



**Solicitation Information
February 24, 2014**

RFP # 7548513

TITLE: Environmental Consulting Services to Support the Rhode Island Bays, Rivers, and Watersheds Coordination Team: Upper Narragansett Bay Water Quality Facilitated Stakeholders Process

Submission Deadline: Friday March 28, 2014 @ 11:00 am (Local Time)

PRE-BID/ PROPOSAL CONFERENCE: Yes Date: Wednesday March 12, 2014: 10:00 am

Mandatory: No

Location: DEM 235 Promenade St., Suite 425 Conf Rm A Director's Office, Providence RI

Questions concerning this solicitation may also be sent to the Division of Purchases at questions@purchasing.ri.gov no later **3/17/ 2014 at 4:00 pm (LT)**. Questions should be submitted in a *Microsoft Word attachment*. Please reference the RFP # on all correspondence. Questions received, if any, with responses will be posted on the Internet as an addendum to this solicitation. It is the responsibility of all interested parties to download this information.

SURETY REQUIRED: No

BOND REQUIRED: No

**Thomas Bovis
Interdepartmental Project Manager**

Vendors must register on-line at the State Purchasing Website at www.purchasing.ri.gov

Note to Vendors:

Offers received without the entire completed four-page RIVP Generated Bidder Certification Form attached may result in disqualification.

THIS PAGE IS NOT A BIDDER CERTIFICATION FORM

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) TO:
**Environmental Consulting Services to Support the RI Bays, Rivers, and Watersheds
Coordination Team: Upper Narragansett Bay Water Quality Stakeholders Process**

INTRODUCTION

The Rhode Island Department of Administration/Division of Purchases on behalf of the Rhode Island Bays, Rivers and Watersheds Coordination Team (hereinafter the “Coordination Team”), in coordination with the Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management, Office of Water Resources (hereinafter the “DEM”), and the Narragansett Bay Commission (hereinafter the “NBC”) is soliciting for consulting services to provide facilitation and project management support for the Upper Narragansett Bay Water Quality Stakeholders Process, in accordance with the terms of this solicitation and the State’s General Conditions Purchase.

REQUIRED SERVICES

Environmental consulting services to provide project management and facilitation support to the Upper Narragansett Bay Water Quality Stakeholders Process, a multi-year project intended to identify, evaluate and assess the feasibility of selected sustainable, cost-effective management strategies for improving the water quality and overall ecological health of upper Narragansett Bay. Project manager will work closely with a Project Steering Committee (PSC) consisting of representatives of DEM, NBC and the Coordination Team Chair, to:

- Investigate and compile scientific and technical information on selected best management practices and management strategies to improve water quality and ecological conditions in Upper Narragansett Bay.
- Advise project participants on the technical merit, feasibility, benefits and costs of selected management strategies determined to be potentially suitable to enhancing conditions in upper Narragansett Bay.
- Organize, facilitate and document a series of technical stakeholder workshops to identify, build consensus for and prioritize those selected management strategies which offer the most potential for contributing to the restoration of upper Narragansett Bay’s water quality and ecological conditions.
- Synthesize the outputs and conclusions of a stakeholder process into a concise summary report. The report should identify areas where further data gathering, investigation or analysis is needed to assess the feasibility or cost-effectiveness of certain management strategies.
- Complete additional investigation, technical evaluations and cost analyses in order to support further assessment of select management strategies.

The selected consultant must possess the requisite technical and facilitation skills to implement the project and serve as an unbiased liaison between governmental organizations, scientists, non-governmental organizations, and public and private stakeholders.

INSTRUCTIONS AND NOTIFICATIONS TO OFFERORS

This solicitation, and any subsequent award, is governed by the State's General Conditions of Purchase, which is available at www.purchasing.ri.gov.

- Potential offerors are advised to review all sections of this Request carefully and to follow instructions completely, as failure to make a complete submission as described elsewhere herein may result in rejection of the proposal.
- Alternative approaches and/or methodologies to accomplish the desired or intended results of this procurement are solicited. However, proposals which depart from or materially alter the terms, requirements, or scope of work defined by this Request may be rejected as being non-responsive.
- All costs associated with developing or submitting a proposal in response to this Request, or to provide oral or written clarification of its content shall be borne by the offeror. The State assumes no responsibility for these costs.
- Proposals are considered to be irrevocable for a period of not less than sixty (60) days following the opening date, and may not be withdrawn, except with the express written permission of the State Purchasing Agent.
- All pricing submitted will be considered to be firm and fixed unless otherwise indicated herein.
- Proposals misdirected to other State locations or which are otherwise not present in the Division of Purchases at the time of opening for any cause will be determined to be late and may not be considered. The "Official" time clock is in the reception area of the Division of Purchases.
- In accordance with Title 7, Chapter 1.1 of the General Laws of Rhode Island, no foreign corporation shall have the right to transact business in the state until it shall have procured a Certificate of Authority to do so from the Rhode Island Secretary of State (401-222-3040). This will be a requirement only of the successful bidder(s).
- Proposals should include the offeror's FEIN or Social Security number as evidenced by a W9, downloadable from the Division of Purchases website at www.purchasing.ri.gov.
- Offerors are advised that all materials submitted to the State of Rhode Island for consideration in response to this Request for Proposals will be considered to be public records, as defined in Title 38 Chapter 2 of the Rhode Island General Laws.
- It is intended that an award pursuant to this Request will be made to a prime contractor, who will assume responsibility for all aspects of the work. Joint venture and cooperative proposals will not be considered, but subcontracts are permitted, provided that their use is clearly indicated in the offeror's proposal, and the subcontractor(s) proposed to be used are identified in the proposal.

- The State of Rhode Island has a goal of ten percent (10%) participation by Minority Business Enterprises (MBE) in all State procurements. While exceptions to this procurement goal are possible, it is strongly recommended that your proposal include a certified MBE. Qualified Vendors must be certified as such by the RI Minority Business Enterprise Compliance Office (RIMBECO). Directories of RI MBE-certified vendors are available from RIMBECO. For further information, please visit the web site of the RI Minority Business Enterprise Compliance Office at www.mbe.ri.gov, or call (401) 574-8253.
- The purchase of services under an award made pursuant to this Request will be contingent on the availability of funds.
- Equal Employment Opportunity (RIGH 28-5.1) Declaration of Policy – (a) Equal opportunity and affirmative action toward its achievement is the policy of all units of Rhode Island State government, including all public and quasi-public agencies, commissions, boards and authorities, and in the classified, unclassified, and non-classified services of State employment. This policy applies in all areas where the State dollar is spent: in employment, public service, grants and financial assistance, and in state licensing and regulation. For further information, contact the Rhode Island Equal Employment Opportunity Office at (401) 222-3090.
- Interested parties are instructed to peruse the Division of Purchases web site on a regular basis, as additional information relating to this solicitation may be released in the form of an addendum to this RFP / LOI.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

The Upper Bay Water Quality Stakeholders Project will use a technical stakeholder process to identify, investigate and evaluate selected sustainable management strategies that have the potential to contribute to the restoration of water quality and ecological conditions in the Upper Narragansett Bay region. The project is intended to focus on management strategies other than those practices related to public wastewater systems; e.g. upgrades to wastewater treatment facilities and combined sewer overflow controls. It will explore instead other management strategies that could prove beneficial to restoration of upper Narragansett Bay. Examples of strategies expected to be considered include watershed-based green infrastructure, physical habitat restoration, modification to circulation patterns, and watershed-scale management of fertilizer uses, marine aquaculture, and shellfish restoration. Information developed during the project is expected to be used to inform related existing and future water quality and decision support modeling efforts and to develop pilot demonstration projects as appropriate.

BACKGROUND

Upper Narragansett Bay, including the estuarine Providence and Seekonk Rivers, is known to be heavily impacted by human activities. Historically, urbanization in the Providence metropolitan region involved filling of coastal marshes and other wetlands, increased impervious cover added to the landscape and alterations to rivers and channels; e.g. dams, dredging. Population growth generated both domestic and industrial wastewaters that were discharged, often untreated in the past, into the bay and its tributaries. The cumulative impact of these alterations to upper Narragansett Bay continues to manifest today in poor water quality and degraded aquatic habitats.

With the enactment of the federal Clean Water Act and other environmental statutes over forty years ago, Rhode Island and upper Bay municipalities have worked to reduce pollutant loadings and restore and maintain the overall chemical, physical, and biological health of upper Narragansett Bay. These efforts have included significantly enhanced wastewater treatment, abatement of combined sewer overflows, limitations on filling in wetlands and floodplains, improved stormwater management, and enhanced on-site wastewater treatment requirements. In addition, various entities are working collaboratively and proactively on aquatic habitat restoration.

While upper bay conditions have improved during this period, water quality in the upper bay region remains designated by the RIDEM as impaired – meaning that the water quality fails to meet water quality standards. Currently about one-third of Narragansett Bay is considered impaired due to the low dissolved oxygen, referred to as hypoxia. This condition is considered one of several symptoms of eutrophication in the upper bay that is fueled by excess nitrogen in the ecosystem. Other symptoms manifest as excessive macroalgae and algal blooms, reduced water clarity and light penetration, loss of submerged aquatic vegetation, and contamination and/or die-off of fish and shellfish. The extent and duration of hypoxia varies year to year and is influenced by a complex set of factors which includes pollutant loadings, rainfall patterns, temperature, and stratification and circulation patterns. Pathogens constitute another water quality problem well documented in the Upper Bay that has resulted in the closure of shellfish growing areas to harvest.

Numerous point and nonpoint sources introduce nutrients and other pollutants into Narragansett Bay and its watershed, including municipal wastewater treatment facilities (WWTF's), combined sewer overflows, stormwater runoff, discharges from on-site wastewater treatment systems, and atmospheric deposition. In recent decades, water pollution control efforts have focused on WWTF discharges, estimated to contribute 62-73% of the total nutrient loadings to upper Narragansett Bay. In 2005, consistent with a 2004 state legislative mandate, DEM issued a [Plan for Managing Nutrient Loadings to Rhode Island Waters \(See Resources Section below\)](#) that stipulated how Rhode Island would achieve the legislative goal of "a 50% reduction in nitrogen loadings from WWTF's" from 1995-1996 seasonal averages. The plan targeted eleven RI WWTFs that discharge directly into the estuarine Providence and Seekonk Rivers, the upper Bay or its tributary rivers including the Blackstone, Pawtuxet and Woonasquatucket. Over the last decade, pursuant to consent agreements between DEM and RI wastewater authorities as a result of RI Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (RIPDES) permitting, WWTFs have been planning, designing and constructing upgrades to their facilities to reduce pollutant loadings of nitrogen. Considerable progress has been made toward attainment of the 50% reduction goal with 10 of 11 WWTFs having completed some or all of their required upgrades. During the period of WWTF nutrient -related upgrades, a strategy to abate combined sewer overflows has also been underway. NBC has completed Phase 1 and is currently constructing Phase 2 of the three phase CSO abatement program. In addition to monitoring the treatment systems, ambient water quality monitoring is conducted throughout the upper bay and its tributaries in order to track improvements in water quality. A number of agencies collaborate on the monitoring activities including but not limited to DEM, DOH, URI-GSO, NBC and Brown University.

In addition to actions taken by WWTFs, it is well recognized that achieving water quality goals will require actions to abate and more effectively manage other more dispersed sources of water pollution. Various regional, state and local programs are working to reduce pollutant loadings from sources within the watershed such as stormwater discharges, on-site wastewater systems, fertilizer use and pet waste.

Rhode Island continues to advance state and municipal efforts to reduce stormwater pollutant loadings into Narragansett Bay and its tributaries. In 2010, DEM and CRMC issued a revised Rhode Island Stormwater Design and Installation Standards Manual (See Resources Section below) that strengthened stormwater treatment requirements and requires the application of low impact design principles for site development and building design and the utilization of stormwater best management practices that conform to the manual's standards for pollutant removal.

While the upper Bay metropolitan region is serviced by public sewers, portions of the contributing watershed remain reliant on on-site wastewater treatment systems (OWTS). Rhode Island's regulatory on-site wastewater systems (OWTS) program, administered by DEM in collaboration with CRMC and other entities, is advancing strategies to reduce the impacts from OWTS through use of alternative technologies, better maintenance and advanced treatment requirements. Pursuant to state law, DEM is implementing the mandate for phasing out reliance on cesspools in certain areas; e.g. within 200 feet of coastal shoreline feature (See Resources Section).

In addition, Rhode Island state agencies and other entities (NGOs, watershed councils) have collaborated extensively on habitat restoration including restoration of saltmarshes, coastal and

riparian buffers and creation of fish passage in rivers and streams that provide habitat for anadromous fish. In addition to improved habitat values, such projects often deliver important water quality benefits.

Despite the numerous treatment and remedial actions taken to address nutrient and pathogen discharges and restore habitat quality and ecological functions, additional efforts are expected to be needed to abate eutrophic conditions and achieve long-term water quality goals for upper Narragansett Bay. Given the significant costs involved in further reducing nitrogen from WWTFs as well as other dispersed sources, the Coordination Team seeks to convene a stakeholder process that will assess a broader range of strategies that may offer additional options for achieving sustainable water quality and improved ecological conditions. The overall goal of the stakeholder process would be to facilitate collaborative learning regarding the feasibility, cost, and efficacy of alternative and innovative systems-based strategies that would target the underlying causes of eutrophication and hypoxia in upper Narragansett Bay. This project would thus evaluate strategies other than WWTF upgrades in order to identify those that may contribute significantly to water quality improvements and enhance the resiliency of the bay ecosystem. Such strategies would complement any further actions planned to improve wastewater infrastructure.

This stakeholder process will engage experts from a range of disciplines; e.g. water quality modeling, marine ecology, aquaculture, fisheries, wetlands, estuarine hydrodynamics and wastewater engineering. Representatives from federal, state and local government, academia and non-governmental organizations are expected to participate. Following the technical review process, broader public input will be sought as part of the overall project.

Approaches to be considered for further investigation may include innovative green infrastructure designs and treatment systems, beneficial use of nutrients through aquaculture, restoration and creation of wetlands, eelgrass and oyster beds, further hydro-modifications (e.g. dam removal, modification of circulation patterns) and watershed-wide controls related to fertilizer use. In addition, the working group and stakeholder group may choose to provide detailed recommendations on the highest priority research and monitoring needs.

This project is intended to reflect ecosystem-based management (EBM) principles and holistic systems thinking. By evaluating management options for the upper bay ecosystem more holistically, multidisciplinary solutions may emerge that deliver a range of benefits. Applying an EBM perspective will allow recognition of other important societal benefits associated with given management strategies: enhanced water-reliant economic activities such as aquaculture and tourism, improved flood hazard mitigation and resilience, and sea-level rise adaptation.

This project is expected to both draw upon and to yield information relevant to efforts underway to refine water quality models and develop decision support tools aimed at enhancing systems-based approaches to water quality management in upper Narragansett Bay. While this project is not specifying use of the following models, the project manager will need to be familiar with the work being undertaken in order to optimize the exchange of information that supports model refinements.

In 2012, the Environmental Protection Agency Region I (EPA) completed Phase 1 of the development of Narragansett Triple Value Simulation (3VS Model) (“Triple value” refers to

economic, social, and environmental values.) which is intended to “help policy makers and regional stakeholders explore a variety of cause and effect scenarios and investigate a variety of solutions to improve the health of the Bay in the face of growing population and climate change.” Specifically, the 3VS Model could be used to systematically evaluate the chemical, biological, and socio-economic consequences of different nutrient fluxes on watershed and Bay-wide scales. While this model is not yet publicly available, DEM anticipates continued work by EPA to further develop the model including seeking broader stakeholder involvement.

Other modeling work already underway of potential relevance to the project includes: the University of Rhode Island’s Narragansett Bay Coastal Hypoxia Research Program (CHRP), the Blackstone River Hydrological Simulation Program – Fortran (HSPF), water quality modeling by EPA-AED and NBC’s collaboration with the University of Rhode Island’s Dr. Chris Kincaid on a Regional Ocean Modeling System (ROMS) hydrodynamic and nutrient transport model for Narragansett Bay. As noted above, it is expected that the project will yield information that may be helpful in refining the water quality modeling tools under development. The reports forthcoming from the project will provide sound scientific information that can be utilized in the future water quality restoration planning; e.g. development of a nutrient and dissolved oxygen TMDLs for the upper Bay.

PROJECT PURPOSE

For this project, the Coordination Team, NBC, and DEM will initiate and oversee a multidisciplinary stakeholder process whose charge will be to identify and evaluate the feasibility of a range of management approaches that could address upper Narragansett Bay’s water quality management challenges including nutrients and pathogens. By engaging experts in coastal ecology, water quality, aquaculture, fisheries, wetlands, estuarine hydrodynamics, wastewater engineering, and estuarine science, the project will seek to build consensus on the feasibility of various strategies that should be considered for inclusion in a cost-effective integrated water quality management strategy for upper Narragansett Bay. With support from the consultants, the Coordination Team will develop background information about various strategies and then share and refine the information with a diverse stakeholder group. Practices to be examined include, but are not limited to, options for beneficial re-use of nutrients, expanded aquaculture, constructed wetlands and/or other natural buffers and changes in fertilizer use across the watershed. In addition, an evaluation of the expected effects of possible physical changes to the upper Bay, including improved circulation achieved through dredging or other means will be performed.

The stakeholder group and process, facilitated and supported by the consultant, and building upon the initial outputs of an expert working group will identify alternative management strategies and build consensus on the scientific basis and technical merits of these options. For strategies deemed potentially effective, the consultant will conduct additional work to complete preliminary feasibility analyses (where existing data allows) and/or identify information gaps that must be addressed to fully assess alternative management strategies. In evaluating options, potential legal and regulatory constraints will be identified for the assessed management options. In addition, preliminary information on the cost of implementation will be developed as deemed appropriate.

The expert working group and the stakeholder group and process would involve the NBC, DEM, EPA (Region I and EPA-AED), RI Department of Administration, RI Coastal Resources Management Council, RI Economic Development Corporation, Narragansett Bay Estuary Program, RI Sea Grant, RI Rivers Council, Army Corp of Engineers, other Narragansett Bay and bay watershed organizations, including those located in Massachusetts. The project would also seek active involvement of non-governmental organizations including but not limited to Save the Bay, the Blackstone River Watershed Council/Friends of the Blackstone, and the Nature Conservancy.

Resources:

The following information/reports are available for the Respondents:

- “Plan for Managing Nutrient Loadings to Rhode Island Waters”:
<http://www.dem.ri.gov/pubs/nutrient.pdf>
- 2010 Rhode Island Stormwater Design and Installation Standards Manual:
<http://www.dem.ri.gov/programs/benviron/water/permits/ripdes/stwater/t4guide/desman.htm>
- On-site wastewater treatment systems rules and nitrogen reducing systems:
<http://www.dem.ri.gov/programs/benviron/water/permits/isds/index.htm>
- OWTS Cesspool Phase-out Program:
<http://www.dem.ri.gov/programs/benviron/water/permits/isds/cessfaze.htm>
- RI Bays, Rivers, and Watersheds Systems-Level Plan:
<http://www.dem.ri.gov/bayteam/slplanning.htm>
- Narragansett Bay Sustainability Pilot report on the Triple Value Simulation:
<http://www.epa.gov/research/waterscience/water-nutrient-case-studies.htm>
- “The Development and Application of the Full Bay ROMS Hydrodynamic Model for Simulations of Chemical Transport with Multiple Freshwater Sources” (Narragansett Bay Commission)
- The Coastal Hypoxia Research Program:
<http://www.gso.uri.edu/merl/CHRP.html>
- Blackstone River HSPF Water Quality Model Calibration Report (Upper Blackstone Water Pollution Abatement District):
<http://www.ubwpad.org/news/Blackstone%20River%20Monitoring%20and%20Modeling.htm>
- RI Shellfish Management Plan Development:
<http://www.rismp.org/>
- The Narragansett Bay Fixed Site Fixed-Site Monitoring Network:
<http://www.dem.ri.gov/bart/stations.htm>
- NBC Upper Bay Water Quality Monitoring Program and data:
<http://snapshot.narrabay.com/app/>
- Insomniac & Day Trippers Data (nighttime/day time surveys of Narragansett Bay dissolved oxygen):
<http://www.geo.brown.edu/georesearch/insomniacs/>
- Narrbay.org (portal to Narragansett Bay coastal and marine datasets):
<http://www.narrbay.org/>

PROJECT TASKS AND DELIVERABLES

Year 1 Tasks:

Task 1. Initial Identification of Strategy Options

A Project Steering Committee (PSC) consisting of representatives of NBC, DEM the Coordination Team Chair, and potentially other stakeholders such as EPA Region I, will be formed to oversee execution of the project. The consultant will work with the PSC to complete an initial scoping of alternative management strategies that could address upper Narragansett Bay's water quality management challenges including nutrients and pathogens; these alternative management strategies would subsequently be assessed in greater detail by a technical stakeholder committee. Management strategies proposed for consideration are expected to include, but not be limited to, innovative green infrastructure designs and treatment systems, beneficial use of nutrients through aquaculture and shellfish restoration, restoration and creation of coastal wetlands, eelgrass and oyster beds, hydro-modifications (e.g. dam removal, modification of circulation patterns) and watershed-wide controls related to fertilizer use.

Task 1 would thus entail two meetings of the PSC: (1) an initial project kick-off meeting to refine the scope of work and coordination with the committees; and (2) meeting to refine an inclusive list of potential management strategy options for presentation to the Technical Stakeholder Committee.

Deliverables: Meeting notes, technical memorandum identifying strategies options

Task 2. Initial Technical Stakeholder Committee Meeting

Using the outcome of Task 1, the PSC will form a Technical Stakeholder Committee (TSC) reflecting a range of scientific disciplines and expertise. The TSC is expected to consist of scientists and engineers from the University of Rhode Island, University of Massachusetts, Brown University and Roger Williams University, state and federal agencies and laboratories, and non-governmental organizations. Drawing on readily available information, the consultant will develop information sufficient to briefly describe pertinent information on each strategy identified for consideration in Task 1; e.g. summary report or table. Using this summary, the TSC will meet to review, prioritize and select a subset of strategies for further investigation and evaluation.

Deliverables: Summary report/table of management strategy options
Documentation of rationale regarding strategies selected for further evaluation

Task 3. Technical Stakeholder Committee Meetings

During Year 1, a series of TSC meetings (minimum of five) would be organized to review and assess the scientific rationale, feasibility, efficacy, and costs of alternative management approaches. The consultant, working with the TSC, will compile background and synthesize information and guidance on the potential efficacy of applying alternative management approaches to upper Narragansett Bay. As information allows, the background information document would address:

- Relevant scientific information concerning the specific strategy

- Quantify pollutant reduction potential
- Describe benefits with respect to estuarine habitat quality and other ecosystem services
- Experience with the strategy in other estuaries or watersheds
- Factors affecting the feasibility of applying the strategy in Upper Narragansett Bay and its watershed
- Legal or regulatory constraints
- Preliminary Characterization of Costs
- Identification of key data gaps or other limitations of the existing information

The TSC meetings would be used to review and refine the information developed and through discussions reach a consensus on the technical and scientific merits of each management strategy being considered. The consultant will be responsible for leading the organization and facilitation of the meetings of the TSC. Coordination with the PSC would be expected to occur through conference calls or additional meetings as needed. As appropriate, additional technical experts may be invited by the PSC to participate in each meeting based on its topic area and content. As part of this process, information pertaining to cost effectiveness and regulatory considerations, including identification of potential obstacles, would be reviewed.

Deliverables: Background documents for strategy topics (minimum of topic areas)
 Five facilitated meetings of the TSC
 Meeting notes

Task 4. Technical Reports

Each TSC meeting would lead to generation of a summary technical report for the strategy option(s) reviewed. A draft of the report would be subject to comment and review by the TSC before finalization. The reports should reflect consensus on the technical and scientific merits of a strategy option as well as the benefits and drawbacks of each prospective option. Key information gaps would be identified. Additionally, the potential utility of information developed by the TSC process to on-going systems or water quality modeling project would be described. The reports will serve as the basis for discussions, review and collaboration by a larger stakeholder group also to be convened during Year 1.

Deliverables: Draft and final technical reports strategy topics (minimum of 5 areas)

Task 5. Capstone TSC Meeting, Public Stakeholder Meeting and Summary Report – Year 1

The consultant will facilitate a meeting of the TSC to consider the results of the prior topic-based meetings, identify opportunities for integration of management strategies and begin to assess which mix of management strategies may offer the greatest potential to enhance water quality and ecological restoration of upper Narragansett Bay. This analysis would be done within the context of information concerning the potential for additional pollutant loading reductions from WWTFs (including costs) using information provided by the PSC. Those strategies for which there is a consensus on the potential viability and efficacy would be recommended for further feasibility assessment in years 2 and 3.

The consultant would prepare meeting materials in advance, facilitate the meeting and reflect results in a summary report for year 1 of the project. A preliminary draft of the summary report would be subject to review and comment by the TSC.

Key findings from the preliminary draft summary report would be presented at a larger public meeting that invites additional stakeholder input from scientists, NGOs, concerned citizens, government officials, user groups, and others. Based on additional stakeholder comment generated by the public meeting, the preliminary draft report would be revised with guidance from the PSC as needed. The revised final draft would be subject to review and comment by the TSC as part of its finalization.

Deliverables: Preliminary draft report

Facilitated public stakeholder meeting

Documentation of public comment

Final draft summary report – year 1, response to comments

Final summary report – year 1

Note: See note under Work Plan submittal requirements regarding Tasks 6-8.

Task 6. Data Collection to Address Gaps – Year 2 & 3

The PSC anticipates that key data gaps would be identified during the review process that will constrain assessment of the feasibility of implementing certain management strategies. These could range from information known to be available but not yet compiled or aggregated into a readily available form to information that is unavailable. For strategies deemed priorities for further assessment, the PSC may elect to assign tasks in year 2 that involve data collection.

Deliverables: To be determined based on results from Year 1

Task 7. Feasibility Assessments – Year 2:

The consultant will advise the TSC in the selection of one or more management strategies that merit further evaluation in order to assess potential effectiveness or facilitate implementation. Where appropriate, the PSC will assign additional tasks pertaining to more detailed assessment of feasibility that would be needed to support implementation of one or more management strategies. During this process, the party or parties responsible for or willing to implementing a particular management strategy would be identified. The specific work involved in assessing feasibility could be variable and involve research of land ownership, field inspections to verify site conditions, identifying access issues that need to be resolved, calculating preliminary estimates for materials, devising conceptual engineering designs, reviewing permitting requirements and procedures, etc. It is intended that task would lead to conceptual designs (e.g. 10% engineering) and preliminary cost estimates for the implementation of the selected strategies.

Deliverables: Feasibility Reports – to be determined.

Task 8. Engineering Designs of Pilot Projects – Year 2:

The PSC believes certain management strategies may prove to be amenable and appropriate for pilot demonstration. The consultant may be tasked with developing detailed final designs to support implementation of a pilot project in year 3. The specific work involved may include field inspections, engineering design; e.g. calculations, modeling, etc., other design plans; e.g. landscape architecture, etc. and preparation of any information necessary to support required permitting, where applicable, to implement the pilot project. Each project selected for final design would also include a detailed budget for project implementation.

Deliverables: Final project implementation plans – to be determined.

Engineering designs – to be determined.

OFFER SUBMISSION AND DUE DATE

The letter of transmittal and proposals **(one original plus 5 (five) copies)** should be mailed or hand-delivered in a sealed envelope marked “**RFP # 7548513, Upper Narragansett Bay Water Quality Facilitated Stakeholders Process**” by the date and time listed on page 1 of this solicitation.

**RI Dept. of Administration
Division of Purchases, 2nd floor
One Capitol Hill
Providence, RI 02908-5855**

NOTE: Proposals received after the above-referenced due date and time may not be considered.

Proposals misdirected to other State locations or which are otherwise not presented in the Division of Purchases by the scheduled due date and time will be determined to be late and may not be considered. Proposals faxed or emailed to the Division of Purchases will not be considered. The official time clock is located in the reception area of the Division of Purchases

PROPOSALS SHOULD INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING:

A completed and signed four-page RIVIP Bidder Certification Cover Form, available at www.purchasing.ri.gov.

1. A Fixed Cost Proposal **in a separate sealed envelope** based on Year 1 deliverables outlined in this RFP and, in addition, a cost proposal reflecting the hourly rate for each proposed staff member, or other fee structure, proposed for this scope of services; and fee structures for staff available to be assigned for years 2 and 3, by year as needed.
2. A *separate* Technical Proposal describing the qualifications and background of the applicant and experience with similar programs, as well as the work plan or approach proposed for this requirement.
3. A completed and signed W-9 (taxpayer identification number and certification) in proposal marked “**Original**” only. Form is downloadable at www.purchasing.ri.gov.
4. In addition to the multiple hard copies of proposals required, Respondents are requested to provide their proposal in electronic format (CD-ROM, Diskette, flash drive) (exclude cost proposal from electronic copy). Microsoft Word/Excel OR PDF formats are preferable. Only

one (1) electronic copy is requested. This CD or diskette should be included in the proposal marked “original”.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PROPOSAL CONTENT AND FORMAT:

Technical Proposal - Consistent with the Project Tasks and Deliverables described above, the Technical Proposal content must include, at a minimum, the following information for the Project Management Team to review:

- ❖ **Company Introduction:** Respondents are to include a complete description and other relevant information documenting organizational structure and the agency’s expertise and length of experience relative to the service requested.
- ❖ **Relevant Experience:** Respondents are to describe their prior experience in environmental planning, stakeholder involvement, water quality restoration and management, water pollution control, environmental engineering, habitat restoration or other relevant work; and include a representative list of projects completed involving such work.
- ❖ **Existing Workload:** Respondents should describe their capacity to add this project to their existing workload within the timeline expressed.

ORGANIZATION AND STAFFING:

- ❖ **Staff Qualifications:** Respondents are to include an overview of experienced personnel presently on staff, prior experience and/or qualification of key personnel to be assigned to the project. For year 1, staff assignments and concentration of effort for each staff member are to be addressed. Respondents must demonstrate that staff has appropriate knowledge and depth of experience to execute the tasks.
- ❖ **Sub-Consultants:** As applicable, disclosure of any sub-consultant agencies’ organizational structure and business background as well as the type of work they will perform must be documented in response to this RFP. The qualifications of subcontractors to perform tasks must be documented. Full disclosure of the proposed team to be assigned to this project is required in the Technical Proposal.

PROJECT WORK PLAN:

- ❖ **Project Approach:** Respondents are to provide a detailed technical synopsis of their proposed services based on the year 1 project Tasks and Deliverables requested by the Coordination Team and the PSC, including any technical or personnel issues that will or may be confronted at each stage of the project. Proposals that depart from or materially alter the terms, requirements or Project Tasks and Deliverables as defined by this RFP will be rejected and considered non-responsive. Respondents should also describe their general approach to managing any tasks that may be assigned under Year 2 and 3; e.g. data collection, further feasibility assessment, conceptual engineering designs.

- ❖ **Work Plan:** Proposals must include a year 1 work plan including a statement of scope (both what is in-scope and any exceptions which the vendor proposes are out of scope), identification of all roles and responsibilities for the project, proposed staffing plan, key risks, a schedule, and detailed budget along with any other related documentation the vendor feels is relevant to the project plan. Project plans must include a deliverables based work breakdown structure identifying all top level deliverables, all work to be completed by vendor, and any work the vendor assumes the state will be completing.

Respondents do not need to prepare a detailed workplan for Year 2 and 3 as the specific tasks to be assigned will be determined based on the outcomes of Year 1. Rather respondents should include a listing of personnel (name, title) and associated hourly rates (inclusive of overhead) that would be available to complete tasks 6-8 during Years 2 and 3 of the project. The description should clearly reflect the full range of expertise and capacities of the respondent employees or subcontractors that are relevant to the potential future tasks.

- ❖ **Project Manager:** Vendor must provide a project manager to serve as the main interface with the PSC and the Coordination Team Chair as the project fiscal administrator. Project must be managed by a person of adequate expertise in legal, management, engineering, and scientific issues surrounding the current state of and management goals for water quality in upper Narragansett Bay. The project manager must have experience with projects that are comparable in size and scope.
- ❖ **Reporting Requirements:** Any technical, draft and final reports generated will be submitted both in hard copy and electronically (Microsoft Word) for ease of review. The successful respondent will be prepared to discuss and review findings in a coordinated team meeting environment should this be required and consistent with the Project Tasks and Deliverables. The PSC and the Contractor must mutually agree upon any alternative electronic formats.
- ❖ **Supplemental Information:** Respondents are encouraged to submit any other information deemed useful to provide the PSC with sufficient relevant information to evaluate the consultant's qualifications and approach to the project.

COST PROPOSAL

The **separate sealed cost** proposal must identify costs for each project deliverable/service and will be inclusive of all costs and expenses for Year 1 (Tasks 1-5). Costs should be itemized by major tasks and sub-tasks. Personnel costs should be detailed in hourly rates and the hours estimated for each task or sub-task. Contractors must also identify any assumptions made when developing their cost proposal. The State reserves the right to eliminate certain tasks from the final contract award pending funding availability. As noted above, the respondent must include a listing of hourly rates for personnel that would be available to carry tasks in Year 2 and 3 should the PSC elect to assign such tasks (Task 6-8).

The contract awarded from this solicitation will be a fixed price. The State will reimburse the Contractor in accordance with the agreed upon deliverable price. All invoices should reflect actual work done. Specific details of invoices and payment will be agreed upon between the State and the Contractor after the proposed Contract Agreement has been signed and accepted by

both the Contractor and the State's Chief Purchasing Officer. This activity will occur only upon the specific written direction from the Rhode Island Division of Purchases.

The State's designee will review all work for acceptance within a mutually agreed upon timeframe from completion and/or receipt. The Contractor will not be paid for any costs attributable to corrections of any errors or omissions that have been determined by the State to be occasioned by the Contractor. Payments will not be made until work is accepted.

The Coordination Team estimates a contract period of thirty-six months with Tasks 1-5 being completed in the first twelve months of the contract period.

Offerors are advised that reimbursable expenses, to include sub-consultant services, that may be included in the contract award resulting from this solicitation shall not exceed actual cost incurred x 1.04.

COMPLETION AND ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA

The following criteria will be used by the State to determine Acceptance of the Services and/or Deliverables provided under this RFP.

DOCUMENT DELIVERABLES:

1. Documents include, but are not limited to, memos, reports, maps, plans, electronic presentations, review documents, project schedules, and status reports.
2. Draft documents are not accepted as final deliverables.
3. Each deliverable will be complete within itself and will be consistent with previously produced deliverables.
4. The PSC will review and approve each deliverable. If a deliverable is determined to be unacceptable, the PSC will identify the deficiencies in writing to the Contractor. The contractor will be required to correct identified deficiencies to the satisfaction of the PSC.

The following criteria will be used by the PSC to determine Final Acceptance under this award.

1. All documents and services are delivered and accepted by the PSC Team in accordance with the requirements of this contract and the accepted Contractor's proposal.
2. All bills related to this contract have been submitted and approved for payment.

AWARD PROCESS

METHOD OF EVALUATION:

All proposals received by the submission deadline will be evaluated by a Project Management Team. This committee will evaluate and score each respondent on the selection criteria described in this solicitation and a formal written evaluation, with an award recommendation, will be provided to the State Purchasing Agent, or his designee, who shall make the final award determination.

EVALUATION CRITERIA:

The following criteria will be used to score proposals:

1. (20 points) - Overall quality of the proposal and responsiveness to the Request, including description of how year 1 tasks and objectives will be fulfilled;
2. (15 points) - Competence and relevant experience of the organization to provide the required services;
3. (15 points) –Qualifications and relevant experience of the personnel assigned to the project for Year 1 and available in Years 2 and 3;
4. (20 points) – Demonstration of a managerial approach that will result in the successful and timely completion of the project; including ability to meet deadlines;
5. (10 points) – Allocation of staff effort to year 1 project tasks is acceptable and reasonable
6. (20 points) Project cost – calculated as the lowest responsive cost proposal/this cost proposal multiplied by 20 points

Total 100 points

Only those proposals receiving a minimum score of **60 out of 80 possible technical points** will have their cost proposals opened to calculate for a total score.

ORAL PRESENTATION:

Bidders who submit proposals **may** be required to make oral presentations of their proposals to the State. These presentations provide an opportunity for the Bidders to clarify the proposals through mutual understanding. Purchasing Operations will schedule these presentations, if required.

Notwithstanding the above, the State reserves the right not to award this contract or to award on the basis of cost alone, to accept or reject any or all responses, to make multiple awards, and to award in its best interest.

Responses found to be technically or substantially non-responsive at any point in the evaluation process will be rejected and not considered further and cost proposal will remain sealed. The State reserves the right to reject any or all responses submitted and to waive any informalities in any vendor's submission.