REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION (RPC)
Of Jefferson, Orleans, Plaquemines, St. Bernard, St. Charles,
St. John, St. Tammany and Tangipahoa Parishes

Questions about Request for Qualifications/RPC Responses

December 3, 2025

RE: Flood Risk Assessment: Geospatial Dataset Development
RPC Task No: LWICB

1. Can you provide a shapefile of the individual project areas shown on Page 2 of the SOW?

A geodatabase of input data including all boundaries will be provided to the selected firm after issuance of a Notice to Proceed. The RPC's Metropolitan Planning Area boundaries are currently available online at **https://www.arcgis.com/apps/mapviewer/index.html?url=https://gis.dotd.la.gov/topo/rest/services/OpenData/Boundaries/FeatureServer/18&source=sd**.

2. Please provide detailed specifications for the lidar data, including the collection date, data density, classification scheme, and quality level.

   There are various dates of collection for complete regional coverage. They are all available through USGS at QL1.

3. What is the spatial resolution of land cover data, the creation date and number of classes, and the accuracy of land cover data?

1-meter land cover from NOAA https://coast.noaa.gov/dataviewer/#/landcover/search/-10063000.72929498,3372266.390604533,-9893866.560932055,3600907.8932165857

4. Do you have existing hydraulic structure in a GIS data format, including culverts within the study area? If not, will RPC be providing any available reference information regarding their location. Finally, if data does not exist is expected that the proponent will collect this?

RPC will provide data regarding state and federal structures. The proponent will not be expected to collect additional data regarding non-state or -federal structures

5. Could you please clarify the preferred or expected modeling approach for this study? Throughout the SOW, there are mixed references to both GIS-based spatial analysis approaches and physically based hydrologic/hydrodynamic modeling tools. For example:

GIS based spatial analysis is the preferred approach but:

   a. *"Supplemental modeling tools (e.g., HEC-HMS, SWMM, Python/R libraries) must produce GIS-importable outputs."*

While ArcHydro is preferred, an RFP refers to our willingness to consider supplemental ideas that would strengthen the development of outputs of the effort as long as they can be integrated with GIS. This allows flexibility in respondents proposal.

b. *"Runoff Coefficient Model: GIS-based mapping of runoff variability across land cover, soil types, and slopes."*

c. *"Classify development intensity into categories based on spatial patterns and thresholds relevant to hydrologic modeling."*

Based on expertise respondent is to propose and work with us to develop a structure for classifying our land cover data into a land development intensity score/index based on relationship with hydrological features.

d. *"Calibration using observed hydrologic data (e.g., flow measurements, flood records)."*

This activity is intended to verify model results by comparing them to historical flood data that is publicly available.

6. To ensure our proposal aligns precisely with the RPC's technical expectations, we require confirmation on the primary modeling methodology for simulating pluvial flooding and deriving the final Pluvial Flood Risk Index. Specifically, is the RPC's expectation to implement:

    a. GIS spatial hydrological analysis: A static, spatial analytical approach where the Risk Index is derived from weighted overlays and GIS-based empirical models (e.g., the Runoff Coefficient Model), without utilizing a time-series, physically-based hydrodynamic simulation engine?

This would be the level of desired outcome RPC is looking for per earlier response and background resources provided.

    b. Physically-based hydrodynamic modeling: The use of established, calibrated modeling software (e.g., HEC-HMS/HEC-RAS or SWMM) to dynamically simulate rainfall-runoff and subsequent flood depths and extents, with GIS utilized primarily for model input preparation and final output visualization and index calculation?

This would not be expected as a deliverable and is intended to allow respondent flexibility in proposing alternative methods based on knowledge and expertise that would strengthen output.

7. It states on Page 12 in Task 10 that validation will be done on external data sets, sensitivity analysis and calculate performance metric such as Nash – Sutcliffe Efficiency. It also

states, "This task is critical to confirming that the final products meet technical standards and are suitable for planning, engineering, and decision-making applications" Our questions are the following:

a. What are the threshold values that the model must achieve to be accepted by RPC

b. Can you provide the technical standards the work must meet

c. Does modeling require an engineering signoff/stamp.

The intention of this is to develop an understanding of the statistical relationship between land development patterns and their impact on run-off. Validation is required to aid an understanding of land development intensity as a possible predictor of runoff generation within the built environment.

As an RFP we are flexible in allowing respondents to determine validation process based on expertise. We understand that there are many alternative methods and we are looking for respondents to provide us with proposals on best approach.

This does not require engineering sign off. This is intended to be a tool for general planning assessments. **RPC data development policy and disclaimers cover potential liability issues that we are aware of in using these outputs for planning purposes.**

8. Page 12 in the objective of Task 9 proponent is to "Provide a planning-level tool for evaluating the impact of land use and infrastructure on flood vulnerability". This is not in the deliverable list, can you please confirm if this is expected, and if it is, could RPC provide details on the requirements of the tools?

Objectives listed under tasks are to help respondents understand the intended use of the outputs and deliverables. The Pluvial Flood Risk Index is the planning tool.

9. Page 5: For "web-based GIS delivery," can the Contractor use the RPC's ArcGIS Online/Hub account?

RPC, does have an ArcHub page that is constructed but not public yet that can host online delivery.

10. Page 1 of the Public Notice mentions, "Credit for DBE participation," however, this is not included in the evaluation criteria on the DOTD form. Will DBE participation factor into the RPC's contractor selection, and if so, how will it be scored?

There are no DBE requirements stated for this project and considerations of DBE participation will not be considered in the scoring.

11. Would the RPC consider extending the proposal submission deadline?

Yes, the deadline will be extended one week to Friday, December 19th, 2025 at 12:00 PM CT.

12. Development of the geospatial intensity-duration-frequency (IDF) curves is listed as one of the project components on p. 3 of the RFP, however, there is no corresponding project task and no description of the scope of this work. Can you elaborate on the scope of this component?

    The Key Activities listed under Task 8 include precipitation intensity duration frequency curves (IDF) under bullet 5. NOAA provides GIS based layers for such. As an RFP we are open to suggestions from respondents who may have better options or approaches.

13. Could you clarify what is meant by the Runoff Coefficient Model in the RFP? Is it referring to the runoff coefficient as used in the rational method in rainfall-runoff modeling? Alternatively, is it referring to the SCS-CN (curve number) method? In either case, what is the envisioned approach to addressing the antecedent moisture conditions (AMC): is it expected that the Runoff Coefficient Model will be specific to particular AMC (e.g. AMC I, II or III as used in the SCS-CN approach)?

We are referring to the rational method in rainfall-runoff modeling with the intention of understanding the statistical relationship between land development patterns and their impact on run-off. See earlier question.

14. Tasks 7 landscape Development Intensity Index is required to quantify the degree of human development across the RPC region. Is RPC's expectation to conduct a basic geospatial analysis of using the identified the geospatial layers in the RFP and classify into categories of intensity development or conduct a more rigours landscape intensity model by applying an energy method based ecological engineering to evaluate natural and human contribution to landscape quantified through energy primarily solar energy?

Geospatial layers identified in the RFP are the basis of analysis. Respondents are encouraged to bring their respective expertise to bear on how to cost effectively produce the deliverable.

15. Can you provide the Hydrological Unit Code level RPC is expecting for the refinement of watershed/sub watershed delineation and Pluvial Flood Risk Index to be developed?

RPC uses HUC 8 as standard for other work. As this is an RFP respondents should propose more detailed units if it can potentially strengthen the output deliverables.

16. Lastly, would you permit both electronic and hardcopy submissions on the due date, provided we include proof of shipment for the hardcopy sent on that date?

Yes, this is acceptable.

17. The RPC is requesting financial information about other existing contracts, which is highly unusual and could be a breach in an existing contract or NDA. Would the RPC consider removing or revising the requirement?

RPC asks the question to ascertain the availability of key personnel the respondent puts forth in the proposal to do the ***actual work***. In lieu of dollar amounts, we will accept "percent complete." All other columns are to be accomplished.

18. For teams that include a subconsultant, on the subconsultant's (i.e., attachment which comes after the Prime's sections) Section 3, we want to confirm whether it should list the prime consultant's firm name, with subconsultant information provided elsewhere in the form, or the subconsultant's firm name directly within Section 3.

Under Item #20 of the provided submittal form, we require only the subconsultant information. Below Item #20, where it states, "Sections 1–9 and 16–18 must be completed separately by each subconsultant and included below," you may list the prime consultant's name in Section 3 as requested, indicate "N" in Section 4, and complete the remaining sections for the subconsultant.