



CITY OF PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND

Department: Planning and Development

RFP Title: Technical and Scientific Services for Port Shoreline Resilience

Opening Date: 12/16/2024

Addendum #: 2

Issue Date: 12/02/2024

The purpose of this addendum is to disseminate answers to questions submitted regarding the RFP and to clarify details such as budget and timeline specifics. File attached.

Technical and Scientific Services for Port Shoreline Resilience Addendum 2
December 2, 2024
Received RFP Questions and Answers
(Aggregated and sorted by Category)

BUDGET:

Q: What is the anticipated budget?

A: The budget for the services described in the RFP is not to exceed \$233,500.

Q: What is the total grant amount and is there a match?

A: The total NOAA grant amount (it is a “cooperative agreement”) is \$526,680. The neighborhood cohort team work is underway and is managed by Groundwork RI, which is a grant sub-awardee (Save The Bay is the other sub-awardee). There is no match (City time is not compensated by the grant). A core team represented by the City of Providence, Providence Resilience Partnership, and sub-awardees helps manage the overall project.

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT:

Q: Can the City share details of prior public engagement?

A: The already-recruited resident cohort group has been engaged since early 2024 (through Groundwork RI, and to a lesser extent STB) and along with the second and third that will be recruited represent the primary focus of outreach, with the intention that those residents act as connectors to a wider public. Their work and the information gained through this process will be the basis of greater outreach in the form of at least one community meeting and networking. It should be noted that there are other ongoing efforts engaging the public in the immediate area as well; these include the ProvPort Master Plan, the NSF 3CRS project, and quarterly meetings of the Port/Community Working Group.

Q: What is the proposed role of public engagement for the duration of the project, particularly with the resident cohort in the concept design process?

A: See above for broader context. There is no formal process, and concept design and recommendations are not tied to a defined project or funding source in the future, though it may influence decisions.

Q: How has the community relationship with the learning process been developed to date? Have residents and small business owners in subject neighborhoods been engaged?

A: The community relationship to date has focused mainly on outreach for recruitment of resident cohort members and the work of cohort members in collaboration with Groundwork RI, Save The Bay, and numerous presenters with whom they have interacted. Small businesses are a targeted resource, but those connections have not yet been made; the work outlined in this RFP may be used as a catalyst to engage community businesses.

TIMELINE/PROJECT DURATION/MEETINGS:

Q: Are there key milestones or interim deadlines that need to be met?

A: There are no hard deadlines or milestones except those dictated by the terms of the grant period itself (July 31, 2026). That said, the timeline of and interaction with the cohort will likely determine deadlines and milestones.

Q: Given the proposal deadline extension, will the project start (January 2025) and end dates be adjusted? Or are any dates fixed due to the NOAA grant? Could the project be completed in 12 months in lieu of 24 months? Or what is the justification for the 24-month engagement? Will there be any significant review or wait periods anticipated as part of this duration?

A: The start date will be pushed back to February, 2025 and the end date will be July, 2026. (The RFP reference to the end date was incorrect—the grant period ends July 31, 2026.) While the adjusted period for the services in this RFP will run over the course of 19 months, much of the technical work can be frontloaded, and the selected firm will be expected to essentially be on call to engage in iterative processes with the cohort groups and core team to refine concepts and recommendations, as well as participate in periodic meetings.

Q: Could the City provide an anticipated schedule or list of interim deadlines for consultants to align our proposed fee?

A: We anticipate the foundational existing conditions and analysis (with periodic cohort engagement) to take 8-10 months, and the recommendations and design concept work (with cohort engagement) to take place over another 8-10 months. (This is not a rigid schedule and is dependent on unknown factors such as the ease or difficulty of obtaining data, weather, etc.).

Q: Is there a resiliency timeline/forecast year?

A: This project is more general in scope, but a resiliency timeline could be established if there is a desire for that type of definition. Other ongoing projects focusing on the port area may have useful data and assumptions that inform the approach taken.

Q: How many revisions will result from “at least quarterly cohort meetings?”

A: Any designs, prototypes, recommendations are conceptual in nature and not directly tied to any funded or mandated project; therefore, design revisions are fluid and not tied to any particular iteration process, though a schedule may be developed.

DATA COLLECTION:

Q: Will topographic and bathymetric surveys be provided or are these services requested in RFP?

A: These services are requested by the RFP to the extent that they are feasible and beneficial to the project (educationally and for concept design). See also below.

Q: Will documentation of site contamination, site assessment, remediation activities, and land use restrictions be provided to compile, or is obtaining it part of the RFP/project?

A: See below for answers to both questions.

Q: Is it the intention of the City to perform a desk top study and utilize existing available information to formulate existing site conditions to the greatest extent possible, or is the expectation that site conditions are to be formally established based upon field data collection efforts including but not limited to, topographic, bathymetric, geophysical (for vessels/debris), property line, wetland delineation, shellfish/benthic, and/or eelgrass surveys and/or sediment sampling/analysis?

Is inspection of existing port infrastructure required to assess conditions, and will the City obtain required permissions to conduct work?

A: It is our expectation that this analysis and data collection will be a hybrid of the two ways described, and will be based in part on what is readily available, observable from locations such as Collier Point Park, Public Street and by boat, and pertinent to the goals of the overall project.

Because most the land in the subject area is private, it will likely be difficult to obtain significant permissions, and as a result observation may be limited to specific vantage points and data from existing records and other ongoing projects such as the Infrastructure Resilience Planning Framework (IRPF) being conducted in tandem with the ProvPort Master Plan (the IRPF covers all of the port area).

The project is primarily an education/co-learning and engagement effort, designed to better familiarize and connect area residents to the industrial waterfront and to concepts of resilience, habitat restoration meaningful access, and informed involvement in future decision-making.

DELIVERABLES, FORMAT, PROCESS

Q: It is our understanding that all of the work, findings and recommendations developed for this project will be presented at a public meeting; however, are there specific deliverable(s) required to meet City and/or grant requirements?

A: Regarding a public meeting, the overall project is largely for the benefit of residents of port-adjacent neighborhoods and their involvement in a resilient, naturalized and more accessible shoreline. The idea is that ideas generated by the resident cohort groups and the technical/scientific analysis will be presented to the local public—not as a formal meeting or hearing but with significant outreach. We anticipate this would include presentation of preliminary concepts for shoreline restoration, waterside interventions, and public amenities. The overall project has no binding City requirements; the grant agreement is not too specific as to deliverables but we anticipate a concept design or designs as well as a concise report. It is for citizen engagement and co-learning, and ultimately for inclusive planning purposes.

Q: What is the City's vision for the website and its content? Would the site be hosted by the City or by the consultant? Who is responsible for managing the website once it has been launched? How often is the site meant to be updated?

A: A website is just one recommended tool for disseminating findings, recommendations and concepts. It would likely be hosted by the consultant, and there is no preconceived plan for its management and updating, though a plan for doing so (and obtaining funding) could well be part of a proposal.

Q: Is there a preferred format for proposed concept designs?

A: There is no preferred format, but presentations, renderings, etc. should be accessible and portable for presentation to cohorts, the core team, and ultimately a larger public meeting. Because of the conceptual, aspirational nature of anything proposed, the level of refinement can be equivalent to 30% design or less, depending on how the process unfolds. To the extent possible, more than one concept is likely to be preferred.

Q: Is planning for parking/transit/other infrastructure a consideration to support public amenities?

A: While these are factors in any future planning for inclusion and accessibility, it is beyond the scope of this project, which is conceptual in nature. Such factors could certainly influence recommendations and restoration/design concepts.

SELECTION PROCESS:

Q: Is it sufficient to use the forms to present the fee?

A: Yes.

Q: Does the City intend to do interviews from shortlisted firms? Or will selection be solely on proposal submissions?

A: Yes, the intention is to interview shortlisted applicants.

MISCELLANY:

Q: Will the City provide an Environmental Assessment Phase I for the project limits?

A: No, an environmental assessment is not part of this project. As detailed above, the work described is inclusionary, informational, educational, aspirational, and conceptual in intent, and there is no specific development project associated with the overall project or this part thereof.