Office of Contracting
& Procurement
Government of the
District of Columbia

**GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**
**OFFICE OF CONTRACTING AND PROCUREMENT**

**PROCUREMENT ANNOUNCEMENT**

**The Government of the District of Columbia is soliciting bids for the following:**

**CAPTION:** **Evaluation of Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Program Activities**

**MARKET TYPE:** **OPEN**

**ADVERTISING/ISSUANCE DATE:** **January 14, 2008**

**REQUEST FOR QUOTATIONS:**

**RFQ NUMBER:** **DCKG-2009-Q-7989**
**CLOSING DATE:** **January 23, 2009**
**CLOSING TIME:** **2:00 P.M.**

**QUALIFICATION DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE AT:**

**Office of Contracting and Procurement**
**441 4th Street, NW, Suite 703 South**
**Washington, DC 20001**
**Bid Counter**
**(202) 727-0252**

**OCP WEBSITE ADDRESS:** **www.ocp.dc.gov**

**District Department of the Environment**
**Evaluation of Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Program Activities**

## 1.0 SUPPLIES OR SERVICES AND PRICE

The Office of Contracting and Procurement, on behalf of the District Department of the Environment (DDOE) seeks a Contractor to provide an evaluation of the Water Quality Division, Monitoring and Assessment Branch (MAB) program activities. The evaluation will determine how well the program serves the water quality data needs and decision needs of the Department. Through research and interviews, the evaluation will also make recommendations for improving the effectiveness of the program for the long term.

### 1.1 Contract Type

The District anticipates award of a fixed price contract.

### 1.2 Price Schedule

#### 1.2.1 Base Period of Performance (Date of Award – six (6) months thereafter)

| Contract Line Item Number (CLIN) | Item Description | Price |
|---|---|---|
| 0001 | Provide an evaluation of the water quality monitoring and assessment program activities services as described in Section 2. | $ _____ |

## 2.0 SPECIFICATIONS/WORK STATEMENT

### 2.1 SCOPE

The District Department of the Environment (DDOE) seeks a Contractor to provide an evaluation of the Water Quality Division, Monitoring and Assessment Branch (MAB) program activities. The evaluation will determine how well the program serves the water quality data needs and water resources management decision needs of the Department. Through research and interviews, the evaluation will also make recommendations for improving the effectiveness of the program for the long term.

### 2.1.1 Applicable Documents

The following documents are incorporated in this quotation and resulting Contract by this reference:

| Item No. | Document Type | Title | Date |
|---|---|---|---|
| **1** | Federal Act | Clean Water Act<br><br>33 U.S.C. §1256, Federal Water Pollution Control Act §106.<br><br>**Available at: http://epw.senate.gov/water.pdf** | 1971 |

### 2.1.2 Definitions

2.1.2.1 **Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (COTR) -** the representative responsible for the general administration of this contract and advising the Contracting Officer as to the compliance or noncompliance of the Contractor with this contract. In addition, the COTR is responsible for the day-to-day monitoring and supervision of this contract. The COTR is not authorized or empowered to make amendments, changes, or revisions to this contract.

2.1.2.2 **Monitoring**- periodic or continuous surveillance or testing to determine the level of compliance with statutory requirements and/or pollutant levels in surface water.

2.1.2.3 **Stakeholder**- an organization, government entity, or individual that has a stake in or may be impacted by a given approach to environmental regulation, pollution prevention, etc.

2.1.2.4 **Watershed-** the land area that drains into a stream or river.

2.1.2.5 **Water Quality Standards**- state adopted and EPA-approved ambient standards for waters

## 2.2 BACKGROUND

2.2.1 In the early 1960's, the District of Columbia began an ambient monitoring fixed-station network. Parameters monitored included dissolved oxygen (DO), temperature, conductivity, pH, and coliform bacteria. The District of Columbia (District) assumed responsibility for the quality of its ambient waters with the passage of the federal Clean Water Act of 1971 (CWA) (Applicable Document # 1) and the establishment of Home Rule in 1973. These responsibilities included development of state water quality standards, assessment of its ambient waters, assignment of designated beneficial uses, and the determination of water quality standard compliance via monitoring. However, it was not until the late 1970's, under the direction of the Department of Environmental Service, that the District began a

comprehensive water quality monitoring program.

2.2.2 The current DDOE Water Quality Monitoring Program strategy is to establish a monitoring framework to properly manage the city's water resources and encompasses all the city's waters. The results generated by the monitoring program provide managers with sound information on how to best approach new efforts to improve the District's water quality, as well as determine the designated use attainment of the District waters on an individual and overall basis, based on criteria set in the water quality standards.

2.2.3 The District has performed water quality monitoring activities in a fixed station network since the 1960s. The type and range of activities has changed over the decades, as the focus of managing the city's watershed's resources has shifted. Since the last monitoring strategy was developed in 2004, the atmosphere in which the monitoring program exist has changed significantly. For example, the monitoring program is now part of a relatively new department, with a new director, and a new organizational structure. As a result of the organizational restructuring, the analytical tasks performed by the Water Quality Division staff persons at the Environmental Science Center and the water quality monitoring field activities have been folded into the newly formed Monitoring and Assessment Branch. This current period of reorganization within the department is an opportune time to assess the current activities of the Branch, to identify current and developing needs related to the new department's goals, and the future activities of the new branch to implement emerging water quality monitoring technologies and procedures.

2.2.4 This is the first time that an independent Contractor will be used to assess the water quality monitoring program. No regular on-going assessment of the program by Contractors is planned.

## 2.3 REQUIREMENTS

2.3.1 The Contractor shall research and evaluate state-of-the-art, innovative, water quality monitoring, data management, assessment programs and activities. Research shall include the identification of equipment, methodologies, and technology that support those programs. Research shall include an assessment and analysis of programmatic and technical approaches employed by other jurisdictions around the country.

2.3.2 The Contractor shall determine the federal CWA (Applicable Document # 1) goals, regulations, and policies as they relate to water quality monitoring programs.

2.3.2.1 The Contractor shall evaluate the MAB's progress towards meeting the CWA (Applicable Document # 1) goals and regulations.

2.3.3 The Contractor shall prepare an overview of the current water quality monitoring program. The overview should describe the goals, objectives, and activities of the MAB's program.

2.3.4 The Contractor shall prepare a work plan, to include an anticipated schedule, for the project within seven (7) business days of the contract commencement to the COTR. The COTR will review the plan and within 5 business days respond to the Contractor with comments or the notice to proceed.

2.3.5 The Contractor shall develop a list of proposed interview questions that evaluate all aspects of monitoring program's activities. The proposed interview questions shall be submitted to the COTR who will respond to the Contractor with comments. The COTR will provide a basic list of persons to be interviewed. The Contractor shall conduct interviews with MAB staff and stakeholders, including water resource managers at U.S. EPA, state and local governments, regional water quality organizations, persons in academia, on the MAB program or water quality monitoring. The Contractor shall also add to the list of interviewees. The Contractor shall use information collected from the interviews when developing recommendations for the MAB program.

2.4 **Reports**

2.4.1 The Contractor shall provide a draft assessment and recommendation report for review. The Draft Final Report shall, at a minimum, integrate report sections into a coherent document and include an executive summary and sections detailing the information gathering methodology, listing and information on all stakeholders interviewed, findings, and recommendations for improving the program. The COTR will provide comments to the Contractor within 10 business days of receipt of the draft report.

2.4.2 The Contractor shall provide a final report that includes, at a minimum, the program description, a summary of the interview responses, an evaluation of the program, recommendations for improving the program in the short term, recommendations for meeting the emerging water quality monitoring needs of the city's waters, and identify water quality monitoring technology and procedures that would facilitate development of an effective, state-of-the-art water quality monitoring program.

.

## Section 3 Deliveries and Performance

### 3.1 Term of the Contract

The term of the contract shall be for a period of six months from date of award.

### 3.2 Deliverables

| N0. | Deliverable | Qty/ Format/ Method of Delivery | Due Date |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Work Plan, as described in 2.3.4 - | 1 Electronic and 1 Hard Copy | Within seven (7) business days from award of contract |
| 2 | List of Interview Questions, as described in 2.3.5 | 1 Hard Copy and 1 Electronic Copy | One week after the review by COTR |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | Draft Final report, as described in 2.4.1 | 2 Hard Copies and 1 Electronic Copy | One month prior to the end of the contract period |
| 4 | Final Report, as described in 2.4.2 | 3 Hard Copies and 2 Electronic Copies (Word and PDF) | Within 30 days after the contract expiration. |

## Section 4 Contract Administration

### 4.1 Contracting Officer

Contracts will be entered into and signed on behalf of the District only by contracting officers. The name, address and telephone number of the Contracting Officer is:

James H. Marshall, Contracting Officer
441 4th Street, NW, #700 south
Washington, DC 20001
Telephone: 202-724-4197

### 4.2 Authorized Changes by the Contracting Officer

**4.2.1** The Contracting Officer is the only person authorized to approve changes in any of the requirements of this contract.

**4.2.2** The Contractor shall not comply with any order, directive or request that changes or modifies the requirements of this contract, unless issued in writing and signed by the Contracting Officer.

**4.2.3** In the event the Contractor effects any change at the instruction or request of any person other than the Contracting Officer, the change will be considered to have been made without authority and no adjustment will be made in the contract price to cover any cost increase incurred as a result thereof.

### 4.3 Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (COTR)

**4.3.1** The COTR is responsible for general administration of the contract and advising the Contracting Officer as to the Contractor's compliance or noncompliance with the contract. In addition, the COTR is responsible for the day-to-day monitoring and supervision of the contract, of ensuring that the work conforms to the requirements of this contract and such other responsibilities and authorities as may be specified in the contract. The COTR for this contract is:

Nicoline Shulterbrant
Department of the Environment

51 N Streets, N.W.
Washington, DC 20002
Telephone: (202) 535-2194

**4.3.2** The COTR shall not have authority to make any changes in the specifications or scope of work or terms and conditions of the contract.

**4.3.3** The Contractor may be held fully responsible for any changes not authorized in advance, in writing, by the Contracting Officer; may be denied compensation or other relief for any additional work performed that is not so authorized; and may also be required, at no additional cost to the District, to take all corrective action necessitated by reason of the unauthorized changes.

## 5.0 Instructions to Offerors

### 5.1 Award

The District intends to award a single contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible Offeror whose offer conforming to the solicitation will be the best value to the District, cost or price, technical and other factors, specified elsewhere in this solicitation considered. A description of how the District will evaluate offers is found in Section 6.

### 5.2 Proposal Submission

Offerors shall provide and submit electronically a technical proposal and a price proposal under separate cover to dwight.hayes@dc.gov no later than 2:00 P.M. Friday January 23, 2009. The email subject line shall state "Proposal in Response to Request For Quotation No. DCKG-2009-Q-7989 Evaluation of Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Program Activities."

#### 5.2.1 Technical Proposal

The Contractor's Technical Proposal shall include at a minimum the following;

a. Technical Approach and Methodology
   1. Narrative to describe the Contractor's approach and methodology to successfully complete the required services as described in Section 2 including the offeror's understanding of the scope and the District's objectives,
   2. Demonstrate experience with water quality monitoring activities and issues, through actual sample collection or data collection and management.
   3. Demonstrate ability to evaluate environmental programs.
   4. Demonstrate experience in data gathering for program evaluation.
   5. Narrative to describe the Contractor and the Contractor's staff specific experience and expertise in providing evaluation water quality monitoring and assessment program activities services;

b. Past Performance
   1. A listing of contracts and subcontracts that the Contractor has performed services similar in size and scope as those described in Section 2 in the past five (5) years with two (2) completed past performance evaluation forms (Attachment 7.1) from previous clients in which the Contractor has performed services similar in size and scope as those described in Section 2.
   2. Demonstration of at least 5 years experience in water quality data collection and water quality data management.
   3. Three (3) letters of reference from previous clients in which the Contractor has performed services similar in size and scope as those described in Section 2.

**5.2.2 Price Proposal**

a. Completed Section 1 Price Schedule

## 6.0 Evaluation for Award

**Preference for Local Businesses, Disadvantaged Businesses, Resident Business Ownerships or Businesses Operation in an Enterprise Zone**

**a. General Preferences**

Under the provisions of D.C. Law 13-169, "Equal Opportunity for Local, Small, or Disadvantaged Business Enterprises Amendment Act of 2000", the District shall apply preferences in evaluating offers from businesses that are local, disadvantaged, resident business ownership or located in an enterprise zone of the District of Columbia.

| EVALUATION FACTORS<br><br>0-100 POINTS | | |
|---|---|---|
| **EVALUATION FACTOR** | **POINT VALUE** | **RELATIVE IMPORTANCE** |
| **Past Performance and Previous Experience** | **0 - 40** | |
| **Technical Approach and Expertise** | **0 - 40** | |
| | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Price** | **0 - 20** | **Price** is less important than Technical Capability and Past Performance and Experience. |
| [redacted] | | |
| **Preference Points** | **0 –12** | |
| Small Business Enterprise (SBE) | 3 | |
| Resident Owned Business (ROB) | 3 | |
| Longtime Resident Business (LRB) | 10 | |
| Local Business Enterprise (LBE) | 2 | |
| Disadvantaged Business Enterprise located in an Enterprise Zone | 2 | |
| Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) | 2 | |

Lowest Price Proposal x (20) = Evaluated
Price of Proposal Being Evaluated Price Score

## 7.0 Attachment

## 7.1 Past Performance Evaluation Form

**PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM**

(Check appropriate box)

| Performance Elements | **RATING** (See Rating Guidelines on Page 2) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **5** – Excellent | **4** – Good | **3** – Acceptable | **2** – Minimally Acceptable | **1** – Poor | **0** – Unacceptable |
| Quality of Services/Work | | | | | | |
| Timeliness of Performance | | | | | | |
| Cost Control | | | | | | |
| Business Relations | | | | | | |
| Customer Satisfaction | | | | | | |

1. Name of Contractor being Evaluated: _____

2. Name & Title of Evaluator: _____

3. Signature of Evaluator: _____

4. Name of Evaluator's Organization: _____

5. Telephone Number of Evaluator: _____

6. Type of service received: _____

7. Contract Number, Amount and period of Performance _____

8. Remarks on Excellent Performance: Provide data supporting this observation. Continue on separate sheet if needed)

   _____

   _____

9. Remarks on unacceptable performance: Provide data supporting this observation. (Continue on separate sheet if needed)

   _____

   _____

RATING GUIDELINES

Summarize Contractor performance in each of the rating areas. Assign each area a rating of 0 (Unacceptable), 1 (Poor), 2 (Acceptable), 3 (Good), 4(Excellent), or ++ (Plus). Use the following instructions a guidance in making these evaluations.

| | **Quality Product/Service** | **Cost Control** | **Timeless of Performance** | **Business Relations** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | -Compliance with contract requirements<br>-Accuracy of reports<br>-Appropriateness of personnel<br>-Technical excellence | -Within budget (over/ under target costs)<br>-Current, accurate, and complete billings<br>-Relationship of negated costs to actual<br>-Cost efficiencies<br>-Change order issue | -Meet Interim milestones<br>-Reliable<br>-Responsive to technical directions<br>-Completed on time, including wrap-up and<br>-contract administration<br>-No liquidated damages assessed | -Effective management<br>-Businesslike correspondence<br>-Responsive to contract requirements<br>-Prompt notification of contract problems<br>-Reasonable/cooperative<br>-Flexible<br>-Pro-active<br>-effective contractor recommended solutions<br>-Effective snail/small disadvantaged business Subcontracting program |
| **0. Unacceptable** | Nonconformances are comprises the achievement of contract requirements, despite use of Agency resources | Cost issues are comprising performance of contract requirements. | Delays are comprising the achievement of contract requirements, Despite use of Agency resources. | Response to inquiries, technical/ service/administrative issues is not effective and responsive. |
| **1**, Poor | Nonconformances require major Agency resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements. | Cost issues require major Agency resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements. | Delays require major Agency resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements. | response to inquiries, technical/ service/administrative issues is marginally effective and responsive. |
| **2. Minimally** Acceptable | Nonconformances require minor Agency resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements. | Costs issues require minor Agency resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements. | Delays require minor Agency resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements. | Responses to inquiries, technical/ service/administrative issues is somewhat effective and responsive. |
| **3. Acceptable** | Nonconformances do not impact achievement of contract requirements. | Cost issues do not impact achievement of contract requirements. | Delays do not impact achievement of contract requirements. | Responses to inquires, technical/ service/administrative issues is usually effective and responsive. |
| **4. Good** | There are no quality problems. | There are no cost issues. | There are not delays. | Responses to inquiries, technical/ service/administrative issues is effective and responsive, |
| **5. Excellent** | The contractor has demonstrated an exceptional performance level in some or all of the above categories. | | | |