



Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District

International Tower | 229 Peachtree St., NE | Suite 100 | Atlanta, GA 30303

ADDENDUM #1
Consultant Support for District-Wide Stormwater Management Infrastructure Mapping Strategy Project

March 28, 2025

The following questions were received by the March 24, 2025 deadline. Answers to these questions refer to the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District, District, or MNGWPD interchangeably using the language in question as the term selected for response.

Question: 1. Exhibit B – Where should subcontractors be entered on the cost form? Should their hours be included in the Direct Labor section, or in the ODCs section? Or, can we create a separate sub-section on the form specifically for subcontractor costs?

Answer: A separate Exhibit B should be created for each subcontractor. This form should mirror the format of the Prime Consultant's Exhibit B.

Question: 2. How many individual data contributors do you anticipate within the 15-county footprint?

Answer: Task 4 Subtask 1 states that the minimum sources will include an “Open call to Local Governments to voluntarily submit/share GIS data.” The Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District is comprised of 15 counties and 97 cities. The maximum number would be 112 jurisdictions, but it is unclear what the final number will be for this task.

Question: 3. Do you anticipate any field data collection efforts?

Answer: Survey is not part of this Scope of Work.

Question: 4. Does the mapping requirement include only the linear network connectivity, or are Z values required on network structure features?

Answer: Z values are not required on network structure features. However, if they are provided from original data sets, it would be worth noting the availability of Z values for some data sets in the gap analysis.

Question: 5. Is data collection required? Does Exhibit A, Overview, 3rd paragraph: “*project detailed within the Scope of Work, including data collection, analysis,*” reference data gathering of source database to be included in a new database schema and not actual data collection and compilation? Is “*including data collection*” a reference to Task 4, Subtask 1. Please confirm that data compilation and field data collection is not part of the scope of work.

Answer: Data collection, defined as survey, is not part of the Scope of Work. Additional information about the phrase “including data collection” is provided in and a reference to Task 4, Subtask 1. As defined by Tasks 4 and 5, data collection and compilation will be required as part of the Scope of Work.

Question: 6. What is the District thinking the public will use the RSWI map for? Viewing only?

Answer: The final Regional Stormwater Infrastructure (RSWI) Map will be an online GIS Data Browser that lets the public search GIS maps with no special software required. The deliverables for this Scope of work do not include a final (aka complete) RSWI Map. The deliverables of this project may or may not be viewed by the public based on the outcomes of Task 2: Project Advisory Committee. The project advisory committee will provide guidance which should be incorporated into the Task 6 Deliverable: Strategy Document.

Question: 7. Based on research of the District’s Stormwater Forecast it appears that the Forecast performs the stormwater volume gap analysis, and that deliverables from this task (geodatabase) need to store information / data that is utilized inside the Forecast analysis tools for runoff analysis. Please confirm that no integration with Forecast is required, and that this task is only identifying data gaps in a stormwater database that need to be filled so that Forecast analysis can be run separately.

Answer: No integration with the Forecast is required as part of this Scope of Work.

Question: 8. Meetings - Can it be assumed that meetings can be held remotely via Teams?

Answer: The first deliverable under Task 2 Deliverables states, “Consultant attendance and support at four in-person Advisory Committee meetings.” Extenuating circumstances, especially those that would impact the project schedule, may be considered on a case-by-case basis, but is not the preferred format identified in the deliverables list.

Question: 9. Task 2, Subtask 2, 2nd bullet – To understand the needs and concerns of the 15 Counties will we be required to meet with each County to identify requirements, or will the 4 Advisor Committee meetings including 10 Committee members be indicating the needs and acting as representatives for all Counties?

Answer: The Project Advisory Committee will be the primary representatives to provide feedback on the Scope of Work and share insight into future stakeholder coordination. The required meetings are identified in the Task 2 Deliverables, “Consultant attendance and support at four in-person Advisory Committee meetings.”

Question: 10. Task 4, Subtask 1 - Will relevant stormwater source data from the Open Data & Mapping Hub be available for download and used / referenced locally by the consultant.

Answer: Yes, anything on the ARC Open Data & Mapping Hub is available for download and use by anyone for any purpose, including the consultant. This includes items produced by ARC and items produced by local government partners that push to the ARC Open Data & Mapping Hub.

Question: 11. Task 4, Subtask 1 - How many annual reports with associated data will be available for review? Does each County have an annual report data submittal that needs to be reviewed?

Answer: Most local jurisdictions that are members of the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District have Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System Permits that require annual reporting. An optimal outcome for this project would be all annual reports are reviewed, but this may not be possible. Coordination with GA EPD will, in part, dictate what annual reporting data will be available for review. District staff will facilitate coordination between GA EPD and the consultant as needed.

Question: 12. Task 4, Subtask 1 - Will the District facilitate the open call to Local Governments to share data, or is that the responsibility of the consultant?

Answer: The District will make the first open call to Local Governments to voluntarily submit/share GIS data.

Question: 13. Task 4, Subtask 1 - Can the District provide an estimated number of source databases that the consultant will be expected to review and include in a database design / map?

Answer: The number of source databases that will result from the minimum required sources listed in Task 4 Subtask 1 is unknown.

Question: 14. Task 4, Subtask 2 - Is the data presented in the Atlanta Regional Commission Open Data & Mapping Hub Greenspace already included in the portal

Answer: Yes, the Greenspace in Atlanta Region layer is currently available on the ARC Open Data & Mapping Hub. ARC staff continue to update the layer, and the most current version will be made available to the consultant for use on this project.

Question: 15. Task 4, Subtask 2 - Please elaborate what the consultant will be doing with the Greenspace property data?

Answer: ARC Staff update the Greenspace in Atlanta Region layer but may not have identified and collected all existing greenspace property data. If, during the data collection efforts in Task 4, Subtask 1 other greenspace is identified, then it should be proposed for incorporation into the Greenspace in Atlanta Region layer. Ultimately, the Greenspace in Atlanta Region layer should be added to the map per Task 5 and incorporated along with all other data collected into strategy per Task 6, as applicable.

Question: 16. Task 4, Subtask 3 – Can the consultant assume that “the ability to perform basin specific volume management gap analysis using the District’s Stormwater Forecast” means that the task is only a data gap analysis and not a model gap analysis for the Forecast functionality? Please confirm that the consultant will not be integrating with the Forecast model/analysis.

Answer: As part of this Scope of Work, the consultant will not be integrating with the Forecast model/analysis.

Question: 17. Task 5 - Will the consultant be responsible for the migration of multiple source datums into the newly developed database schema?

Answer: Yes, migration of multiple source datums into the newly developed database schema is an expected part of processing spatial data and creating features in a new file geodatabase. Any geospatial data created by the consultant should be using the same coordinate system regardless of the system used in the original source data. For this project, everything should be projected using NAD 1983 State Plane Georgia West FIPS 1002 (US Feet).

Question: 18. Task 5 - Do source databases include attachments such as photographs that may affect posting to a hosted feature layers?

Answer: It is currently unknown whether source databases include attachments such as photographs that may affect posting to a hosted feature layer. Identification of this challenge through Tasks 4 and 5 would be appropriate to discuss in Task 6 as part of the Strategy Document addressing gap analysis, final map elements, and potential security considerations.

Question: 19. After the consultant provides the map package and AGOL feature layers, will MNGWPD staff be in charge of making the map publicly accessible (i.e. publish to ArcGIS Portal and/or the MNGWPD website)?

Answer: The deliverables of this project may or may not be viewed by the public based on the outcomes of Task 2: Project Advisory Committee. In the case that it will be made publicly accessible, the MNGWPD will publish.

Question: 20. Task 5, Subtask 1 indicates that a comprehensive schema is requested for each feature class type (point, line, polygon). Is a schema for each data type also desired? For example, a different schema for greenspace property data and BMP data (though both could be polygons)?

Answer: The first priority is good metadata (Task 5 subtask 1) and a comprehensive spreadsheet for documenting attribute field definitions (Task 5 subtask 4) for all data incorporated into the final map package. It should be documented such that the methodology can be clearly followed. Having a schema for each feature class type (point, line, polygon), as well as each raw data source (MS4 reporting submissions, city parks, etc.) and/or stormwater infrastructure attribute type (ponds, pipes, inlets, GI, BMPs, etc.) would be preferable. However, the consultant's methodology for developing a comprehensive schema will ultimately be decided by consultant based on evaluation of data in Task 4 and limits on schedule and budget.

Question: 21. Task 6 mentions internal and external attributes. Is there a desire to have an internal and external version of the map such that different attributes can be displayed based on the audience/permissions?

Answer: The deliverables of this project may or may not be viewed by the public based on the outcomes of Task 2: Project Advisory Committee and Task 3: Literature review. The guidance from these tasks should be incorporated into the Task 6 Deliverable: Strategy Document addressing gap analysis, final map elements, and potential security considerations.

Question: 22. Is the desire to allow the public to run the MNGWPD's Stormwater Forecast script tool through the public RSWI map? Or is this meant to be an internal tool and ensure the final data can be easily input into the tool for the basin specific volume management gap analysis?

Answer: It would be a desire to allow the public to run the MNGWPD's Stormwater Forecast script tool through the public RSWI Map. However, this Scope of Work outlines tasks to investigate the viability and develop a strategy for creating the RSWI Map. There is a scenario where the culmination of Tasks 2, 3, 4, and 5 lead to the conclusion that this might not be a viable strategy for functionality of final RSWI Map. The deliverables for this Scope of work do not include a final (aka complete) RSWI Map.

Question: 23. We suspect some data will be static copies of geodatabases rather than URLs to live data which means regular updates may be necessary to keep the map current/aligned with the authoritative data sources. Should update guidance be included in the Strategy Document assuming MNGWPD staff may be in charge of keeping the data updated after the project is complete?

Answer: Yes, maintenance of the RSWI Map would be a good topic to include in the Task 6: Strategy Document for developing a strategy for future phases of the project.

Question: 24. Can you please confirm that Exhibits D and E are not to be included as part of our proposal? If Exhibits D and E are to be included as part of the proposal, can you please confirm they will NOT be counted toward the page limit?

Answer: Exhibits D and E are not to be completed or included as part of your proposal. However, the District will expect to move through contracting quickly once a consultant has been selected. Please ensure that your organization is comfortable with all contracting documentation provided prior to submittal.

Question: 25. Is the DBE participation information part of the 10 page proposal text limit?

Answer: DBE participation information is not part of the 10 page proposal text limit.

Question: 26. The level of effort in task 5 will vary depending on the success of data collected in task 4, specifically subtask 4.3. Is it possible to define the scope of Task 5 further once Task 4 has been completed to balance the deliverable goal with the current available funding?

Answer: The District acknowledges that the level of effort required for Task 5 will vary depending on the data collected in Task 4. Given the fixed budget provided for this project, the project manager will coordinate with the consultant to define the level of effort for the remaining tasks to ensure the completion of the project goals.

Question: 27. If a cover letter is provided, will it count towards the total page count?

Answer: A cover letter will not count toward the total page count.

Question: 28. Please confirm if responses to Exhibit D and Exhibit E are included as part of total page count?

Answer: Exhibits D and E are not to be completed or included as part of your proposal. As part of the contract, the selected firm will be required to complete Exhibit D and Exhibit E. Please ensure that your organization is comfortable with all contracting documentation provided prior to submittal.

Question: 29. Under Task 2, please confirm the anticipated meeting length?

Answer: Meetings under Task 2 are anticipated to be at least one hour but no more than two hours.

Question: 30. Under Task 2, confirm what if any expenses should be anticipated by the selected firm vs. expenses that may be covered by the District?

Answer: Task 2 deliverables include, "documentation required by the 319(h) grant of Advisory Committee meetings including meeting invitations/announcements, agendas, attendance sign-in sheets, presentations and handouts, and minutes." Direct expenses incorporated into the project budget by the consultant should ensure the successful completion of this deliverable. There is no specific requirement for expenditures related to meeting rooms.

Question: 31. Under Task 3, if data sharing “agreements / contracts” are required, will the District or the selected consulting firm be designated as the official recipient of the data?

Answer: Data sharing agreements would be approached on a case-by-case basis based on the requirements within the agreement.

Question: 32. Under Task 4, Subtask 2, confirm if this includes an assessment of private properties?

Answer: If there is existing greenspace property data for private properties, it would be included in Task 4, Subtask 2.

Question: 33. Under Task 4/5, will the selected consultant be provided access rights to ARC’s AGOL account?

Answer: The selected consultant will not be provided access rights to ARC’s AGOL account. All necessary Esri software, including an ArcGIS Pro and ArcGIS Online Organization account licensed to the consultant, shall be used to complete tasks. Upon completion, all assets will be migrated to Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) infrastructure and published internally through the ARC ArcGIS Online Organization account.

Question: 34. Task 3 - Will the District act as liaison with relevant governments on this request or will the consultant be solely responsible for coordination?

Answer: The District will act as a liaison for the Project Advisory Committee and will facilitate the first open call to Local Governments to voluntarily submit/share GIS data.

Question: 35. Task 4 - Is there an assumption that no fieldwork is involved in this task, all data shall be digital in nature and sourced from datasets that can be accessed electronically or digitally submitted to the consultant?

Answer: Under Task 4, the consultant will identify and compile existing data required to create the RSWI map and perform a data gap analysis by completing Subtasks 1- 3. There would be no fieldwork (e.g. survey) to generate new data. However, coordination with GA EPD will, in part, dictate what annual reporting data will be available for review. Datasets will be electronic but may not be able to be accessed electronically from consultant offices and may require a visit to GA EPD offices. District staff will facilitate coordination between GA EPD and the consultant as needed.

Question: 36. Task 4 - Will consultant be responsible for identifying data sources and collecting the data for private grey and green infrastructure across the District, or does the MNGWPD already have private data sets compiled and plan provide these to the consultant?

Answer: The MNGWPD does not have private data sets compiled. Consultants will only be responsible for identifying and compiling existing data. If data for private grey and green infrastructure is not available, it should be documented in the Task 4 deliverable: technical memo summarizing identified data gaps.

Question: 37. Task 5: The deliverables involve the creation of an ArcGIS pro project, geodatabase and map that is configured for publishing for online viewing in ArcGIS Online. Is the ArcGIS Online organization this will be published to already in existence or will an organization need to be stood up or provided?

Answer: All necessary Esri software, including an ArcGIS Pro and ArcGIS Online Organization account licensed to the consultant, shall be used to complete tasks. Upon completion, all assets will be migrated to the existing Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) infrastructure and published internally through the ARC ArcGIS Online Organization account, which the consultant will not be provided access to.

Question: 38. Task 5: The deliverables involve the creation of an ArcGIS pro project, geodatabase and map that is configured for publishing for online viewing in ArcGIS Online. A set of configured web layers and map is typically only a component of a web mapping application on ArcGIS Online – is the consultant or the district responsible for designing and configuring a web mapping application to consume and display the web map?

Answer: The District/ARC is responsible for building the web application for hosting on the ARC ArcGIS Online Organization account. The consultant is responsible for providing a final ArcGIS Pro project file and ArcGIS Online items and publishing the final GIS dataset as a hosted feature layer(s) such that internal District/ARC GIS analysts could create an online web map hosted on the ARC ArcGIS Online Organization account. See Task 5 in the Scope of Work for details.

Question: 39. Does the printed hardcopy need to physically arrive at the District's office by 5:00 p.m. on April 14, 2025, or is providing the tracking number by that time sufficient to meet the deadline?

Answer: The printed hardcopy does not need to physically arrive by 5:00pm on April 14, 2025. No later than April 14, 2025 at 5:00 p.m. the District must receive an email c/o Katherine Atteberry (KAtteberry@atlantaregional.org) that contains one (1) electronic copy of the proposal in PDF format AND a tracking number for one (1) printed copy that was sent via a shipping service with tracking.

Question: 40. Can the District please provide a copy of the invoice template provided by GA EPD?

Answer: The District will share the invoice template provided by GA EPD with the selected consultant.

Question: 41. Can the selected consultant invoice the District monthly based on percent complete as stated in the Consultant Agreement (Exhibit C)?

Answer: Yes

Question: 42. In the SOW, task 7, it states, “In subsequent years of the project term, project review meetings will be held annually (if applicable).” Will there be an opportunity to renew with the District for continued work once the 13 months are completed?

Answer: Continuation of this contract will be based on the outcomes of this Scope of Work and funding availability.

Question: 43. Does the District require that either the vendor be a DBE/SBE or have a subconsultant that is a DBE/SBE?

Answer: No. However the District follows the ARC Procurement policies which includes the following DBE Plan: <https://cdn.atlantaregional.org/wp-content/uploads/arc-dbe-plan-2022.pdf>

Question: 44. Can the MNGWP supply a map of the area to be stormwater mapped so that vendors can properly estimate costs?

Answer: An overview of the MNGWPD can be found here: <https://northgeorgiawater.org/about/> For a download of the MNGWPD counties, visit <https://opendata.atlantaregional.com/> and Search: MNGWPD Counties.

Question: 45. Would MNGWP be open to allowing references be excluded from the page count to allow vendors to provide better details for tasks 1-8?

Answer: A references page (e.g. citations) may be excluded from the page count to allow vendors to provide better details for tasks 1-8. Full reference material documents are not citations and would not be excluded from the page count.

Question: 46. Once available data has been collected, is fieldwork expected to fill in the gaps?

Answer: Survey is not part of this Scope of Work.