



Responses to Questions for the Stream Crossing Co-Benefits Research

RFP No.: 2024-USCon-02

RFP Title: Stream Crossing Co-Benefits Research

Point of Contact (POC): Chip Heil (StreamCrossing@pewtrusts.org)

Thank you for your interest in our request for proposals. Below are compiled answers to all questions received. Where questions were similar, they were combined, and we also made edits to language for purposes of brevity and clarity. Please reach out to StreamCrossing@pewtrusts.org should you need anything else.

1. Is there a budget range or award ceiling that can be shared regarding this RFP?

The anticipated budget will be around \$80,000.

2. Is there a maximum timeline for this project or a preferred completion date?

An approximate timeline is as follows:

- a. Detailed research design for all RQs completed by October 15th, 2024
- b. Draft results for RQ3 sent in a short report by January 15th, 2025
- c. Progress report, including any early results available by March 1st, 2025
- d. Report with preliminary results for all RQ by May 1st, 2025
- e. Final results by June 1st, 2025

3. Do you envision or desire to have milestone check ins or working meetings with Pew staff to review drafts, exchange ideas, and otherwise collaborate?

We would anticipate project updates and check-ins, and that we would work that out with the provider as appropriate.

4. What level of detail or state of practice are you seeking in response to RQ1? Is the program looking to conduct independent original research and designs; or, to leverage existing research and designs as a literature review? Or both?

We are looking for a synthesis for RQ1 – not new research.

- 5. For referencing climate and hydrograph data, what is the geographic expectation for data scaling (e.g., global, continental, or regional levels)? Would eastern and western coastal variability meet the need?**

A sampling of references may be appropriate, depending on the degree of variability that exists. If splitting by east and west tells the story, that would be fine. Or, if there are very different trends in hydrographs, we might want to consider referencing others to convey the fact that there are significant regional differences. The point here is to tell the story of whether water passage infrastructure is sufficiently specialized to address climate-informed hydrographs and intensity-duration-frequency (IDF) curves for the life of the asset.

- 6. Regarding the Project Description - No. 3 “Conveying Key Findings in Presentation Format,” are these presentations intended to be virtual, or in-person? This will assist us in determining if a travel budget needs to be included in our cost estimate.**

For the purposes of this budget, the meetings are intended to be virtual. We will likely invite the project team to present in-person as well at relevant meetings/conferences but can address those budget needs separately.

- 7. The RFP states that the respondent should plan for 6-10 presentations and participation in 1-2 conference sessions. Would a “presentation” be considered a virtual presentation of the study findings to an external audience, whereas a “conference session” would be considered a virtual meeting with internal project team members to discuss project progress, approach, etc.? If this is incorrect, could you please clarify the difference between presentations and conference sessions?**

We meant presentations more in a virtual sense, whereas conferences would likely be in-person. Per above, we can address travel costs associated with conferences separately from this budget.

- 8. Could you point to an example of a similar report commissioned by Pew to provide an idea of the approximate level of effort, technical nature, format, etc. that Pew would anticipate for the final report?**

[This commissioned report](#) was done for roughly half of the budget of this proposed project, which might provide a sense of expectations in terms of scope and scale.