

# **REQUEST FOR STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS AND SCOPE OF WORK/PROPOSALS**

## **GALLATIN COUNTY REGIONAL WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT SYSTEM FEASIBILITY STUDY PHASE II**

### **I. INSTRUCTIONS TO APPLICANTS/SUBMISSION PROCEDURES**

All questions concerning the request or scope of work should be directed to Larry Watson, Gallatin County Grants & Projects Administrator, 406/582-3192.

Respondents are required to submit their Statement of Qualifications and Scope of Work/Proposal Requests no later than 4:00 p.m. on July 27th, 2009 to:

Gallatin County Clerk and Recorder  
Gallatin County Courthouse  
311 West Main, Room #203  
Bozeman, MT 59715

**Respondents will need to submit six (6) copies of the Statement of Qualifications and Scope of Work Proposal Requests** hereafter "SOQ/SW/PR." The SOQ/SW/PR shall be limited to 15 single-sided pages, including graphics. A letter of introduction, section dividers, detailed resumes and sample work products are not included in this limit. One of the six (6) copies of the Statements/Proposals shall be designated as "original." The SOQ/SW/PR shall be limited in size to 8 ½ X 11" with a minimum of 11 point font. All copies of the SOQ/SW/PR shall be made complete. The SOQ/SW/PR are to be delivered in one box or envelope. The outside of the box must be clearly labeled on the front with:

### **"Statement Of Qualifications And Scope Of Work/Proposal Requests Regional Wastewater Management System Feasibility Study Phase II Project"**

Any interpretation or correction of the SOQ/SW/PR will be made by written addendum issued and mailed or faxed to all recipients of this SOQ/SW/PR. Addenda shall be acknowledged in all SOQ/SW/PR.

In the event that it becomes necessary to request additional clarifying information, or to revise any part of this SOQ/SW/PR, six copies of the revisions, amendments, or supplements are required.

SOQ/SW/PR received after the due date and time will be returned. Modifications to the SOQ/SW/PR will not be entertained after the due date and time unless specifically requested in writing. The Respondent may withdraw the SOQ/SW/PR, prior to the time fixed for submission.

All SOQ/SW/PR submitted shall be legally binding upon the Respondent for 180 calendar days from the SOQ/SW/PR submission deadline. Negligence on the part of the Respondent in preparing the SOQ/SW/PR confers no right of withdrawal after the time fixed for submission of

SOQ/SW/PR. All costs of preparing the SOQ/SW/PR and any subsequent presentation are to be borne by the Respondent. Therefore, it is absolutely necessary that the Respondent sign the SOQ/SW/PR using the correct and complete legal names and titles of the business entities and individuals.

**County reserves the right to withdraw this solicitation at any time or extend the due date. Appropriate notice of time extensions will be sent to all individuals and firms who have received this SOQ/SW/PR request. A contract is anticipated to be awarded to the selected respondent but is not guaranteed.**

## **II. PROJECT OVERVIEW**

Gallatin County has experienced a sustained period of rapid growth. Much of the wastewater management in the county is currently accomplished with individual or community on-site systems that discharge water into the subsurface. As growth continues, many local residents have raised concern that the proliferation of on-site systems will threaten water quality. The quality of these waters is vital to the region, therefore any degradation is undesirable. A Regional Wastewater Study ("RWS"), prepared by Great West Engineering in 2007, considered the possibility of systems servicing high-density growth areas along the U. S. Highway 191 and Jackrabbit Lane corridor between Gallatin Gateway and the City of Belgrade, Montana. Since that study was concluded, steps towards infrastructure planning have been taken by the Commission in its growth policy implementation effort. Consistent with what that Phase I Study recommended, and pursuant to the conclusions of the Wastewater and Water Sub-Committee of the County Planning Board, further consulting and engineering study is necessary and appropriate. The County is soliciting statements of qualification from engineering firms qualified to provide the following services:

## **III. SCOPE OF WORK**

The study will:

1. Consider a somewhat larger study area (see map A) than what was used in the RWS Phase I ,
2. Reflect population and density projections based on a different approach to assumptions and reflect Commission efforts since the RWS,
3. Identify locations for facilities that would be appropriate to serve future as well as near term needs in sufficient detail so that this Commission can begin now to preserve the ability of future Commissions to take then necessary and appropriate steps, and
4. Indicate which of those facilities might be appropriate to pursue in the near term.
5. A final report will be prepared, incorporating the work developed under tasks 1 through 4. The contracted engineering firm will assist the County in presenting the findings of the report, in a public hearing process.

At a minimum this second study should:

- A. Describe and compare the current state-of-the-art and any realistic innovative potential alternatives provided by different wastewater collection, treatment, and effluent and sludge disposal products and processes from those designed for single residence use to those identified pursuant to B.
  - 1. Included in the discussion should be: cost, comparative degrees of treatment achieved (including reduction of nitrogen in effluent) and ease of upgrade to higher levels, status under current Montana regulations, range of loads efficiently and economically served, land area required for prudent operation and, where such is practicable, any necessary adjustment to those facilities to enable them to appropriately treat effluent received from commercial and industrial loads.
  - 2. Included also should be a discussion of how the identified smaller treatment and disposal facilities, if used in new developments, might be laid out physically to facilitate later connection to a larger system capable of a greater degree of treatment should become necessary or desirable and how choice of such layout might be influenced by current Montana regulations.
- B. Identify, generally and not specifically, in currently undeveloped areas the location and approximate parcel size of appropriate (from an engineering, construction cost and operating cost perspective) centralized treatment and disposal facilities that could be efficiently and economically constructed and operated in conformity with applicable regulatory requirements and expanded or combined over time to serve the treatment and disposal needs in all portions of the Study Area appropriate for centralized service. Describe generally the facilities, including their cost, for each such location.

The Study Area is the area within the study boundary shown on the attached map A and not excluded by the next following sentence. There shall not be included in the study those areas (i) within, surrounded by or nearly enclosed by the Bozeman municipal boundary, (ii) within the portion of the Belgrade water plan boundary shown on map A, (iii) within the Rae County Water and Sewer District service area shown on map A and (iv) within the Gallatin Gateway Water and Sewer District boundary, and (v) within the Four Corners Water and Sewer District boundary and areas, if any, outside such District for which there are in effect contracts for Utility Solutions to provide service.

For purposes of the study the following assumptions should be made;

- 1. Because it cannot be known now what density limits and other regulations may apply in the future, for study purposes only the study should assume:

- (a) residential density (i) in all currently existing County Zoning Districts at maximum build-out through future development in accordance with their currently existing regulations, (ii) in the portion of the Study area within the Bozeman 2006 land use and facility planning boundary at average density currently required for annexation by Bozeman and (iii) in the remainder of the Study Area at an urban density sufficient to make service economical throughout such remainder,
  - (b) treatment by central facilities is the preferred method from a health and safety standpoint for both level of treatment and maintenance considerations and thus for study purposes is the required method where density makes such cost competitive,
  - (c) reasonable pretreatment requirements for new commercial and industrial loads will be established by regulation,
  - (d) eventual hookup of existing individual and shared residential, multiple residential user and small commercial user systems will occur in areas of density sufficient to make such hookup reasonably practicable, and
  - (e) such facilities and those identified in C will be financed by the county but smaller collection lines will be financed by developers or others.
2. Because no recommendation or decision with respect to type of facility has been made, for purposes of the study only, site location and size identification should reflect an assumption that in and on ground disposal of treated effluent is preferred to the extent practicable and should assume future applicability of increasingly rigorous treatment standards, including for pharmaceuticals, but the study also should discuss the efficiencies and economies, if any, that might be achieved through river discharge and show the site location changes that would result.
3. If as a technical matter service to any part or parts of the Study Area might be dependent on, or might be more easily achieved through or improved by, a coordinated effort with another centralized wastewater treatment system, (i) identify the part or parts, (ii) describe generally the nature of the coordination and (iii) indicate the technical reason for the conclusion. Such coordination may include county assisted expansion of existing facilities if such might be the more economic choice.
- C. Identify the appropriate location of transmission and collection facilities (down to the level of main trunk lines and major branches) necessary for the eventual full, implementation of the scenario laid out in B. Describe such transmission and collection facilities associated with each such treatment facility, including their cost, and indicate the size of the necessary rights of way for them.

- D. Describe the density and population necessary for economic practicability of initial construction and operation of each such centralized facility.
- E. Describe the changes in the conclusions reached pursuant to B and C that would result from the changes in density assumptions set forth in B that would flow from the further assumptions set forth in the next two following sentences. Assume the adoption of the Gallatin County "Part 2" Zoning Districts, Regulations and Maps and the Amendment to the Gallatin County Subdivision Regulations (Section 11: Planned Unit Development) in the form presented in the Growth Policy Implementation Program November 12, 2008 draft document package. Assume further, again solely for purposes of simplification of the study by limiting the number of potential variables, that the AG-160 area will be developed at the maximum density permitted through use of clusters pursuant to the Rural Cluster Development Program.
- F. Identify and discuss the economics of those of the facilities identified in B and C that might be appropriate for current or near term consideration under the assumptions set forth under B and, if different, under the further assumptions set forth under E.
- G. Discuss the economics of possible eventual transmissions of effluent from the facilities identified in B to the Trident area for discharge into the Missouri River, including factors relevant to the potential hydroelectric power generation, and any necessary physical changes to those facilities and the facilities described in C were such discharge to be pursued.
- H. Describe any minor adjustment to the Study Area boundaries that would materially alter any of the study's conclusions.
- I. If the recommended facilities include any lift stations discuss the reason for their inclusion.

J. For ease of analysis and comparison, all economic projections should use today's costs, unescalated for inflation, and assume tax exempt AA rated financing by the county; and land acquisition cost assumptions should be separately stated.

K. List and describe the significance to the study of all material assumptions used in conducting the study.

If while the study is being performed any draft zoning regulation other than the one mentioned in E is made public by the Planning Department at the direction of the Commission, describe separately any material effects adoption of such regulation would have on the conclusions described pursuant to any of the foregoing. If in the opinion of the preparer of the study adding such a description would require a material increase in the effort required to perform the study, agreement of the county on reasonable additional compensation would be a condition to providing such further description.

#### **IV. RESULTING CONTRACT**

This SOQ/SW/PR and any addenda, the Respondent's SOQ/SW/PR response, including any amendments, and any clarification question responses shall be included in any resulting contract. The contract will require that the Respondent have insurance coverage in an amount not lower than 1.5 million dollars per occurrence and will require the Respondent to fully comply with all applicable federal, state, or local laws, rules and regulations, including the Montana Human Rights Act, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and the Montana Prevailing Pay Wage. In accordance with section 49-3-207, MCA, the Respondent agrees that the hiring of persons to perform the contract will be made on the basis of merit and qualifications and there will be no discrimination based upon race, color, religion, creed, political ideas, sex, age, marital status, physical or mental disability, or national origin by the persons performing the contract. Should the County and Respondent fail to adopt a mutually acceptable Contract the Respondent will receive written notification that negotiations are terminated. After termination, the next highest ranked firm or individual will be contacted and negotiations will begin until an acceptable agreement is reached.

#### **V. TENTATIVE SCHEDULE OF EVENTS**

| <u>EVENT</u>                                 | <u>DATE</u>     |
|--|-----------------|
| SOQ/SW/PR Issue Date                         | June 28th, 2009 |
| SOQ/SW/PR Response Due Date                  | July 27th, 2009 |
| SOQ/SW/PR Responses opened at public meeting | July 28th, 2009 |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Review of Responses/Interviews                         | July 28 <sup>th</sup> –August 14th, 2009 |
| Selection/Contract Negotiations                        | August 14th, 2009                        |
| Intended Date for Contract Award                       | August 18 <sup>th</sup> , 2009           |
| Estimated date for work to begin                       | August 19 <sup>th</sup> , 2009           |
| Presentation to Planning Board on Preliminary Document | January 26, 2010                         |
| Date for completion                                    | February 9, 2010                         |

## **VI. QUALIFICATIONS**

This project will require substantial expertise in wastewater treatment planning and engineering, especially experience showing an understanding of current local and state regulations and working effectively with the State's Department of Environmental Quality. The County's intent is to select an engineering firm demonstrating the desired qualifications and offering the best combination of experience and expertise.

Firms responding to this SOQ/SW/PR should provide individual and firm qualifications that demonstrate expertise and competence in wastewater facility planning and development. Of particular importance is the demonstration of knowledge of and experience in compliance with all applicable requirements under the Montana laws, Federal laws and similar wastewater treatment laws, rules and regulations.

The response should provide the following:

- Firm profile
- Resumes of key individuals who will work on the project
- Listing of previous wastewater treatment projects, particularly within the State of Montana and the Rocky Mountain region.
- Project references

## **VII. EVALUATION AND SELECTION**

All SOQ/SW/PR will initially be classified as either "responsive" or "nonresponsive." SOQ/SW/PR may be found nonresponsive any time during the evaluation process or contract negotiation if any of the required information is not provided or the submitted price is found to be excessive or inadequate as measured by criteria stated in the SOQ/SW/PR. If a proposal is found to be nonresponsive, it will not be considered further.

### **Evaluation of Submittals:**

Respondents SOQs will be evaluated and selected according to the following listed criteria:

1. 5% - Location.
2. 30% - Quality of Firm and Personnel:
  - (a) Related experience on similar projects.
  - (b) Qualifications, experience and training of staff to be assigned to project.
3. 35% - Capability and Capacity of Firm:
  - (a) Ability to meet insurance requirements.
  - (b) Ability to meet all technical requirements.
  - (c) Capability and Capacity of firm to meet project time requirements.
  - (d) Capability and Capacity to respond to project, County and Wastewater regulatory requirements.
  - (e) Compatibility of systems, equipment (i.e., CADD and public visualization capabilities).
4. 30% - Record of Past Performance of Firm in Previous Projects:
  - (a) Measure of previous record with the County will be based on the in-house documentation of quality of work, on-schedule performance, cost performance, and cooperation with the County staff.
  - (b) A limited or no previous record with the County will require reference checks. County will devise an equitable measure for this rating criterion.

Respondents SW/PR will be evaluated and selected according to the following listed criteria:

1. 20% - Quality of Firm and Team Personnel Assigned to Project.
2. 20% - Related Experience on Similar Projects.
3. 20% - Commitment of Responsible Principal to Project.
4. 20% - Record of Past Performance on Similar Projects.
5. 20% - References from Similar Projects.

If necessary, other pertinent factors may be considered and weights adjusted accordingly.



## **VIII. GUIDELINES FOR REPONSES**

### **1. Title Page**

The title page shall include the firm/individual name, address, contact, telephone number and email address to contact for information regarding the SOQ/SW/PR. The title page must bear the signature of authorized representative of the Respondent and designates, by name, not more than two individuals authorized to sign agreements with the County on behalf of the Respondent.

### **2. Executive Summary**

This section shall provide an overview of the SOQ/SW/PR and the Respondent's understanding of the County's needs. Emphasis should be placed on the Respondent's expertise in the subject area. The summary should also include any points the Respondent wishes to highlight, as well as any relevant conditions or restrictions.

### **3. Firm/Individual Profile**

This section shall provide a profile of the firm/individual including the number of employees and their locations. Brief resumes shall be provided for each key project individual. Any proposed subcontractors should be clearly identified and their profiles described. The percentage of total time key staff people (e.g. project manager, implementation staff) will devote to this project should be listed. A complete list of local government clients shall be provided including all Montana local governments. A minimum of three references shall be provided including names, addresses, telephone numbers and titles of contacts for similar sites. References for key project staff in particular are requested. Proof of insurance coverage is required. **(Key staff may not be replaced once a contracting firm has been selected without prior approval of the County.)**

### **4. Scope of Project**

This section shall describe how the Respondent will fulfill the Scope of Work.

### **5. Cost**

Proposals may not exceed a total cost of \$45,000. The County utilizes a "qualifications based" selection process to negotiate a contract with the firm determined to be the most qualified at a price, which is determined to be fair and reasonable.

### **6. Proposed Schedule**

This section shall include the Respondent's schedule for completion. Work will begin upon the approval of a contract between both parties and will continue according to the schedule established as part of the final Scope of Work. Work is expected to commence on or about August 19<sup>th</sup>, 2009 and be completed by February 9<sup>th</sup>, 2010.

*The County reserves the right to accept or reject any and all Proposals, or parts of Proposals; waive technicalities; and to make its decision on the basis of merit, appropriateness, and any other factor. Unless all Proposals are rejected or the solicitation is canceled, a contract may be awarded to the Respondent whose Proposal best meets the requirements and criteria set forth in this request.*