



LTBMU Caldor Fire Recovery RFP Written Response to Proposal Questions

Request for Proposal to Provide National Environmental Policy Act Services

Posting Time & Date: Monday April 15, 2024 by 5:00pm

***Please see five DOWNLOAD RESOURCE documents posted 04/15/2024 on the Great Basin Institute LTBMU-Caldor Fire Reforestation Project- NEPA Services [Employment - The Great Basin Institute - Build Your Career](#) to reference alongside this Q&A document to assist in RFP development*

Disclaimer:

Written questions submitted by Monday April 1 at 5:00 pm PST will be responded to in writing by Monday, April 15th at 5:00 pm PST per the RFP and posted to the GBI website page for the RFP. Any question asked and answered during the Zoom meeting on Thursday April 11 at 10:00 am PST will also be added to the written response to questions and posted by Monday, April 15 to the GBI website page for the RFP. No additional written questions will be taken after these 2 separate opportunities to submit questions. If clarification of any GBI written response is needed, GBI reserves the right to provide additional clarification in the form of an addendum to its written responses (as needed). All responses and any future clarification would be posted to the GBI website page for the RFP and are the responsibility of each bidder to download and review.

GENERAL

Q.1: About how many cooperating state and federal agencies (e.g., other landowners, including Bureau of Land Management, state, private) within the project area would be involved in the development of the proposed action?

A.1: Only the Forest Service, (LTBMU) will be involved with the development of the Proposed Action (PA).

Q.2: Is the project site to be evaluated in the EA the 9,885 acres on the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit referenced in the Background section of the RFP?

A.2: The max extent may depend upon IDT determinations for treatment activities. The Project Area will be the entire 9,995 acres of the Caldor Fire footprint located within the Tahoe Basin and could include some portions of unburned forest within or adjacent to the fire perimeter. The IDT will determine the final Project Area footprint. The Project Area would be used for cumulative analysis, overall project acres for analysis needs. The actual proposed treatments are likely to be a smaller footprint and based upon the final set of actions identified in the PA that will be developed prior to public scoping.

Q.3: Is the CATEX available publicly?

A.3: Yes

TASK 1: DATA COLLECTION

Q.4: Please confirm that “next summer” is summer 2024 or summer 2025. This is used under Task 1.2 and Task 1.6.

A.4: Summer 2024. Deliverable is due prior to 2025 field season.

Q.5: Can an estimate be provided of the acreage associated with the “priority areas” under Task 1.2?

A.5: This will depend on IDT determination. Priority areas will be determined based upon the final PA and level of existing information/current surveys already in the project area.

Q.6: Can the meaning of the “RLS day of survey = TBD by the consultant” text under Task 1.2 be clarified?

A.6: RLS: Reconnaissance Level Survey. This will be determined by data gap analysis of IDT as activities are preliminarily scoped and spatially analyzed.

Q.7: Is the “cost per acre by resource” information specified under Task 1.2 also required for Task 1.4?

A.7: Cost per acre- speculation on cost per acre on surveys/analysis requested in all resource areas.

Q.8: Is the LTBMU Climate White Paper referenced in Task 1.10 the same document as the LTBMU Climate Change Trend Assessment? If not, can a copy of the white paper be provided?

A.8: They are not the same. Yes, a copy of the “Carbon white paper” will be provided, it is currently being finalized by a Regional Team and is anticipated to be available in the next few weeks. The reference to “Climate Change White Paper” should say “Carbon white paper”.

Q.9: Can a copy of the “Forest Plan consistency check list” referenced in Task 6.2 be provided?

A.9: Yes.

Q.10: Does the December 8, 2024, deadline for Specialist Reports in the Contract Deliverables and Timelines section apply to the Archaeological Assessment under Task 1.6?

A.10: Yes, all reports are due at the same time.

Q.11: Task 1.2: Will USFS be identifying/providing the priority areas requiring survey?

A.11: Yes

Q.12: Regarding the “complete water quality sampling from data gap sites” under Task 1.5, can the expected water quality parameters and number of sampling sites be specified?

A.12: Not at this time, to be determined by IDT. Not anticipating this need, but protocol and number of sites will be provided if determined to be needed by IDT.

Q.13: Should the “National Environmental Policy Act Guidance on Consideration of GHG Emissions and Climate Change (2003)” referenced under Task 1.10 be replaced by the interim guidance that CEQ published in the Federal Register on January 9, 2023?

A.13: The 01/09/2023 interim guidance is what we are following for this project. I have attached the current NEPA Template and Instructions (see GBI website where these Q&As are posted). There is a new version currently under review, if the new version is approved prior to finalization of a DRAFT EA for public review, we will use the new template for this project, otherwise we will use the current template.

Q.14: Clarifying that GBI is not asking for extensive fieldwork components?

A.14: There will be a data gap analysis but GBI is not anticipating any fieldwork. numerous resource surveys have already been completed to cover other compatible NEPA projects, but some may be needed.

Q.15: What resources might have the most focus for additional fieldwork?

A.15: Wildlife is in good shape (minimal), some botany and heritage may be anticipated.

Q.16: Heritage survey needs, would those be needed this summer?

A.16: LTBMU has been successful with SHPO but likely looking for a heritage report ahead of a NEPA decision, the Forest is not sure what's needed for a NEPA decision versus implementation. LTBMU guesses that the decision would primarily require a report of the existing survey work, they are not sure at this time.

Q.17: The RFP references water quality surveying. Can you clarify what is needed?

A. 17: The FS cannot answer with certainty, but they don't anticipate water quality surveying will be needed. There is already a good amount of water quality monitoring going on. If needed, it will probably include your usual suite of things. USFS is looking to get to a NEPA decision within one year of Scoping, and intends to use the Emergency Declaration (ED) authority, it may include no development of alternatives.

Q.18: Specialist Reports (Tasks 1.2-1.10), what are the intents of those reports? Inventory vs memo vs effects analysis?

A. 18: GBI will specify moving forward once clarified with the LTBMU.

TASK 6: EIS, SCOPING, ETC.

Q.19: Task 1.2 – Will USFS be identifying/providing the priority areas requiring survey?

A.19: Yes

Q. 20: Would GBI/Forest Service resource specialists provide direction regarding the monitoring plan, or would the contractor's resource specialists, in collaboration with GBI/Forest Service, determine the approach?

A.20: Monitoring plan will be developed in collaboration with IDT.

Q.21: Will a template for the monitoring plan be provided, and if yes, about how many pages would the plan be (not including appendices)?

A.21: To be determined by USFS IDT according to Federal framework. We do not have a template to provide and would limit to project level monitoring and utilization of current monitoring programs. The USFS IDT will provide guidance for monitoring.

Q.22: Task 6.3: Do you know at this time/anticipate requiring effects analysis for eliminated alternatives, and if so, are there certain resource areas specifically where you think this may be needed?

A.22: Alternative considered, but eliminated from further consideration will not require analysis. Development of alternatives is not required and is based upon extent of public comment and issues raised, additionally we will seek ED Authority for this project, which could exclude alternatives from being considered in the EA.

Q.23: Can you provide details on the monitoring plan in Task 7?

A.23: USFS expectations are that a robust monitoring plan is not required for this project, the intent is to have a conversation about the protocols we will use, etc... We would like to avoid "monitoring for the sake of monitoring", we do not anticipate a large standalone monitoring portion for this project.

SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

Q.24: Can the "Implementation Plan Draft" deliverable referenced in the Contract Deliverables and Timelines section be clarified?

A.24: USFS and GBI will discuss whether this is something for contractors to develop as a part of the NEPA project.

Q.25: Is the objection filing period expected to be 45 days or 30 days?

A.25: 30 days.

Q.26: Are Tasks 1.2 through 1.10 optional or just Tasks 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, and 1.9?

A.26: All tasks are considered options. Contractor may bid on select resource areas depending on expertise and availability of staff, however, GBI prefers contractors that can provide a full suite of services. GBI will sub-contract services if necessary.

Q.27: Task 4 (page 14) of the RFP states, "...the project record must be provided within one week of the initiating the objection filing period (should an ED be unavailable). Is USFS looking into the use of an ED/exemption for this project?

A.27: ED exception is intended for this project.

Q.28: Is the 15 Page limit for the entire proposal? Does that include resumes and/or past work etc.?

A.28: No. All pages of the Technical Proposal are 8.5 x 11. The single page cover letter, a single cover page, a table of content (if provided), resumes and/or vitae of key staff as well as past performance information does not count towards the 15-page Technical Proposal page limit.

***Please see five DOWNLOAD RESOURCE documents posted 04/15/2024 on the Great Basin Institute LTBMU-Caldor Fire Reforestation Project- NEPA Services [Employment - The Great Basin Institute - Build Your Career](#) to reference alongside this Q&A document to assist in RFP development*