Can you provide further explanation on how participant stipends will be allocated (e.g., is it intended to compensate meeting participants for their time; or to provide services like staffing events, hosting meetups, or interviewing fellow community members)?

**This process includes budget to compensate people with lived experience for their time and expertise, and to reduce barriers to participation. It is one way the City and its partners are working to reduce inequities in public process. The consultants will be responsible for all sub-consultant and direct costs, and can be reimbursed by the City up to the amount budgeted in the eventual contract. The consultant will propose and recommend how engagement activities should be carried out and, consequently, the costs for whatever is needed to support the approach, including compensating sub-consultants and participants, booking venues, buying food, providing services such as childcare and/or transportation, etc.**

**As presented in the MVP application budget, the Task B consultant has a budget of \$188,400 for consultants/sub-consultants, and an additional budget of \$40,000 for engagement direct costs. The City is open to considering the use of some of the direct costs budget for sub-consultants.**

16. What are the social service providers/CBOs and what is the status of the relationship with them? (Inventoried, contacted, relationship established, partnership established?)

## Addendum No. 1, RFP 20-57

The consultant will be responsible for forming the partnerships with service providers and CBOs in order to complete the work. While the RMC is familiar with some stakeholders in the region, we have not comprehensively inventoried all potential partners, nor have we contracted with or otherwise enabled any particular relationships with social service providers and CBOs for the purposes of this project. In your proposal, you may choose to name specific potential partners, and describe the extent to which they have expressed interest in joining your team, or you may describe a process by which you would inventory, identify, and reach out to CBOs once selected to establish the partnerships.

17. Is it expected that residents of the Lower Mystic communities be *equally* engaged or *equitably* engaged (relative to vulnerable populations identified)?

**Equitably.** The RMC is seeking consultant's expertise in order to engage residents in the most effective manner.

18. The RFP states that the methodology will combine 'existing data and new data' (Task 1B, p.10); what are some examples of 'new data' that might inform the assessment?

**"New" data refers to what is learned through the assessment process. One example of new data may be a list of transportation options people use when they can't get to work using their standard mode of transportation because of heavy rains or winds or an associated impact in storm conditions.**

19. Is an online engagement tool a requirement for Task B?

**No, it is a suggestion. Consultants may choose not to recommend the use of an online engagement tool.**

### Connections between Task A and Task B

20. Will the Task A contractor be involved in the selection and acquisition of Phase 2 Task B2 socioeconomic data, or just analyzing it? In either scenario, will Personal Identifiable Information (PII) such as in the LIHEAP example be de-identified prior to provision?

**The social vulnerability assessment consultant does not need to have the expertise on their team to perform the technical aspects of Task 2B.2. Therefore, everyone who submits a proposal to complete Task A (critical infrastructure vulnerability assessment) should assume they will perform the technical work associated with Task 2B.2, including data selection, acquisition, and analysis, with appropriate consultation and coordination with the social vulnerability assessment consultant and work group. In the event that the consultant who is selected to perform Task 2 (the social vulnerability assessment) does, in fact, have the technical expertise to complete the GIS analysis, and they included that work in their proposed approach, the Task A consultant would be able to allocate resources they intended to dedicate to Task 2B.2 to other work.**

## **Addendum No. 1, RFP 20-57**

21. The RFP states that the technical aspects of Sub-task 2B.2 will be completed by the consultant working on the infrastructure assessment. Will the consultant provide information about the nature of the impacts of an infrastructure failure, in addition to the geography? Will different geographies be provided for the different design storm parameters?

**As the tabletop exercise involves the scenario of a major coastal storm hitting Greater Boston, associated impacts will predominantly involve saltwater flooding (we don't know yet how well we can project wind/wave damage). Assume, therefore, for the purposes of the social vulnerability assessment, that saltwater flooding from infrastructure failure is the primary issue people are trying to manage.**

**Also, note the issue of timing. The infrastructure assessment will provide two pieces of information: which pieces of infrastructure fail under a given storm scenario, and where the flooding most likely occurs. It is unlikely to provide accurate data on how long it might take for the infrastructure to be operational again. The social vulnerability assessment should be designed to learn about the nature of the impacts on people due to short-term (e.g., one day to one week) versus long-term (e.g., three to six months) infrastructure failure would have on their lives.**

22. The RFP implies that the critical infrastructure assessment will result in sensitive and non-sensitive data. (p.14) Can you clarify what type of information from the critical infrastructure assessment will not be available to the social vulnerability team, and what type of information from the critical infrastructure assessment will be available to the social vulnerability team but not made public?

**Facility-specific vulnerabilities will only be available internally to those facility managers themselves. The social vulnerability team will know which facilities would be harmed in a severe coastal storm (e.g., the Maverick MBTA station versus Orient Heights).**

**For the purposes of the social vulnerability assessment, questions would be more general: "How would you get to work if the Blue Line were shut down for repairs for six months?" "Where would you go if you had to evacuate for two weeks because of a major oil spill?"**

23. The RFP suggests that the infrastructure team will not be expected to produce data deliverables before Sept 2020. What type of data/information can the social vulnerability team expect to inform the drafting of the assessment framework and public vetting of that assessment (sub-task 1B.3, 1B.4, and 2B.1)?

**The consultant for Task B can work with the consultant for Task A to acquire existing flood maps and other readily available reports or information to help the Task B consultant gain insight into the kinds of impacts that may happen when large storms impact the short- or long-term operations of Logan Airport, the MBTA, Ted Williams and Callahan tunnels, the New England Produce Center, Deer Island, and the Amelia Earhart Dam.**

**The consultant for Task B will then need to work with general potential outcomes in mind, such as "the buses and subway are not running," and "transportation by bus is limited, and the blue line is not available at all," to develop the framework for the**

## Addendum No. 1, RFP 20-57

**vulnerability assessment and vet it. A large degree of flexibility and capacity to incorporate new information as it becomes available throughout the process will be required to complete both assessments, but particularly the social vulnerability assessment.**

24. Can you confirm that the social vulnerability team will be expected to produce the deliverable for sub-task 1B.3 (related activities appear to be missing from the infrastructure assessment team scope)? If so, what type of data/assumptions can the social vulnerability team expect will be available to integrate or reference in the memo?

**In order to align the two work streams under the anticipated timeframe required by the grant, the work performed under Task 1B.3 has been modified from what is described in the grant application. Proposals for both Task 1 and Task 2 should anticipate a meeting to discuss and align the following:**

- The list of infrastructure to be assessed
- The type and general magnitude of storm being used for analysis
- The likely, general impacts and existing, readily available information that provides guidance on the range of potential impacts.
- Timelines (in particular, when the two streams of work need to overlap)

**The RMC support team will be responsible for drafting a memo that captures the outcomes of this meeting, and the consultant team(s) will be responsible for reviewing and confirming the contents.**

25. How many iterations are envisioned in the synthesis of the two tasks' prioritized punch lists?

**The primary synthesis occurs in Task 2B.3, where findings from the infrastructure tabletop exercise are integrated into the social vulnerability analysis. This project is not meant to result in a complete synthesis of the two punch lists; RMC will carry out this work as it develops the communities' shared policy agenda in 2021.**

### Proposal requirements

26. In requesting a budget by task, does the City envision this being a lump sum for Task A, or a detailed breakdown by phase and subtasks (eg. Phase 2, Task A2) as outlined in the grant application?

**The budget should be broken down by Task. If the respondent chooses, the budget can be broken down further by sub-task. The budget must also be broken down by fiscal year (tasks completed by June 2020 and tasks completed by June 2021).**

27. Is the anticipated ordering of subtasks, such as Phase 2 Task A4 for the identification of real-time regional communication and assessment tools, negotiable?

**If the consultant makes a compelling case in the proposal and/or work plan development, the City may consider reordering the subtasks. Reordering, however,**

## **Addendum No. 1, RFP 20-57**

**cannot disrupt the City's commitments to deliver and perform work under its contract for the MVP grant.**

28. The proposal page limit is 15 pages. Is this the limit even if your team is proposing on Task A and Task B?

**Proposals are limited to 15 pages per Task. A proposal for both tasks has a limit of 30 pages. Please keep proposals as succinct as possible.**