REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

CSO Advanced Facilities Plan (AFP) and Program Support Services (PSS)

WBS NO. 1304

November 2012

This Request for Proposal (RFP) is made available to interested consulting firms for Professional services for the CSO Advanced Facilities Plan (AFP) and Program Support Services (PSS) Project. The District considers this project a Category 1 (complex design and/or high risk), and this category will factor into the scope and negotiation with the successful consultant.

The RFP is organized as follows:

SECTION 1.0 SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS
SECTION 2.0 INTRODUCTION
SECTION 3.0 DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT AND SERVICES
SECTION 4.0 PROPOSAL CONTENT AND FORMAT
SECTION 5.0 PROJECT SCHEDULE
SECTION 6.0 EVALUATION AND SELECTION PROCESS

Various supporting and informational documents are referenced throughout this RFP. Unless otherwise noted, these documents are available on the Consultant and Contractor Resource Page on the District’s internet site (www.neorsd.org). Any future addenda related to this project will be posted to the NEORSD website under the “Bids and Proposals” section.

Additional information related to this RFP is provided through a designated ftp Sharefile site. This site can be accessed at https://neorsd.sharefile.com/i/i49d889371c2403a8.

The additional information specific to this RFP found on Sharefile are as follows:

Attachment 1: District’s CSO LTCP Consent Decree including Appendices
Attachment 2: 2005 CSO Summary Report
Attachment 3: 1999 Westerly CSO Phase II Facilities Plan Final Report
Attachment 4: 2002 Easterly CSO Phase II Facilities Plan Final Report
Attachment 5: 2002 Southerly CSO Phase II Facilities Plan Final Report
Attachment 10: Post-Construction Monitoring Location Plan (PCMLP) - Control Measure 24
1.0 SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS

Proposals for providing these services will be accepted until the close of business (4:30 P.M.) on December 7, 2012.

Proposals are to be delivered to the following name and address:

    Julius Ciaccia, Executive Director
    Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District
    3900 Euclid Avenue
    Cleveland, OH  44115-2504

    Attn:  Kellie Rotunno, Director of Engineering and Construction

Late submittals will not be considered. Proposals not meeting the requirements of this RFP may be deemed non-responsive at the sole discretion of the District.

A pre-proposal meeting for consultants will be held at District’s Administrative Offices (GJM Building) located at 3900 Euclid Avenue at 4 P.M. on November 14, 2012 in the 3rd Floor Operations Conference Room. Questions regarding this RFP shall be directed to Ms. Devona Marshall at the pre-proposal meeting or at other times by calling (216) 881-6600, ext. 6452 or e-mailing to marshalld@neorsd.org.
2.0 INTRODUCTION

2.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

The Federal Clean Water Act and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s (U.S. EPA) Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) Control Policy, along with the Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District’s (District’s) state-issued CSO National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit, required the District to develop a Long Term Control Plan (LTCP) to reduce or eliminate the number of overflows from its permitted CSO outfalls. After many years of facilities planning and negotiating with the government, the District came to an agreement in 2010 with the U.S. and Ohio EPA, U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), and the Ohio Attorney General’s (AG) Office on its plan for CSO control. On July 7, 2011, the District entered into a Consent Decree with the U.S. and Ohio EPA for a 25-year, $3 billion CSO LTCP. With an agreed upon CSO LTCP Consent Decree in place, the Ohio EPA initiated discussions in 2012 with the District regarding its currently expired CSO NPDES permit. Based on the initial discussions as well as recently issued CSO NPDES permits in the State of Ohio, CSO monitoring and modeling requirements for purposes of CSO activation reporting are expected in the District’s future permit anticipated for issuance in early 2013.

The District has already invested an estimated $850 million and reduced CSO volumes by half – from 9 to 4.5 billion gallons since 1972. The District’s originally proposed CSO LTCP, the last of which was submitted in 2002, would further reduce the number of overflows to four or less per year and capture 97% of the total volume of wet weather flow in the combined sewer system, which is above the 85% specified in U.S. EPA’s CSO Control Policy, at an estimated cost of $2.7 billion (in 2009 dollars). In its subsequent negotiations with Ohio EPA and U.S. EPA, the District agreed to additional, cost-effective enhancements to its program that would result in 98.2% capture of all wet weather flow in the combined sewer area – with 97% capture achieved in year 20 of the District’s proposed 25-year implementation period – and reduce CSO volumes to less than an estimated 500 million gallons in a typical year. This included a commitment to an additional 44 MG of CSO control beyond that of the required gray infrastructure through the use of green infrastructure.

The required gray infrastructure Control Measures and associated design criteria for achieving the agreed upon level of control are detailed in Appendix 1 of the CSO LTCP Consent Decree and the requirements for the additional 44 MG of CSO control are detailed in Appendix 3 of the CSO LTCP Consent Decree. The basis of the required Control Measures and GI projects were the previously completed CSO facilities planning projects as well as the subsequent GI planning efforts.

- 1994 CSO Facilities Plan Phase I Study
- 1999 Westerly CSO Phase II Facilities Plan (WCSO or WCSO Plan)
- 2002 Southerly District CSO Phase II Facilities Plan (SCSO or SCSO Plan)
- 2002 Easterly District CSO Phase II Facilities Plan (ECSO or ECSO Plan)
- 2002 Doan Brook Watershed Study
2008 Easterly Advanced Facilities Plan (AFP)
2011 Green Infrastructure (GI) Feasibility Study
Green Infrastructure Advanced Facilities Plan (GI AFP) – In design

Additionally, Appendix 4 of the Consent Decree outlines the opportunity and requirements related to reducing the Appendix 1 required gray infrastructure through the use of gray infrastructure.

**General Description CSO Phase II Facilities Plans – Easterly, Southerly, & Westerly**

In accordance with its NPDES Permit and the pending federal CSO Policy, the District completed a system-wide CSO Facilities Plan Phase 1 Study in 1994. The study reviewed a range of broad system-wide alternatives and recommended more detailed CSO facilities plans be developed for the combined sewer areas tributary to the District’s Easterly, Southerly, and Westerly Wastewater Treatment Plants (WWTPs). These more detailed CSO Phase II Facilities Plans identified causes and developed solutions for the activation of CSOs in accordance with the U.S. EPA CSO Policy and the Ohio EPA CSO Control Strategy. Within each district, a system of conveyance and storage facilities were identified to capture combined sewage for treatment. The CSO Phase II plans are the basis of the District’s CSO LTCP and the Appendix 1 Control Measures and Performance Criteria.

**General Description of the Easterly Advanced Facilities Plan (AFP)**

The first step taken by the District to implement its original proposed CSO LTCP was to advance the major components of the Easterly district CSO control systems to preliminary design. This effort, known as the Easterly Advanced Facilities Plan (AFP) which commenced in 2003 and was completed in 2008, included advanced planning for the components listed below. For those components not listed, no advancement beyond the Phase II plans has been performed.

- Euclid Creek System
  - Euclid Creek Storage Tunnel (ECT)
  - Nottingham Interceptor – Area Refinements
  - Lakeshore Interceptor – Area Refinements
  - Euclid Creek Pump Station Upgrade (ECPS)
- Dugway Brook System
  - Dugway Storage Tunnel (DST)
  - Dugway East Interceptor Relief (DEIR)
  - Dugway West Interceptor Relief (DWIR)
• Doan Brook System
  o Doan Valley Storage Tunnel (DVT)
  o Woodhill Conveyance Tunnel
  o MLK/Chester Conveyance Tunnel
• Shoreline Storage Tunnel (SST)
• Tunnel Dewatering Pump Station (TDPS)

Under the AFP, the aforementioned components were advanced and preliminary design level plans and corresponding engineer’s estimate of probable cost were developed.

**General Description of the GI Feasibility Study and Advanced Facilities Plan**

In 2011, the District performed and completed a Feasibility Study for green infrastructure (GI) for the main purpose of developing the GI Plan required by Appendix 3 of the CSO LTCP Consent Decree. The GI Plan, which was submitted in December 2011 and ultimately approved by EPA in March of 2012, recommended conceptual level GI projects identified to be the most effective and beneficial means of achieving the 44 million gallons of additional CSO control within the required 8 year timeframe. The GI Advanced Feasibility Plan (AFP) project is currently developing and evaluating design options for these conceptual level projects for purposes of advancing the GI projects to preliminary design. In addition to identifying and advancing GI projects for the purposes of the 44 MG of additional CSO control, these studies also identified areas where green for gray opportunities may have more potential.

In 2011, the District also performed and completed a more targeted evaluation of the use of GI as an alternative CSO control method in the Doan Valley sewershed. Opportunities for reduction of stormwater entering the combined sewer system and subsequent reduction in the size and/or elimination of gray infrastructure where evaluated.

### 2.2 AVAILABLE INFORMATION

Consultants may request to examine documents not already provided as an exhibit to this RFP. If the request is approved, the documents will be uploaded to the designated ftp Sharefile site, or if that is not possible, will be made available at the District’s Administrative Office for examination. Requests should be directed to Devona Marshall by calling 216-881-6600 Ext. 6452 or e-mailing at marshalld@neorsd.org.
2.3 RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF PROPRIETARY SOFTWARE

The consultant is expected to enhance the District’s flexibility to accomplish follow-up studies or design related efforts as well as other District projects. Software utilized by the consultant in accomplishing the scope of services must support this expectation, and at the District’s request must be provided for its use. Use of proprietary software which cannot be turned over to the District at the end of this project is not allowed.

2.4 EVALUATION OF CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE AFTER SELECTION

The District will evaluate the performance of consultants on its projects, in the interest of improving project designs, ongoing consultant performance, and future project selections. The Consultant Project Performance Evaluation form that the District will use is located on the Consultant and Contractor Resource Page on the District’s internet site (www.neorsd.org).
3.0 DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT AND SERVICES

3.1 DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

The purpose of this project is to update, and in some cases advance, the remaining elements of the District’s CSO LTCP within the Easterly, Westerly, and Southerly CSO planning areas as necessary to meet the design and performance requirements outlined in Appendix 1 of the Consent Decree, and to provide technical support as the District implements its CSO LTCP and CSO NPDES requirements.

The basis of the District’s CSO LTCP as required under the Consent Decree is the aforementioned CSO Phase II Facilities Plans, the last of which was completed in 2002, and the Easterly AFP which was completed in 2008. In addition to the information for which the plans were developed being over a decade old, the Consent Decree negotiations with the U.S. DOJ, U.S. EPA and OEP resulted in a higher level of control than originally recommended under the CSO Phase II Plans including but not limited to no more than 2 overflows/typical year at priority CSOs as identified in Appendix 1 of the Consent Decree. Furthermore, the extent of the associated land requirements as it relates to property acquisition and community impacts has been recognized as a critical item as the District proceeds in implementing its program.

As the District moves further into implementation of its CSO LTCP and with the imminent issuance of a new CSO NPDES permit with monitoring and modeling requirements, the effort and technical support needed to manage, deliver, and meet the requirements especially in the area of performance compliance is anticipated to remain significant.

Consent Decree Required Level of Control

As planned, the District’s original proposed CSO LTCP would control CSOs to no more than 4 overflows in a “typical year” and where applicable provide flooding relief for the 5-year, 6-hour storm event. Developed as part of the CSO facilities planning efforts, the typical year is a series of 6-hr design storms comprised of a 121 actual rainfall events recorded at Cleveland Hopkins Airport based on analysis of 46 years of rainfall.

For each district, a system of conveyance and storage facilities were identified and documented in the CSO Phase II Facilities plans to achieve the required level of control and flooding relief. In the Easterly district, the major components were advanced to preliminary design. Negotiations with the government however resulted in a higher level of required control than in some cases recommended under the CSO Phase II plans. This included a higher level of control be provided by the seven (7) large tunnel systems:
Typical Year Level of Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tunnel</th>
<th>Original CSO LTCP</th>
<th>CSO LTCP Consent Decree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Euclid Creek Tunnel (ECT)</td>
<td>≤ 3 overflows (all)</td>
<td>≤ 2 overflows (all)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugway Storage Tunnel (DST)</td>
<td>≤ 3 overflows (all)</td>
<td>≤ 2 overflows (all)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doan Valley Tunnel (DVT)</td>
<td>≤ 3 overflows (all)</td>
<td>≤ 2 overflows (priority)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>≤ 3 overflows (non-priority)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline Storage Tunnel (SST)</td>
<td>≤ 3 overflows (all)</td>
<td>≤ 2 overflows (priority)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>≤ 3 overflows (non-priority)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerly Storage Tunnel (WST)</td>
<td>≤ 4 overflows (all)</td>
<td>≤ 2 overflows (priority)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>≤ 3 overflows (non-priority)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southerly Tunnel (SOT)</td>
<td>≤ 4 overflows (all)</td>
<td>≤ 3 overflows (all)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Creek Tunnel (BCT)</td>
<td>≤ 4 overflows (all)</td>
<td>≤ 3 overflows (all)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on available information at the time, it was believed that the required higher level of control for all but the WST would be accomplished through changing the consolidation and drop systems to accept and control the largest typical year peak storm event. For these six (6) tunnels, no increase in tunnel volume to achieve the higher level of control was projected to be required as is reflected in the Appendix 1 Control Measure descriptions and design criteria. However, in order to achieve the higher level of control for all ECT controlled CSOs without upsizing the tunnel upsizing, CSO 001 overflows which were to be tributary to and controlled by the ECT under the ECSO Plan would no longer be tributary to the ECT but would be treated via either a high rate chemical treatment or ballasted flocculation facility adjacent to the EWWTP. The evaluation of the type of treatment for CSO 001 is currently in progress and is not part of this project. In addition to eliminating the need to upsize the tunnel, pulling the CSO 001 flows out of the ECT frees up significant storage capacity within the ECT/DST which should allow for/result in increased control of other ECT/DST controlled outfalls. For the WST controlled CSOs, upsizing the tunnel diameter from 18-ft to 24-ft along with updates to the consolidation and drop systems was believed necessary to achieve the increased level of control.

Appendix 1 of the District’s CSO LTCP Consent Decree identifies the required Control Measures and corresponding level of control for the applicable CSOs. The consultant shall evaluate and demonstrate the ability of the District’s CSO LTCP, as currently planned, designed, and/or constructed, to achieve the required level of control for purposes of identifying any required changes.
**Consent Decree Required Control Measures**

Appendix 1 of the CSO LTCP Consent Decree includes 25 required control measures – 20 of which are considered control measures for CSO control within the collection system excluding the control of the CSO 001 and CSO 002 which are located at the Easterly and Westerly WWTPs. Each of these required Control Measures has associated required design criteria, performance criteria related to the number of allowable overflow activations in a typical year for the applicable CSOs, and milestone dates including bid and achievement of full operation. Within these 20 control measures, there are currently approximately 60 planned projects. Although some Control Measures are comprised of only one (1) planned project, many of the Control Measures including the six (6) tunnel system control measures are comprised of multiple projects. This packaging of projects within the larger Appendix 1 Control Measures allows for flexibility as the District moves forward in design of the systems.

The consultant shall consider the flexibility within the required Control Measures as they advance the CSO LTCP to preliminary design for purposes of optimizing or even potentially eliminating currently identified projects including those projects advanced during the Easterly AFP as applicable. This shall include the optimization of gray and green infrastructure within the designs.

**Update and Advancement of CSO LTCP Projects**

Similar to the Easterly AFP, it is anticipated that only the major components (projects) will be advanced to preliminary design:

- Tunnels, including drop structures and shafts
- Tunnel Pump Stations and consolidation sewers,
- Consolidation and Interceptor Relief Sewers

As part of their proposal, the consultant shall comment on what additional components of the CSO LTCP, if any, they recommend be advanced to preliminary design including the justification for advancing the components. Similarly, the consultant shall comment on any of the identified components that may not be necessary to advance to preliminary design along with the justification.

The projects not advanced to preliminary design shall be updated as necessary to meet the requirements of Appendix 1. Additionally, the CSO Phase II Facilities Plans identified projects where the scope of the CSO control and/or flooding relief is less clearly documented including but not necessarily limited to the following planned projects:

- Dugway Regulators /Relief
- Easterly/Downtown Regulators Relief
- Flood Control & System Enhancements
- Miscellaneous Southerly District Relief Sewers
Although most if not all of these projects will most likely not be advanced to preliminary design, the consultant shall develop these projects to a level sufficient to support design RFP/ scope development and CIP budget validation.

**Consideration of Green Infrastructure (GI) – Gray & Green Optimization**

The District continues to consider the use of green infrastructure (GI) as it moves forward in implementing its CSO LTCP. This includes identifying and encouraging the identification of cost-effective and cost-beneficial opportunities for reduction of stormwater entering the combined system that reduce and/or eliminate planned gray infrastructure during project design. Throughout the combined sewer area, opportune areas for GI have been identified as part of completed and ongoing efforts including the GI Feasibility Study and the ongoing GI AFP project.

The consultant shall consider the use of GI as it updates projects or advances projects to preliminary design. The consultant shall comment in their proposal on the use of a triple-bottom line analysis in evaluating green for gray opportunities as part of project evaluation and advancement. For the required gray infrastructure specifically defined in Appendix 1 of the Consent Decree, the consultant shall refer to the requirements and opportunities outlined in Appendix 4 of the CSO Consent Decree for utilizing green infrastructure to reduce the size of and/or replace the required gray infrastructure.

**Green Leave Behind Opportunities**

In addition to evaluating green for gray opportunities, the District is also looking for opportunities to enhance the traditional gray projects with “greener leave behinds”. These green leave behinds are an opportunity to provide community improvement and neighborhood revitalization as a leave behind legacy of the District to the communities it serves and the neighborhoods it will be impacting in some cases for multiple years during construction. Identified areas where such opportunity may exist include but are not limited to shaft locations and vacant properties along or near project alignments. The District is currently working with Land Studio through a partnership with the Cleveland Foundation to identify key strategic locations for permanent site improvements and neighborhood revitalization targets based on the neighborhood plans/vision and partnership opportunities within areas of planned gray infrastructure. The current focus of this effort is the DWIRS project currently in design.

The consultant shall consider this initiative as they update and advance the projects to preliminary design. To facilitate and accommodate these future improvements, the consultant shall coordinate with the District and Land Studio both in identifying potential locations on projects/project alignments as well as considering identified opportunity areas as they advance the designs.

**Property (Land) Acquisition**

As previously mentioned, 20 of the 25 Appendix 1 Control Measures are located in the collection system. Currently comprising these 20 control measures are over 60 planned projects including but not limited to seven (7) large deep tunnel systems and their associated near surface
consolidation and drop systems, and multiple interceptor and CSO relief sewers. In the planning of these facilities, the alignments including drop shafts were located in public rights of way wherever feasible. Despite this approach, significant property acquisition needs exist and are anticipated to remain as the plans are advanced.

Based on the extent of the required land, the current opportunity around vacant properties, and the need to secure critical areas for the projects, the District is moving forward on property acquisition as critical and/or available (i.e. land bank properties) areas needed for the projects are identified. To date, the focus has been on those components of the Easterly system that were part of the Easterly AFP as well as near-term projects.

The consultant shall identify property acquisition requirements as it updates and advances projects to preliminary design. Likewise, the consultant shall consider property acquisition opportunities (e.g. land bank properties) and “green leave behind” opportunities. For critical areas and/or opportunity areas, the consultant may be requested to provide legals/plats and/or Environmental Assessments (Phase 1 or 2).

**CSO Consent Decree Models**

In 2011, the District through its Project Management Office (PMO) Contract performed an update of its CSO Recommended Plan models in support of the 2011 GI Feasibility Study. The scope and the results of the updates are documented in the applicable 2011 model upgrade technical memo (TM):

- Big Creek Consent Decree Model 2011 Model Upgrades TM
- Doan Valley Consent Decree Model 2011 Model Upgrades TM
- Easterly Consent Decree Model 2011 Model Upgrades TM
- Southerly Consent Decree Model 2011 Model Upgrades TM
- Westerly Consent Decree Model 2011 Model Upgrades TM

The upgrades were limited to what was identified as priority 1 system updates, including the changes related to the negotiated higher level of control, and did not include any model recalibration efforts. A description of the changes and recommended future work related to the changes were documented in Table 2 of the applicable memo. Other identified system changes ranked as less of a priority were not part of the 2011 model upgrades but are documented in Table 1 of the applicable memo. These updates of the Recommended Plan models resulted in what is now known as the Consent Decree models.

The District has also recently commenced efforts to standardize the software platform of all its collection system hydraulic models. Under the PMO contract, the conversion of all CSO Baseline models, the Mill Creek Recommended Plan model, CSO Consent Decree Models currently in InfoWorks CS, and non-CSO models are being converted to InfoWorks ICM. As part of this conversion effort, the CSO baseline models and Mill Creek Recommended Plan model are also being updated based on the above mentioned 2011 upgrades where applicable as well as any significant system change since the 2011 updates. These model conversions and updates are
scheduled to be complete by the end of the 1st quarter 2013. The conversion of the remaining three (3) models including the Easterly CSO Consent Decree Model, the Big Creek CSO Consent Decree Model, and the Southerly Consent Decree Model to InfoWorks ICM from their current MikeUrban 2011 platform shall be performed under the CSO Program Technical Support effort included in the scope of this project.

The consultant shall update the CSO Consent Decree models as necessary in support of and/or as a result of the CSO AFP efforts in accordance with the District’s *Hydrologic and Hydraulic Modeling for Combined Sewer Systems Standards and Protocols*. Additionally, any recommended updates as it relates to existing collection system changes shall be reviewed with the District.

**Post-Construction Monitoring and Performance**

In accordance with Appendix 2 of the Consent Decree, the District is required to submit a Control Measure Report for EPA approval within twenty-four (24) months of Achievement of Full Operation of each Control Measure to demonstrate compliance. This includes a one-year post-construction monitoring period and use of the applicable District CSO model(s) to demonstrate compliance with the performance criteria identified in Appendix 1 of the Consent Decree. Under the PMO contract, the District has developed or is in the process of developing post-construction monitoring location plans (PCMLPs) for use on project designs as applicable and ultimately post-construction monitoring activities. The PCMLP for Control Measure 24 (CSO-063 Relief/Consolidation Sewer) which is scheduled to Achieve Full Operation in 2014 has been developed. The PCMLP for Control Measure 6 (Euclid Creek Tunnel/Dugway Storage System) is currently in development. Most if not all monitors are likely to be temporary instruments used solely for post-construction monitoring and performance.

The consultant shall be responsible for developing PCMLPs for all remaining collection system Control Measures. The consultant shall also be responsible for updating the PCMLP for Control Measure 6 as necessary based on advanced planning performed as part of this project.

**Operational Protocols**

The District has identified the need for the development of an overall CSO system operational protocol for each district including Easterly, Southerly, and Westerly. The protocols shall describe how each control facility and the system it is tied to operate during and after wet weather events. Development of the operational protocol for the Easterly district is planned for under the PMO contract; however, the completeness to which this will be developed is not certain.

The consultant shall develop operational protocols for both the Southerly and Westerly districts utilizing what was developed for the Easterly district as a basis. The consultant shall also update and/or complete the operational protocols for the Easterly district as necessary based on the advanced planning performed under this project and the deemed level of completeness at the time of contract negotiations.
CSO Program Technical Support

The Project Management Office (PMO) currently provides technical support to the District’s management and implementation of the CSO Consent Decree and CSO-related activities. This support has been at both the project and program level. The majority of the project level support has been in the area of project delivery covering such activities as project definition development and technical support during design for both the gray and green infrastructure projects. The program level support has mainly been in the area of hydraulic model maintenance and management, modeling standards development, and compliance-related modeling tasks and evaluations. The need for CSO technical support will continue beyond the PMO contract which is scheduled to be complete at the end of the first quarter of 2013.

The consultant shall be required to provide technical support for CSO related activities as determined necessary during the term of this project. The consultant shall work under the direction of the District’s CSO Design Manager on project-level support and under the direction of the CSO Consent Decree/Planning Manager on program-level support. In addition to providing technical support as determined necessary for Appendix 1 and Appendix 3 projects, the effort includes conversion of the remaining 3 CSO Consent Decree models to InfoWorks ICS, maintenance and management of the District’s CSO master models, and CSO NPDES permit compliance support.

The scope and the associated level of effort for technical support for Appendix 1 and Appendix 3 projects and the maintenance and management of the District’s CSO master models shall be determined during contract negotiations with the successful consultant. Therefore for Task 5, the consultant shall only include hours for Subtasks 5A and 5B in the Task and Hour Summary required under Section 4.4 of the RFP. The consultant however shall include comment in their technical proposal on all tasks to be performed under Task 5.

CSO NPDES Permit

The District’s current CSO NPDES Permit expired in 2002. However, with the finalization of the CSO LTCP Consent Decree and the recent issuance of new NPDES permits for the District’s three (3) WWTPs, issuance of a new CSO NPDES permit is anticipated to occur by early 2013. Based on recent discussions with OEPA, monitoring and modeling requirements for purposes of reporting overflows (events and/or volume) are anticipated in the next CSO NPDES permit. In addition to requiring monitoring of a select number of outfalls, this will include utilization of the District’s multiple CSO Baseline models to estimate the annual overflows within the system based on the yearly rainfall. Similar monitoring and/or modeling requirements have also been established in other CSO NPDES permits issued within Ohio.

Consent Decree Control Measure 24

Control Measure 24 is the first Appendix 1 Control Measure required to achieve full operation (Achievement of Full Operation: 2014). As defined by Appendix 1 of the Consent Decree,
Control Measure 24 includes only the CSO 063 Relief/Consolidation Sewer (CSO 063) project scheduled to commence design in November 2012. The CSO 063 project scope is anticipated to include a Specific Allowance for performance compliance activities including the required 1-year post-construction monitoring period and subsequent Control Measure Report development.

The consultant may be required to assist the District in the management/oversight of the performance compliance activities for Control Measure 24 as determined necessary.

**CEHRT Pilots**

As part of Control Measures 2, 3, and 4 of the Appendix 1, the District is required to pilot chemically enhanced high rate treatment (CEHRT) technology for treatment of CSO 001 located at the Easterly WWTP, CSO 002 located at the Westerly WWTP, and treatment of the primary effluent bypass (PEB) located at the Southerly WWTP for purposes of demonstrating to the EPA the ability of the technology to achieve the identified performance criteria. The pilot facilities which recently commenced construction are scheduled to be complete in March 2013, May 2013, and May 2013 respectively. Upon the completion of the pilot facilities, the District will have until March 2015, March 2016, and March 2015 respectively to demonstrate the ability of the CEHRT technology to achieve compliance. The pilot operations and management services are being procured by the District under a separate contract.

The consultant may be required to assist the District in the management/oversight of the pilot operations contract as determined necessary.

### 3.2 REQUESTED TASKS AND SERVICES

The District is requesting the following major tasks be performed to address the needs of this Project.

Task 1. Project Management Plan
Task 2. Planning and Evaluation
  - Task 2A: Project Data Collection and Management
  - Task 2B: Evaluation of Existing Information
  - Task 2C: Surveying
  - Task 2D: Geotechnical Investigation
  - Task 2E: Hydraulic Modeling and Analysis
  - Task 2F: Control Measure/Project Optimization Evaluation
  - Task 2G: Community Impacts and Opportunities
  - Task 2H: Coordination with other Entities & Initiatives
Task 3: Updated CSO LTCP
  - Task 3A: CSO LTCP Projects & Costs
  - Task 3B: Design/Construction Schedules
  - Task 3C: Property Acquisition & Permit Needs
  - Task 3D: Green Leave Behind Opportunities
Task 3E: Updated CSO Consent Decree Models  
Task 3F: Control Measure Post-Construction Monitoring Location Plans  
Task 3G: CSO Systems Operational Protocols  

Task 4. Preliminary Design  
Task 4A: Basis of Design Reports  
Task 4B: Conceptual Design Drawings  

Task 5. CSO Program Technical Support  
Task 5A: Easterly, Big Creek, Southerly Consent Decree Model Conversions  
Task 5B: CSO NPDES Compliance Support  
Task 5C Master Models – CSO Hydraulic Models Maintenance and Management  
Task 5D: Project Delivery Technical Support – Consent Decree Appendix 1  
Task 5E: Project Delivery Technical Support – Consent Decree Appendix 3  

Task 6. Allowances  
Specific Allowance 1 – Legals/Plats and Environmental Assessments (Phase 1 and 2)  
Specific Allowance 2 – Performance Compliance Support - Control Measure 24  
Specific Allowance 3 – Support Management - CEHRT Pilots  
General Allowance  

Some key services associated with delivery of this project may include, but are not limited to, the following.  

- CSO Facilities Planning  
- CSO Design  
- Green Infrastructure Planning and Design  
- Surveying  
- Geotechnical investigations and/or baseline report  
- Hydraulic and Hydrologic modeling  
- Cost estimating  
- Public outreach  
- Drafting/CAD  
- Land acquisition support  
- Phase 1 and 2 Environmental Assessments  
- Utility location/coordination/test pits  
- Permitting  
- Scheduling  

The consultant should base the Technical Approach section of the proposal on the described tasks and the description of the project and services in this RFP.  

Negotiation of the Scope of Services with the successful consultant will begin with a project specific version of the Exhibit B Scope of Services. The Exhibit B Scope of Services document for Planning projects can be found on the Consultant Contractor Resource Page. The successful
consultant will work with the District to revise and refine the Scope of Services to meet the District’s needs for the Project.

3.3 PROJECT UNDERSTANDING

Proposals will be evaluated in part on the consultant’s understanding of key issues, challenges, and technologies that may determine the success of the Project. The consultant may present information in the Proposal related to concepts that significantly enhance the scope of this project.
4.0 PROPOSAL CONTENT AND FORMAT

Each consultant shall submit one original and seven (7) copies of the proposal, as well as an electronic version, in .pdf format with bookmarks, on either a CD or USB drive. The font size on all submitted materials shall be equivalent to Times New Roman 12 pt or larger.

Proposals shall be no more than 50 printed pages, with hard copies printed on sheets of double-sided recycled paper. All pages will be counted (i.e., each side of a sheet will count as a unique page, so one double-sided sheet will be counted as two pages) unless indicated otherwise in this RFP. Sheets that are 11”x17” shall be counted as two pages per side, or four pages if double sided.

The following information shall be included in the proposal:

4.1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Include a concise synopsis of the proposal focused on how the consultant will address the District’s key issues with its approach and team.

4.2 PROJECT DELIVERY

The District is looking for a consultant team that has the capacity and required skill sets to provide excellent service and deliver a quality project for the District. The District expects this quality service to extend through the entire duration of the Project. In this section of the Proposal present the capabilities, skills, and experience of your project manager as well as how you have served the District on prior projects. These factors will be strongly considered in selecting the successful consultant for this Project.

4.2.1 Proposed Project Manager

The District expects the proposed project manager to lead the consultant project team, be the single point of accountability for project delivery, and provide the primary point of communication between the District and project team. Describe the proposed project manager’s experience on similar projects, experience on other District projects, and skills and results supporting the ability to serve the District. The project manager is considered the most important key team member, and will be committed for the Project’s duration. Any change in project manager, or any other key team member, will require prior approval by the District.

The Consultant’s proposed project manager must be experienced in projects of the magnitude and complexity of the CSO Advanced Facilities Planning (AFP) and Program Support Services (PSS) Project. The Consultant’s proposed project manager shall have past project manager experience in CSO facilities planning and design equivalent to that required under this RFP. In addition to have managed a CSO facilities planning or advanced facilities planning project to the scale of the CSO AFP, the proposed project manager must have managed a technical support effort similar to the CSO Program
Support Services required under this project and hold a position within their firm that ensures access to qualified individuals in the needed disciplines as required under this project. It is expected that the Consultant’s proposed project manager will be available for frequent personal interaction with the District project management team. The project manager must also meet the following requirements:

- Must be a registered professional engineer in the State of Ohio at the time or within 12 months of contract award and throughout the contract duration
- Must have had a key role in a minimum of two (2) CSO facilities planning and/or advanced facilities planning projects
- Must have managed a minimum of one (1) facilities planning or advanced facilities planning projects
- Must have managed a minimum of one (1) technical support services effort

4.2.2 Performance on District Projects

Summarize your team’s experience on District Projects. List the District staff that you worked with and would be most familiar with your work. Your prior performance on District projects is an important consideration in the selection process. The successful consultant’s performance will be formally evaluated on this Project for use in subsequent procurements.

Consultants that do not have prior experience working for the District will receive a neutral rating for this evaluation criterion.

4.3 QUALIFICATIONS

Because of the critical nature of the work described within this RFP, the District seeks services from highly experienced and qualified teams. The teams must be able to staff this project with qualified individuals, experienced in the key technical disciplines needed, who shall remain committed to this work from inception through completion. Furthermore, the teams must be able to support anticipated and unanticipated periods of high volume activity around the CSO Program Support Services effort. A clear and comprehensive organization chart must be presented to illustrate the organization of the team and key team members, including subconsultants.

4.3.1 Experience of Key Team Members on Similar Projects

Include brief resumés of key staff members (excluding the proposed project manager, who should be addressed as noted in section 4.2.1) and/or subconsultants proposed to work on the project. The information should be focused on experience on similar and/or complementary projects. The information for these projects shall include, at a minimum, the following: project description, key staff member’s role, client, client contact information, construction cost (as applicable), and year completed. The roles proposed for each subconsultant as well as their qualifications in that area shall also be identified in the Proposal.
Key consultant staff include but are not limited to project manager, technical discipline leads, design manager, design engineer, and other key staff on the top or mid levels of the proposed organization chart. Your ability to identify and highlight key staff in the Proposal will be considered when evaluating your understanding of the Project.

The Consultant’s proposed key staff must be experienced in projects of the magnitude and complexity of the CSO Advanced Facilities Plan and Program Support Services project. The Consultant’s proposed task leads must also have, within the last five years, led tasks on similar projects within their area of expertise.

The following lead capabilities must be demonstrated in the Consultant’s response to the RFP:

- CSO Facilities Planning
- CSO Hydraulic Design
- Tunnel Design
- Green Infrastructure Planning
- Green Infrastructure Design
- Hydrologic and Hydraulic Modeling

The consultant’s proposed key design task leads must be also be Registered Professional Engineers in the State of Ohio at the time or within 12 months of the Award of Contract and must maintain said registration throughout the duration of the contract period. Architectural leads must be Ohio licensed architects or within 12 months of the Award of Contract and must maintain said registration throughout the duration of the contract period.

In addition, the Proposal should include a description of three (3) of the most recent projects/programs/efforts that included similar scope of work for the prime consultant and relevant subconsultants. The following information shall be included for each project:

- Project title
- Firm name and role
- Proposed team members involved
- Project description
- Client name
- Client contact (address, phone, e-mail)
- Year completed
- Total fee($)
4.3.2 Key Team Members’ Availability

It is expected that the consultant will honor its proposed project staffing and all proposed key individuals shall be assigned to the project. Substitutions will not be allowed for the convenience of the consultant. In the event a proposed individual becomes unavailable the firm must propose, in advance and in writing, a substitution. The District reserves the right to accept or reject any and all proposed substitutions.

In order to demonstrate the availability of key staff proposed for the Project, including and in particular the proposed project manager, the consultant must include a summary similar to the following table in the Proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability of Key Staff During Project Delivery Period*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Project delivery period is specific to the staff person &amp; role (i.e. when they are needed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Doe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.3 Business Opportunity Program Participation

The Proposal should include a summary of the proposed local and MBE/WBE participation, along with the percentage commitment to each category. The summary should include the roles and responsibilities of all proposed subconsultants with respect to each task. Submittals will be evaluated on the percentage and quality of participation by Minority Business Enterprise (MBE) and/or Women Business Enterprise (WBE) subconsultants.
The Project’s goal for Business Opportunity participation is 20% total, which can include any combination of MBE and/or WBE firms. The percentage shall be calculated upon the entire Project including allowances. The Proposal shall also include the following information:

- Statement of the overall percentage of MBE/WBE involvement; and
- Principal contact information for each MBE/WBE firm.

The MBE/WBE firms proposed as part of this project team shall be certified with the District at the time of Proposal. Questions regarding the District’s Business Opportunity program shall be addressed to Ms. Tiffany Jordan, the District’s Contract Compliance Manager, at (216) 881-6600, Ext. 6640. A copy of the District’s MBE/WBE policy is available on the District’s web site www.neorsd.org.

4.3.4 Conflicts/Restrictions of Consultant Team on Other District Projects

The scope of this project is expected to be vast and interface with most, if not all, of the District’s CSO LTCP projects, present and future. However, it is anticipated that this involvement can be isolated from any future projects that members of the Consulting team may be interested in pursuing. The District will require the consultant team to identify any projects its members plan to pursue in advance of RFP development, thereafter a mutually agreed upon decision on how to proceed shall be determined by the District and the consultant. Therefore, participation as a Prime or Subconsultant on this project should not preclude the ability to pursue future CSO work at the District.

4.4 TECHNICAL APPROACH

The consultant team’s technical approach to the Project is a very important component of the selection. In the Proposal, the consultant is requested to demonstrate their project understanding to meet the District’s objectives.

4.4.1 Project Understanding

The consultant should concisely demonstrate its understanding of the Project in this section of the Proposal. Key activities and approaches that improve the chances of success should be presented, along with key issues and challenges and how they will be addressed. The consultant should include a preliminary list of key deliverables the team feels will be necessary to successfully complete Tasks 1 through 6 of this Project.

A task and hour summary similar to the following table should be completed for the Project as organized and described in Sections 3.0 and 4.0 of this RFP. The table should reflect the projected effort necessary to complete the top-level tasks (e.g. Task 1, Task 2). The form will serve as an indicator of the consultant’s understanding of relative effort between tasks and for the Project as a whole. The total of the hours for all tasks shall
reflect the estimate of the consultant’s total labor effort needed to perform the entire project as outlined in the RFP.

### Example: Task and Hour Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Task Name</th>
<th>Prime Labor Hours</th>
<th>Majority Sub Labor Hours</th>
<th>Minority Sub Labor Hours</th>
<th>Projected Total Labor Hours</th>
<th>Firms Involved</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>ABD, Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>ABD, Good, Franklin, Best</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>ABD, Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>ABD, Best</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>ABD, Best</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>700</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Allowances</td>
<td>Specific and General Allowances are potential additions to the base scope, and will only be utilized as authorized by the District.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>435</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The District reserves the right to request additional task and hour information to clarify the consultant’s project understanding. A prompt response of one (1) working day shall be adhered to in these requests.

### 4.5 STATEMENTS (Not included in the Page Count)

The consultant shall include the following statements in the Proposal as an appendix.

“By virtue of submitting this Proposal, I certify as a legal representative of the prime firm that I have reviewed the District’s current Standard Agreement for Professional Services available on the Consultant and Contractor Resource Page on the District’s internet site (www.neorsd.org). Any requested exceptions to the standard agreement are stated below.”

“By virtue of submitting this Proposal, I certify as a legal representative of the prime firm that I have examined background reports and data and agree to acquire the additional information needed to perform all aspects of the work as outlined in this RFP.”

“By virtue of submitting this Proposal, I certify as a legal representative of the prime firm that neither the firms on the team nor the key personnel presented have known personal or organizational conflicts of interest associated with this Project and/or the District, or that any known potential conflicts of interest have been communicated in written form to the District.
prior to the submittal of this Proposal, and that information may be considered by the District in evaluating the team’s suitability for this Project.”

4.6 NEORSD REQUIRED FORMs (Not Included in the Page Count)

The consultant shall also provide in this appendix a completed and signed copy of the District’s Declaration of no assistance to a Terrorist Organization.

Pages in this appendix are not included toward the total page count.

4.7 DETAILED RESUMES (Not Included in the Page Count)

Detailed resumes for key team members may be included as an appendix. No more than one page per resume. Pages in this appendix are not included toward the total page count.
5.0 PROJECT SCHEDULE

The selected consultant shall adhere to the following schedule:

- Begin work immediately upon authorization to proceed.

- If selected, and following notice to proceed, consultant shall prepare and submit a detailed draft baseline schedule as required in the Standard Agreement and conforming to the requirements of the District’s Schedule Guidance Document as available on the Consultant and Contractor Resource Page on the District’s internet site (www.neorsd.org).

- For purposes of the Proposal, a preliminary schedule showing general tasks and anticipated dates shall be included in the Proposal’s Technical Approach section. The preliminary schedule may be submitted in tabular or Gantt chart format within the Proposal.

- For use in preparing the preliminary schedule for the Proposal, assume the NTP for the Project will be:

  **March 2013**

The District’s current schedule expectations, pending negotiation of the detailed scope of services and review of the consultant’s detailed draft baseline schedule following NTP, are as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Task</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tasks 1 through 4: CSO Advanced Facilities Plan (AFP)</td>
<td>Notice to Proceed</td>
<td>March 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks 1 through 4: CSO Advanced Facilities Plan (AFP)</td>
<td>Completion</td>
<td>Within 36 months of Notice to Proceed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 5: CSO Program Support Services (PSS)</td>
<td>Notice to Proceed</td>
<td>March 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 5: CSO Program Support Services (PSS)</td>
<td>Completion</td>
<td>48 months after Notice to Proceed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.0 EVALUATION AND SELECTION PROCESS

Once all proposals have been received, the consultant selection will follow these steps.

1. The written Proposals will be evaluated and scored by a District Selection Committee utilizing the following criteria:

   **Delivery (25% of Total Score)**
   - Proposed Project Manager 10%
   - Performance on District projects 15%

   **Qualifications (25% of Total Score)**
   - Experience of key team members on similar projects 10%
   - Key team members’ availability 10%
   - Business Opportunity Program Participation 5%

   **Technical Approach (30% of Total Score)**
   - Project understanding 15%
   - Proposed methods to accomplish scope of services 15%

2. Upon completion of the scoring and ranking of the written submittals, the District may make a selection based on evaluation of the preceding categories. Alternately the District may, at its sole discretion, select up to three (3) of the top ranked firms to deliver a presentation and provide further clarification of their capabilities, experience, and approach. The District may prepare and submit a list of questions to each of the short-listed firms prior to their interview, or may instead provide the questions by asking them during the interview.

   The District may allot up to 90-minutes for the presentation and interview, including a 30-minute question and answer period. Key project personnel will be expected to take the lead in presenting and answering questions regarding the Project. Upon completion of the presentations, the District selection committee will score each firm according to the following criteria:

   **Presentation and Interview (20% of Total Score)**
   - Confirmation of technical approach/understanding – 10%
   - Confirmation of PM/team qualifications – 5%
   - Response to District Questions – 5%

3. If interviews are held, the scores for the Presentation and Interview will be combined with the scores from the evaluation of the written submittals to determine the overall score and corresponding ranking of the short-listed firms.

4. The District will enter into negotiations with the highest ranked firm to develop a final and mutually agreed-upon scope of services, using Exhibit B as a basis, and a corresponding
price for the services to be performed. If the District cannot reach an agreement with the highest ranked firm, the District may initiate negotiations with the next highest ranked firm.

5. Upon reaching agreement on the scope and total not-to-exceed price for the project, the District’s Project Manager will make a recommendation to award to the District’s Consultant Review Committee (CRC) for review.

6. Upon approval by CRC, District Staff will report to the Board of Trustees and make a recommendation to enter into an agreement based on the outcome of the negotiations.

7. The selected consultant cannot commence work on any aspects of the project prior to Board approval and subsequent execution of the District’s standard Agreement.

END OF RFP