



# Request for Proposals:

## Grant Administration for Flakes, Flights, and Forecasts: Snowpack Measurement Enhancements in the Uinta Mountain Headwaters

The Colorado River Authority of Utah  
60 East South Temple, Suite 850  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Release Date: June 24, 2024  
Close Date: July 22, 2024, 4:00 PM MT

THE COLORADO RIVER AUTHORITY OF UTAH



# Respondent Questions & Answers

## Question Set 1

**1.1 There are several different meetings mentioned in the RFP, can these coordination meetings be conducted remotely or is there an expectation that some of these will be held in-person?**

All meetings directly within this project can be conducted remotely. The Authority typically holds an annual “all contractors” coordination meeting where in-person attendance by one representative from each project team is preferred, but a hybrid option is available.

**1.2 Is any scoring preference given to Utah-based firms or offices?**

No.

**1.3 Can letters of support from project references be included as attachments (and not count towards the total page limit)?**

Yes, letters may be included as part of the resumes section and will not be included in the page count.

**1.4 Can you clarify how the Technical Criteria Scores are calculated? The evaluation criteria table does not add up. For example under Evaluation of Proposal and Approach it says scoring is "0-5 with a weight of 8 for a maximum total of 40 points", however the points column to the right shows 30 points.**

Our sincerest apologies, the original table posted had a typo, the “Points” column is correct. The table is now updated in the RFP, and included below.

**Table 3.** Proposal Selection Criteria and weighting.

Selection Criteria	Points
<b>Technical Criteria</b> (Scores Determined by the Technical Evaluation Committee)	
<p>1. <b>Evaluation of Proposal and Approach</b> (0-5 with a weight of 6 for a maximum total of 30 points)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Responsiveness to the RFP’s Purpose, Objectives, and Scope of Work described herein</li> <li>● Description and adequacy of engineering methods and approach</li> <li>● Familiarity with the Authority’s mission, Management Plan, and Work Plans</li> <li>● Familiarity with the Authority’s role</li> <li>● Familiarity with Colorado River issues and policy and Utah water regulations</li> <li>● Familiarity with snow measurement and water supply forecasting methods and entities, water supply planning, project analysis and evaluation, federally-funded project administration, etc.</li> <li>● Potential schedule showing key dates, program milestones, and critical path issues</li> </ul>	30
<p>2. <b>Evaluation of Experience</b> (0-5 with a weight of 6 for a maximum total of 30 points)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Demonstration of consulting firm’s experience and knowledge in developing and implementing work similar to the Pilot Project Grant Administration requested, including prior experience performing work for the Authority, if applicable</li> <li>● Demonstration of experience with projects that included technical analysis of snow water supply, management, and planning, federally-funded project management, and effective technical communication to a range of audiences</li> <li>● Project Team Profile provided with Table 2 completed</li> </ul>	30
<p>3. <b>Evaluation of Resources</b> (0-5 with a weight of 2 for a maximum total of 10 points)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Demonstration of resources and availability to complete contract requirements within the schedule</li> <li>● Identification of a quality control and quality assurance plan</li> </ul>	10
<b>Cost Criteria</b>	
<p>4. <b>Evaluation of Cost Proposal</b> (Score = 30*(Lowest Proposed Price/Proposed Price))</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Cost proposal is within the budget described in Section 4.3</li> </ul>	30
<b>Total Points Possible</b>	<b>100</b>

## Question Set 2

**2.1 The RFP mentions that the contract may include a single Task Order with the potential for additional Task Orders throughout the Pilot Project Period (ending September 30, 2026) and extending into the Final Report period (concluding January 28, 2027). Could you clarify if the estimated project budget encompasses both the pilot phase and all subsequent activities up to 2027, or is it limited to the duration of the pilot project ending in September 2026?**

The estimated budget encompasses all task orders and activities through the conclusion of the Final Report period in 2027.

**2.2 In Table 3, one of the criteria for evaluating the proposal and approach is "Description and adequacy of engineering methods and approach". Could the Authority elaborate on the scope of engineering services anticipated for this project? Additional insights into the specific requirements or objectives for these services would be greatly appreciated.**

The Authority anticipates that the selected grant administration firm will have extensive knowledge of snow measurement, snow water supply forecasting, and water management engineering. Engineering services may involve intercomparison of snow water supply datasets and forecasts, consideration of future snow data needs, and evaluation of and reporting on results of data generated through the project and intercomparison outcomes as they relate to the five Objectives. Given the pilot nature of the project, exact services required may evolve.

**2.3 Regarding subtask 3, the requirement is for the consultant to 'evaluate results from PWRE's comparison between UCRAF planning outputs and ASO-informed UCRAF planning outputs' as well as 'Evaluate results from PWRE's integration of ASO data into SACS forecast modeling, in consultation with ASO and PWRE'. Could you specify the scope of this evaluation? Furthermore, how involved will ASO and PWRE be in the evaluation process?**

Under the scope of this project, evaluation of planning and model outputs will be focused on reporting results under the NGA reporting requirements, and offering a technical opinion on the value of the data, and possible next steps beyond the Pilot Project as they relate to the five Objectives. ASO and PWRE will both be available to support the evaluation process conducted by the selected firm as needed to ensure complete understanding of the datasets and forecasts by the selected firm.

**2.4 Would the Authority be willing to share information about the members or agencies that constitute the Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC)?**

The Technical Evaluation Committee will consist of three voting members and one to three advisory, non-voting members. All TEC members will have familiarity and/or direct involvement with the Pilot Project, the Authority, and with ASO. TEC members are not yet finalized, so additional details are not available.

## Question Set 3

### **3.1 Can the NGA be provided for review?**

The NGA is included as an attachment to the RFP document. The attachment was added June 25, so if the RFP was downloaded June 24, the updated version will need to be downloaded.

### **3.2 What types of tasks are included in “other grant administration tasks”? How will the scope be managed with this?**

Other Grant Administration tasks may be required to comply with the NGA that are not explicitly outlined in the RFP. Given the pilot nature of the project, exact services required may evolve. The scope of the selected firm’s work will be managed through a “not to exceed” amount in the budget, and through ongoing scope management between the Authority and the selected firm.

### **3.3 Will the successful consultant have a responsibility in managing the grant?**

The Authority has the primary responsibility to manage the grant as the signatory to the NGA. The successful consultant will be responsible for supporting management of the grant as related to reporting under the NGA, and through the tasks described in the RFP.

### **3.4 Do these count toward the page limit: cover, section dividers and table of contents?**

No.