REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

The Colorado River Authority of Utah (Authority) announces a Request for Proposals (RFP) for an analysis of past and present metering and gaging stations in the Colorado River system in Utah. The following summarizes the requirements for submitting an RFP for the Metering and Gaging Gap Analysis Project (Project), a brief description of the scope of work to be accomplished, scoring and selection criteria, and the nature of the proposal requested.

Project Background

The Colorado River is one of Utah’s most critical natural resources. Nearly half of the state falls within the Colorado River Basin and major portions of the Utah population center are supported in various ways: through agriculture, industrial and municipal uses. It is also critical to Utah’s Native American communities, wildlife and natural environments, and recreational interests. In acknowledgement of this, the state established the Colorado River Authority of Utah in 2021 through landmark legislation. It was sponsored by the Speaker of the House and Senate President in the Utah State Legislature. The Authority is a state entity whose mission is to protect, conserve, use and develop Utah’s Colorado River interests.

In April of 2022, the Authority adopted a five-year management plan to guide the agency in meeting its mission. In the Management Plan (Plan), the Authority identified the following three primary focus areas: Hydrology and Operations, Measurement, and Drought Mitigation.

The subject of this RFP directly supports the Measurement element of the Plan. As noted in the Plan, “improved understanding of Colorado River water use is at the core of the Authority’s mission and is a basic requirement of effective and equitable water management. The expansive Colorado Region in Utah, and extensive dependence on Colorado River water, complicates measurement of water availability and use, while simultaneously highlighting its importance. Building on existing infrastructure, the Authority will improve, expand, and maintain a measurement network that produces sound and transparent data that is publicly available.”

The first step in improving measurement is to establish a clear understanding of the current measurement conditions, identify gaps in, and risks to, data, funding,
maintenance, and other factors that influence quality, coverage, and access to natural distribution and diversion measurements. The successful consulting company will perform work to this end, as defined in the following Project Scope of Work.

**Project Scope of Work**

- This Project includes the investigation and analysis of water supply and use measurement gaps in the Colorado River system in Utah, which is defined for purposes of this Project as the Colorado River and its tributaries in Utah and includes stations located outside of Utah boundaries, but within the HUC-8 boundaries that cover both Utah and portions of the adjoining state, a report detailing the findings of the analysis and delivery of collected data in a geospatial layer (GIS) linked to a database.

  In particular, the gap analysis will include, but not necessarily be limited to:

  - Identification of all active stream gaging and measurements stations in the Colorado River system in Utah:
    - Show location and access
    - Identify the agency or group that manages the measurement station(s) (e.g., U.S. Geological Service (USGS), Utah Division of Water Resources, Utah Division of Water Rights, Irrigation Districts, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation)
    - Identify all information collected at the metering station(s) (e.g., water quality)
    - Provide an annual cost break-down and agreements on measurement stations operations and maintenance (if available)
    - Provide a condition assessment of the active gaging and measurement stations
    - Identify type of data collection used and whether telemetry or other means is used to transmit data electronically; where telemetry or other automatic data transmission measures are not used, determine what equipment and related measures would be required to automate data transmission
    - Provide information on when gage began collecting data, stopped collecting data (if applicable), if the gage is seasonally operated, and annual percent of missing data values.

  - Identification of all retired or non-functioning gaging and measurement stations in the Colorado River system in Utah:
    - Show location and access
    - Identify the agency or group that manages the measurement stations
    - Provide an annual cost break-down and agreements on the measurement stations operations and maintenance (if available)
    - Provide a description as to why the gaging and measurement station is no longer active (e.g., costs, no longer needed, duplicate)
    - Describe the nature/condition/format of the historic data, if available; work under this scope does not include collection of metered data.
    - Identify type of data collection that was used and if telemetry or other used to transmit data electronically

  - Identification of major diversions (servicing canal companies, or similar collaboratives, and diverting capacity in excess of 50cfs)
    - Show location and access
- Identify the company or group that manages the diversion(s)
- Identify if other information is collected at the Diversion(s)
- Identify and provide contact information for the diversion operator.

- Describe the nature and prevalence of minor diversions. Estimate the number of minor diversions (not including groundwater pumping).
- Assessment of stream gaging and measurement needs in the Colorado River system in Utah in collaboration with the Authority, DWRe, and DWRi
  - Discuss the trajectory of gaging and measurement within the project area, including risk to data collection, quality, accessibility and general utility in water management.
  - Provide a market analysis of cost trends for replacement, upgrade, or new installation of metering and gaging stations. Include options for each, and the benefits and disadvantages of each.
  - Identify and recommend locations that should be considered for upgrade, replacement, or new installation because they are lacking adequate measurement and gaging. Provide prioritization ranking and rationale for such. This work will inform next steps in improving the metering and gaging system.
- Coordinate with Division of Water Rights regional engineers, pertinent river commissioners, Upper Colorado River Commission, system operators, and other pertinent entities to ensure gaps are reasonably identified, understood, and to substantiate other information that has been collected as part of this Project.

**Project Goals**
The Colorado River Authority of Utah is seeking to partner with a consulting team that exemplifies the Authority's vision, strategic goals, emphasis areas, and core values. The Authority and the selected consultant will complete an analysis and provide the Authority with a written assessment documenting the Project findings, recommendations and analyses identified above in the scope of work and outlined in detail in the contracting documents.
RFP and Project Schedule
The following is the RFP schedule and the anticipated analysis schedule:

RFP Released .............................................................. Wednesday, August 17, 2022
RFP Advertised ............................................................ Wednesday, August 17, 2022
**Proposals Due** ....................................................... 1:00 PM, Friday, September 16, 2022
Consultant Presentation (optional) ........................................ Friday, October 2, 2022
Approval to Award Contract .................................................. Friday, October 22
Execution of the Project ...................................................... Fall 2022 to June 30, 2023

The Authority reserves the right to cancel, delay, or postpone award of project for any reason that it deems necessary and in its best interest.

Content of the Proposal

1. Cover Letter
2. Project Team, Key Personnel, and Experience
   a. Introduction of Consulting Firm and Description of Experience, Capabilities, and Availability
   b. Provide Project organization chart with names and titles of project team members, experience, and availability
   c. Name and show any subconsultants on the organization chart
   d. Provide any related experience on a similar project (e.g., design and construction of diversions, measurement systems, telemetry, SCADA)
   e. Identify previous projects and key personnel who worked on these projects (projects must be completed)
      i. Discuss experience working with on the Colorado River and its tributaries or similar river systems
   f. Discuss experience working with the Authority, DWRd, DWRi, or USGS, etc.
   g. Provide readable Table A (see example table at the end of the RFP)
3. Approach to Completing the Project
   a. Discuss and describe understanding of the Project
   b. Describe the methods and approach for completing the Project
   c. Describe potential risks and issues that may delay the completion of the Project
4. Schedule
   a. Discuss any critical schedule issues and possible items that could impact the Project schedule
5. Resumes (**not included in the page count for the RFP**)
   a. Provide key personnel resumes in an appendix to the proposal
Proposal Submission
To be responsive to this RFP, interested consultants must submit six (6) copies of their proposal no later than 1:00 P.M., on Friday, September 16, 2022. In addition, a digital copy in portable document file (PDF) format must be provided on an unencrypted USB flash drive. The written proposal shall not exceed 12 single-side pages in length, not including the cover letter, resumes, or Table A (resumes and Table A should be included in an appendix attached to the proposal). Fonts shall be 10-point or greater. Electronic PDF files must be organized similarly to the hard copy submittal and wherever possible, should be generated electronically directly from the native document software rather than scanned copies. Proposals should be addressed to:

Colorado River Authority of Utah
60 East South Temple, Suite 850
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
Attn: Danny Schoenfeld, Director of Administration

You are instructed not to have any direct or indirect communications with any of the selection team members. Further, if in this selection process, you are contacted directly or indirectly regarding the selection process by any of the selection team, or otherwise identify any possible conflict of interest that you might have, you must inform the Authority’s Executive Directory immediately. This is necessary to preserve the integrity of the competitive process and to avoid delays of this critical project.

RFP Contact
Inquiries regarding this RFP should be directed to Bart Leeflang at (801) 230-1284.

Any unsolicited communication (from your firm or anyone on behalf of your firm) concerning this RFP to any employee, trustee, or officer of the Authority not listed as the RFP contact before the award of contract is grounds for disqualification from this procurement.

Minimum Qualifications
The Consultant and the Consultant’s team shall be capable of providing all professional services as described in this RFP and maintain those capabilities until notification that the Consultant’s proposal was unsuccessful or, if the proposal is successful, until the project has been successfully completed. Exclusion of any service needed for the project may serve as cause for rejection of the proposal.

Specifically identify Key Personnel and their roles on Table A (see example at the end of the RFP), who would be assigned to the project, including qualifications, experience, and background of each. Note that Key Personnel identified in the responding proposal may not be changed without the advance, written approval of the Authority. Also, specifically identify related or relevant projects on Table A. Only projects on which Key Personnel were participants should be listed. Projects may be listed for participants when they were working for a firm different from their current firm.
**Cost Proposal**
Firms will be required to prepare and submit at the same time as their proposal a cost estimate to complete the Project as described. The cost estimate must be sealed in a separate envelope. The cost estimate is for the services described as part of the Project to complete the analysis and report. A PDF cost estimate is not required. Only the top-ranked firm’s cost estimate will be opened after the selection process is complete based on qualifications. The cost estimate will then be reviewed by the Authority and used for contract negotiations. The cost estimate will not be used in the consultant selection process.

**Selection Process**
The selection committee will review and evaluate the submitted proposals and will rank each on a set of predetermined criteria. The consultant selection will be based on the information exclusively in the submitted proposals and the Authority reserves the right to select the most qualified firm from the submitted proposals. However, if the selection committee determines that consultant presentations are needed to determine final rankings, then presentations will be included in the selection process for those consulting firms with the highest ranked written proposals. Final rankings will be determined by the selection committee members’ scores from the written proposals and consultant presentations (if needed). Consulting firms selected to provide presentations are required to meet with the selection committee on **Monday, September 26, 2022**, the date set for the consultant presentation (if needed). A consulting firm will be considered non-responsive if they are asked to give a presentation but are unable. Presentations will be a total of 30 minutes and will consist of a 20-minute presentation by the consultant team followed by 10 minutes of questions.

If the selection committee determines presentation are necessary, project-specific topics will be provided to each team that is invited to give a presentation. Proposal scores will be carried over and will be weighted at 30% of the final score. The remaining 70% of the final score will be based on the interview. More specific information will be provided to those consulting firms selected to give a presentation.
**Evaluation of Proposals**

The selection committee will evaluate submitted proposals based upon the qualifications presented and the selection criteria set forth by the selection committee. The selection criteria are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORING CRITERIA</th>
<th>POSSIBLE POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describe the Project Team’s qualifications, experience, and availability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Identify the Project Manager and his/her availability for the Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Identify other key members, their roll, and availability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provide a Project Team Organization Chart</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Discuss logistics (office location) and collaboration efforts relating to how the Project Team will successfully complete the Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Describe the Project Team’s understanding and experience with the Colorado River, its tributaries, and any relevant work or projects that involved metering and gaging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Discuss Project Team’s knowledge of metering and gaging stations and telemetry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Information for this criterion must be consistent with Table A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe the Project Team’s approach with completing the Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Discuss and describe the Project Team’s understanding of the Project</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Describe the methods and approach for completing the Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Describe potential risks and issues that may delay the completion of the Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Discuss Project Team’s experience working with the Authority, DWRe, and DWRi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Show Project milestones</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Discuss the rationale behind the schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Identify risks, challenges, and conflicts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Accuracy of Proposals and Other
All proposals will be relied upon to be true and accurate. The selection committee will rely on this information when evaluating each submission by the criteria listed in the Evaluation Process and Award of Contract sections below. Any proposal failing to clearly present all the requested information or failing to be in the requested format may be considered non-responsive and rejected.

In accordance with Utah State Law, proposals are a public record and are subject to public review upon request. However, a firm may request that any part of its proposal be designated as a protected record and not available for public release by complying with the requirements of §63G-2-309(1), Utah Code Annotated. To do this, firms must provide the Authority with a written claim of business confidentiality and a concise statement of reasons supporting this claim. This information must be submitted together with the proposal to be considered.

The Authority reserves the right to request a firm clarify any part of the submitted proposal. Response to such requests must be made in writing and will become part of the proposal. Supplementary information and materials received after the deadline, that are not expressly solicited by the Authority, will not be considered in the evaluation. All firm proposals, including electronic media, will become and remain property of the Authority.

Evaluation Process
The evaluation process will be in compliance with State of Utah procurement code requirements and procedures. To determine which proposal provides the best qualified services with the best value to the Authority, the selection committee shall evaluate the proposals submitted in conformance with the applicable requirements of the Utah Procurement Code, using a staged evaluation process authorized by §63G-6a-710, Utah Code Annotated, as follows:

Stage 1: The selection committee will review all proposals that are received in a timely manner and by the due date – 1:00 PM Friday, September 9, 2022. Proposals that are non-responsive, or do not comply with the requirements of this RFP and the requested submission format, will be eliminated from consideration. A written notice will be sent to those responders who are eliminated from consideration, and the responder’s sealed cost proposal will be returned with the notice.

Stage 2: The selection committee will evaluate proposals that are not eliminated in Stage 1 in accordance with the selection criteria found in the Evaluation of Proposals listed above. The top-ranked proposals based on the selection criteria scoring will be designated as finalists and will move on to Stage 3. A written notice will be sent to those responders who are eliminated from consideration after step 2, and the responder’s sealed cost proposal will be returned with the notice.

Stage 3: If needed, presentations may be conducted with responders who were not eliminated in Stage 1 or Stage 2. The presentations will be conducted in person on Monday, September 26, 2022. The scores awarded under Stage 2 may be adjusted, if justified. If presentations are deemed unnecessary, proposals may be accepted without a presentation. A written notice will be sent to those responders
who are eliminated from consideration after step 3, and the responder’s sealed cost proposal will be returned with the notice.

**Stage 4:** After the adjustments described in Stage 3 are made, the top ranked finalist will be notified and their cost proposal will be opened and reviewed.

**Award of Contract**
After the selection committee has reviewed all proposals and selected the most qualified consulting firm based on qualifications, the Authority will immediately enter into negotiations with that firm in order to prepare a draft agreement. If an agreement cannot be reached, the Authority will immediately enter negotiations with the second most qualified firm.
# Table A Key Project Personnel – Metering and Gaging Analysis Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Project Personnel*</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Office Location</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Professional Licensure/ Certifications (if applicable)</th>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Summary of Relevant Experience and Related Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>With Firm</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal in Charge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others As Needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others As Needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others As Needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others As Needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others As Needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others As Needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others As Needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others As Needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others As Needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Insert or modify rows and columns as needed.