

Questions received about the Economic Evaluation RFP

- **Does GLC have a policy on whether indirect costs are allowed or restricted?**
GLC can and will accept RFPs that include indirect costs in their proposed budgets. If applicant organizations have a NICRA, we will accept the negotiated rate; however, we reserve the right to negotiate a lower rate within the proposed budget if they are selected. We will also accept if applicants choose to voluntarily reduce their rate to increase their proposal's chances of selection/competitiveness with other applicants. If an applicant organization does not have a NICRA, we will accept proposals with no indirect recovery. We will also accept their use of the de minimis rate set by the OMB Uniform Guidance (currently 15% of modified total direct costs)
- **Roughly how many projects are expected to be in the initial list at the start of Task 1?** We can't anticipate how many projects will be submitted but we are hoping to collect a broad range from across the Great Lakes basin.
- **Are the case study candidates all completed projects or also prospective projects?** The project team will be releasing a project mapper in April that will be used to solicit completed projects.
- **Is it possible to provide example data that will be in the dataset for a candidate case?** We will be collecting general project information based on some of the inputs required by the GSI Hub Calculator. We are also asking if project leads will be willing and able to provide additional information that may be needed for all stages of the analysis.
- **Does the 12-page total include the 10 pages for appendices?** The proposal itself cannot exceed 12 pages. An additional 10 pages of appendices are allowed (for an overall total of 22 pages)
- **How much additional research is expected to meet the research questions?**
This will largely be based on the outcomes of the analysis performed using the GSI Impact Hub calculator. Proposals should emphasize the applicant's familiarity with the tool and any additional analyses the applicant feels may be useful to supplement the calculator's outputs in order to answer the proposed research questions.
- **Do the research questions or tasks have a higher emphasis?** The research questions are what have been proposed by the project team to address the overall goals of the evaluation. The tasks are also what have been developed by the team as a logical way to answer those questions. For the application, we would recommend highlighting your familiarity with the Calculator and how your team would be best equipped to both conduct additional economic analyses and disseminate findings to stormwater program managers to increase buy-in of NBS across the region. You may also add additional sub-tasks if you find them necessary or appropriate.
- **For Research Question 4, by "life-cycle cost" do you mean a true life cycle assessment of materials used or just the total costs throughout the project's**

Questions received about the Economic Evaluation RFP

lifespan? This question is intended to mean the total costs throughout the project's lifespan and should provide a comparison between the total life-cycle cost and the estimated cost output from the GSI calculator tool.

- **How big is the Collaborative?** The Collaborative is currently comprised of a Leadership Team (20 members) and 126 subscribers to the Collaborative's listserv. The project team has seven members from the Leadership Team.
- **Is the study restricted to the GL Basin or if it includes surrounding states and provinces?** The study is restricted to projects within the GL basin.
- **Will case studies come from communities from GLC or nominated by partners?** An initial list of projects will be generated from listserv subscribers and partners within each of our Leadership Team members' networks. The selected applicant will work with the project team to develop and apply selection criteria to that list and to identify additional projects for consideration, if needed.
- **Would you please confirm that the award contemplated by this RFQ is a contract for the procurement of goods or services as defined in 2 CFR § 200.33(b)(1)-(5)?**
Yes, this is correct
- **We note that the Proposal Requirements section of the RFQ indicates the Applicant is to submit a budget and estimated costs to complete the work. Later in the Contract and Administrative requirements section, the RFQ states that the selected applicant will be notified and asked to submit a draft SOW and budget for incorporation into the contract. Would the Great Lakes commission please confirm that a summary level budget is requested for the initial submission, while a detailed breakdown will be submitted after selection?**
Correct. We are expecting an initial budget and scope of work to be included in the proposal. Additional details can be discussed and provided during contract negotiations.
- **Would the Great Lakes Commission please confirm that participation in monthly project team calls and biannual meetings, and presentation of project findings at a future Great Lakes Stormwater Collaborative webinar may be supported remotely?**
Yes, the majority of our meetings are virtual. We plan to set up a virtual project briefing with the Leadership Team prior to their in-person meeting that will take place in October.
- **Would the Great Lakes Commission please confirm whether presentation of project findings at a future Great Lakes Stormwater Collaborative will be conducted remotely or in person?**
We are anticipating that the only in-person presentation would be at the Great Lakes Stormwater Collaborative Symposium that will take place in May 2027. The location for that event has not yet been confirmed but may take place in Toronto.

Questions received about the Economic Evaluation RFP

Any other final presentations (to the Leadership Team, to the Standing Committee on Climate Resilience, and during a webinar) would be virtual.

- **Does the Great Lakes Commission have a vision for the consultant's level of engagement with case study stakeholders? Is there flexibility to prioritize development of case studies with high-quality data that clearly supports NBS adoption from a user perspective?**

This will depend on which projects are chosen as case studies and which additional analyses the selected consultant deems necessary to fulfill the overall goals of the evaluation. The GLC is collecting basic information about each project as we compile the initial list. Any additional information will need to be gathered by the consultant, with limited support from GLC staff.

- **Does the Great Lakes Commission have an approach in mind for calculating benefits in cases where project attributes do not align with the calculator's parameters?**

This will be an important criterion to consider when identifying the final case studies. This will also be important to acknowledge as you consider additional analyses that may be needed to fill those gaps.

- **Given that case studies are a type of retrospective analysis, and the calculator is a forward-looking planning tool, how does the Great Lakes Commission envision case studies informing or complementing the user experience of the calculator? Is the intention to adapt benefits calculation approach based on case study findings or to supplement what is already available through the calculator?**

The answer is a bit of all the above. We are expecting to have a full analysis completed that will answer the proposed research questions and fulfill the goals of the evaluation, using the calculator as a stepping stone to identify benefits. We are also hoping that this exercise will identify how the actual outcomes of the case studies can help to inform ways that the calculator could be improved.

- **We assume that Research Question #2 (re. fluctuations in the NPV of GSI) refers to the project level impacts of each case study. Please correct us if that is incorrect.**

Yes, that is correct.

- **We find Research Question #6 to be a bit unclear. Whether estimated benefits meet or exceed the intended purpose of the project may depend on whether the project planners developed goals associated with GSI co-benefits. Can you please clarify the Commission's intent here?**

For this question, we are hoping to learn if the benefits exceed the cost of designing for a specific WQ requirement and/or other desired co-benefits we will learn from the survey.

Questions received about the Economic Evaluation RFP

- **Task 3. “perform additional benefit impact analyses to supplement results provided by the GSI Impact Hub Calculator.”**
 - **Please provide any additional guidance or information about (a) the type or subject of the additional analyses, and (b) number of analyses to be conducted**

This will be up to the consultant. We are expecting proposals to demonstrate an understanding of the outputs from the calculator and the ability to recommend and perform additional analyses that may be needed to provide information that the calculator does not.