REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) FOR AN ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF "FLOOD CONTROL 2.0" STRATEGIES

The San Francisco Estuary Partnership (SFEP), a program of The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), a joint powers agency, formed under California Government Code Sections 6500, et seq., invites qualified applicants to respond to this Request for Proposals (RFP) for the provision of third party economic analysis services to the Flood Control 2.0 project (FC2.0).

I. BACKGROUND

Flood channels were designed to move water quickly to the Bay, with less consideration for sediment transport. As a result, coarser sediments often drop out of suspension and remain in many channels, requiring costly periodic maintenance removal. Resulting impacts include increased flood risk, frequent habitat disturbance, Bay marshes less resilient to rising sea levels, and shoreline development more vulnerable to sea level rise effects. From a human and economic hazard perspective, these areas face increasingly high flood risk because of climate change and the predicted increases in storm intensity and sea level.

The Flood Control 2.0 project will develop and implement a set of innovative approaches for flood control management along the San Francisco Bay shoreline. Our broad local-regional partnership leverages flood control agency resources to significantly improve the amount, quality, and long-term resilience of Bay Area tidal wetlands, beaches and mud flats, and major creeks. We aim to incentivize these emerging approaches by helping local flood control agencies solve a suite of expensive and time-consuming technical, financial, and regulatory challenges related to excessive in-channel sedimentation. This timely and comprehensive project takes advantage of the "second chance" provided by Bay Area history: the need and opportunity to rebuild aging or out-of-date flood control infrastructure at the Bay shore, while addressing the interrelated challenges of habitat restoration, ineffective sediment transport, and increasing flood risk from sea level rise, storms and altered precipitation patterns.

This project recognizes the environmental benefits and cost-savings that would be granted through recognition of sediment in flood control channels as a resource rather than a waste. By redesigning the flood control channel-Bay interface so that sediment is dispersed to missing points of connectivity such as historic delta wetlands and mudflats, we can re-create critical habitat features along marsh fronts, historic tributary deltas, and beaches, while simultaneously improving flood conveyance and re-establishing more resilient shorelines. The project will integrate regional datasets on sediment availability/quality and a regional historical ecology stream-shoreline analysis with the results of local demonstration projects into a regional strategy that addresses the economic and regulatory benefits of these new approaches, defining opportunities and a path forward.

II. SERVICES REQUIRED

The Flood Control 2.0 project seeks a contractor with economic expertise to undertake a focused economic analysis of the short-term and long-term costs versus benefits of "Flood Control 2.0" strategies. The analysis will cover two scales:

1) Regional analysis: At a regional scale, the consultant will evaluate costs versus benefits for both standard and alternative flood control approaches. Standard approaches include maintenance dredging and offsite sediment disposal, whereas alternative approaches include redesigning flood control channels to take advantage of natural processes to move sediment through the channel while also increasing habitat (e.g., removing levees to increase tidal prism and promote natural sediment scour). To the degree possible, the analysis will also incorporate assessment of the other benefits and costs associated with these systems (including sea level rise resilience, habitat value, fish migration, natural sediment movement, etc.). The economic analysis will take into account data and information generated from the first phase of the Flood Control 2.0 project, particularly the availability, distribution, and volume of sediment and recurrent costs for its management in the San Francisco Bay Area.

2) Case study: Building upon the results of the Novato Creek demonstration project, the consultant will provide a short-term and long-term economic analysis of costs associated with the current flood control approach in the Novato creek watershed in comparison with the Flood Control 2.0 Novato Creek "Vision" (conceptual model) currently being developed.

III. DELIVERABLE

The Economic Consultant will produce a report with the results of the cost-benefit analysis described above.

IV. TIMEFRAME

Services are anticipated to begin with negotiation of a contract following the advertising period of about 30 days from the submittal deadline. The estimated time frame for the Economic Consultant services is from September 2014 to April 2015.

V. COMPENSATION

Up to $30,000.00 is available for the Economic Consultant associated with the project. The Economic Consultant must be a bona-fide independent consultant. The Economic Consultant is responsible for payment of applicable state and federal taxes. All payments will be in arrears.

VI. REQUIRED QUALIFICATIONS

- The Economic Consultant shall demonstrate sufficient experience with economic analysis for similar types of projects (dredging projects, sea level rise analysis, channel restoration projects).
- The Economic Consultant shall demonstrate sufficient experience reading technical documents appropriate to this project, including sediment transport and dredging plans, stream restoration plans, flood control specific documents.

The Economic Consultant will be evaluated based on professional qualifications and education, credentials, and professional associations sufficient to demonstrate a high level of relevant expertise.

VII. PROPOSAL CRITERIA

Every proposal will be evaluated according to the criteria below; points will be awarded per criterion based on completeness (maximum points for each are provided in parentheses). To provide an objective, fair review of candidate submittals, proposals are to include only the following information:

1. **Transmittal Letter (10)** - Normal transmittal letter, covering highlights and unique features of your proposal. Any special terms and conditions of the offer should also be summarized here. Letter should include the name and telephone number of a contact person and your office address. (1 Page maximum)

2. **Statement of Qualifications and Experience (40)** – Proposals will be evaluated based on the level of experience and background in performing similar services. Provide a description of your firm. Provide your resume and the resumes of any support staff who will be assisting in the economic analysis tasks. List the similar projects on which you provide an economic analysis, and briefly describe the project and your role. (2 Pages maximum)

3. **Statement of Project Approach (40)** - Proposals will be evaluated on the adequacy of the material submitted in response to services required as described above. The Economic Consultant must demonstrate understanding of the project and tasks to be performed, project approach, and schedule. Describe your approach to this project, including proposed timeline, workflow practices and verification process. (3 Pages maximum)

4. **Fee Proposal (10)** - Identify all costs and expenses for which you would seek reimbursement in connection with the work. Provide your cost for services described in the approach, broken out by personnel, hours, hourly rate by task. Also provide a schedule of fees for all personnel associated with this project. (1 Page maximum)

5. **References** - Provide three (3) references, including name, title, organization, phone number, email, and type of services you provided to this organization. (1 page maximum)

Proposals must respond to all the requirements of this request, and must include all information specifically required in all sections of this request. ABAG/SFEP intends to review each proposal received in accordance with the criteria itemized above. A Selection Committee will evaluate and rank the Proposals. The two highest scoring consultants will be selected for an interview at SFEP offices, 1515 Clay Street, Suite 1400, Oakland, CA, at their own expense. Through the interview, the Selection Committee will evaluate and rank those selected according to pre-determined criteria outlined in this RFP.

ABAG/SFEP will negotiate with the highest ranked consultant. If ABAG/SFEP is unable to negotiate a satisfactory agreement with the top-ranked consultant, ABAG intends to negotiate with the others according to their ranking until it has reached a satisfactory contractual agreement.

VIII. SUBMISSION FORMAT, LENGTH, and DEADLINE

Interested applicants must submit an electronic copy (pdf) of their proposal by 5:00 p.m. on August 29, 2014 to Caitlin Sweeney at the email address below. Proposals received after that date and time will not be given consideration. Proposals should be no longer than 8 pages. Questions may be directed to Caitlin Sweeney, Project Manager.

Caitlin.Sweeney@waterboards.ca.gov

IX. CONTRACT AWARD

Contract award shall be made to the responsible consultant on the basis of the evaluation criteria listed above and whose statement is most advantageous to ABAG. Our objective is to obtain the highest qualified consultant to achieve the objectives within a realistic time frame and reasonable cost. Qualifications and experience as a whole are more important than cost.

This request does not commit ABAG to award a contract. We reserve the right to reject any or all proposals received in response to this request. Award of contract may not be made to unless an agreement can be secured for all general and special contract provisions. Award will not be made to a consultant whose proposed period of performance is not within a period of time acceptable to ABAG/SFEP. Applicants are informed that the award of any contract as the result of this solicitation is contingent upon the availability of funds.