



Responses to Questions for RFP FSLRRD-2026-08-26

Southern Bayside Cities Shoreline Resilience Plan Issued 09/28/2026

Q1. Could OneShoreline please confirm that proposers are not expected to provide a task-by-task methodology describing how each element in Scope 3 (Scope of Work) will be executed? We note that the Section "Planning Approach & Technical Judgment" specifies: "Do not restate the Scope of Work or provide a task-by-task work plan."

A1. Proposers should not restate the Scope of Work or provide a task-by-task work plan (RFP §5.5). The Scope of Work is largely defined by BCD's RSAP Guidelines, and OneShoreline does not need it replicated back to us. For example, we already know the Consultant will submit monthly progress reports and maintain a project decision log. The Scope of Work as stated in the RFP §3 will be used for contracting, along with any revisions a proposer identifies and justifies in its proposal.

Proposers should instead respond to the prompts in §5.5, Planning Approach & Technical Judgment. We are evaluating how a team would do this work: the choices, methods, working relationships, engagement processes, and technical judgment it would bring to the Scope of Work as written. This includes any alternative approaches that would improve delivery or outcomes while staying within the not-to-exceed amount and project timeline. Proposers are strongly encouraged to review the RSAP Guidelines in detail when preparing their proposals.

Q2. Would OneShoreline consider optional tasks and separately priced items beyond the proposed budget?

A2. The total proposed fee, including any optional tasks, may not exceed the maximum contract amount provided in the RFP (§5.7). OneShoreline will not consider optional tasks priced beyond this amount. If a proposer's base scope comes in under the maximum, it may propose optional tasks within the remaining budget. Each optional task should be priced separately from the base scope and include its rationale, cost, and schedule effect, consistent with the Proposal Flexibility provision in §3 (Scope Assumptions). OneShoreline will decide whether to include any optional tasks in the contract as part of contract negotiations. As stated in §6, additional scope will not by itself be evaluated more favorably.

- Q3. Could OneShoreline clarify the intended division of responsibilities between the Technical Consultant and the Outreach Consultant for satisfying the RSAP Equity Assessment Standard? Several scope elements related to community vulnerability, historical inequities, and equity assessments appear to overlap. Additional guidance would help proposers assemble teams and appropriately scope responsibilities.**
- A3. The division of responsibilities is described in §2.3, Table 1 and in the introduction and deliverables of Task 3. The overlap is intentional and reflects a co-creation, equity-centered approach. Proposers should scope their teams to the Technical Consultant responsibilities as written in §3, and their fee should account for the coordination with the Outreach Consultant that those responsibilities required.
- Q4. Attachment D:**
- a. **Is the Non-Collusion and Conflict of Interest Statement (Attachment D) required for all team members or only for the prime?**
 - b. **Please clarify whether proposers should disclose all prior and existing contractual relationships relevant to the project, or only those relationships that may create an actual or potential conflict of interest. If all prior and existing contractual relationships should be disclosed, is there a specific lookback period that should be applied?**
- A4. a) The Non-Collusion and Conflict of Interest Statement is a single declaration, signed by the bidder/prime, covering affiliated firms. b) The Proposer (“bidder”) must declare “actual or potential conflict of interest relationships that pose substantial risk... to provide objective services in the best interest of the project.” If such conflict of interest exists, the bidder must disclose the contractual relationship.
- Q5. Can you please provide more detail on the preferred technical areas of expertise for the Senior Technical Reviewer role? Are you looking for an experienced planner or engineer for this role?**
- A5. The RFP is intentionally discipline-flexible, so there is no preference for a planner or an engineer. Proposers should put forward the person they believe is best qualified for the role, provided they meet the experience requirements in the RFP. That choice will be evaluated for how well it supports the proposed approach and independent quality review.
- Q6. SOW Task 5.1 – Adaptation Strategies and Pathways states, “evaluate and prioritize adaptation alternatives using and evolving OneShoreline’s planning framework.” Can you please clarify whether the “planning framework” refers to a pre-existing document or plan guidance?**
- A6. The planning framework is not a single document. It is being developed through OneShoreline's ongoing work in the Colma Creek and San Bruno Creek watersheds, and it

includes evaluation criteria, metrics, and consistent terminology for adaptation measures and strategies. Other OneShoreline-led Shoreline Resilience Plans that precede the 5 Cities Plan will further refine the framework in consultation with BCDC.

The framework's purpose is consistency across OneShoreline's planning efforts, so that San Mateo County's Subregional Shoreline Adaptation Plans use common methods and language and work together as a regional approach. The Consultant is expected to apply the framework and help evolve it where the planning area's conditions and stakeholder input call for refinement, while keeping it consistent across projects.

Q7. Section 3.1.1. Scope Assumptions. Can you please clarify the what OneShoreline means by "enhanced planning-level descriptions and Regional Project Database-ready information"?

A7. Refer to the RSAP Element G1(d).

Q8. Task 4.2. Should a proposer anticipate that a singular compound flood event be paired with each sea level rise scenario, or does OneShoreline want to evaluate multiple compound flood events of differing magnitude?

A8. OneShoreline is interested in compound flood events of differing magnitude. More frequent events under near-term sea level rise may drive projects through 2050, while larger events under higher sea level rise may inform longer-term strategies and adaptation pathways. Proposers do not need to identify specific events at this stage. Instead, they should describe how they would determine which events to evaluate in their response to the Compound Hazards & Uncertainty prompt in §5.5, and state an assumed number of scenarios for pricing in the Pricing Assumptions (Appendix A). The final approach will be confirmed with OneShoreline during scope negotiation.

Q9. Task 5.3. Please confirm if the order of magnitude cost estimate will consist of only construction costs to build the alternatives or whether implementation costs (e.g. design, permitting, legal, construction management, etc.) should be included as well?

A9. Refer to the RSAP Standard F2(a).

Q10. Task 4.2. When evaluating compound flooding the major drivers will be riverine and coastal conditions. A rising groundwater table will also have effects on both coastal and riverine flooding. Is OneShoreline looking for the effects of elevated groundwater to be included within the compound coastal and riverine flooding analysis? If so, additional modeling may be required.

A10. Refer to the RSAP Minimum Coastal Flood Hazards (§3.3.1). OneShoreline does not expect this Plan to include new, fully integrated compound flood modeling that combines coastal, riverine, and groundwater drivers. That level of modeling takes significant resources and time, and current state funding for Subregional Plans is not enough to support it region-wide at this stage. Further, the Ocean Protection Council grant for this effort clearly does not

accommodate integrated groundwater modeling for the entire multi-jurisdictional Planning Area.

There are many tradeoffs in deciding where a deeper analysis is warranted. OneShoreline is looking for a consultant who can demonstrate the judgment to determine what can reasonably be accomplished within this Plan's budget and schedule to meet RSAP requirements, and what should be identified for future study.

Q11. Section 5.3. Can the Senior Technical Reviewer be drawn from a subconsultant firm rather than the prime, and can that individual belong to a firm that otherwise contributes to production on the relevant task, provided the individual personally holds no production responsibility for the work being reviewed?

A11. Yes.

Q12. Section 6.2. Is the 40% weighting for the Planning Approach & Technical Judgment section distributed evenly across each of the 5 questions?

A12. The evaluation criteria contain no further breakdown of weighting beyond what is provided in §6.2, Table 8 of the RFP.

Q13. Section 6.3. Interview & Reference Checks: Do all key personnel need to attend the in-person interview?

A13. Key personnel, as defined in §5.3 footnote, should attend and should tentatively hold the interview dates stated in §4.1, Table 3. Specifically, Required Project Function key personnel (Table 4) must attend, while attendance by additional key personnel are the proposer's choice.

Q14. Attachment A. The available hydrology and hydraulics models included in Attachment A appear to cover the full study area (OLUs 24 and 25). Can you please confirm these models, together, cover the entire shoreline and creek systems within OLU 24 and 25?

A14. Per Attachment A, OneShoreline does not confirm full coverage. While we are working with the cities to gather all available models, coverage will vary. Evaluating the extent of coverage gaps is the Consultant's role.

Q15. Attachment A. When confirming model platform/version for all available models, is it also possible to confirm whether the models are 1D, 2D, or simply nodal?

A15. OneShoreline cannot provide additional information on existing models beyond what is included in Attachment A at this time. Proposers should base their approach and assumptions on the information in Attachment A and their own knowledge and expertise. Confirming model details is expected to be part of the consultant's review of existing information during the project.

Q16. Attachment B. Please confirm that the "Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)" in the OPC grant summary refer to the same body as the RFP's Implementation Partner convenings, or is it a separate group?

A16. For the Consultant's scope of work, the 'Implementation Partner convenings', as defined in RFP §2.3, are the applicable engagement structure. Where the RFP and the OPC workplan differ, the RFP governs.

Q17. The RFP provides ranges for several proposal-pricing assumptions, including 6–8 priority geographies/systems/corridors, 8–12 adaptation concepts evaluated, 6–8 strategies advanced, and 3–4 City Resilience Team meetings per city.

a. Please clarify if 6-8 enhanced planning-level descriptions are per priority area, or across the whole planning area?

b. To provide a consistent basis for comparison among proposers, can OneShoreline identify the quantities proposers should use for pricing each of these items?

A17. a) The quantities in the Scope Assumptions (RFP §3.1.1) are totals across the whole planning area. b) Proposers should use their best judgment and state any additional assumptions needed to support their level of effort, in the Pricing Assumptions section of Appendix A. OneShoreline will evaluate proposed level of effort and staffing for fit with the proposed approach and Consultant assumptions, consistent with the Cost & Value evaluation criterion (§6.2, Table 8).