

March 15, 2011

Mr. \_\_\_\_\_  
Company  
Address  
City, State, Zip

Dear Mr. \_\_\_\_\_:

Re: Request for Proposals (RFP)  
NPDES Support Services

The Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (District) is soliciting proposals from interested firms (Respondents) to perform specific NPDES Support Services as required by Riverside County's area-wide National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permits. We have enclosed an RFP Package for your information and use.

The Scope of Services includes Retrofit Studies, Hydromodification Susceptibility Mapping, Regional Geodatabase, Santa Margarita HMP and Comprehensive Nutrient Reduction Plan. Respondents may bid on one or more of the listed services.

If interested in submitting a proposal on any of the listed services, please submit one (1) bound original and five (5) bound copies of your proposal to the District at the address below by **4:00 p.m. on April 19, 2011**:

Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District  
Attention: Claudio Padres, Senior Civil Engineer  
RFP Environmental/Regulatory Professional Services  
1995 Market Street  
Riverside, CA 92501

A committee of District and NPDES MS4 Permittee staff will evaluate proposals received. Selected firms may be asked to appear for interviews, after which a final ranking will be made. The committee will make a recommendation for selection based on factors including experience, qualifications, professionalism, quality of work, approach and cost for the proposals. When the recommendation is approved by the General Manager-Chief Engineer, firms may be invited to negotiate a contract. Final contracts will be submitted to the District's Board of Supervisors for consideration and approval.

For questions or clarification, please contact Alberto Martinez of this office at 951.955.2901.

Very truly yours,



JASON E. UHLEY  
Chief of Watershed Protection Division

Enclosures: RFP, including Attachments A-C

AM:AMM:cw  
P8/136438

**March 15, 2011**

**Request for Proposals  
to provide National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Support Services for the  
Santa Ana and Santa Margarita Watershed Regions of Riverside County  
(NPDES) Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit Programs**

The Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (District) is soliciting proposals to provide NPDES Support Services for the Santa Ana and Santa Margarita Watershed Regions of Riverside County NPDES MS4 Permit Programs. The timeline for the RFP process is as follows:

- |           |  |                                       |
|-----------|--|---------------------------------------|
| <b>A.</b> | Release of Request for Proposals           | Tuesday, March 15, 2011               |
| <b>B.</b> | Non-mandatory bidder's meeting             | Thursday, March 24, 2011 – 10:00 a.m. |
| <b>C.</b> | Deadline for Submission of Questions       | Tuesday, March 29, 2011               |
| <b>D.</b> | Responses to Questions from District       | Tuesday, April 5, 2011                |
| <b>E.</b> | Deadline for Proposal submission           | Tuesday, April 19, 2011 - 4:00 p.m.   |
| <b>F.</b> | Tentative date for awarding of Contract(s) | Thursday, May 19, 2011                |
| <b>G.</b> | Tentative beginning date for Contract(s)   | Monday, June, 20, 2011                |

Questions pertaining to the RFP must be submitted in writing. The District will mail responses to written questions to all firms receiving RFP documents.

The Scope of Work includes Retrofit Studies, Hydromodification Susceptibility Mapping, Regional Geodatabase, Santa Margarita HMP and Comprehensive Nutrient Reduction Plan.

To assist with preparation of the Proposal, the District has enclosed the following:

- Attachment A - Definitions, Project Background & Scope of Service
- Attachment B - Required Proposal Content
- Attachment C - Proposal Instructions, Evaluation Criteria & Selection Process

Please submit one (1) bound original and five (5) bound copies of your Proposal to the District by April 19, 2011 by 4:00 p.m. Please see Attachment C, Section V for Proposal Submittal Instructions.

A committee of District and NPDES MS4 Permittee staff will evaluate Proposals received. Selected firms may be asked to appear for interviews, after which a final ranking will be made. The committee will make a recommendation for selection based on factors including experience, qualifications, professionalism, quality of work, approach and cost to the Request for Proposals. When the recommendation is approved by the General Manager-Chief Engineer, firms may be invited to negotiate a contract. Final contracts will be submitted to the District's Board of Supervisors for consideration and approval.

## Attachment A

### Definitions, Project Background and Scope of Service

#### I. Definitions

Addendum - An amendment or modification to the RFP.

Bid - The Proposal submitted by Respondents consistent with the Instructions to Respondents, to complete the work for a specified sum of money and within a specified period of time.

Contract - The written agreement resulting from this RFP executed by Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District and Consultant.

Desert Task Force - A Permittee staff committee to direct the development of the Storm Water Management Plan and the implementation of the overall Urban Runoff program as described in the Report of Waste Discharge for the Whitewater River Permit Area.

District – Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District.

Drainage Area Management Plan (DAMP) - The DAMP is a programmatic document developed by the Permittees and approved by the Executive Officer that outlines the major programs and policies that the Permittees individually and/or collectively implement to manage Urban Runoff in the Santa Ana and Santa Margarita Permit Area.

GIS – Geographic Information System

Hydromodification – The change or alteration of the hydrologic processes and runoff characteristics (i.e., interception, infiltration, overland flow, interflow and groundwater flow) of coastal and non-coastal waters that result in increased stream flows and sediment transport, which in turn could cause degradation of water resources.

IBI – Index of Biotic Integrity

Jurisdictional Runoff Management Program (JRMP) – includes a written description of the specific jurisdictional runoff management measures and programs that each Permittee will implement to comply with Order R9-2010-0016 and ensure that stormwater pollutant discharges in runoff are reduced to the MEP and do not cause or contribute to a violation of water quality standards.

Low Impact Development (LID) – A stormwater management and land development strategy that emphasizes conservation and the use of on-site natural features integrated with engineered, small-scale hydrologic controls to more closely reflect pre-development hydrologic functions.

NPDES MS4 Permits – National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System Permits issued under the authority of the federal Clean Water Act by the

Regional Boards on behalf of U.S. EPA. The current NPDES MS4 Permits in Riverside County include:

- The Santa Ana Region (SAR) MS4 Permit, Order No. R8-2010-0033, issued by the Santa Ana Region Regional Board;
- The Santa Margarita Region (SMR) MS4 Permit, Order No. R9-2010-0016, issued by the San Diego Region Regional Board; and
- The Whitewater Region (WWR) MS4 Permit, Order No. R7-2008-0001, issued by the Colorado River Region Regional Board.

Permit Area – The portions of the Santa Ana or Santa Margarita Watersheds within Riverside County covered by the respective Santa Ana or Santa Margarita Region NPDES MS4 Permit.

Permittees - The Principal Permittee and the Co-Permittees or the Dischargers named in the individual NPDES MS4 Permits.

Pollutants of Concern - Pollutants expected to be present on the project site. Pollutants can be broadly defined as any agent that may cause or contribute to the degradation of water quality such that a condition of pollution or contamination is created or aggravated. In developing a pollutant list, consideration should be given to the chemicals and potential pollutants available for stormwater to pick-up or transport to receiving waters and legacy pollutants at the project site. Pollutants of concern for new development and significant redevelopment projects are those pollutants identified above for which a downstream waterbody is also listed as impaired under the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list or by a Total Maximum Daily Load.

PDP – Priority Development Projects consist of both new development and redevelopment project categories listed in Section F.1.d(2) of Order No. R9-2010-0016, or section XII.D.2. of Order No. R8-2010-0033.

Proposal - Used interchangeably with "Bid".

Regional Boards – The California Regional Water Quality Control Boards with jurisdiction in Riverside County, specifically the Colorado River Region, San Diego Region and Santa Ana Region Regional Water Quality Control Boards.

Respondent - Qualified organizations and/or firms interested in performing required National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) public education and outreach program services.

RWQCB - California Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Santa Ana/Santa Margarita Technical Advisory Committee - A committee consisting of one or more representatives from each Permittee that provides technical direction on the development of the DAMP and the implementation of the overall Urban Runoff program.

SMC – Southern California Stormwater Monitoring Coalition.

Stormwater - Stormwater runoff and snow melt runoff from urban, open space and agricultural areas consisting only of those discharges that originate from precipitation events. Stormwater is that portion of precipitation that flows across a surface to the MS4 or receiving waters. Examples of this phenomenon include: the water that flows off a building's roof when it rains (runoff from an impervious surface); the water that flows into streams when snow on the ground begins to melt (runoff from a semi-pervious surface); and the water that flows from a vegetated surface when rainfall is in excess of the rate at which it can infiltrate into the underlying soil (runoff from a pervious surface). When all other factors are equal, runoff increases as the perviousness of a surface decreases. During precipitation events in urban areas, rain water may pick up and transport pollutants through stormwater conveyance systems, and ultimately to Waters of the U.S.

Standard Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SSMP) – A plan developed to mitigate the impacts of runoff from Priority Development Projects, equivalent to the Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) in Riverside County.

Sub-contractor/Sub-consultant - Any person, firm, or corporation performing work or providing service for the Respondents in support of the Scope of Services for an agreement.

TAC – The Santa Ana/Santa Margarita Technical Advisory Committee. This is an Advisory Committee made up of NPDES MS4 Permittee representatives who guide the development and implementation of the NPDES MS4 Permit compliance programs.

USEPA – United States Environmental Protection Agency

Watershed Action Plan – Integrated plan for managing a watershed that includes consideration of water quality, hydromodification, water supply and habitat protection. The Watershed Action Plan integrates existing watershed based planning efforts and incorporates watershed tools to manage cumulative impacts of development on vulnerable streams, preserve structure and function of streams, and protect source, surface and groundwater quality and water supply in the Permit area. The Watershed Action Plan should integrate hydromodification and water quality management strategies with land use planning policies, ordinances, and plans within each jurisdiction.

Watershed Water Quality Workplan (Watershed Workplan) – A plan to identify, prioritize, address and mitigate the highest water quality issues/pollutants in the Upper Santa Margarita Watershed.

Waste Load Allocations – Maximum quantity of Pollutants a discharger of waste is allowed to release into a particular waterway, as set by a regulatory authority. Discharge limits usually are required for each specific water quality criterion being, or expecting to be, violated. Distribution or assignment of TMDL Pollutant loads to entities or sources for existing and future Point Sources.

Watershed Workplan – See Watershed Water Quality Workplan

Watersheds – One or more of the three watersheds regulated by NPDES MS4 Permits in Riverside County, specifically the Santa Ana, Santa Margarita and Whitewater River Watersheds.

## II. Project Background

In California, NPDES MS4 Permits are typically issued on a countywide basis by a Regional Water Quality Control Board on behalf of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). Riverside County is unique in that it falls within the jurisdiction of three different Regional Boards: the Santa Ana Region, the San Diego Region and the Colorado River Region Regional Water Quality Control Boards (Regional Boards). The County is therefore separately regulated by three (3) NPDES MS4 Permits, each with a term of five years from the date of its adoption. Each NPDES MS4 Permit covers the portion of the unincorporated County and cities located within each Regional Board's jurisdiction. The Permit Areas coincide with the three major watersheds draining western Riverside County – the Santa Ana River Watershed, the Santa Margarita River Watershed and the Whitewater River Watershed. Each Permit contains its own unique program requirements. The current status of the Riverside County NPDES MS4 Permits is summarized below:

The Santa Ana Region (SAR) MS4 Permit (Order No. R8-2010-0033), issued by the Santa Ana Region Regional Board, was adopted on January 29, 2010. Permittees include the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, County of Riverside, and the cities of Beaumont, Calimesa, Canyon Lake, Corona, Hemet, Lake Elsinore, Menifee, Moreno Valley, Murrieta, Norco, Perris, Riverside, San Jacinto and Wildomar.

The Santa Margarita Region (SMR) MS4 Permit (Order No. R9-2010-0016), issued by the San Diego Region Regional Board, was adopted on November 10, 2010. Permittees include the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, County of Riverside, and the cities of Murrieta, Temecula and Wildomar.

The Whitewater Region (WWR) MS4 Permit (Order No. R7-2008-0001), issued by the Colorado River Region Regional Board, was adopted on May 21, 2008. Permittees include the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, County of Riverside, Coachella Valley Water District and the cities of Banning, Cathedral City, Coachella, Desert Hot Springs, Indian Wells, Indio, La Quinta, Palm Desert, Palm Springs and Rancho Mirage.

To facilitate coordinated development and efficient implementation of NPDES MS4 Permit compliance programs, the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District serves as the coordinating, or Principal Permittee, for each NPDES MS4 Permit Area in Riverside County. As the Principal Permittee responsible for coordinating area-wide NPDES MS4 program management in Riverside County, the District has the primary responsibility for coordinating and implementing required area-wide programs, consistent with the requirements of each NPDES Permit.

The District also convenes and coordinates the Santa Ana/Santa Margarita Technical Advisory Committee to coordinate NPDES MS4 Permit program implementation with NPDES MS4 Permittees and interested stakeholders. The Committee jointly addresses the Santa Ana and Santa Margarita NPDES MS4 Permits because two (2) Permittees are covered under both the Santa Ana and Santa Margarita NPDES MS4 Permits. Authorized representatives from the Permittees, as listed above, make up the Stormwater Program's TACs (Santa Ana/Santa Margarita TAC and Desert Task Force) which review and approve recommendations from the District regarding expenditures for and implementation of the regional NPDES MS4 Permit programs.

The services requested herein are part of the District's efforts to find cost effective ways of meeting the NPDES MS4 Permit requirements for program development and implementation.

Additional information regarding the County's NPDES MS4 Permits and the County's NPDES MS4 Program can be obtained at [www.rcflood.org/NPDES/](http://www.rcflood.org/NPDES/).

Available information includes:

- Current NPDES MS4 Permits;
- Current Drainage Area Management Plans and Storm Water Management Plans for each Permit Area; and
- Recent Annual Reports documenting program activities.

### **III. Scope of Service**

The District is seeking experienced and qualified Respondents to complete the tasks described below. Respondents must bid on at least one task, and may bid on multiple tasks within their Proposal. All Proposals must address the applicable requirements of this Scope of Services, and be prepared consistent with Attachment B hereto.

Proposals should clearly specify how the Respondent will address each task. Each task requires specific deliverables that are required to be submitted to the Regional Boards on a specified timeline. The District reserves the right to require that a task be submitted at an earlier date than described in the NPDES MS4 Permits. The Respondent shall take note of the task(s) and timelines prior to submitting a bid on the task(s) and consider timelines in the development of their Proposal and cost estimates.

Based on the Proposals received, the District may issue individual contracts for each task, may combine Proposals for multiple tasks by a single Respondent into a single contract, or may decide not to issue contracts for particular tasks.

#### **Task 1: Retrofit Studies**

This task shall be for conducting retrofit studies as required pursuant to the Santa Ana Region (SAR) and Santa Margarita Region (SMR) MS4 Permits. The retrofit studies are to be conducted at a screening level and will serve as an additional tool available to the Permittees to address water quality problems originating from areas of existing urban development. The goal of this task is to identify preliminary opportunities for regional retrofits that can be further investigated by the Permittees should enhanced BMPs be warranted to address urban water quality issues from specific sub-watersheds. This task is intended to preliminary screen existing MS4 (SAR and SMR Region) and existing private developments (SMR Region) for retrofit opportunities based on considerations such as public lands adjacent to MS4, existing public and privately owned flood control, increased runoff or water quality BMPs, and other factors to be proposed and as described further below. Proposals should be focused on utilization of desktop screening tools such as GIS mapping, aerial photography, Permittee input, readily available public records, and/or other similar tools. Presume limited field review.

Proposals for this task shall: clearly describe the recommended specific retrofit study (or studies) to be conducted to comply with applicable portions of the two MS4 Permits, be consistent with the guidelines below, and be designed to make efficient use of Permittee resources.

#### **A. Proposal Considerations**

- i. Santa Ana Region - The portion of the retrofit study to be performed within the Santa Ana Watershed shall be designed to address the SAR MS4 Permit requirement found in Section XII.B.3.b., The Proposal shall recommend retrofit studies that will be conducted to identify candidate areas for retrofits within existing public and private MS4, parks and recreational areas and that incorporate opportunities for addressing TMDL implementation plans, hydromodification from urban runoff, LID implementation and pollutant discharge reduction. At a minimum, the Proposal should include consideration of the following:
  - a. Comprehensive Bacteria Reduction Plan (CBRP) – Describes the specific actions that have been taken or will be taken to achieve compliance with the Middle Santa Ana River Bacterial Indicator TMDL urban WLA. The Draft CBRP was submitted to the Santa Ana Regional Board on December 30, 2010. The Santa Ana Regional Board will provide comments on the Draft CBRP by March 31, 2011. A copy of the Draft CBRP is available for review upon request. See SAR MS4 Permit requirement found in Section VI.D.1.c for more information.
  - b. Comprehensive Nutrient Reduction Plan (CNRP) – The CNRP, similar to the CBRP above will describe the specific actions that have been taken or will be taken to achieve compliance with the Lake Elsinore/Canyon Lake Nutrient TMDL urban WLA. The development of the CNRP is included as Task 5 below and will be in development during the development of this Task. A draft of the CNRP, if available, can be provided for review by Respondent selected to perform this task. See SAR MS4 Permit requirements found in Section VI.D.2.d and VI.D.2.e for more information.
  - c. Previous work in the Riverside County portion of the Santa Ana Watershed analyzing retrofit opportunities - The Permittees conducted a study dated May 2005 that identified opportunities within existing MS4 for incorporating regional BMP retrofits to improve water quality and maintain receiving water designated beneficial uses. A copy of this study is available for review upon request.
  - d. Location of existing increased runoff basins.
  - e. Other BMP retrofit opportunities.
- ii. Santa Margarita Region - The portion of the task to be performed within the Santa Margarita Watershed shall be designed to address the SMR MS4 Permit requirements found in Sections F.3.d.(1) and F.3.d.(2) of the Permit, and additionally develop a retrofit program framework to assist with implementation of the requirements in Sections F.3.d.(3) and F.3.d.(4) of the Permit.
  - a. Retrofit Study – The Proposal shall describe the specific studies that will be implemented to identify, inventory and prioritize areas within existing public and private development; including municipal, industrial, commercial and residential

areas that may be candidates for retrofit. This portion of the task expands upon the Santa Ana portion of the task, by requiring assessment not only of existing public and private MS4, parks and recreational areas, but also of areas of existing private development. The Proposal should focus on utilizing desktop tools such as GIS mapping to identify candidate areas, and meet the requirements of Sections F.3.d.(1) and F.3.d.(2) of the Permit.

- b. Retrofit Program Framework - Respondents shall also propose a retrofit program framework to be developed as part of this task. The Proposal shall provide an overview of the framework. The framework at a minimum should include the following:
  1. Shall be designed to assist the Permittees in complying with Section F.3.d.(3) of the Permit, including (but not limited to) determining when retrofit may be the most effective method for addressing urban water quality problems from existing areas of development versus education, inspection and/or enforcement.
  2. Shall provide a 'menu' of types of specific retrofits that can be effective at addressing various potential water quality problems. The 'menu' shall be linked to the results of the Retrofit study, and include retrofit types appropriate to both public and private lands. Associated information shall be included to help the Permittees determine the most cost effective and appropriate approach in responding to an identified water quality problem. Opportunities as described in Section F.3.d.(6) shall be considered for integration into the menu.
  3. Shall include detailed programs or activities that can be implemented to encourage private property owners to retrofit their existing development, consistent with Section F.3.d.(4) of the Permit. The Fact Sheet Discussion on Finding D.3.h. includes examples that may be discussed. Implementation of such programs or activities to encourage private retrofit are not part of this task, however the task will be to develop the programs with sufficient detail to facilitate an understanding of the scope and costs involved, and a recommended process and procedure for conducting the programs/activities.
  4. Shall identify opportunities for coordination between the retrofit program and other Capital Improvement programs.
  5. Shall discuss how the requirements in Permit Section F.3.d.(5) can be addressed for tracking constructed retrofit projects.
  6. Shall allow for incorporation of retrofit needs that may be identified pursuant to Sections F.3.a(4)(c) and F.1.h(1)(h).

**B. Deliverables** - The Proposal shall describe in detail the deliverables that will be provided in performance of this task, including at a minimum:

- i. **Project Management:** Including any costs not directly related to the deliverables below. Regular status updates and feedback meetings with the respective watershed Permittees should be incorporated into the Proposal.

- ii. **Research & Data Collection:** Performance of any necessary background research and data collection to support the recommended retrofit study.
  - iii. Performance of the recommended studies.
  - iv. **Documentation:** Preparation of draft and final reports, maps, and/or other tools. The study shall result in documentation of the study(ies) performed, and tools/maps that can be used to inform the Permittees of potential opportunities for strategic retrofits.
    - a. Santa Ana Region: The documentation shall be prepared to facilitate incorporation into the Watershed Action Plan described in Section XII.B of the SAR MS4 Permit.
    - b. Santa Margarita Region: The documentation shall be prepared to facilitate incorporation into the respective SMR Permittee JRMP documents described in Section F of the SMR MS4 Permit and the Watershed Workplan described in Section G of the SMR MS4 Permit.
  - v. Other interim or final deliverables as necessary to complete the task.
- C. Cost Breakdown** – Provide the overall cost for completing the task, with subtotals for each Permit Area (i.e. SAR and SMR Permit Areas). Each Permit Area subtotal shall itemize the costs and assumptions for each of the deliverable items identified pursuant to the requirements above.
- D. Timeline** – A preliminary schedule highlighting the completion dates of key deliverables should be provided presuming authorization to proceed is provided by July 1, 2011. Final schedules will be negotiated during the execution of a contract to perform this task. Proposals however should clearly confirm the ability of the firm to complete the task within the following guidelines:
- i. Santa Ana Region: Final documentation as required pursuant to this task will be integrated into the Watershed Action Plan (not part of this task) and submitted by the District to the Santa Ana Regional Board by January 29, 2013. To allow for the completion of the Watershed Action Plan, Respondents should presume that the final draft Retrofit Study is complete by September 29, 2012. Alternative final submittal dates of the completed retrofit study documentation may be proposed and discussed in the Proposal.
  - ii. Santa Margarita Region: Final documentation as required pursuant to this task will be integrated into the JRMP (not part of this task) and submitted by the District to the San Diego Regional Board by June 30, 2012. Respondents should presume that the final draft Retrofit Study is complete by December 31, 2011. Alternative final submittal dates of the completed retrofit study documentation may be proposed and discussed in the Proposal.

## **Task 2: Hydromodification Susceptibility Mapping**

The purpose of this task is to conduct a screening level analysis to identify and map streams that are susceptible to hydromodification as required pursuant to the SAR and SMR MS4 Permits. The results of this assessment shall be integrated into a GIS layer that identifies areas that are tributary to susceptible reaches of such streams. Proposals should be focused on utilization of desktop

screening tools as much as possible to ensure that the Proposal will make efficient use of Permittee resources. Proposals should consider leveraging and building upon existing Hydromodification Susceptibility Mapping studies conducted by San Bernardino, San Diego and/or Orange County NPDES MS4 Permit programs, as applicable. Additionally, the Proposal shall clearly describe approach and methods to be utilized, and be consistent with the guidelines below.

#### **A. Proposal Considerations**

- i. Santa Ana Region: The portion of the task within the SAR shall be designed to address the SAR MS4 Permit requirements found in Sections XII.B.4, including the delineation and mapping of existing unarmored or soft-armored stream channels that are vulnerable to hydromodification from development projects. The delineation should utilize desktop tools such as GIS mapping to initially screen streams that may be susceptible to hydromodification, and include field review/assessment only where necessary to confirm channels and channel reaches that either are or are not susceptible.
- ii. Santa Margarita Region: The portion of the task within the SMR shall be designed to address the same requirements, and be performed in the same manner as in the SAR; however the requirements in Section F.1.h(1)(h) of the SMR MS4 Permit shall additionally be addressed. This shall include delineation and mapping of existing stream channels with evidence of historic hydromodification which are tributary to documented low or very low Index of Biotic Integrity (IBI) scores. Information on IBI scores can be obtained from Annual Reports for the watershed, and are available on the District's website at: <http://www.rcflood.org/npdes/santamargaritaWS.aspx>
- iii. Other Considerations: Proposals for this task shall additionally describe how similar efforts in San Bernardino, San Diego and Orange Counties will, or will not be leveraged or otherwise utilized.

**B. Deliverables** - The Proposal shall describe in detail the deliverables that will be provided in performance of this task, including at a minimum:

- i. **Project Management**: Including any costs not directly related to the deliverables below. Regular status update and feedback meetings with the respective watershed Permittees should be incorporated into the Proposal.
- ii. **Research & Data Collection**: Performance of any necessary background research and data collection to support the analysis.
- iii. **Performance of the assessments**.
- iv. **Documentation**:
  - a. Preparation of draft and final reports documenting the analyses performed, including printed maps of susceptible reaches.
  - b. Development of GIS mapping data/layers for susceptible and non-susceptible reaches and associated tributary areas; and for the Santa Margarita Region streams with evidence of historic hydromodification that are tributary to documented low or very

low IBI scores. The layers shall incorporate attributes or similar data necessary for incorporation into a web-enabled Geodatabase. (Geodatabase is part of Task 3)

v. Other interim or final deliverables as necessary to complete the task.

**C. Cost Breakdown** – Provide the overall cost for completing the task, with subtotals for each watershed. Each watershed subtotal shall itemize the costs and assumptions for each of the deliverable items identified pursuant to the requirements above.

**D. Timeline** – A preliminary schedule highlighting the completion dates of key deliverables should be provided presuming authorization to proceed is provided by July 1, 2011. Final task schedules will be negotiated during the execution of a contract to perform this task. Proposals however should clearly confirm the ability of the firm to complete the task within the following limitations:

Santa Ana Region: Pursuant to the SAR MS4 Permit Section XII.B.4., this task must be completed by January 29, 2012. To allow for adequate Permittee review of the final documentation, Respondents should presume that the susceptibility mapping and associated documentation is complete by January 2, 2012. Alternative final submittal dates of the completed deliverables may be proposed and discussed in the Proposal.

Santa Margarita Region: Final documentation as required pursuant to this task will be integrated into the Santa Margarita Hydromodification Management Plan (see Task 4) and submitted by the District to the San Diego Regional Board by June 30, 2013. To allow for the completion of the Hydromodification Management Plan, Respondents should presume that the susceptibility mapping and associated documentation is complete by December 31, 2012. Alternative final submittal dates of the completed deliverables may be proposed and discussed in the Proposal.

### **Task 3: Regional Geodatabase**

The purpose of this task is to create a Geodatabase and web interface as required pursuant to the SAR MS4 Permit, however the resulting Geodatabase shall integrate information from the three Riverside County MS4 Permit areas (Santa Ana, Santa Margarita and Whitewater). A secondary purpose of this task is to facilitate the development of a web interface for Riverside County that is similar to the web interfaces developed by Orange and San Bernardino Counties, so as to facilitate ease of use by developers that may be working in multiple MS4 Permit regions. The web interface shall be designed to allow for the input of a project location / area, and then output a report of design related constraints and information specific to that project; such as watershed and hydrologic sub area(s), downstream receiving waters including hydromodification susceptibility (see Task 2) and 303(d) listed pollutants, soil types, structural post-construction BMPs suitable for the site based on the previously listed constraints, MSHCP areas, flood zones, land use designations, District Master/Area Drainage Plans, MS4 facilities, etc.

Proposals for this task shall be designed to make efficient use of Permittee resources, clearly describe approach and methods to be utilized, and be consistent with the guidelines below.

## **A. Proposal Considerations**

- i. The Proposal shall be designed to address the applicable requirements in Sections XII.B.6 of the SAR MS4 Permit; however it should integrate information from and be applicable to the three Riverside County MS4 Permit areas.
- ii. Other Considerations: Proposals for this task shall describe how similar efforts completed or underway in San Bernardino and Orange Counties will or will not be leveraged or otherwise utilized.

## **B. Deliverables** - The Proposal shall describe in detail the deliverables that will be provided in performance of this task, including at a minimum:

- i. Project Management, including any costs not directly related to the deliverables below. Regular status update and feedback meetings with the District should be incorporated into the Proposal.
- ii. Development of the Geodatabase: Performance of any necessary background research and data collection to support and populate the Geodatabase.
- iii. Development of the web-enabled interface.
- iv. Documentation: Preparation of documentation necessary to facilitate ongoing maintenance and updates to the Geodatabase by the District.
- v. Other interim or final deliverables as necessary to complete the task.

## **C. Cost Breakdown** – Provide the overall cost for completing the task, including itemized costs and assumptions for each of the deliverable items identified pursuant to the requirements above.

## **D. Timeline** – Final task schedules will be negotiated during the execution of a contract to perform this task. Proposals however should clearly confirm the ability of the firm to complete the task within the following limitations:

- i. Santa Ana Region: Final deliverables as required pursuant to this task will be integrated into the Santa Ana Watershed Action Plan (not part of this RFP) and submitted by the District to the Santa Ana Regional Board by January 29, 2013. To allow for the completion of the Watershed Action Plan, Respondents should presume that the final Geodatabase and web interface be complete by September 29, 2012. Alternative final submittal dates of the completed deliverables may be proposed and discussed in the Proposal.

## **Task 4: Santa Margarita HMP**

The purpose of this task is to develop the Hydromodification Management Plan (HMP) pursuant to the SMR MS4 Permit. Proposals should be designed to 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) to ensure that the Proposal will make highly

efficient use of Permittee resources while promoting consistency. The Proposal shall additionally clearly describe approach and methods to be utilized, and be consistent with the guidelines below.

## **A. Proposal Considerations**

- i. Santa Margarita Region: The Proposal shall be designed to address the applicable requirements in Section F.1.h.(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 results of which shall be incorporated into the HMP. For further information see Finding C.10, Finding C.11 Finding D.2.g, and corresponding Discussions in the Fact Sheet. The HMP document shall include the methodologies that will be implemented by Priority Developed Projects (PDPs) to ensure that post-project runoff flow rates and durations do not exceed pre-development runoff flow rates and durations by more than 10 percent as well as compensate for loss in sediment supply. The HMP document, once completed shall be able to be incorporated as an appendix to the Water Quality Management Plan (or referred to as the Standard Storm Water Mitigation Plan in the SMR MS4 Permit). At a minimum, the Respondent should discuss their approach to the following in the Proposal:
  - a. How similar work completed in San Diego County and currently underway in Orange County will, or will not, be leveraged or otherwise utilized.
  - b. Any hydrologic, hydraulic and/or geomorphologic analyses recommended to be performed, such as in the establishment of performance standards, range(s) of runoff flows to be controlled, and methods to assess and compensate for the loss of sediment supply. The SMR MS4 Permittees are expecting that the HMP Proposals will rely heavily on existing HMPs and hydromodification analyses conducted by the Southern California Coastal Water Research Project and the San Diego, Orange and other MS4 Programs, thus limiting the need for new field studies, modeling and analyses to the maximum extent feasible.
  - c. The establishment of end-user friendly tools to ensure ease and clarity in implementation by both planning/plan check staff and the development community, including a simplified approach to selecting, sizing and documenting appropriate BMPs, to mitigate the effects of hydromodification, including a BMP sizing calculator and other tools such as checklists, flow charts, templates, etc.
  - d. How the draft Riverside County LID BMP Design Manual will be modified or expanded upon in the development of the suite of BMPs to be used on PDPs to mitigate hydromodification impacts. Any new or updated BMPs shall be in a similar format and provide a similar level of design guidance as the current draft LID BMP design manual. A copy of the Draft LID BMP design manual is available for review upon request.
  - e. Development of a hydromodification monitoring plan that will assess effectiveness of implementation of the HMP. The plan shall include identification of the sites to be monitored, descriptions of monitoring and program evaluations to be conducted and include an effectiveness assessment methodology for both changes to physical and biological conditions of receiving water channels as PDPs are constructed upstream.

- f. Establishing a waiver program consistent with Section F.1.h.(3).
- g. Identifying and justifying any appropriate HMP exemptions pursuant to Section F.1.h.(4)(c).
- h. How similar work completed in San Diego County and currently underway in Orange County will, or will not, be leveraged or otherwise utilized.

**B. Deliverables** - The Proposal shall describe in detail the deliverables that will be provided in performance of this task, including at minimum:

- i. Project Management: Including any costs not directly related to the deliverables below. Regular status update and guidance meetings with the respective watershed Permittees should be incorporated into the Proposal.
- ii. Research & Data Collection: Performance of any necessary background research, data collection, and any recommended hydrologic, hydraulic, and geomorphologic analyses to support the development of the HMP.
- iii. Documentation:
  - a. Development of conceptual, draft and final tools to facilitate the implementation of the HMP, such as project-specific templates, suite of BMPs, BMP sizing calculators, waiver program, etc.
  - b. Development of the hydromodification monitoring plan to facilitate assessment of the HMP implementation effectiveness.
  - c. Preparation of complete HMP document draft(s) as necessary to facilitate adequate Permittee review and a minimum 30-day public review comment period, prior to submittal to the Regional Board, and a final HMP following receipt of Regional Board comments.
  - d. Preparation of comment-response matrices for all Permittee and Public Reviews.
- iv. Other interim, final or post board-approval deliverables as necessary to complete the task and facilitate the roll-out of the new HMP program.

**C. Cost Breakdown** – Provide the overall cost for completing the task, including itemized costs and assumptions for each of the deliverable items identified pursuant to the requirements above.

**D. Timeline** – Final task schedules will be negotiated during the execution of a contract to perform this task. Proposals should clearly confirm the ability of the firm to complete the task within the following limitations:

- i. The final HMP as required pursuant to this task will be submitted by the District to the San Diego Regional Board by June 30, 2013. Respondents should presume that the final draft HMP will be required to be complete by March 1, 2013. Alternative final submittal dates of the completed HMP documentation may be proposed and discussed in the Proposal.

- ii. The Proposal shall identify schedules for interim deliverables as necessary to ensure that 1) the final HMP document submitted to the District will have gone through a minimum of a 30-day public review, and appropriate comments will have been addressed, and 2) the Permittees have reviewed at least two complete drafts of the HMP prior to release for public review.

### **Task 5: Comprehensive Nutrient Reduction Plan (CNRP)**

The purpose of this task to develop the Comprehensive Nutrient Reduction Plan (CNRP) as required pursuant to the SAR MS4 Permit. Proposals for this task shall be designed to make efficient use of Permittee resources, clearly describe approach and methods to be utilized, and be consistent with the guidelines below.

#### **A. Proposal Considerations**

- i. This task shall address the SAR MS4 Permit requirements found in Section VI.D.2.d and VI.D.2.e. The CNRP should describe the specific actions that have been taken or will be taken to achieve compliance with the Lake Elsinore/Canyon Lake Nutrient TMDL urban WLA. The Respondents are expected to rely heavily upon existing BMP groundwork developed by the Lake Elsinore/Canyon Lake TMDL Task Force (Task Force), which is a collaborative effort of all the named dischargers named in the Lake Elsinore/Canyon Lake TMDL. The goal of the Task Force is to jointly develop science, technology and regulatory compliance programs that can assist with addressing the TMDL and restoring Beneficial Uses to Lake Elsinore and Canyon Lake. The SAR Permittees are working closely with the Task Force and are expecting that the CNRP will rely heavily upon in-lake remediation technologies currently being evaluated by the Task Force such as the Lake Elsinore Aeration and Mixing Systems, Lake Elsinore Fishery Management Programs, and the proposed Canyon Lake Hypolimnetic Oxygenation System. The Lake Elsinore/Canyon Lake TMDL Task Force is currently developing a pollutant trading program that will allow the Permittees and other dischargers to offset watershed based loads by paying for partial operation of these systems. However, the CNRP must also address and characterize the pollutant reduction benefits of existing and any newly proposed watershed-based BMPs deployed by the Permittees, as these in-lake technologies may not be able to fully offset all of the Permittees' nutrient loads to the lakes. Further, some cities, due to their location and proportion of area in the watershed, may need to rely less heavily on the regional in-lake treatment systems. Other factors, such as the impacts of ongoing land use conversion on watershed nutrient loads should also be considered in developing the CNRP.
- ii. In development of the Proposal for this task, the Respondent *should evaluate* the following existing resources:
  - a. The recent Draft Comprehensive Bacteria Reduction Plan (CBRP) developed to meet the requirements in Section VI.D.1.c of the SAR MS4 Permit describes the specific actions that have been taken or will be taken to achieve compliance with the Middle Santa Ana River Bacterial Indicator TMDL urban WLA. The Draft CBRP was submitted to the Santa Ana Regional Board on December 30, 2010. The Santa Ana Regional Board will provide comments on the Draft CBRP by March 31, 2011. A

copy of the Draft CBRP is available for review on the District's website under public notices. This document may serve as a model for the scope and scale of the CNRP.

- b. Compliance Plans developed by the Lake Elsinore/Canyon Lake Nutrient TMDL Task Force (available at <http://www.sawpa.org/roundtable-LECLTF.html>), including:
  - i. Lake Elsinore In Lake Sediment Nutrient Reduction Plan
  - ii. Canyon Lake In-Lake Sediment Reduction Plan
  - iii. Phase-2 Monitoring Plan for the LE/CL Lake Nutrient TMDL (dated December 23, 2010)
  - iv. Modeling Update Plan for the LE/CL Lake Nutrient TMDL (dated December 23, 2010)
  - v. Phase-2 Alternatives List for the LE/CL Lake TMDL (dated December 23, 2010)
  - vi. Pollutant Trading Plan (Pending)
  - vii. Ongoing studies and activities of the LE/CL TMDL Task Force
- c. TMDL Compliance programs incorporated into Section 13 of the Drainage Area Management Plan for the Santa Ana/Santa Margarita Region (April 2007).
- d. Santa Ana Regional Board approval of the deferment of the Phase 2 watershed-wide monitoring program, and approval of the revised Lake Elsinore and Canyon Lake in-lake monitoring programs as submitted by LESJWA. (Item 7 on the March 4, 2011 Regional Board agenda.)

**B. Deliverables** - The Proposal shall describe in detail the deliverables that will be provided in performance of this task, including at a minimum:

- i. Project Management: Including any tasks not directly related to the deliverables below. Regular status update and guidance meetings with the respective watershed Permittees should be incorporated into the Proposal.
- ii. Research & Data Collection: Performance of any necessary background research and data collection to support the development of the CNRP.
- iii. Documentation:
  - a. Preparation of complete CNRP document draft(s) as necessary to facilitate adequate Permittee review and a minimum 30-day public review comment period, prior to submittal to the Regional Board; and a final CNRP following receipt of Regional Board comments.
  - b. Preparation of comment-response matrices for all document reviews.
- iv. Other interim or final deliverables as necessary to complete the task.

**C. Cost Breakdown** – Provide the overall cost for completing the task, including itemized costs and assumptions for each of the deliverable items identified pursuant to the requirements above.

**D. Timeline** – Final task schedules will be negotiated during the execution of a contract to perform this task. Proposals should clearly confirm the ability of the firm to complete the task within the following limitations:

- i. The final 'Draft' CNRP as required pursuant to this task will be submitted by the District to the Santa Ana Regional Board by December 31, 2011. Respondents should presume that the final 'Draft' CNRP will be required to be complete and submitted to the District by December 1, 2011. Alternative submittal dates to the District may be proposed and discussed in the Proposal provided that all regulatory deadlines are met.
- ii. Within 80 days following receipt of comments from Regional Board staff, the final CNRP must be submitted to the District.
- iii. The Proposal shall identify schedules for interim deliverables as necessary to ensure that the above timeline and deliverable requirements are met.

## **Attachment B**

### **Required Proposal Content**

Proposals must be:

- Prepared simply and economically, providing a straightforward and concise description of methodology and approach to satisfy the requirements of each applicable Task;
- Prepared uniformly on letter size (8-1/2"x11") sheets of white paper, single or double-sided, minimum 12 font;
- Divided in sections, with each section clearly titled, with tabs for the Main Body labeled A through D, and at minimum Appendices I and II, as identified below; and
- Be clean and suitable for copying.

Emphasis should be on completeness and clarity/conciseness of content with sufficient detail to allow for accurate evaluation and comparative analysis among Proposals. The information required below will be used to evaluate the Respondent's Proposal based on the criteria outlined in Attachment C of this RFP. Respondents may be deemed non-responsive if they do not respond to each of the Sections, A through D of the main body of the Proposal, and at minimum Appendices I and II, as identified below.

Each Firm's Proposal shall include a main body, and a separate appendix for each task being proposed. Both the Main Body and the Appendices shall be separated into sections tabbed with corresponding letters and related headings in the order presented below. The main body of each firm's Proposal should be kept to no more than five (5) double-sided pages, and each Appendix should be kept to no more than ten (10) pages, excluding resumes and examples of previous work:

#### **Main Body:**

- A. Executive Cover Letter
- B. Table of Contents
- C. Statement of Compliance
- D. Firm Overview

#### **Appendices**

- I. Certificate of Insurance
- II. Task # - (Task Title)
  - a) Project Team
  - b) Record of Past Performance
  - c) Service Approach and Methodology
  - d) Deliverables and Timeline
  - e) Cost Proposal
- III. Additional Appendices for additional tasks, as needed, and following structure of Appendix II.
- IV. Additional Appendices for additional tasks, as needed, and following structure of Appendix II.
- V. Additional Appendices for additional tasks, as needed, and following structure of Appendix II.

## **Discussion of Proposal Content**

### **Main Body (5 pages max):**

#### **A. Executive Cover Letter**

The Executive Cover Letter shall be a brief formal letter from Respondent that provides information regarding the firm and its ability to perform the requirements of this RFP. This letter must include the following information: Company Name, Address, Contact Person, Telephone Number and Email Address. The Executive Cover letter should also clearly specify for which task(s) the Respondent is submitting a proposal.

The Executive Cover Letter must be signed by an authorized representative. Signature by an authorized representative of the firm on the Executive Cover Letter shall constitute a warranty; the falsity of which shall entitle the District to pursue any remedy authorized by law, which shall include the right, at the option of the District, of declaring any contract made as a result thereof to be void.

All Addendums to the Proposal must be signed by an authorized representative and included in this section of the main body.

#### **B. Table of Contents**

This Section must contain a comprehensive table of contents that identifies material in the main body by Sections A-D (in order listed above) utilizing sequential page numbers, and in the Appendices by Appendix number and sub-section number, utilizing sequential page numbers specific to each appendix.

#### **C. Statement of Compliance**

Respondents shall include in this section either a statement of compliance with all parts of this solicitation (terms and conditions, scope of services, insurance, etc.) or a list of exceptions. The list of exceptions must include suggested rewording/changes for submitting the proposed exception and any impact the proposed exception may have on the services to be provided.

#### **D. Firm Overview**

1. Business name and legal business status (i.e., partnership, corporation, etc.)
2. Identify the owners, principals and management staff of the Respondent. Provide a history of the Respondent which shall include years in business, total number of employees and number of clients (including references). Information should also include an organizational chart of the Respondent, including sub-contractors.
3. Indicate the type of Respondent or partnership and indicate whether the Respondent is locally-owned, statewide, national, etc.
4. Listing with job titles and resumes of key personnel (including sub-consultants). Resumes should highlight title, education, licenses (including expiration dates), relevant experience within the last five years, and other qualifications for the services described in this RFP.

## **Appendices:**

### **I. Certificate of Insurance**

Respondents shall clearly confirm and state the willingness and ability to provide the required insurance coverage and accord insurance form. The District will request the actual insurance form when recommendation for award is made.

- General Liability = **\$1,000,000**
- Vehicle Liability = **\$1,000,000**
- Worker's Compensation insurance covering all of the Consultant's employees shall be furnished in accordance with the Statutory Requirements of the District and shall include Employer's Liability insurance with a limit of **\$1,000,000** for each accident for bodily injury or disease
- Professional Liability or Errors and Omissions = **\$1,000,000 per occurrence/ \$2,000,000 annual aggregate**

### **II. Task Specific Appendices (max 10 pages each):**

An appendix shall be provided for each task that is bid upon. Each task-specific appendix shall include the following sections:

#### **a) Project Team**

1. Identify the Respondent's principal office location where the work for the specific task will be provided. If sub-consultants will be utilized, identify their location(s).
2. Organizational Chart and staffing plan identifying key personnel and related support staff (including sub-consultants) that will perform and/or assist in the completion of the task.
3. Provide a resource allocation table, that includes the names and title of each person that will be primarily responsible for completion of the task (or portions thereof including sub-consultants), their proportional responsibility for the task in hours, and any conflicting assignments that may impede their availability.

#### **b) Record of Past Performance**

Summarize up to three (3) current and/or past contracts (within the past five years, one page each) that best demonstrate the bidder's ability to successfully complete the task in the manner described in the Scope of Services.

For each, Respondent shall provide:

1. Project Name
2. Client name and address
3. Client contact name, telephone and fax numbers and email address
4. Brief Project Description
5. Initial and final Project schedule and cost (e.g. start/end dates and total fee to Respondent)

6. Names of key personnel of the Respondent's team that participated on the project and their specific role, including applicable problems resolved and/or solutions recommended.

Samples of final work products may be provided in electronic formats where applicable (via cd).

**c) Service Approach and Methodology**

Clearly articulate the Respondent's proposed approach to completing the task as described in the Scope of Services. The Proposal should be sufficiently detailed to serve as a draft scope of work which, subsequent to selection, would be finalized and incorporated into a professional services agreement. Respondent is encouraged to identify and recommend any improvements/enhancements/alternatives for the proposed service, as well as highlight other issues Respondent deems prudent. Respondent is also encouraged to identify any unique or specialized approach they may take to perform any of the requested work and the benefits that may be realized by the client as a result of this approach.

**d) Deliverables and Timeline**

Each task in the Scope of Services identifies specific deliverables that are required to be submitted within a specified timeline. The District reserves the right to require that a task be submitted at an earlier date than described in the NPDES MS4 Permits. The Proposals shall clearly confirm the ability of the Respondent to provide the deliverables within the specified timeline(s).

**e) Cost Proposal**

Provide a cost estimate that encompasses all costs expected to be invoiced for the completion of the Task. Costs shall be itemized and provided consistent with any specific guidelines identified in the Scope of Services. The cost estimate will be considered along with the other Evaluation criteria identified in Attachment C.

Hourly rates and direct and indirect expense charges for the term of the contract shall also be submitted and shall be clearly defined for each classification with the Proposal. Fees for any projected sub-contracted services shall also be included and clearly disclosed.

## Attachment C

### Proposal Instructions, Evaluation Criteria and Selection Process

#### I. Proposal

The Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (District) is seeking Proposals from interested organizations and firms (Respondents) to perform the Tasks outlined in Attachment A, as required by Riverside County's area-wide National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permits.

All interested and qualified Respondents are invited to submit a Proposal for consideration. Submission of a Proposal indicates that the Respondent has read and understands this entire RFP, including all appendices, attachments, exhibits, schedules and addenda (as applicable); that all concerns regarding this RFP have been satisfied; and that the firm has the full capacity to perform and deliver the services described in the proposal within the timeframes specified or referenced in the applicable portion of Attachment A. Respondents may propose on one or more of the Tasks contained in Attachment A by including an appendix for each proposed Task as described in Attachment B.

#### II. Work Product

All Proposals become the property of the District. All information submitted in the Proposal becomes "public record" as defined by the State of California upon completion of the procurement process.

#### III. RFP Timeline

A.	Release of Request for Proposals	Tuesday, March 15, 2011
B.	Non-mandatory bidder's meeting	Thursday, March 24, 2011 – 10:00 a.m.
C.	Deadline for Submission of Questions	Tuesday, March 29, 2011
D.	Responses to Questions from District	Tuesday, April 5, 2011
E.	Deadline for Proposal submission	Tuesday, April 19, 2011 - 4:00 p.m.
F.	Tentative date for awarding of Contract(s)	Thursday, May 19, 2011
G.	Tentative beginning date for Contract(s)	Monday, June 20, 2011

The purpose of the Non-mandatory Bidder's Meeting is to allow potential Respondents an opportunity to present questions and obtain clarification relative to any facet of this solicitation. While attendance at this meeting will not be a prerequisite for offering a Proposal, Respondents are encouraged to attend. Any changes that may be made as a result of this meeting will be noted in an addendum to the RFP.

#### IV. Period of Performance

The period of performance will vary for each contract based on the regulatory constraints associated with each particular task. By submitting a proposal, the Respondent indicates that they understand and can meet the regulatory time constraints that may be associated with a particular

task, as described or referenced in Attachment A. *Contracts will be subject to an annual renewal clause.*

## V. Proposal Submission

Respondents are encouraged to carefully review this RFP in its entirety prior to preparation of the Proposals.

Proposals shall be enclosed in a sealed package. Respondent's name and address shall appear in the upper left-hand corner of the package. All Proposals shall be identified with "NPDES Support Services RFP/Respondent Proposal", and the applicable Task number(s) bid upon, legibly written on the outside of the package(s). If multiple packages are submitted, each package must be legibly numbered, i.e., 1 of 3, as required.

**Proposals must be received no later than the date and time as specified in the timeline (Section III).** Proposal must be consistent with the Required Proposal Content (Attachment B) and Proposal Instructions (Attachment C). **All Proposals shall include a cover letter signed by an authorized agent. Respondent shall submit a Proposal package consisting of:**

1. One (1) bound original and five (5) bound copies of the written Proposal.
2. Copies of similar work products, including past reports, can be provided on a master CD or DVD in word or .pdf format. All electronic information should be organized so as to be readily apparent as to which files relate to which service.

All Proposals must be submitted to:

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

**In Person Delivery:** All Proposals delivered in person or by courier must have the receptionist at the front desk date and timestamp all Proposals upon receipt. Proposals received after the stated time and date will be considered late and will be returned.

**Standard Mail:** Late Proposals will not be accepted. Postmarks **will not** be accepted in lieu of this requirement. Proposals received after April 19, 2011 at 4:00 p.m. will be considered late and will be returned.

The District will not be responsible for submittals that are delinquent, lost, incorrectly marked, sent to an address other than that given herein, or sent by mail or courier service and not signed for by the District. Proposals received at any other County office will not be accepted. Faxed or emailed Proposals will not be accepted.

## VI. General Requirements

- The District reserves the right to waive, at its discretion, any irregularity within a Proposal which the District deems reasonably correctable or otherwise not warranting rejection of the Proposal.
- The District reserves the right to request clarification of information submitted, and to request additional information from any Respondent.
- The District reserves the right to withdraw all or a portion of the RFP, to reject in whole, or in part, a specific proposal for noncompliance within the RFP provisions, or not award a contract at any time because of unforeseen circumstances, or if it is determined to be in the best interest of the District.
- The District shall not pay any costs incurred or associated in the preparation of this or any Proposal or for participation in the procurement process.
- Any Respondent who wishes to make modifications to a Proposal already received by the District must withdraw his/her Proposal in order to make the modifications. All modifications must be made in ink, properly initialed by the Respondent's authorized representative, and executed and submitted in accordance with the terms and conditions of this solicitation. It is the responsibility of the Respondent to ensure that modified Proposals are resubmitted **before the RFP submittal deadline**.
- Respondents may withdraw their Proposals at any time prior to the due date and time by submitting notification of withdrawal signed by the Respondent's authorized agent. Proposals cannot be changed or modified after the RFP submittal deadline.
- A Proposal may be considered non-responsive if conditional, incomplete, or if it contains alterations of form, additions not called for, or other irregularities that may constitute a material change to the Proposal.

## VII. Interpretation of the RFP

The Respondent must make careful examination and understand all of the requirements, specifications and conditions stated in the RFP. If any Respondent planning to submit a Proposal finds discrepancies in or omissions from the RFP, or is in doubt as to the meaning, a written request for interpretation or correction must be given to the District. Any changes to the RFP will be made only by written addendum and may be posted on the District website at [www.rcflood.org](http://www.rcflood.org). The District is not responsible for any other explanations or interpretations.

All Respondent questions, clarifications or comments must be submitted in writing and must be received by the District no later than March 29, 2011. Inquiries received after this date will not be accepted or responded to. Ensure all questions, clarifications or comments are addressed to:

Alberto Martinez, Associate Civil Engineer  
[amart@rcflood.org](mailto:amart@rcflood.org).

All email correspondence shall be clearly marked in the subject line with "NPDES Support Services RFP/Questions". Within the body of the email, each inquiry must reference the section number and title from the RFP to which the question pertains.

## **VIII. Contractual Development**

Upon selection of the most qualified respondent for each task, the District will negotiate a price which it determines as fair and reasonable. If the District is unable to negotiate a satisfactory contract with the firm selected, negotiations with that firm will terminate and negotiations with the second ranking Respondent shall commence.

After selection of the preferred Respondent(s), the final scope of work shall be negotiated and maximum compensation for the completion of the task determined accordingly.

## **IX. Evaluation Criteria**

Proposals will be evaluated based on relevant factors, including but not limited to the following:

All Proposals must satisfy all of the following pre-qualification requirements on a pass/fail basis:

1. The Respondent must demonstrate experience in implementing similar NPDES MS4 Program Tasks in California.
2. The Respondent must have a local or regional (e.g., within one hour's drive of the Permit Areas) office, or demonstrate the ability to be as responsive as a local or regional office would enable.
3. The Respondent must have extensive knowledge of Southern California water quality and water conservation issues as applicable to the Proposal.
4. The Respondent must bid on at least one Task. The Respondent must have the ability to perform all services for the tasks that they bid, or if not able to individually accomplish all bid services, must demonstrate the ability to accomplish all bid services via a sub-contractor or other approach.
5. Respondents must demonstrate the full ability and availability to meet any regulatory timelines.
6. The Respondent must demonstrate experience, qualifications and competence in performing described services.
7. The Respondent's Proposal must address the required elements of the applicable tasks as described or referenced in Attachment A.
8. Proposals must show an ability to meet the District's insurance and indemnification requirements.
9. Proposal is consistent with formatting requirements of Attachment B, including electronic data. Electronic data that is not clearly identified will be excluded from evaluation.
10. Proposal is received prior to the deadline for Proposal submission.

Each Proposal that has met requirements noted above will be competitively evaluated on its relative strengths and weaknesses against the standardized criteria listed below. The order of the listed criteria is not indicative of their priority, weight or importance:

1. Assessment of the Project team, such as current or previous personal experience(s) of team members applicable to the Proposal, certifications and licensure, references, and demonstrated staff availability to complete the Proposal.
2. Assessment of the firm's and/or the project team's record of past performance on similar projects such as applicability of the Respondent's previous projects to the Proposal, performance verifications with project owners, quality and utility of previous products to end user, timeliness of completion, budget overruns, etc.
3. Assessment of the Respondent's proposed approach and methodology to completing the task such as clarity, completeness, and appropriateness of methods, deliverables, assumptions and timelines.
4. Assessment of the Respondent's cost estimate, including competitiveness, reasonableness and completeness, and the extent to which it maximizes the utilization of available resources and minimizes Permittee costs.

Additional consideration will be given to Respondents that (together with their identified sub-consultants) can provide comprehensive services (e.g., address entire Scope of Services or multiple tasks); however, the District reserves the right to award individual services, or portions of services, to one or more Respondents based on the criteria established.

After selection of the preferred Respondent(s), the final Scope of Work shall be negotiated and maximum compensation determined accordingly.

## **X. Evaluation Process**

Throughout the entire process of preparation, submission and evaluation of the Proposals, Respondent may only contact Alberto Martinez who is administering the RFP. Attempts by the Respondent to contact any other District representative may result in disqualification of the Respondent.

The Selection Committee will be comprised of three or more representatives from the District and MS4 Permittees. All evaluation material will be considered Confidential and not released by the District to anyone other than the Selection Committee, which may include NPDES MS4 Permittees.

Proposal evaluation will commence promptly following the pre-qualification review conducted by the District. During the evaluation process, the Selection Committee may request clarification, as necessary, from Respondent. Respondent should not misconstrue a request for clarification for negotiations. It is anticipated that the evaluation process will be completed within approximately 30-60 working days. Respondents will be notified via email regarding the outcome of Respondent's Proposal.

The District may select qualified Respondent(s) based solely on the submitted Proposal(s).

Following the evaluation of the submitted Proposals, a short-list of the most qualified Respondents may be developed based on the Evaluation Criteria outlined above. The District may elect to have the short-list of Respondents give oral presentations. Short-listed Respondents must be prepared

to give their presentation within five (5) business days of the request by the District. The Selection Committee may ask questions about Respondent's written Proposal and other issues regarding the Scope of Service. Presentations will be evaluated and the District may ask short-listed firms to submit a "best and final" Proposal. The short-list interview may be scored. In addition to interviews with the short-list of Respondents, the Selection Committee may also conduct on-site visits and/or tours of the Respondent's place of business.

The Selection Committee will submit its analysis and recommendation, in a summarized form, to the Santa Ana/Santa Margarita Technical Advisory Committees for formal recommendation to the General Manager-Chief Engineer. The District reserves the right to split or make the award that is most advantageous to the District.

The successful Respondent(s) will be expected to enter into a Consulting Services Agreement. If public or quasi-public agencies are selected to conduct one or more service, a cooperative agreement will be developed consistent with the terms of the consultant services agreement. All Respondents should note that any contract pursuant to this solicitation is dependent upon the recommendation of the District, Santa Ana/Santa Margarita Technical Advisory Committee and the approval of the District's Board of Supervisors.