



COPPER RIVER WATERSHED PROJECT

Request for Qualifications RFQ202401

Title: FISH PASSAGE CONSULTANT

***Copper River Watershed Habitat Enhancement Project, Fish Passage
Quality Control Analyst and Construction Oversight***

**Copper River Watershed Project
511 1st Street
Cordova, Alaska 99574
March 25, 2024**

Table of Contents

1.1	Introduction	4
1.3	Specifications, Codes, Ordinances, and Standards.....	4
	<i>Phase I: Qualifications.....</i>	6
	<i>Specialized Experience and Technical Competence:</i>	6
	<i>Professional Qualifications:</i>	8
	<i>Phase II: Past Performance.....</i>	8
	<i>Capacity and Quality Management:.....</i>	9
	<i>Geographic Location:</i>	10
	<i>Rate Table:</i>	10

COPPER RIVER WATERSHED PROJECT REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS RFQ-202401 FISH PASSAGE CONSULTANT

Copper River Watershed Habitat Enhancement Project, Fish Passage Quality Control Analyst and Construction Oversight

1.1 Introduction

The Copper River Watershed Project (CRWP), a non-profit organization working to ensure the long-term sustainability of the Copper River watershed's salmon-based economy and culture, is seeking applications to procure expertise to assist in planning and implementation of fish passage improvement projects in the Copper River watershed in Alaska. The bid also includes the necessary reference materials to outline specific known project components pertinent to the application.

CRWP is working with Alaska Department of Fish & Game, Chugach National Forest, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), and Alaska Department of Transportation & Public Facilities (ADOT&PF) to conduct the highest quality of fish passage projects while maximizing restoration dollars in support of this biologically-significant region.

1.2 General Statement of Work

Provide expert fish passage project consultation, quality control, design review, contract and RFP material development and construction on-site inspection services for fish passage infrastructure work in the Copper River watershed herein referred to as 'the Consultant'. The contract performance period for this work begins April 22, 2024 for one full year. Annual renewal and extensions may be provided up to three additional years pending funding available.

Please submit your application to:

Alexis Cooper, Interim Executive Director

Copper River Watershed Project

511 First St.

Cordova, Alaska

55974-1560

executivedirector@copperriver.org **Electronic submissions are preferred*

Applications will be received by email or hardcopy mailing up until **5PM AKT April 12th, 2024.**

1.3 Specifications, Codes, Ordinances, and Standards

Comply with the current specification, codes, ordinances and standards of work as they pertain to road infrastructure construction and as identified by the Copper River Watershed Enhancement Partnership.

The Consultant will serve as the owner representative to the CRWP on all fish passage projects. The Consultant shall provide quality assurance services to ensure the work completed by the design engineers, construction contractor and third party contracted services meet project requirements.

The Consultant shall provide the following services:

Remote Duties:

- Attend design meetings for fish passage project discussions, when applicable.
- Provide review comments on fish passage project designs.
- Coordinate with CRWP staff as necessary to ensure compliance with designs and other requirements.
- Assist with RFP material development and review.

On Site Construction Inspection Duties:

- Ensure all aspects of construction and installation are in accordance with the contract designs and other documents, which include the current ADOT&PF Standard Specifications for Highway Construction (SSHC).
- Facilitate scheduling with the Consulting Engineer who will be implementing compaction testing services as required.
- Be present on site each day of construction for a sufficient length of time to witness substantial construction operations and contractor quality control activities for pre-determined projects.
- Prepare daily inspection reports, including highlight photos of the project, using a template provided by CRWP. Upload inspection reports of construction activities to an online file sharing service daily provided by CRWP. The inspector will check in daily with the contractor's quality control manager to compare daily reports as referenced in section 104, special provisions, of Addendum #2. Contact CRWP for any discrepancies in report that can't be resolved between contractor's quality control manager and the inspector.
- Take photos to document implementation of the project, including during culvert removal, installation, stream construction, and surfacing, or others as needed. Upload photos of construction activities daily to an online file sharing service provided by CRWP within 24 hours preferably, but no later than 48 hours.
- Notifies CRWP within 1 hour or as soon as can be done safely, if conditions are unsafe for any party or the public, or otherwise harmful to water quality or fisheries.
- Participate in weekly inspection meetings by teleconference or web meeting format with the construction contractor, CRWP, and other interested stakeholders.
- Review invoices submitted by the construction contractor within 24 hours of receipt to ensure consistency with daily inspection reports and report inconsistencies to CRWP.
- Adheres to all relevant items in Inspection Checklists provided and addresses inspection items in the daily inspection reports.
- Maintain timelapse cameras on-site, downloading media and changing out batteries as needed. Intent of these cameras are to generate media for education and outreach efforts.

Evaluation Criteria

Submissions received in response to this notice will be evaluated by a panel of representatives of the Watershed Enhancement Partnership. The evaluation panel may hold discussions with the most highly qualified individuals during the final selection process.

The following color ratings will be used to evaluate the documentation submitted:

Color	Definition
Blue	Exceeds specified performance or capability in a way beneficial to the Copper River Watershed Project and has high probability of satisfying the requirement; has no significant weaknesses.
Green	Meets evaluation standards; has good probability of satisfying the requirement; any weaknesses can be readily corrected.
Yellow	Fails to meet evaluation standards; has low probability of satisfying the requirement; has significant deficiencies.
Red	Fails to meet minimum requirement; deficiency requires a major revision to the proposal to make it correct.

The contracting officer, the Copper River Watershed Project, in partnership with the evaluation panel, will select the best overall value/benefit to the Copper River Watershed Project using a two-phased approach: Phase I: Qualifications, Phase II: Past Performance Evaluations and may use Phase III: Interviews with the top candidates.

Phase I: Qualifications

Offerors shall provide proposal information for northern rural regions with a preference for Alaska, specifically.

Submission packages for each individual are limited to 17 pages **exclusive** of cover letter and indexing tabs. Font shall be no less than 10-point font, single line spacing, margins no less than ¾", and page size of 8.5" x 11". (A page is defined as each face of a sheet of paper containing information. When both sides of a sheet of paper display printed material, it shall be counted as two (2) pages.)

Individuals will be rated with respect to the following criteria listed in descending order of importance:

Specialized Experience and Technical Competence:

4 page maximum - 1 pages per project, 3 projects maximum + 1-page 2024 Specialties and Experience Chart Completed

Identify no more than three (3) projects substantially completed within the past three (3) years preceding the date of issuance of this notice that best demonstrate competence and specialized experience identified in *the General Statement of Work*. (Substantially

complete means a fully designed project with construction of the project more than 80% complete.)

2024 Applicable Specialty and Experience

Instructions: Place an X in the box that best describes your experience with the project types listed. Include these project types in your project experience descriptions, if possible.

Project Type	None	Minimal	Moderate	Substantial
Construction Site Surveys at Key Milestones				
Construction On-site Inspection (fish passage), including reviewing as-builts				
Fish Passage Infrastructure Design Review				
Construction Contract Administration				
Culvert construction				
Fish Passage Improvement for Road-Stream Crossings				
Hydraulic Design				
Hydrologic Studies				
Permit Compliance (fish passage specific)				
Rivers, Canals, Waterways				
River and Stream Restoration, Natural Channel Design				
Storm Water (SWPP) Compliance				
Construction RFP development				
Topographic Surveying for Stream Restoration Projects				

Evaluation Methodology:

Evaluation will be based on a subjective assessment by the panel of the individual's ability to effectively address the specialized experience and technical competencies. Copper River Watershed Project projects have different rules and requirements than private sector projects; therefore, individuals that demonstrate more experience with Federal Government projects will be considered slightly more highly qualified than those that have similar experience with private sector commercial projects. A firm that more effectively demonstrates a diverse experience range consistent with the description of work will be considered more highly qualified than one

that is not able to. Prime contractor experience will be considered more important than key sub-contractor experience in determining the most highly qualified individuals.

Professional Qualifications:

Individuals will be evaluated on professional qualifications, competence, and experience of the proposed key personnel in providing services to accomplish the tasks required under this contract.

Disciplines required are as follows:

Project Manager* , Environmental Engineer* , Hydrologist*

**Professional engineering license, registration or certification required in state(s) where firm is proposing to do work. Provide registration number and state of registration in résumé or type of certification as applicable.*

Please provide a resume demonstrating experience in the above disciplines. The individual resumes shall be no more than 3 pages and will be considered as part of the page limitation. The individual must oversee all task order work in their disciplines, unless a substitution is approved by the Contracting Officer.

Evaluation Methodology:

Evaluation of each discipline will consider education, registration, relevant experience, and longevity. Evaluation will be based on a subjective assessment by the panel of the individual's ability to effectively address the professional qualifications as described above. A firm that provides resumes for key personnel with greater levels of education, relevant experience, and longevity with the firm will be considered more highly qualified than one that provides less qualified personnel, with less education, less relevant experience and a shorter duration. Failure to provide balanced experience in the disciplines required to satisfy the requirements of the scope listed above will result in the individual being considered not qualified.

Phase II: Past Performance

2 pages maximum, 1 page per PPQ + up to 2 pages supplemental information

Individuals will be evaluated on past performance with Government agencies and private industry in terms of Quality of Service, Cost Control, Timeliness of Performance, and Business Relations. Evaluating past performance and experience will include information provided in Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs). In addition, the Copper River Watershed Project may review any other sources of information for evaluating past performance. Other sources may include, but are not limited to, past performance information retrieved through the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) using all CAGE/DUNS numbers of firm team members (partnership, Joint Venture, or parent company's subsidiary or affiliate), inquiries of owner representative(s), and any other known sources not provided by the firm. While the Copper River Watershed Project may elect to consider data from other sources, the

burden of providing detailed, current, accurate and complete past performance information rests with the individual.

Submission Requirements:

A performance record must be submitted only for projects included in the Specialized Experience and Technical Competence Section. DO NOT submit past performance for projects not included in the above mentioned section. Individuals shall have clients complete the Past Performance Rating Questionnaire (PPQ), and direct the submission to the contact listed in the PPQ description and instructions. A minimum of 1 PPQ is required. Ratings will not be affected by a firm that supplies more questionnaires than another. The number of ratings merely helps to clarify a firm's true past performance record.

Individuals can also submit recognition documents received in the last five years, such as awards from clients, customers or professional organizations received within the last three (3) years.

Supplemental information shall not exceed 2 single-sided pages in total and will be included in page count.

Evaluation Methodology:

Past performance will be evaluated in terms of Quality of Service, Cost Control, Timeliness of Performance, and Business Relations. Evaluation will be based on a subjective assessment by the panel of the past performance evaluations submitted. Evaluation of past performance may also include information provided by the individual, customer inquiries, Government databases and personnel, and publicly available sources. A firm without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available shall not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance. Failure to provide the minimum requested data, accessible points of contact, or valid phone numbers may result in an individual being considered less qualified.

Capacity and Quality Management:

1 page maximum

Individuals will be evaluated on the capacity to accomplish the work in the required time and the individual's ability to plan for and manage work under the contract.

Submission Requirements: Capacity and Quality Management descriptions shall not exceed one single-sided page in total and will be included in page count.

1. Describe the individual's present workload and availability for the specified contract performance period.
2. Describe the ability of the individual to manage, coordinate and work effectively with an external and diversified partnership; federal, state and

NGOs. Discuss the history of working relationships with team members, including joint venture partners where applicable.

3. Describe the individual's quality management plan, including quality assurance process, coordination of the in-house work with contractors and sub-contractors.

Evaluation Methodology: Evaluation will be based on a subjective assessment by the panel of the individual's ability to effectively address the Capacity and Quality Management as described above. General statements of availability/capacity may be considered less favorably. A demonstrated history of working with partnerships may be considered more favorably. An individual with a longer relationship with key partners may be considered more highly qualified than one with a shorter relationship.

Geographic Location:

1 page maximum

Individuals will be evaluated on demonstrated knowledge of the general geographic areas in which the firm is proposing to work.

1. Provide a narrative describing the Individual's knowledge of the selected geographic area(s) in which projects could be located. See description in General Statement of Work.
2. Provide a narrative to describe the individual's ability to provide timely response to requests for on-site support.

Evaluation Methodology: Evaluation of firms will include consideration of the individual's location and familiarity within the specific geographic area(s) of choice. Individuals with a demonstrated history of project experience and providing timely support may be considered more favorably.

Rate Table:

Rate Table Form

Individuals are required to provide a rate table indicating hourly rates. Use provided Sample Rate table form for more information. Individuals need to complete rates for base year plus 3 option years. ***The rate table will not be utilized for evaluations.*** The rate table will become part of the final contract to price future task orders if a firm is awarded a contract.

**Copper River Watershed Project
Sample Rate Table**

Company Name: _____ **Date:** _____

Pricing: Fill in the skill category as it applies to the services to be rendered as mentioned in the General Scope of Work.

Option years can be stated as a percentage (i.e., 1% under Option Year 1, etc.)

___ (%) Maximum markup on materials (Includes Profit and Overhead)

	Skill Category	Base Year	Option Year 1	Option Year 2	Option Year 3
1	Expert Consultation; Quality Control, Design Review, Contract and RFP material development				
2	On-site Construction Inspection Services				
3	Administrative and quality assurance – off site Construction Inspection Services				

- Hourly rate for each category includes all expenses (i.e., Overhead, General and Administrative, etc.).
- Profit to be determined on each Task Order based upon complexity of work.

Past Performance Rating Questionnaire

Title: *Copper River Watershed Habitat Enhancement Project, Fish Passage Quality Control Analyst and Construction Oversight*

Offeror will send this questionnaire to clients, who in turn will complete and send directly to the address below. Completed forms from clients that are received directly from the offeror will not be considered, as well as forms received after the date/time of proposal submission. Up to the first five (5) forms received will be considered.

Copper River Watershed Project
511 First St.
Cordova, AK 99574-1560

(Attn: Alexis Cooper)

Phone: (907) 424-3334

Email: executivedirector@copperriver.org

Subject: RFP-202401 Past Performance <Name of Offeror>

PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE
SOURCE SELECTION SENSITIVE INFORMATION

To be filled out by Offeror:

Name of Offeror:

Name of Client: Contract Number:

Contract Title:

Contract Value:

Type of Contract: Period of Performance:

To be filled out by Client:

Performance Elements	Unsatisfactory 0	Poor 1	Fair 2	Good 3	Excellent 4	Outstanding 5
1. Quality of Product or Service						
2. Cost Control						
3. Timeliness of Performance						
4. Business Relations						

5. Remarks on Outstanding performance:

Provide data supporting this observation; you may continue on a separate sheet if needed.

6. Remarks on Unsatisfactory performance:

Provide data supporting this observation; you may continue on a separate sheet if needed.

7. Please identify any corporate affiliations with the offeror.

8. Other comments that you wish to make:

9. Would you do business with (insert offeror's name) again?

10. Questionnaire completed by:

Name:

Title:

Mailing Address (Street and P.O. Box):

City, State and Zip Code:

Telephone Number:

Fax Number:

Date Information provided:

PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

Ratings and Performance Categories

The offeror shall be evaluated based on the following ratings and performance categories:

Ratings:

- 0 = unsatisfactory
- 1 = poor
- 2 = fair
- 3 = good
- 4 = excellent
- 5 = outstanding

Quality of Product or Service

Unsatisfactory: Non-conformances are jeopardizing the achievement of contract requirements, despite use of client resources. Recovery is not likely. If performance cannot be substantially corrected, it constitutes a significant impediment in consideration for future awards containing similar requirements.

Poor: Overall compliance requires significant client resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.

Good: There are no, or very minimal, quality problems, and the offeror has met the contract requirements.

Excellent: There are no quality issues, and the offeror has substantially exceeded the contract performance requirements without commensurate additional costs to the client.

Outstanding: The offeror has demonstrated an outstanding performance level that was significantly in excess of anticipated achievements and is commendable as an example for others, so that it justifies adding a point to the score. It is expected that this rating will be used in those rare circumstances where offeror performance clearly exceeds the performance levels described as "Excellent".

Cost Control

Unsatisfactory: Ability to manage cost issues is jeopardizing performance of contract requirements, despite use of client resources. Recovery is not likely. If performance cannot be substantially corrected, this level of ability to manage cost issues constitutes a significant impediment in consideration for future awards.

Poor: Ability to manage cost issues requires significant client resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.

Fair: Ability to control cost issues requires minor client resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.

Good: There are no, or very minimal, cost management issues and the offeror has met the contract requirements.

Excellent: There are no cost management issues and the offeror has exceeded the contract requirements, achieving cost savings to the client.

Outstanding: The offeror has demonstrated an outstanding performance level that justifies adding a point to the score. It is expected that this rating will be used in those rare circumstances where the offeror achieved cost savings and performance clearly exceeds the performance levels described as "Excellent".

Timeliness of Performance

Unsatisfactory: Delays are jeopardizing the achievement of contract requirements, despite use of client resources. Recovery is not likely. If performance cannot be substantially corrected, it constitutes a significant impediment in consideration for future awards.

Poor: Delays require significant client resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.

Fair: Delays require minor client resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.

Good: There are no, or minimal, delays that impact achievement of contract requirements.

Excellent: There are no delays and the offeror has exceeded the agreed upon time schedule.

Outstanding: the offeror has demonstrated an outstanding performance level that justifies adding a point to the score. It is expected that the rating will be used in those rare circumstances where offeror performance clearly exceeds the performance levels described as "Excellent".

Business Relations

Unsatisfactory: Response to inquires and/or technical, service, administrative issues are not effective. If not substantially mitigated or corrected it should constitute a significant impediment in considerations for future awards.

Poor: Response to inquires and/or technical, service, administrative issues are marginally effective.

Fair: Response to inquiries and/or technical, service, administrative issues are somewhat effective.

Good: Response to inquiries and/or technical, service, administrative issues are somewhat effective.

Excellent: Response to inquiries and/or technical, services administrative issues exceeds client expectation.

Outstanding: The offeror has demonstrated an outstanding performance level that justifies adding a point to the score. It is expected that this rating will be used in those rare circumstances where offeror performance clearly exceeds the performance levels described as "Excellent".