



Bull Run Creek RM 0.5 Design

North Fork John Day Fish Habitat Project

RFP No. 2023-02-411

Responses to Requests for Clarification:

What was the recent 2023 BRC implementation cost?

- 1.6 million.

What is the purpose of doing more extensive topographic surveys in addition to LiDAR?

- Ground truthing LiDAR and establishing control points for design and implementation.

Who does CTUIR use for plants and plantings? Do you have a large stock of seed?

- When purchasing plants, CTUIR uses the CTUIR Native Plant Nursery. If a planting and propagation contract is flown, it can be through a single company outside of CTUIR.
- No seed on hand but have a source for seed and have collected seed for growth at tribal nursery.

What is CTUIR's goal with Cross-sectional data collection?

- Ground truthing LiDAR.
- Monitoring and adaptive management plans that we need to adhere to and report.
- Hydrologic monitoring if not pulled from LiDAR data.

What do you foresee to be the largest challenge with BRC RM .5?

- Cut fill balance ratios to minimize costs and locating places to waste tailings on site or off.

Describe permitting and consulting requirements and who it will fall upon?

- ARBO will cover consultation with the services and Fill/Removal will be covered by USFS programmatic BOs including the 1200C. Oregon SHPO consultation will be covered through the USFS and/or CTUIR.

Any floodplain related permitting needed? Who is the floodplain administrator for Grant County? Are there any issues involving FEMA or flood insurance?

- Grant County planner needs to sign off on planning aspects of permits. We are unaware of any FEMA involvement, though it could apply in the town of Granite.

Are scour analyses required on the culverts that will be replaced on private lands?

- Assume so.

GAAP Process?

- There is no GAAP for this area. JDBP ATLAS prioritization and 2012 BRC action plan have been used for planning purposes.

Is the schedule timeframe flexible? One year is a pretty short timeframe.

- Ideally will occur within one year, though we can make allowances for extended time if needed.

Is there any flexibility on all 5 design phases?

- We will adhere to ARBO requirements. All 5 could be more useful in dealing with the landowners.
- The RFP's timeline was a first cut based upon estimated fund availability. Non-BPA funds and BPA contracting efforts may extend the estimated timeline.

Is there any need for assistance from the design contractor with landowner outreach?

- In the past CTUIR has not had any need for that so assume not though design step meetings may include questions from private landowners.

How do you pronounce Kuckucéepe téekin? What is the meaning?

- We can provide a recording of the pronunciation if anyone is interested. It roughly translates to "Small Meadow Place".

What level of wetlands assessment is required?

- CTUIR staff had a brief conversation with Oregon DSL which suggested a wetland delineation will not be required. Rather a 1:1 comparison between types and area of wetland lost vs gained. To address this, non-riverine wetlands will be incorporated into the design.

Do polygons in imagery in RFP reflect site boundaries?

- Not necessarily. Polygons were created to portray approximate private and public lands north of the Grant County 24 Road. Federal lands and possibly private lands south of the road may be fair game and quarries up to six miles distant may be available for wasting tailings on federal lands.

Has there been an analysis of tailings relative to pre-disturbance floodplain surface?

- We've not found strong evidence of pre-mining site conditions though historic imagery suggests stringer meadows existed to some extent.
- For the project we implemented this past summer an REM and GGL process was used to estimate cut and fill. This exercise indicated leveled tailings would lift Bull Run Creek ~6' near to remnant floodplain surface elevations. There are relic floodplain surfaces within the project area so we assume a similar exercise would produce similar results.

Is the DEM the same as the 2021 LIDAR that is referenced in the RFP? We noticed the lateral extents of the DEM are about 500 to 700 feet narrower on each side of the creek than the LIDAR shown in the RFP.

- The USFS DEM was produced from USFS 2021 LiDAR. LiDAR shown in the RFP was secured in 2015 by the CTUIR. The selected contractor will have access to all LiDAR data.

The design contractor for our effort upstream of this site reprocessed the data to a 1' gradation.

- I brought that up as something we've dealt with in the past which may need to occur again based upon the data used. I'm not familiar with the USFS LiDAR data beyond its existence.

Would you expect portions of the channel contours to be missing? (see images #2 and #3; the flowline is added from the National Hydrography Dataset)

- I am not familiar with the extent of the USFS's 2021 LiDAR relative to the DEM. If it's inadequate for design the CTUIR 2015 data can be used with ground truthing.

Are you open to a reduced number of design phases, assuming this is acceptable with project permitting processes?

- For the purpose of this RFP assume a 60% design will not be required.

Can you provide any clarification on the Federal Highways design and construction timeline?

- Hopefully 2024 though more likely 2025 as collaborators are still seeking funding.
- Grant County, USFS, and CTUIR and USFS have not yet had detailed since finding out the counties last grant application was not funded.

Can CTUIR share documentation of soils and substrates encountered on nearby tailings restoration projects?

- Tailings are generally rocky on top with more fines as one works down through the profile though not fine and consistent enough to deny water movement through the tailings. We have run across good soil in a small area this past summer.

Regarding the wetlands task: Our understanding is that the CTUIR and WWNF will oversee and process state and federal permitting under ARBO/HIP, with technical materials provided by the contractor?

- The USFS's ARBO programmatic will be used for consultation with the services. The USFS/CTUIR will deal with any Fill/Removal permit application though cut/fill volumes will come from the selected design contractor.

Regarding the WWNF bridge design plans, most of the design has been performed, but there are some missing details. Please clarify:

1. Based on the 95% plans provided, most of the bridge design appears to have been performed. It was noted during the site tour that two bridge crossings are to be taken to construction as part of this project. Please identify which specific crossings, or is the intent for the bridge design contractor to complete the entire design package as provided to 100% design level, ready for bid?
 2. Will the bridge design contractor be required to stamp the design plans? If yes, then please confirm that the WWNF will provide copies of all calculations and materials relied on to produce the design to date.
 3. Can the WWNF identify which specific design sheets still need to be (i) created, and (ii) completed to 100%?
- The Grant County 24 road culvert replacements are not a part of this design contract. They were mentioned as something that will occur, hopefully, within the next two years through a joint Grant County/USFS/CTUIR effort.

Regarding private land stream crossings: Can you confirm the number to be replaced = 1? Is there a preference for type of replacement?

- Landowners agreed to cooperate to the 30% conceptual design step. Any cooperation beyond that is not certain, hence, the estimated number of culverts were stated in Task 5. For the purpose of this RFP use the information provided and any adjustments will be made as more information becomes available.

Regarding private land stream crossings: Are any new crossings proposed?

- At this point only two crossings do not currently exist. On Parcel 600 two culverts were misidentified as going across Bull Run Creek when it's actually one across Bull Run Creek and another across Corral Creek.

Question 1 - In Section 2.21 – TASKS - Tasks are listed in Numeric order, however, the numbers Task 3 and Task 5 are listed twice.

Task 3 – Prepare Design Plan Set

Task 3 – Develop Design Report

Task 5 – Develop 60% to 100% Designs on Private Lands

Task 5 – Develop USFS 7366 Road Culvert Design

- Task 1 - Topographic Survey Project Area
- Task 2 - Hydraulic Modeling and Hydrologic Assessment
- Task 3 - Prepare Design Plan Set
- Task 4 - Develop Design Report
- Task 5 - Conduct Wetland Assessment
- Task 6 - Develop 80% to 100% Designs on Private Lands
- Task 7 - Develop USFS 7366 Road Culvert Design
- Task 8 - Hydrologic Connectivity and Tailing Composition
- Task 9 - Implementation Oversight/As-Built

Section 2.5 Required Proposal Components states “For the purpose of this RFP, prospective contractors will submit a proposal package (**maximum 40 pages**) to the Administrative Contact (see Section 1.4) that includes the following components:

- A. Cover letter**
- B. Executive summary**
- C. Proposed method of task completion**
- D. Qualifications and experience**
- E. Project Schedule**
- F. Price Quote**
- G. References**

Are Resumes in support of Section D and our General Terms and Conditions considered as part of the 40-page maximum, or can they be attached in an Appendix and not included in the page count?

- **Part of the 40 pages.**