

CALIFORNIA STATE COASTAL CONSERVANCY

**REQUEST FOR SERVICES:
ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES,
INCLUDING PLANNING, DESIGN, and
PERMIT DOCUMENTATION**

**TERMINAL FOUR WHARF, WAREHOUSE, AND PILING
REMOVAL PROJECT**

August 25, 2017



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	SCOPE OF WORK.....	4
III.	REQUEST FOR SERVICES REQUIREMENTS AND PROCESS	6
IV.	CONSERVANCY CONTACT INFORMATION	10

REQUEST FOR SERVICES

I. INTRODUCTION

The State Coastal Conservancy (Conservancy) is seeking the services of a consultant firm or team to provide engineering and environmental and related services for the Terminal Four Wharf, Warehouse, and Piling Removal Project (the Project) located at Point San Pablo (City of Richmond Terminal Four, San Pablo Bay, within San Francisco Bay). The services will generally involve the further development of a plan and designs and preparation of environmental and permitting documentation for the removal of an existing, dilapidated wharf and warehouse and associated creosote and concrete pilings. In addition, the selected firm or team will be required to assess whether and to what degree restoration of the site to address potential shoreline instability or habitat degradation following removal will be necessary or desirable and, if so, the preparation of plans, designs and permitting documentation for the recommended restoration. The exact nature of the services will be dependent on any revisions to earlier design and plans and on the need for restoration, which will be determined through the services provided by the contractor selected.

Tasks include: conducting planning, review of existing 30% plan documents, preparing plan documents including 60% level designs and specifications for wharf, warehouse, creosote and concrete piling removal, including assessment of the need for (and resulting plan documents if necessary) a shoreline or habitat restoration component to the project, preparing monitoring plan documents, preparing all regulatory and other permit applications, and preparing all environmental compliance documents for a fill removal and shoreline, intertidal, and subtidal habitat enhancement project in San Francisco Bay. All tasks must take into account and adhere to applicable environmental laws and requirements. Tasks include updating and revising the existing 30% design plans and specifications, and existing draft cost estimates for the fill removal project at Terminal Four on the southern portion of Point San Pablo in Richmond. The selected contractor may be further retained to prepare final design and specifications for the Project, but this additional task is dependent on availability of funds, Conservancy review and approval of the Project and approval of the environmental documentation for the Project and the adoption of required findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

The Conservancy prefers to contract with one firm, whether the firm undertakes all tasks through its own personnel or through a team, consisting of the lead firm's personnel and the personnel of subcontractors to the lead firm. Nonetheless, the Conservancy reserves the right to select either one, or multiple, firms/teams depending on the qualifications that best match each of the tasks associated with the project detailed in the scope of work, below.

Terminal Four Wharf, Warehouse, and Piling Removal Project, Point San Pablo, Richmond

The Conservancy has been working with the City of Richmond and the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission on conceptual ideas for the removal of Terminal Four, including a derelict warehouse, pier, and approximately 2,500 creosote and/or concrete pilings, at Point San Pablo in Richmond. A draft project description and cost estimates were prepared by City of Richmond staff in 1999, and in 2015 the Conservancy, through a retained contractor, developed updated 30% design and draft cost estimates for the Project.

A copy of the 30% design plans are located at this ftp link:

<http://info.scc.ca.gov/thinclient>

Username: creosote, Password: terminal4richmond

The 30% draft design did not include a shoreline or habitat restoration component. The retained consultant that prepared the 30% design recommended that restoration to protect the shoreline should be assessed due to concern that there may be instability resulting from the removal of the structures. Habitat restoration was not considered in the 30% design, since there are ample, existing intertidal and subtidal habitat resources at the site. The 30% draft design and cost estimates took into account activities that may be required to protect existing habitat resources and identify proposed methods, timing, etc. to minimize impacts to eelgrass beds and other habitat in the vicinity of the pilings.

As part of the next phase of work that is the subject of this RFS, tasks will include review of the previous work described above, assessment of whether there is a need for a shoreline or habitat restoration component. This component would include development of a nature-based adaptation method (if possible) to prevent erosion after the removal of the Terminal Four structures and to restore natural habitat and preparation of 60% design plans and specifications, cost estimates, permit applications, and environmental compliance documentation for the Project.

Background

The Project is informed by efforts to date in San Francisco Bay, including a multi-agency effort to examine the ecological and environmental benefits and impacts of artificial structures in subtidal habitats, as part of the San Francisco Bay Subtidal Habitat Goals Project (Conservancy 2010, www.sfbaysubtidal.org). This 50 year Conservation Plan was completed in 2010 and the Conservancy and collaborators have also been involved in the development of the Baylands Ecosystem Goals Science Update, which also recommends and supports the removal of derelict creosote pilings, and cleanup, protection, and enhancement of our shorelines as a necessary step in regional adaptation to climate changes and sea level rise. The Conservancy and many local, state, and federal collaborators are implementing recommended regional science, protection, and restoration goals through the San Francisco Bay Creosote Removal and Pacific Herring Restoration Project, San Francisco Bay Living Shorelines Projects, and many other efforts.

As part of the Subtidal Habitat Goals Project, in 2009 the San Francisco Estuary Institute (SFEI) and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) identified and mapped over 33,000 derelict pilings that could be seen above the surface of San Francisco Bay at low tide, and estimated that at least that many more pilings (and stubs of pilings) occur on the bay bottom below the surface of the water at low tide. Nearly all of these wooden pilings were injected with creosote, a by-product of the coal and coke industry used from the mid-1800s into the 1950s to protect marine structures from decay. Creosote is a complex mixture of chemicals, many of which are toxic to fish and other marine organisms, causing impacts such as mutations in developing herring eggs. Because of concerns over toxicity, use of creosote treated pilings was banned in 1993 by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Many existing creosote pilings have been modified with concrete collars for support, so there are a subset of creosote pilings also wrapped in concrete. There are also large numbers of derelict concrete pilings in the bay, which haven't been numerically totaled or mapped.

The San Francisco Subtidal Habitat Goals Project was a collaboration between the Conservancy, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC), NOAA, and the San Francisco Estuary Partnership (SFEP) which culminated in the *San Francisco Subtidal Habitat Goals Report (Subtidal Goals Report)*, 2010. The *Subtidal Goals Report* is a 50-year conservation plan for how to move forward with science-based research, protection, and restoration of subtidal habitats in the San Francisco Bay. The report states that one long-term strategy for the Central Bay and the Richmond shoreline is to restore subtidal habitats like oyster and eelgrass beds near sites where creosote pilings are being removed, to replace the lost physical structure and provide natural substrate to attract spawning Pacific herring.

In recent years, these organizations have a successful history of working with multiple stakeholders to acquire, restore, enhance, and manage subtidal and tidal wetland habitat in San Francisco Bay. To date, over 50,000 acres have been protected, restored, and enhanced in San Francisco Bay, placing these efforts among the most aggressive wetland habitat conservation programs in the nation. There are many current and newly developing projects that are including multiple habitat types in their designs, with the goal of better linking and connecting habitats from the shallow subtidal (native oyster and eelgrass beds and other habitats) to intertidal marshes and beaches, and adjacent upland ecotone transition zones. These multi-objective projects include goals for both *biological habitat enhancement* to support species use and functions, as well as *physical shoreline protection* goals. This is becoming increasingly important as sea level rises, and feasible, effective methods to protect shorelines and adapt to climate changes are needed.

The related San Francisco Bay Creosote Removal and Pacific Herring Restoration Project is being undertaken nearby at the Red Rocks Warehouse site, on the north side of Point San Pablo. That project is also being implemented by the Conservancy in collaboration with the City of Richmond, and the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation who provided funding to support a creosote-treated pile removal and Pacific herring restoration pilot project in the San Francisco Bay. Phase One occurred from 2014-16, and included a baywide assessment to select a preferred site that best met the various criteria including piling removal and spawning habitat enhancement for Pacific herring, preparation of all demolition and restoration plans, permit applications and environmental documentation, and implementation of creosote piling and debris removal that was completed at the Red Rocks Warehouse site in Fall 2016. Phase Two of the project will be conducted in Spring 2018, and includes a Living Shorelines Restoration component, the goal of which is to restore high quality intertidal and subtidal habitat while using new approaches to natural shoreline protection through construction of reefs as a substrate for oyster restoration that will attenuate waves and stabilize sediment. Phase Two also includes pre- and post-construction monitoring, and sharing lessons learned with Bay Area resource agencies and environmental groups. During the site selection phase for the Red Rocks Project described above, the Terminal Four site was assessed as part of the effort and also physically mapped with desktop and sidescan sonar methods. That data will be available to the contractor selected for the next phase of Terminal Four planning. The information, best management practices, and lessons learned from the piling and debris removal at the Red Rocks site will continue to inform, as applicable, the planning and permitting that is the focus of this RFS for the Terminal Four site.

Terminal Four is the largest derelict piling structure in San Francisco Bay. The Terminal Four Wharf, Warehouse, and Piling Removal Project will help to fulfill recommendations in the Subtidal Habitat Goals Report, Baylands Ecosystem Goals Science Update, and provide new information for others interested in conducting this type of work to improve shoreline and habitat conditions in San Francisco Bay. It is the Conservancy's intent to use all of the best available information and conduct a scaled up removal of derelict structures(s) that continues to test best methods for removal and disposal, and matches the removal with strong habitat protection measures at the same site to maximize environmental benefits.

Objective of Planning, Design, and Environmental Work

The Conservancy's intent is to conduct a wharf, warehouse, and piling removal project, with strong existing habitat protections and potential additional shoreline protection or habitat enhancements, that match recommended demolition and removal timing and goals with a synergistic subtidal habitat protection and/or restoration project in the same location that doesn't adversely impact fish, birds, and other species. The planning, design, methods, equipment, and timing must take into account and accommodate compliance with all applicable laws and regulations including, without limitation, the following: Army Corps of Engineers Nationwide Permit 27 (Aquatic Habitat Restoration, Establishment, and Enhancement Activities) or Nationwide Permit 28 (Cleanup of Hazardous and Toxic Wastes); NOAA Fisheries consultations under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act; Essential Fish Habitat consultation under the Magnuson Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act and Fish and

Wildlife Conservation Act; San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) permitting under the McAtteer-Petris Act; California Department of Fish and Wildlife consultation with BCDC (including consultation to limit any impacts and maximize benefits to state-listed fish and wildlife); San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board water quality certification; California State Lands Commission (including coordination to confirm whether project is on state-owned or leased lands, and to confirm CEQA compliance); State Historic Preservation Office permitting and regulatory requirements; and other regional and local jurisdiction regulations and permitting requirements.

The design will incorporate current best practices, methods, equipment, and timing that minimize disturbance to habitat and wildlife. The restoration design will include a focus on improving shoreline, intertidal, and subtidal habitat substrates, as one part of an overall multi-objective design that improves and enhances diverse habitat structure and function after removal of the pilings. This pilot project will incorporate regional goals and recommendations, and will result in new information on best methods that will be shared with permitting agencies and other stakeholders in San Francisco Bay.

The contract period for the planning, design, and environmental work will be approximately one year. The overall scope of work is described in Tasks 1-8 of Section II. The Conservancy anticipates allocating approximately \$4 million for implementing the project in the future following the work under this RFS and subject to CEQA review and Conservancy review and approval. Implementation will include the wharf, warehouse, and creosote and concrete piling removal, restoration implementation, as needed, and monitoring portions of the project. The anticipated available funding for future construction and restoration and monitoring implementation should be considered (as defining the project scope) in undertaking the planning, design and environmental services sought by this RFS.

Construction and restoration implementation, and post-construction monitoring, are not part of this RFS for the Terminal Four Project, but will be undertaken through future grants or contracts.

The Conservancy prefers to hire one entity that may include a team of subcontractors who can accomplish all tasks 1-8. The Conservancy reserves the right to select either one, or multiple, firms/teams depending on the qualifications that best match each of the tasks associated with the project detailed in the scope of work, below. The Conservancy may or may not work with the same entity on planning and implementation.

II. SCOPE OF WORK

There are eight tasks included in this Request for Services.

The work to be performed consists of conducting planning and preparing 60% design documents, preparing permit/approval documentation, and environmental compliance documentation for the Terminal Four Wharf, Warehouse, and Piling Removal Project at Point San Pablo, City of Richmond, in San Francisco Bay.

Task 1: Draft 60% Planning and Design. For the selected project site(s), prepare 60% design documents and specifications, and updated cost estimates, for the full project. This should be developed with substantial input from the Conservancy and stakeholders and includes several distinct parts:

- 1.1 Demolition and removal of existing structures and pilings, including creosote piling removal and disposal.

- 1.2 Assessment of need for shoreline or habitat restoration. If restoration is recommended and approved as part of the plan, preparation of a Habitat Restoration Design and Construction Plan.
- 1.3 Monitoring Plan- oversight of planning and implementation of demolition and removal of wharf, warehouse, and pilings

Design plans, proposed methods and equipment, and timelines should include extensive detail on the site, proposed methods, recommended type and use of land and water based equipment, shoreline access approach with consideration of shoreline conditions and nearshore bathymetry, physical and biological conditions, and considerations specific to both wharf demolition and removal of creosote and concrete pier and piling structures, and shoreline and estuarine habitat restoration. The Conservancy and contractor will share draft plans with multiple stakeholders including the landowner, project funders and collaborators, and regulatory staff, and gather input to inform changes and improvements.

Task 2: Draft Cost Estimates. Review and update 2015 Cost Estimates if necessary. City of Richmond staff developed very rough cost estimates in 1999, and more specific estimates (including phasing of the project) were prepared by the Conservancy in 2015. Contractor will review and assess 2015 cost estimate, 2016 actual costs for the debris removal project conducted at Red Rocks Warehouse, and other sources of information to assess and consider whether any additions, revisions, or updates to the 2015 cost estimates are necessary. Prepare updated Cost Estimates as necessary. The existing information is located at the ftp link listed on page 1.

Task 3: Final 60% Planning and Design, Cost Estimates, and Timeline. For the selected project site(s), prepare a final 60% design document, plans and specifications, cost estimates, and timeline for the full project that incorporates feedback received on draft design plans, specifications, cost estimates, and timeline considerations.

Task 4: Permitting. Prepare all documentation for regulatory permits and approvals required for the Bay Project. Provide support for coordination with regulatory agencies and assist in application for permits for the Bay Project. Anticipated permit applications and approvals include:

- **US Army Corps of Engineers:** Either a Letter of Permission, Nationwide Permit 27 (Aquatic Habitat Restoration, Establishment, and Enhancement Activities) or Nationwide Permit 28 (Cleanup of Hazardous and Toxic Wastes).
- **NOAA Fisheries consultation with US Army Corps of Engineers:** Section 7 consultation relative to the Endangered Species Act, Essential Fish Habitat consultation relative to the Magnuson Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act and Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act.
- **US Fish and Wildlife Service:** Section 7 consultation relative to the Endangered Species Act.
- **San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (“BCDC”):** Administrative permit.
- **California Department of Fish and Wildlife consultation with BCDC:** Consultation to limit any impacts and maximize benefits to state-listed fish and wildlife.
- **San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board:** Water quality certification.
- **California State Lands Commission:** Coordination to confirm whether project is on state-owned or leased lands, and to confirm CEQA compliance.
- **California State Historic Preservation Office:** coordination to correctly document historic status and related process of creosote structures to be removed.
- **City of Richmond Approvals:** preparation of items and documentation needed for City Council review and approval, and other City documentation, as requested.

Task 5: CEQA/NEPA Compliance. Prepare the appropriate environmental documentation, including initial study, impact analysis, studies and assessments, documentation and notices, as required by the California Environmental Quality Act. The Conservancy does not expect that an Environmental Impact Report will be required, based on other similar projects, but the extent of review and documentation, will depend on details proposed in a final design with full project scope and the resulting required CEQA documentation.

Task 6: Monitoring Program Development. For the selected project site(s), develop a full monitoring plan as required to meet both Conservancy project goals and regulatory permit requirements. Monitoring plans will be developed in coordination with the Conservancy Project Manager and should include any recommended pre-construction monitoring, construction monitoring, post-construction monitoring, and restoration and biological monitoring.

Task 7: Meetings, Coordination, and Project Management. This task includes project coordination and management, participation in stakeholder meetings, project schedule and budget tracking, communication, including web-ready content, photos and video, preparation of invoices, and other administrative matters.

Task 8: Additional Tasks. If the consultant team foresees necessary tasks that are not outlined in this RFS, please bring those to our attention in your submittal.

III. REQUIREMENTS AND PROCESS

This section outlines the requirements that must be met by the consultant to be considered for the proposed contract, the schedule for consultant selection, and information on the required form and content of the submittal.

GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

- Copies of Licensures, Registrations and Certifications. The consultant must hold current, valid and appropriate licensure, registrations and certifications and must include with its submittal copies of the following:
 - A. For each engineer, licensure as a Professional Engineer by the State of California.
 - B. Registration as a public works contractor: Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) Registration under Labor Code section 1725.5, no contractor or subcontractor may be listed on a submittal or be awarded a contract for a public works project unless registered with DIR. Proof of registration may be obtained at <https://efiling.dir.ca.gov/PWCR/Search.action>. Include one copy with the submittal.
 - C. Registration to Do Business in California: Secretary of State Certification of Status is required if your company is a Corporation, Limited Liability Company (LLC) or Limited Partnership (LP). Required documents may be obtained at <http://kepler.sos.ca.gov>. Include one copy with the proposal.
- The consultant shall furnish all necessary labor, facilities, equipment, and materials to perform the work. The consultant shall be available to meet with the Conservancy and other key stakeholders on a regular basis and shall keep the Conservancy advised of work progress.

- *The consultant must guarantee that the Project Manager will be made available to the project for the duration of the project (unless that individual leaves the firm).*
- The consultant will be paid for its actual time and expenses up to the amount provided for each task in the final project budget. The consultant should anticipate that ten percent (10%) will be withheld, until all work is completed to the satisfaction of the Conservancy
- All contract deliverables shall be submitted in reproducible form in electronic version on CD and in hard copy (text and graphics).

DISABLED VETERAN'S BUSINESS ENTERPRISE REQUIREMENTS

The State has established the Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise ("DVBE") Participation Goal Program for participation in state contracts. **To be considered responsive, submittals must meet the DVBE program requirements. The minimum DVBE participation percentage is 3% for this solicitation.** Proposals that fail to comply with DVBE requirements will be rejected. To be considered responsive, submittals must include the following completed forms, as applicable:

- Bidder Declaration, GSPD-05-105 (available at <http://www.documents.dgs.ca.gov/pd/poliproc/MASTEr-BidDeclar08-09.pdf>). All potential contractors must complete the Bidder Declaration, GSPD-05-105 and include it with the submittal. When completing the declaration, potential contractors must identify all subcontractors proposed for participation in the contract. Potential contractors awarded a contract are contractually obligated to use the subcontractors for the corresponding work identified unless the State agrees to a substitution and it is incorporated by amendment to the contract.
- DVBE Declarations, STD.843 (available at <http://www.documents.dgs.ca.gov/pd/poliproc/STD-843FiilPrintFields.pdf>). All contractors or subcontractors who have been certified by California as a DVBE (or who are bidding rental equipment and have obtained the participation of subcontractors certified by California as a DVBE) must also submit a completed form(s) STD. 843 (Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise Declaration). All disabled veteran owners and disabled veteran managers of the DVBE(s) must sign the form(s).

At the State's option prior to award, potential contractors may be required to submit additional written clarifying information. Failure to submit the requested written information as specified may be grounds for proposal rejection.

The potential contractor understands and agrees that should award of this contract be based in part on its commitment to use the DVBE subcontractor(s) identified in its bid or offer, per Military and Veterans Code § 999.5(e), a DVBE subcontractor may only be replaced by another DVBE subcontractor approved by the Department of General Services. Changes to the scope of work that impact the DVBE subcontractor(s) identified in the proposal or offer and approved DVBE substitutions will be documented by contract amendment.

Failure of the potential contractor to seek substitution and adhere to the DVBE participation level identified in the bid or offer may be cause for contract termination, recovery of damages under rights and remedies due to the State, and penalties as outlined in M&V Code § 999.9; Public Contract Code ("PCC") § 10115.10.

Information submitted by the proposer to comply with this solicitation's DVBE requirements will be verified. If evidence of an alleged violation is found during the verification process, the State shall initiate an investigation, in accordance with the requirements of PCC §§ 10115, et seq., and Military & Veterans Code §§ 999 et seq., and follow the investigatory procedures required by California Code of Regulations Title 2, §§ 1896.90 et seq. Contractors found to be in violation of certain provisions may be subject to loss of certification, sanctions and/or contract termination.

REQUIRED KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND EXPERIENCE

Responses to this RFS should provide sufficient information to enable the Conservancy to determine the degree to which the firm/team possess the following knowledge, skills and experience.

- Marine construction engineering design experience, including installation, maintenance, or demolition of structures, and physical and biological habitat restoration design, in terrestrial, shoreline, intertidal, and shallow and deep subtidal zones.
- Experience with benthic and estuarine ecological impact analysis, terrestrial and aquatic environmental regulation and permitting (Federal Clean Water Act Section 404, Federal and State Endangered Species Acts, NOAA Fisheries Section 7 consultation relative to the Endangered Species Act, Essential Fish Habitat consultation relative to the Magnuson Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act and Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act., McAteer-Petris Act and the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission's San Francisco Bay Plan, California Department of Fish and Wildlife listed species and habitat considerations, San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board policies, California State Lands Commission policies, State and Federal Historic Preservation Act(s), the National Environmental Policy Act and the California Environmental Quality Act, and other regional and local jurisdiction environmental laws, regulations, and policies).
- Experience with San Francisco Bay shoreline, intertidal, and subtidal habitat biology, habitat distributions, and shoreline, intertidal, and subtidal project planning and design, including with both 1) installation and removal/demolition of structures, and 2) habitat restoration design and monitoring, in these habitat types.
- Experience with historical and archeological analysis.
- Managerial experience and strong communication skills by the proposed project manager.
- Collaborative project design experience, can integrate feedback from multiple stakeholders.
- General knowledge of the San Francisco Bay ecosystem and existing plans and policies pertaining to shoreline, intertidal, and subtidal restoration and enhancement in the Bay Area.

OTHER REQUIREMENTS

In addition to the skills and experience requirements outlined above, the following requirements apply:

1. Relationship of Project Manager to Lead Consultant Firm: if the submittal is by a consultant team, the project manager should be an employee of the lead consultant firm.

2. Commitment of Overall Project Manager: the consultant/lead consultant firm must intend that the project manager will be made available to the project for the duration of the project. A minimum availability requirement may be defined as part of the contract negotiations.
3. Project Office: The project manager and the lead firm's office for the project should be located in the San Francisco Bay Area.
4. Contract Negotiations: A copy of the Conservancy's standard contract provisions is provided in Attachment A. *There are contract provisions that may affect the cost of the work*. The Conservancy will enter into contract negotiations with the highest ranked consultant firm/consultant team following submittal of statement of qualification/statement of approach and interviews.
5. Compliance with Funding Sources: Funding sources are expected to include: a grant to the Conservancy from Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission of NOAA funds, subject to federal grant requirements; and funding under an agreement between the Conservancy and BCDC for use of BCDC permit fees.
6. 10% Withholding: The consultant will be paid for its actual time and expenses up to the amount provided for each task in the final project budget. The consultant should anticipate that ten percent (10%) will be withheld on each task, until all work for that task is completed to the satisfaction of the Conservancy. The Conservancy must also approve all interim work products before payment. If the contract is extended for multiple years, the Conservancy and the consultant will identify appropriate milestones that can trigger the release of the 10% withholding prior to the conclusion of all Phase II work.
7. Proposal Format: The written submittal must be printed double-sided on 8.5-inch by 11-inch pages, in Times New Roman or Tahoma Font, with a font size no smaller than 11 point. Larger pages (e.g., 11 inches by 17 inches) should be folded to fit into the 8.5-inch by 11-inch format. No pages larger than 11 inches by 17 inches should be included in the submittal. Detailed format specifications are provided in Section III.

CONSULTANT SELECTION PROCESS

Interested firms should submit a response to this RFS, **by 5:00 p.m. on Monday October 2, 2017**.

Submittals should be emailed to Marilyn Latta at marilyn.latta@scc.ca.gov, AND mailed hard copy to:

State Coastal Conservancy
Attn: Marilyn Latta, Project Manager
1515 Clay St, 10th Floor
Oakland CA 94612

Please convert your document to a single PDF file before emailing, and send a hard copy of the full PDF.

The proposals, along with statements of qualifications and performance data on file with the Conservancy or submitted with the proposal, will be reviewed by representatives of the Conservancy. Conservancy staff will conduct further discussions with at least three firms/teams before ranking firms and seeking to negotiate a contract with the highest-ranked firm/team. The Conservancy anticipates that a decision on the best qualified consultant will be made by October 31, 2017.

The consultant will be hired under contract to the Conservancy. The Conservancy will attempt to negotiate a contract with the best qualified firm/team at compensation which the Conservancy determines

is fair and reasonable to the State of California. If the Conservancy is unable to do so, negotiations with that firm/team will be terminated and negotiations will then proceed in the same manner with the other firms/teams on the list in order of ranking. If the Conservancy is unable to negotiate a satisfactory contract with any of the selected firms/teams, the Conservancy may select additional firms/teams and continue the negotiation process.

Potential consultants will be ranked based on the following criteria:

- 1) Satisfaction of the General Requirements and Disabled Veteran's Business Enterprise Requirements.
- 2) Demonstrated competence, especially in terms of the factors specified in the "Required Knowledge, Skills, and Experience" section above, including the firm/team's past experience with similar projects; the education and experience of key personnel to be assigned and the proposed level of their participation; the firm/team's ability to meet the project schedule; the longevity of the firm(s) and amount of staff turnover; and the nature and quality of the firm(s)'s past completed work, references, and overall quality of the submittal.
- 3) Specialized qualifications for the services and specific tasks to be performed.

These factors will be weighed according to the nature of the project, the needs of the Conservancy, and the complexity and special requirements of the project. After reviewers assess these factors, the Conservancy will take into consideration the small business status of the contractor submitting a response. The small business status of the potential contractor will be considered as a deciding factor in the instance of a tie. Small businesses must be certified as such by the State Department of General Services – Office of Small Business and DVBE prior to selection. See <http://www.dgs.ca.gov/Default.aspx?alias=www.dgs.ca.gov/pd> for more information.

The contract will be awarded without discrimination based on color, race, national origin, ethnic group identification, religion, age, sex, sexual orientation, color, genetic information, or disability.

The consultant should anticipate that ten percent (10%) will be withheld until all work is completed to the satisfaction of the Coastal Conservancy. The Conservancy must also approve all interim work products before payment.

The consultant will also be required to comply with the standard contract provisions provided in Attachment A. The Conservancy reserves the right to vary the contractual requirements and the parties may negotiate terms which are different than those contained in Attachment A.

INFORMATION TO BE INCLUDED IN SUBMITTAL

NOTE: the Submittal should NOT include any financial proposal or personnel rates. Following ranking of the top firms/teams, the Conservancy will negotiate financial terms and rates as specified below.

Approach (up to 5 pages). A description of the approach, methods, equipment, and timing to be used for the Project that outlines the major tasks, deliverables, and the QA/QC process. Please also indicate how the Conservancy will be kept informed of progress and feedback will be obtained from the Conservancy. Include any other relevant information in this section that you would like to share with the reviewers.

Team Organization (1 page). An organizational chart with the names and titles of the key staff/entities that are proposed for this project.

Schedule (1 page). Please include a graphic showing your proposed schedule for completion of all work.

Estimated Work Load Allocation (1 page). Anticipated level of effort for each of the firm's/team's office that will be used on this contract, in percent.

Qualifications of Firm(s) and Personnel (up to 4 pages). The contractor will describe the firm's or team's qualifications that pertain to the work described in this RFS and the minimum qualifications for Contractors. Specifically, indicate relevant experience, specialty areas of expertise, how the firm/team would utilize personnel and carry out work tasks, and indicators of likelihood of successfully accomplishing proposed work and being able to effectively work with entities described herein based on past performance. Provide information about SBE and DVBE status of the firm and its subcontractors if applicable.

Resumes (up to 4 pages). Brief resumes for up to four key staff proposed for this project. Include information about relevant previous projects and technical/managerial skills. Please provide two references for your proposed project manager.

Copies of Valid and Current Licensure, Registrations and Certifications. These include: for each engineer, licensure as a Professional Engineer by the State of California; Registration with DIR as a public works contractor; and Registration to Do Business in California.

Required DVBE forms. See "Disabled Veteran's Business Enterprise Requirements", above.

Proposals should be no longer than 16 pages total (excluding copies of required Licensure, Registrations, and Certifications and DVBE documentation) and submitted as a single .pdf document. Please use at least 11 point font and 1" margins. Please do not include any graphics, cover sheet, cover letter, section dividers, or colored fonts.

IV. CONSERVANCY CONTACT INFORMATION

For questions pertaining directly to the RFS or the RFS process, please contact:

Ms. Marilyn Latta
State Coastal Conservancy
1515 Clay St, 10th Floor
Oakland, CA 94612
(510) 286-4157 phone
marilyn.latta@scc.ca.gov

Exhibits:

Attachment A: Standard Contract Terms- State Coastal Conservancy