



Request for Proposals: OneShoreline
Regarding: Master Services Agreement for Brisbane Shoreline Resilience Planning

RFP Number: FSLRRD-2026-04-10A

Responses to Questions (Q&A 1)

Issued: May 8, 2026

Q1 Will OneShoreline be providing the selected consultant team with the H&H models needed for application on this project?

A1 The H&H model developed for the Brisbane Lagoon will be provided to the Consultant; however, the Consultant is expected to conduct appropriate QA/QC and identify any gaps required to complete the vulnerability analysis.

Q2 For TO#2, Will SERC, NERR, and EOS produce conceptual and 60% design drawings suitable for use by the technical consultant for permitting, quantity takeoffs, and cost estimates; or is the Technical Consultant expected to produce the drawings and information needed? Our experience working with research organizations is that they would typically lead concept development and alternatives analysis supported directly by a design and permitting partner tasked with producing required engineering calculations, drawings, costs, and permit documents. Can you please elaborate on the scope of work for TO#2?

A2.1 *Scope, Approach, Budget for TO2:* As described in RFP 3.3 Proposal Requirements, Required Content, **proposers are only required to provide a scope and budget for Task Order 1.** Task Order 2 scope and budget will be developed collaboratively with the selected Consultant following Measure AA grant execution, with TO2 notice to proceed anticipated to align roughly with the completion of the adaptation strategies phase under TO1.

The design deliverable for TO2 is 30% concept design, not 60% or final design. Specific responsibilities such as drawing production will be defined during TO2 scoping. Consultant effort associated with TO2 scope development is not a compensable activity under TO1.

As part of TO1, proposers are expected to develop and evaluate nature-based adaptation strategies consistent with RSAP Minimum Standards requirements, as described in the RFP

3.3 Proposal Requirements, Section 4. Proposals should clearly describe how the TO1 planning process and early-phase work will support implementation of a living shoreline alongside other potential adaptation strategies, including how relevant Living Shoreline Project (LSP) elements will be investigated and integrated into the TO1 workstream.

However, baseline data collection for the LSP will occur concurrently with TO1 and may not be available to inform early TO1 deliverables. Proposers should therefore describe an approach that allows the Plan to advance on its own schedule through the vulnerability assessment and early adaptation strategy phases, independent of LSP data availability.

A2.2 *Working with Research Partners on TO2:* The consultant's general characterization of the research partner and design consultant relationship is correct. ERC, NERR, and EOS will lead concept development and alternatives analysis. The Technical Consultant is expected to apply the research partners' scientific findings to produce the engineering calculations, drawings, cost estimates, and permit documents required for permitting and implementation, consistent with the division of labor described in RFP. The Technical Consultant is expected to apply the research partners' scientific findings to produce deliverables consistent with the high-level scope of the provided TO2.

Q3 RFP refers to subtasks but the scope does not include subtasks. Can you please clarify if you expect consultants to come up with subtasks?

A3 Proposers may suggest subtasks as necessary to support milestone management and closeout, and other project management needs.

Q4 Section 4 of the proposal only specifies detailing the scope of work for Task Order 1. How should Task Order 2 scope of work be included in the proposal?

A4 See A2.1

Q5 Task 4 specifies alternatives will be evaluated using OSL's planning framework. The Project Context document also states that OSL is creating an evaluation framework. Can proposers assume the consultant does not need to develop an evaluation framework and will be using OSL's framework for project evaluation? Does the same apply to the project prioritization task of Element G?

A5 Proposers should assume that OneShoreline's evaluation framework will serve as the foundation for adaptation strategy evaluation under Element D. The Technical Consultant is not expected to develop a new framework but should build on the framework to propose Brisbane-specific refinements or metrics and apply it to the local context. The existing framework should be treated as a starting point, not a finished product. Element G project prioritization is related but distinct. It draws on the strategy evaluation work in Element D, but the project list needs its

own criteria, scoring methodology, and documentation that is developed to a standard suitable for TAC review, BCDC submission, and City action.

Q6 Given that the TO 2 scope will not be fully detailed until after grant execution, to what level of detail does OSL expect the proposed TO 2 budget to be line itemed at this time?

A6 See A2.1

Q7 How many TAC meetings should the consultant assume? In addition to the 3 community workshops, how many outreach events or meetings are expected to occur (with ARO, other stakeholders, etc.) Which, if any, of the meetings are to be in person?

A7 See Addendum 1.

Proposers will have different approaches and should propose the number of TAC meetings and adjacent jurisdiction coordination meetings they determine necessary to support meaningful technical engagement throughout the project, consistent with the scope and timeline described in the RFP. OneShoreline does not prescribe a minimum number for these meetings and will evaluate proposed assumptions as part of the technical approach.

Community workshops (3) are expected to be held in person. TAC meetings should assume an in-person format for the project kickoff, with additional meetings conducted in a hybrid format. Adjacent jurisdiction coordination meetings may be conducted virtually. As a general practice, OneShoreline prioritizes in-person meetings whenever feasible.

Q8 A tentative schedule of deliverables is provided in the Work Plan. The draft chapters specify “with BCDC comments”, does this mean the deliverable is the public draft version and include revisions from BCDC comments?

A8 See Addendum 2. The Draft chapter (RSAP Elements A-G) deliverables are revisions of the Administrative Drafts that incorporate comments received from BCDC from consultation milestone meetings. OneShoreline Staff will work with the selected team to review and prioritize comments and provide direction regarding revisions.

Q9 The RFP states OPC & BCDC will review the chapters at 3 milestones (B&C, D, A-G). This conflicts with the schedule in the Work Plan which states Draft Chapter A with BCDC

comments to be delivered early in the schedule. Please clarify if Chapter A will have its separate OPC/BCDC review or be reviewed at the end with the full Plan.

A9 See Addendum 3.

Q10 Can you clarify if there will only be 1 public review period for the entire draft plan? Or 3 public review periods, one for each BCDC consultation milestone?

A10 As described in RFP 4.3 Delivery Review Process, Review Periods, there will be a single (1) 45-day public review period of the Public Draft Plan. The BCDC milestones are agency consultations that inform plan development, not public review periods. Community workshops (3) are led by the Outreach Consultant to gather public input but do not constitute formal public review periods.

Q11 Beyond the RSAP atlas and San Mateo County's 2018 Sea Level Rise Vulnerability assessment, what city and county data are available for the vulnerability assessment?

A11 As emphasized in the RFP and during the pre-proposal workshop, the Brisbane Shoreline Resilience Planning Context document (Attachment A) and the Additional Resources therein identify the known datasets, studies, and mapping products relevant to the vulnerability assessment.

Q12 What long term capacity building outcomes are desired for OneShoreline and Brisbane as it relates to climate resiliency?

A12 OneShoreline intends for the planning process itself to build long-term capacity. Through TAC and community engagement, iterative development of technical findings, and shared decision-making at key milestones, the process will strengthen technical understanding, interagency coordination, and alignment around priority vulnerabilities and adaptation strategies. By Plan adoption, the goal is for TAC members and the broader community to be positioned to advance coordinated implementation through sustained multi-agency partnerships.

Q13 Could you clarify whether the technical consultant's design role under Task Order 2 is limited to concept level design, or if it includes elements of final design? We want to

ensure our level of effort aligns with the intended design coordination role described in the RFP.

A13 See A2.1

Q14 Are there any assumed or anticipated future regional projects that the City of Brisbane is expected to account or rely on for delivering this plan (beyond alignment with other regional adaptation plans, and contamination mitigation)?

A14 See A11.

Q15 What contingencies exist if engagement of interagency coordination is a higher level of effort than expected?

A15 No contingency funding is available for interagency coordination or any other scope element. OneShoreline, the City of Brisbane and the TAC carry significant interagency coordination responsibility under this contract, as described in Table 1 of the RFP.

Q16 Please clarify the level of detail requested to be submitted in relation to Task Order 2 (including scope, approach, and detailed fee).

A16 See A2.1

Q17 Please provide more information about Task Order 2 and how we should integrate the work of the Living Shorelines Research Partners into the Subregional Plan schedule. What does the data collection/analysis contain (e.g. bathymetry, biological assessment, and/or wave data/modelling)? When should the selected team expect to receive data analysis and alternatives?

A17.1 See A2.1

A17.2 *LSP Data Collection, Analysis and Delivery:* OneShoreline will procure a separate consultant to complete bathymetric survey while Scientific Research Partners will lead the biological assessment and wave data collection. Data will be made available to the selected Consultant as it becomes available.

Q18 One of the deliverables in Task 4 is listed as "Memorandum summarizing engagement and public comments on Public Draft". Can you confirm this is a deliverable that the technical consultant is responsible for as part of this contract, or if it is meant to be a task for the outreach consultant selected for the Community Engagement and Communications Services on-call contract?

A18 Confirmed. As the primary author of the Public Draft, the selected Consultant is responsible for documenting the technical aspects of the Consultant's engagement contributions and address

comments received during the public comment period. Community input summaries from engagement events are a separate deliverable produced by the Outreach Consultant.

Q19 Given that the Baylands development is a major stakeholder, how will they be engaged in the process?

A19 OneShoreline and the City of Brisbane will lead targeted engagement with decision makers and landowners in the project area, with technical support from the Consultant team as directed. The Consultant team will be invited to participate in public outreach efforts coordinated by the Outreach Consultant. Any project-specific engagement with Baylands stakeholders will occur at the staff level.