

April 5, 2011

Mr. _____
Company
Address
City, State ZIP

Dear _____:

Re: Request for Proposals (RFP)
NPDES Support Services
Questions and Responses

The Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (District) has received various questions from Respondents to the RFP for NPDES Support Services as required by one or more of Riverside County's area-wide National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permits.

The responses attached herein are considered to be part of the RFP. All other terms of the RFP remain unchanged and in effect. These responses are intended to provide additional information and/or to change requirements in the above referenced RFP. Any information contained herein will be considered part of the RFP and as such will be used in the evaluation of the bid responses.

For clarification on any of the questions, please contact Albert Martinez of this office at 951.955.2901.

Very truly yours,



JASON E. UHLEY
Chief of Watershed Protection Division

Attachment

AM:cw
P8/136811

**Non-mandatory bidder's meeting
and
Questions and Responses**

On March 15, 2011, the District issued a Request for Proposals for any of five tasks described in the RFP. Pursuant to the schedule identified within that RFP, the District held a non-mandatory bidder's meeting on Thursday, March 24th at 10:00 a.m. to overview the intent of the RFP and receive and respond to questions. Written questions were also accepted via submittal to Albert Martinez (amart@rcflood.org) through March 29, 2011.

This documents the bidder's meeting, any questions received either at the meeting or in writing, and responses to those questions, for the benefit of all who may be interested in submitting a Proposal.

Attendees to the non-mandatory bidder's meeting:

Amy McNeill	RCFC&WCD
Claudio Padres	RCFC&WCD
Jason Uhley	RCFC&WCD
Charlene Warren	RCFC&WCD
Jessie Powell	PBS&J
Daniel Apt	RBF
John McCarthy	RBF
Lisa Skutecki	Brown & Caldwell
Nancy Gardiner	Brown & Caldwell
Jeff Endicott	AEI-CASC
Bob Collacott	URS Corporation
Richard Haimann	HDR
Michelle Hoalton	PACE
Portia Gonzalez	Parsons
Ernie Figueroa	Parsons

I. General Overview of the RFP

In the non-mandatory bidders meeting, Claudio Padres provided an overview of the RFP. The following points were highlighted.

- The RFP repeatedly mentions that the Proposals shall make effective use of Permittee resources, and also indicates that cost will be a consideration when evaluating and scoring the Proposals. The Permittees have been significantly affected by the recession and many are struggling to maintain funding for their current programs, let alone the additional funding required to develop the elements required in the new permits, such as those tasks included in this RFP. It will be important for all Respondents to ensure that their Proposals are designed to find the most cost effective way to comply with the permit requirements as described in the RFP.
- If there are elements that a Respondent feels are important to include in their Proposal, or that the Respondent feels may provide a significant and desirable benefit to the Permittees, but where the item may not be explicitly or implicitly required to comply with the permit, the item should be designated as optional, and a separate cost for providing that element should be provided.

II. General / Procedural Questions

General Questions:

Q1. Will the attendee list from the non-mandatory bidder's meeting be sent out?

A1. Yes. This document lists the attendees to the non-mandatory bidder's meeting, and is being transmitted to all who: attended the non-mandatory bidder's meeting, and/or submitted written comments, and to all whom the RFP was originally mailed. This document will also be posted on the District's website.

Q2. Will addendums to the RFP be mailed to the group or will they be placed on the website?

A2. Yes. Any addendums will be transmitted to all who: attended the non-mandatory bidder's meeting, and/or submitted written comments, and to all whom the RFP was originally mailed. Addendums will also be posted on the District's website.

Q3. Can the District provide a copy of a sample agreement or contract?

A3. Over time, County Risk Management makes adjustments to the District's standard agreement language. As such, and to avoid confusion, a sample agreement was not included in this RFP. Once a firm is selected, a draft agreement will be sent to that firm. If the Firm and the District are unable to agree on the terms of the agreement, the next highest ranking firm will be selected. An overview of the insurance requirements that must be met are included on Page 3 of Attachment B to the RFP. Note that these insurance requirements must be passed down to any subcontractors, as applicable.

Q4. What is the estimated fee for all services (i.e. Task 1 through Task 5)?

A4. See Section I of this document. No specific budget is being identified for the tasks in this RFP. The District and the Permittees are looking for competitive Proposals that will identify highly cost effective ways to comply with the Permit requirements and this RFP. While cost will not be the only consideration in evaluating Proposals, it will

likely be a significant factor. To aid Respondents in developing a competitive Proposal, the RFP includes descriptions, and descriptive words such as "landscape level" that attempt to identify the scope and scale of effort envisioned by the Permittees. See Section I of this document.

Q5. Can services be provided as Lump Sum or would this be a Time and Materials contract?

A5. The contracting methods will be discussed during negotiations with selected firms. The District has utilized both Lump Sum, and Time and Materials 'Not to Exceed' Contracts.

Questions on Attachment B: Required Proposal Content

(a) Maximum number of pages (Page 1 of Attachment B)

Q6. The RFP states that the main body of the Proposal can be 5 double sided pages, then describes that each appendix be no longer than 10 pages. Can those 10 pages be double-sided as well?

A6. Yes

Q7. Are resumes excluded from the maximum page count?

A7. Yes. Also excluded from the page count are examples of previous work.

(b) Firm Overview (Page 2 of Attachment B)

Q8. Should the number of clients required for the firm overview (Page 2 of Attachment B to the RFP) include clients nationwide, statewide, or local only?

A8. A focus on local clients and services is preferred, however the respondent should convey the number of clients for which the respondent has performed services that are similar in nature to the services being proposed for this RFP. If the numbers of clients are company-wide, please state how many were for projects in the storm water and/or NPDES fields, and how many of those were in Southern California.

Q9. Are references required for all the clients listed in the firm overview? This may not be possible for firms with large client bases.

A9. References will not be required for each of the clients numbered in the Firm Overview. Client references are only required in the 'Record of Past Performance' for each Task Specific Appendix, as described in Section II.B on page three of Attachment B to the RFP.

Q10. Within the Firm Overview, is an organizational chart required? Must the Firm Overview include organizational charts of subcontractors?

A10¹. An organizational chart for the respondent's firm is required to be included in the Firm Overview.

A10². An organizational chart for the respondent's subcontractors need not be included in the Firm Overview. However, the subcontractors shall be included and clearly

identified in the 'Project Team' organizational chart for each Task Specific Appendix, as described in Section II.B on Page 3 of Attachment B to the RFP.

Questions on Attachment C: Proposal Instructions, Evaluation Criteria, and Selection Requirements

(c) Submittal Labeling

- Q11. The Cover Letter and Section V of Attachment C provide differing labels for Proposal submissions. Which of the following is correct for addressing the submittals:
- A11. Use the version provided in Attachment C (Section V).

From Attachment C (Section V)

Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District
Attention: Claudio Padres, Senior Civil Engineer
NPDES Support Services RFP/Respondent Proposal
1995 Market Street
Riverside, CA 92501

III. Task – Specific Questions

Task 1 – Retrofit Studies

Claudio Padres provided an overview of key elements of the RFP. Key points from that overview were:

- The Task is focused on using desktop tools to perform a landscape level, or 'screening level' delineation of potential opportunities. Detailed feasibility assessments for particular opportunities will be assessed separately by the Permittees when a particular need for retrofits within an area is identified.
 - If field investigations or verifications are proposed as part of this Task, they should be separately identified as 'optional', with separate costs.
- Q12. Can we obtain a copy of the May 2005 Regional BMP Retrofit Study as mentioned in Section A.i.c. of Task 1: Retrofit Study?
- A12. The Study can be accessed at the following link:
<http://www.mediafire.com/?c7f4pfpt28g1g>
- Q13. Can the District provide a list for the locations of the existing increased runoff basins as referenced on Page 6 of Attachment A?
- A13. The District maintains a GIS layer of detention basins that it owns. Some Permittees may have similar layers for publically-owned basins within their jurisdiction; however, Respondents should presume that the locations of a majority of existing increased runoff basins are **not** available in readily accessible lists or databases.

Task 2 – Hydromodification Susceptibility Mapping

Claudio Padres provided an overview of key elements of the RFP. Key points from that overview were:

- The District is looking for a level of effort similar to what has been done in San Bernardino County; however, Proposals for this Task need not be identical to what was done in San Bernardino County.
- The District anticipates that Receiving Waters that are engineered streams/MS4, and meet what the respective MS4 Permit identifies as not susceptible, would be initially screened out as not susceptible. It was noted that the Santa Ana and Santa Margarita Permits view susceptibility differently.
- Additional assessments should be generally performed on a desktop level.
- Field verifications / assessments may be considered for a selected subset of stream systems where there is a belief that a field assessment could demonstrate that the system was in fact not susceptible to hydromodification, where it otherwise would have been considered susceptible.
- For the portion of the task within the Santa Ana Watershed, the respondent should also consider the requirements in Section XII.E.9.b.iii, and if applicable, the Proposal should include the preparation of justifications for any variations in accordance with Permit Section XII.E.9.b.iv. For the portion of the task within the Santa Margarita Watershed, the Respondent should also consider the requirements in Section F.1.h.(4), and if applicable, the Proposal should include the preparation of justifications that can be provided to the Executive Officer in accordance with permit Section F.1.h.(4)(c).

Q14. Would the field verification be part of the effort or would that be optional?

A14. If field verifications are recommended as part of the Proposal, they should be separately identified as 'optional' items with separate costs identified.

Task 3 – Regional Geodatabase

Claudio Padres and Jason Uhley provided an overview of key elements of the RFP. Key points from that overview were:

- The District is looking for a level of effort similar to what is being developed in other areas within the region, such as, but not limited to, San Bernardino County and Orange County.
- The intent described within the RFP is to develop a tool that will inform the Water Quality Management Plan process, and provide specific information that will be needed by project proponents or applicants. The RFP identifies specific information that should be considered for integration into the geodatabase, however, Respondents are not limited to those items. If Respondents identify other data that they recommend be included, it is recommended that those be identified in their Proposal.
- The RFP discussed interest among the three counties (San Bernardino, Riverside, and Orange) to coordinate the Geodatabases for the three counties. The intent described in the RFP is for Proposals to address arranging for that coordination; not necessarily to develop a uniform tool, but to facilitate meetings that would be necessary to help the three counties to converge on a tool that, from the end-user perspective, will function and look in a common way.

Q15. A big driver of the cost of any database development work is the completeness, quality and the form that the data is in, and the location where it resides in order to get that data and move it into the database to be developed. I don't see information in the RFP that states what pools of data exist, and what form they are in. Is that going to be provided?

A15¹ One component of the Proposals may be a 'needs analysis' to determine what data sources are readily available, and which data sources may have to be developed over the short or long term.

A15² There are some data layers that will need to be developed. The District, for example, is not aware of data layers for groundwater basins, depths, or plumes.

A15³ Depending on the types of information proposed to include within the geodatabase, some information may already be available in a geo-referenced format. An example of layers that the Permittees are likely to have in a geo-referenced environment are:

- ◇ Watershed and Hydrologic Subarea boundaries
- ◇ Receiving Waters
- ◇ 303(d) listed pollutants as attributes to receiving water elements
- ◇ Hydrologic Soil Types
- ◇ Flood Zones
- ◇ Most Permittee MS4 Facilities
- ◇ Master/Area Drainage Plan Lines
- ◇ MSHCP Areas
- ◇ Parcel Data (Assessors)
- ◇ MS4 Facilities

Task 4 – Santa Margarita HMP

Claudio Padres and Jason Uhley provided an overview of key elements of the RFP. Key points from that overview were:

- A typographical error was found within the RFP. On Page 12 of the RFP, the first sentence within Proposal considerations should read:

***Santa Margarita Region:** The Proposal shall be designed to address the applicable requirements in Section F.1.h. of the SMR MS4 Permit. Please note that portions of Section F.1.h.(1)(h) will have been addressed through Task 2...*

- The RFP discusses that Proposals should leverage similar programs already developed or being developed by other regions (such as but not limited to the San Diego and/or the Orange County NPDES MS4 Permit programs). The Santa Margarita Region of Riverside County has a population of approximately 275,000 people. The District is aware that similar efforts in other regions have spent significant sums of money, reportedly several million dollars, however due to the limited urban area, this Proposal should be scaled appropriately. Proposals should focus on identifying and adapting tools, science and methodologies used in other regions.
- Proposals may also identify opportunities to improve existing HMP tools to better protect water quality, improve ease of use for the development community, increase appropriateness of results, etc.
- The RFP emphasizes that the HMP be as simple and straightforward as possible for the development community and plan check staff to implement.

- Proposals should identify ways to comply with the hydromodification monitoring requirements, which should be designed to assess the effectiveness of the implementation of the HMP. Such assessments need not be on a 'per project' basis, but should focus on receiving waters. It was noted that the Proposal should include the development of a hydromodification monitoring program that will be cost effective for the Permittees to implement on an ongoing basis.

Task 5 – CNRP

Claudio Padres and Jason Uhley provided an overview of key elements of the. Key points from that overview were:

- The District is looking for a level of effort similar to the Comprehensive Bacteria Reduction Plan (CBRP) for the portion of Riverside County that drains to the Middle Santa Ana River.
- There are some specific BMPs that the Lake Elsinore and Canyon Lake TMDL Task Force has already developed and those BMPs should be incorporated into the Proposal, as well as inclusion of supplemental BMPs that the Permittees are or will be implementing as part of their MS4 programs. The effectiveness of all of those features will need to be assessed, and new/additional BMPs identified as necessary, to demonstrate that in the long term, compliance with the TMDL waste load allocations will be achieved.
- Proposals will need to address assessment of the effectiveness of the programs that will be included in the CNRP, which could include various forms of data collection, from reporting of the BMPs deployed – to water quality monitoring.

Q16. Can we get a copy of the CBRP?

A16. The draft CBRP is available on the District's website at:
<http://rcflood.org/downloads/NPDES/Documents/PublicNotices/Draft%20CBRP%20for%20Riverside%20County-NPDES%20Website.pdf>

Q17. What Consultant did the District work with in developing their Comprehensive Bacteria Reduction Plan?

A17. Camp Dresser & McKee (CDM)

Q18. Will this Consultant be excluded from pursuing work on this RFP?

A18. No. The reference to the CBRP was to assist Respondents with understanding the end product envisioned by the Permit. The Permittees expect that the specific BMPs and methods of analysis, and effectiveness assessments may be substantively different for the CNRP as this document is addressing different pollutants and sources, and is intended to protect a different type of water body. Respondents are reminded that the RFP includes references to efforts of the Lake Elsinore and Canyon Lake TMDL Task Force studies, reports, and other activities which will additionally provide a framework for what the CNRP should include.