



DRBC Request for Proposal: WRRP Phase 2 Consultant Questions and Answers (Q&A) Document for Prospective Bidders

Note: In several cases where multiple bidders posed a similar question, we have combined them into a single question for this Q&A, so the wording may not match the exact question that was received in every case.

Q: May the deadline be extended to ensure there is sufficient time to incorporate any resulting clarifications or revisions into the technical approach and cost proposal?

A: Yes. The deadline has been extended by one week to 4:00, Eastern Time, on Friday, April 24, 2026.

Q: Is [type of organization] eligible to bid? Do you have a preference for working with a specific type of organization?

Any organization with relevant experience (as outlined in the RFP's Submittal Requirements) is welcome to apply. DRBC does not prefer a specific type of organization and will evaluate proposals based on the project team's approach, experience, qualifications, and proposed budget (i.e., on their technical and cost proposals).

Q: Are internationally headquartered organizations and/or service providers eligible to bid?

A: Yes.

Q: Does DRBC have a budget in mind for this scope of work that can be shared with bidders?

A: DRBC is not establishing a budget at this time. We prefer to have each bidder provide a budget corresponding to the bidder's approach for achieving an excellent product within the parameters we have described. Bidders are welcome to provide multiple alternatives in terms of level of effort and associated cost.

Q: Can attendees of the pre-proposal meeting (held March 26, 2026) see a log of who attended the meeting?

A: Yes, DRBC staff have circulated the list of Zoom attendees via email with all meeting participants.

Q: Will the pre-proposal meeting (held March 26, 2026) be recorded and released?

A: The meeting was not recorded. The slides presented are available at the DRBC website: https://www.nj.gov/drbc/library/documents/RFP_WRRP_PreProposalMtg032626.pdf. This Q&A document includes all questions asked during the meeting.

Q: Will DRBC be conducting interviews as part of the selection process?

A: DRBC will conduct interviews only for the highest ranked bidders. This process may also include a request to give a brief presentation.

Q: Can two (or more) organizations submit a bid in collaboration? If two organizations were to apply in collaboration, would selection of a primary consultant with a sub-contractor be preferred?

A: Yes, multiple organizations can jointly apply. DRBC has awarded contracts to project teams of this kind in the past. For ease of administration by DRBC, if two or more organizations choose to submit a joint bid, it is required that one be identified as the prime contractor and the other (or others) be identified as subcontractor(s).

Q: If two organizations plan to submit a collaborative bid, is it ok if only one of them attended the mandatory pre-proposal meeting? Is it ok if the subcontractor (not primary consultant) was the one who attended?

A: Yes. A representative of each potential bidding team must have attended, but not necessarily each member of the team. Every bidding team must include an organization that was represented at the meeting.

Q: Was the Water Resources Resilience Plan [Phase 1 report](#) produced entirely by DRBC or was it supported by a consultant?

A: The Phase 1 report was developed entirely in-house by DRBC staff, without the support of a consultant.

Q: Is DRBC anticipating that the selected consultant would create/develop novel modeling tools, or would we leverage existing modeling by DRBC?

A: In the interest of completing Phase 2 in a timely and cost-efficient manner, it is anticipated that Phase 2 will not include the development of new modeling tools or the expenditure of substantial effort to improve existing ones. Rather, the intention is for Phase 2 to rely as much as possible on performing analyses with existing data, tools, and models. Although we are open to model improvements that do not require substantial effort, any novel technical development that would be required for a more complete analysis should be identified as a recommended action as part of Task 3 (Gap Analysis) of the scope of work.

Q: What models and data will be available for the selected bidder to use to complete this work? Are there specific models that are expected to be applied in this work?

A: Table 4-1 in the Phase 1 report ([A Framework for the Delaware River Basin Commission's Water Resources Resilience Plan](#)) lists the proposed data sources that DRBC staff have compiled to evaluate the impacts to the basin's water resources of the climate change hazards we have identified. Other tools that DRBC staff have developed or applied could be available for this work as well:

- Sea-level rise
 - DRBC Hydrodynamic model to evaluate salinity and sea-level rise: <https://www.nj.gov/drbc/programs/flow/SLR-impacts-report.html>
 - NOAA/NASA future flooding tool: <https://sealevel.nasa.gov/flooding-analysis-tool/projected-flooding?station-id=8545240>
- Water quality
 - DRBC linked hydrodynamic and eutrophication model: <https://www.nj.gov/drbc/programs/quality/designated-use.html#8>
- Drought
 - DRBC tools to characterize historical and future meteorological drought indices, such as Standardized Precipitation Evaporation Index (report forthcoming in spring 2026).
- Hydrologic modeling
 - DRBC staff recently explored use of an existing HEC-HMS model for the Delaware River Basin that was calibrated for flooding. It is possible that a version of this model, linked to HEC-ResSim, could be applied in Phase 2. This hydrologic model is not well-suited to model low to moderate flows.

Q: Would DRBC be open to using existing models and/or data sources not included in the Phase 1 report?

A: Yes. DRBC staff have identified proposed data sources to be used in completing Phase 2 and are open to incorporating additional existing tools. The scope of work for Phase 2 does not include developing a new model or tool or expending substantial effort to improve an existing model or tool.

Q: The Phase 1 Report indicates that the vulnerability assessment will rely on existing data and tools. Can DRBC confirm whether Phase 2 is intended primarily as a synthesis and interpretation effort, and whether proprietary datasets that require licensing or are controlled by a sole-source owner should be excluded from consideration?

A: Yes, Phase 2 is intended primarily to synthesize and interpret existing datasets and future projections, as well as to identify additional data or tools that may be needed for future work. DRBC's Phase 2 reports and data will be made public. As such, proprietary datasets requiring a license or separate agreement would be considered only if the owner agrees to DRBC's use and publication of the data, as well as analytical results relying on that data, at a reasonable cost (i.e., within the bidder's proposed budget).

Q: Phase 1 includes Table 4-1 identifying proposed data sources for evaluating each climate change hazard. Is there an equivalent compiled inventory for the three water resource assets themselves as response variables? We are aware of several DRBC monitoring programs but would find it helpful to know which datasets should be prioritized when scoping the vulnerability assessment methodology.

A: DRBC staff have not yet identified specific response variables to characterize the three water resource assets, and we expect that work to be part of Phase 2. The following data sources could potentially be used to evaluate the water resource assets:

- DRBC publishes a State of the Basin (SotB) report every ~5 years ([2025 SotB](#); [2019 SotB](#)) that summarizes a number of relevant indicators.
- Flow and Drought Management dashboard:
<https://www.arcgis.com/apps/dashboards/690464a9958b49e5b49550964641ffd7>
- DRBC has been collecting [water quality data](#) since the 1960s. Reports documenting and interpreting these data include:
 - Water Quality Assessment Reports (generated every other year):
<https://www.nj.gov/drbc/public/publications/wq-assessment-rpts.html>
 - Non-tidal Water Quality Assessment (every ~10 years):
https://www.nj.gov/drbc/library/documents/SPW_EWQ-Atlas/entire-report.pdf

Q: Beyond the WRRP Phase 1 Report, can DRBC provide a list of existing vulnerability assessments, resilience plans, technical studies, datasets, and ongoing initiatives that proposers are expected to review in Tasks 1–3?

A: No, part of Task 3 (Gap Analysis) of the scope of work will be to compile, review, and evaluate such a list. While DRBC is aware of many partners' work in this space, we do not have an exhaustive list on hand. As noted in the Phase 1 report:

"Many partners working in the Basin have completed, or are working on, climate resilience planning efforts. Each of the four Basin states has produced a thorough climate plan and/or climate impacts assessment that addresses many concerns relating to water resource management. Many cities that rely on the DRB's water resources (including New York City, NY; Philadelphia, PA; Wilmington, DE; Trenton, NJ; and Bethlehem, PA) and partner organizations working in the Basin (including the Partnership for the Delaware Estuary and the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission) have ongoing climate resilience planning processes. In recognition of these efforts, DRBC strives for the WRRP to build on and complement our partners' work."

Q: Can DRBC clarify the expected geographic scale and level of detail for the vulnerability assessment and gap analysis? Specifically, should proposers assume a basin-wide screening, subbasin-level analyses, or more location-specific mapping for each water resource asset?

A: The primary focus of the WRRP is a basin-wide screening that brings together data and tools across the four states. As noted in the Phase 1 report, the WRRP seeks to complement and build upon the states' and other partners' work in this space. Many others have already completed finer-scale, location-specific analyses (e.g., for the City of Philadelphia). When appropriate and feasible, we would consider including smaller-scale case study examples or subbasin-level analyses in the WRRP to ground the basin-wide results with more local scale impacts.

Q: What format does DRBC anticipate for the final deliverable (e.g., printed/PDF document, and/or website with interactive maps, or other format)?

A: The primary deliverable will be a series of PDF documents (one for each water resource asset) detailing the methodology, results, and recommendations in a way that is appropriate for a general public audience. A secondary deliverable will be PowerPoint presentations summarizing the report content in a visually engaging way. The report and slides are to include numerous visualizations and maps to communicate the findings and justify the recommendations, but an interactive website is not a necessary part of the scope.

Q: Who from DRBC would be available to support the proposed work? Can DRBC provide information on their backgrounds so bidders can develop a plan on how to best support DRBC staff in this process?

A: The core team of DRBC staff who will attend regular joint meetings with the successful bidder throughout Phase 2 and will devote significant time to the effort are:

- Sarah Beganskas, Manager of Water Quality Assessment and WRRP team lead: Expertise in hydrology, water quality, hydrologic modeling, and water resource management.
- Joseph Fogarty, Water Resource Engineer: Expertise in atmospheric and hydrodynamic modeling, meteorology, mathematics, climate science, and water quality.
- Amanda Khalil, Water Resource Scientist: Expertise in hydrogeology, climate science, groundwater and surface water availability modelling, and strategic water supply planning.
- Avery Lentini, Community Engagement Specialist: Expertise in outreach and stakeholder engagement, science communications, environmental education, and graphic design.

Jake Bransky, Senior Aquatic Biologist, will be regularly available to assist with the aquatic life portion. DRBC is also in the process of hiring a graduate-level summer intern in 2026 who will be ~50% time technical support and ~50% time stakeholder engagement support. As needed, most other DRBC [staff](#) would be available to consult on different aspects of the work relevant to their expertise.

Q: Could DRBC provide a more detailed breakdown of the roles and responsibilities expected to be handled by DRBC staff versus the consultant across Tasks 1–4?

A: We are open to any proposed breakdown of roles and responsibilities that makes efficient use of the expertise and resources available on behalf of the DRBC and the successful bidder(s). Based on our estimation of the level of effort required and DRBC staff availability, we anticipate that DRBC staff will be capable of completing about half the total work comprising Tasks 1 through 4 over 18 months, though we do not anticipate that each individual task needs to be divided evenly.

Q: Are there any in-person requirements for the proposed work? Do you expect the coordination meetings to be virtual, hybrid, or in person?

A: DRBC has the capacity to host virtual, hybrid, or in-person coordination meetings, depending on the location and preferences of the successful bidder. In-person meetings and/or site visits are not required, and this work can be completed entirely remotely. However, the optional stakeholder engagement work would benefit from in-person availability.

Q: Could you share the *DRBC Standard Contract*, referenced on page 7 of the RFP (under item 6. Cost/Payment Terms)? Can you please provide a sample contractual agreement that is expected to be executed on this project?

A: [DRBC's Pro Forma Agreement](#) serves as a template for the agreement that will be expected to be entered into in connection with this RFP. Standard provisions may be modified or dropped from the final agreement entered into by DRBC and the selected bidder, and new provisions may be added. Proposals should note any proposed exceptions to the standard provisions.

Q: In Appendix A: Insurance, should we provide a certificate of insurance for the prime firm only, or should we include COIs for subcontractors as well?

A: A Certificate of Insurance does not need to be submitted for any subcontractors. However, the agreement DRBC enters into with the successful bidder (Contractor) will provide that the Contractor must require all subcontractors to carry the same levels of insurance as the Contractor.

Q: May we hand-deliver the Cost Proposal (instead of sending via mail)?

A: Yes, you may hand-deliver the Cost Proposal to DRBC; provided, however, that you do so during regular DRBC business hours. A Commission staff member shall sign, date, and manually time-stamp (i.e., note the hour) on your submittal, and provide you with a receipt that also includes the date and hour. If you wish to hand-deliver your Cost Proposal, please inform staff in advance to expect it and ask for any additional instructions.

Q: Is there a cap on fringe or indirect costs?

A: No, there is not an explicit cap on fringe or indirect costs. Please include all anticipated costs and expenses in your proposal.