

Integrated Nearshore Algal Monitoring RFP #2200016

- 1) *Is the proposed monitoring and assessment program intended to replace, or supplement the periphyton monitoring program conducted by TERC since 1982? Will TERC continue the periphyton monitoring program in parallel with monitoring conducted to characterize attached and free-floating algae under this new program?*

The monitoring program will replace the existing periphyton monitoring program.

- 2) *Which elements, if any, of the existing periphyton monitoring program should/must be incorporated into the new monitoring program to maintain continuity with historical data?*

There is no requirement to include any of the existing periphyton monitoring program. The primary objective/requirement is the tracking status and trend going forward. Agencies are interested in understanding how algae has changed over the last 40 years but recognize that may not be possible.

- 3) *Will the selected bidder have access to all historic periphyton monitoring program data: including raw tabular data, scans of field documents, methods/standard operating procedures, and results of data analysis? Including UTM or Lat/Long coordinates for sampling locations?*

Agencies will work to provide as much of the historic monitoring program information as they can.

- 4) *Will partner agencies assist in securing necessary approvals/permits to meet project objectives?*

Yes. Partner agencies will assist to the extent possible but the primary responsibility for obtaining the permits will reside with the contractor.

- 5) *The RfP states that the expected annual cost for implementing the monitoring program should not exceed \$150,000, and the total project cost (monitoring plan development and two years of plan implementation) cannot exceed \$330,000. We expect the first-year budget may exceed up to 50% of the total project cost, is this allowable?*

Yes. The expectation is that \$30,000 would be used for development and documentation of the monitoring plan and that these costs would primarily occur in year one. Year one costs are not expected to exceed \$180,000.

- 6) *It might be challenging to fit a schedule and cost in a single page. Would TRPA be amenable to adding space to Section 5 of the response?*

Yes.

- 7) *Section 4 of the response (Qualifications and Experience) calls for "a link to additional information". In the interest of clarity, can you expound upon what types of additional information TRPA might be looking for?*

The section is referring to option for vendors to provide a link to similar projects to demonstrate experience implementing similar programs. This could include reports, papers, or monitoring plan results. This is optional.

- 8) *Is the intention that when potential HABs are observed, do you want a toxicity analysis conducted? Or would you prefer that an allowance for that be made? The iron reducing bacteria would be a different analysis completely to identify them. Is that required/desired? In the past few years there appears to be an increase in potential HABs in the nearshore. There have also been observations of iron reducing bacteria (red, noxious smelling pools). These are both issues that concern the public (they are the reason for a great many calls and press attention) and would therefore seem to relate to Objective 3 "Identify changes in the abundance and distribution of algae that may be conspicuous to the casual observer or recreator."*

The program intent was to quantify status and trend of nearshore algae. HABs are outside the scope of the monitoring program and both states have rapid response programs that initiate sampling when visual indicators of HABs are present. Proposals do not need to include a HABs sampling element.

- 9) *The RFP repeatedly references quantifying "abundance" as a primary objective. Would a program grounded in measurement of rate be considered?*

Yes. The reference to abundance was intended to be broad, and a rate-based monitoring program would be considered. At the highest level, the program's intent is to answer the basic question "is there more algae in the nearshore now than there was before?" If rate-based measurement can be used to infer something about the amount of algae, then it would answer the primary questions posed by the RFP.