Memorandum

To: Interested Engineering Consultants

From: John Winkler, General Manager

Date: 1/12/2017

Re: Request for Proposals for Papillion Creek Watershed Regional Detention Sites WP1, WP4, WP2, DS12, DS19 and DS7 Project Professional Services

Proposals Received by: February 2, 2017

The Papio-Missouri River Natural Resources District (District) is requesting proposals for professional engineering services necessary to preliminary plan, permit, and design six flood control structures in the Papillion Creek watershed (see attached map). This phase of design will include 60% project plans including recreation components, completed geotechnical analysis, necessary state and federal permitting including through Step 10, Finalize 404 Permit Application, of the attached Coordination Process for Section 404 Permitting, and limits of right of way acquisition including legal descriptions. Future phases for final design and construction administration could be delayed a number of years and the District reserves the right to request proposals for these additional phases. Each site will have individual design considerations, stakeholder coordination and project components. These sites are included in the Papillion Creek Watershed Partnership (PCWP) Watershed Management Plan. The Multi Reservoir Analysis Papillion Creek Watershed, The Papillion Creek Watershed Management Plan and various technical memorandums provide conceptual level design, layout and details for each of these structures. This information is available on the District’s website, www.papionrd.org.

The timing to complete preliminary design for each of the six reservoirs is critical because of ongoing adjacent development. For this reason, each of the six reservoirs will be on a similar schedule for completion, approximately 10 months from notice to proceed. The District reserves the right to select multiple qualified firms for the reservoir projects. A qualified firm may be assigned more than one project.

All proposals must follow the format outlined in this request for proposals (RFP). Failure to do so may result in disqualification of the consultant’s proposal. For the purpose of this RFP, a page shall mean one printed side of a sheet of paper. The RFP may include a front and back cover page (no plastic covers please). Do not include any divider pages. Proposals may be printed single sided (one page per sheet of paper) or double sided (two pages per sheet of paper). If interested, the following information should be submitted with the proposal:
1) A letter of interest not to exceed two (2) 8 ½ x 11 pages. Include the firm name, address, telephone number and email address, the year the firm was established, any previous names for the firm and a list of the types of services for which the firm is qualified,

2) The body of the proposal not to exceed ten (10) 8 ½ x 11 pages and three (3) 11 x 17 pages. General overview of firms understanding of the project(s) and approach to the project(s).

3) A description of the project organization not to exceed two (2) 8 ½ x 11 pages. Including the names of the principals of the firm, the names of the personnel expected to be utilized including any sub-consultant personnel and the specific project contact person,

4) A List of not more than four (4) similar projects completed by the firm within the last 5 years. Each project description shall be limited to one (1) 8 ½ x 11 page (maximum of 4 pages),

5) Resumes for up to seven (7) key personnel. Resumes shall include their workplace location, a description of their relevant experience, length of time with the firm, applicable licensures and registrations, and their proposed role in the project. Resumes shall be limited to one (1) 8 ½ x 11 page per resume (maximum of 7 pages).

6) Proposed schedule of completion not to exceed one (1) 11 x 17 page.

7) Proof of professional liability insurance in the amount of $1,000,000 not to exceed one 8 ½ x 11 page.

Selection factors for the project will include the following:

1) Project understanding and approach,

2) Identify one or more sites as a preference among the six projects and the firm’s qualifications for that project(s) design components,

3) The project organization, adequacy of available staff, location of personnel relative to the project location and the proposed schedule of completion,

4) Similar projects completed by the firm,

5) Qualifications of the professional personnel and staff members,

This RFP for consulting services is a qualifications based selection process. The price for consulting services shall be negotiated during the scoping process and should not be included in the proposal. Estimates of probable cost of alternatives included in the proposal may be listed in the proposal. All consultant firms, submitting proposals, must be available to initiate work upon notice to proceed.
An Ad Hoc Subcommittee of the District’s Board of Directors will be responsible for reviewing and evaluating the proposals. Final selection of the firm(s) to perform such services will follow timeline below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 13-17, 2017</td>
<td>Post notification of RFP for engineering consultants and advertise in Omaha World Herald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2, 2017</td>
<td>Final date for receipt of proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 7, 2017</td>
<td>Ad-Hoc Subcommittee meeting on the initial screening of proposals received. Three (3) or more firms selected for interview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 10, 2017</td>
<td>Send letter to selected firms notifying them of the interview time and date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2, 2017</td>
<td>Ad-Hoc Subcommittee meeting to interview selected firms. Subcommittee will rank each firm and select a firm(s) for each of the six projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 9, 2017</td>
<td>Ad-Hoc Subcommittee meeting to negotiate contracts with firm(s) by project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 11, 2017</td>
<td>District Board of Directors adopts Subcommittee recommendation on entering into a contracts with the selected engineering consulting firm(s).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interested firms should submit ten (10) printed copies and one (1) electronic copy of their proposal to the District’s Omaha office, located at 8901 South 154th Street, Omaha, Nebraska 68138, no later than 12:00 pm on February 2, 2017.

Inquiries regarding this matter may be addressed to Amanda Grint, agrint@papionrd.org or Marlin Petermann, mpetermann@papionrd.org. Papio-Missouri River NRD staff may be reached by telephone at 402-444-6222.

Cc: Papillion Creek Watershed Regional Detention Basin Ad-Hoc Consultant Selection Subcommittee:
Rich Tesar, Chairperson Jim Thompson
Fred Conley Tim Fowler
John Conley David Klug, Alternate
Our Watershed connects communities in Washington, Sarpy and Douglas Counties encompassing over 400 square miles.

### Proposed Priority Reservoir Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projected Cost in Millions of Dollars</th>
<th>Projected Cost in Millions of Dollars</th>
<th>Projected Cost in Millions of Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dam Site 7 16th &amp; Bennington Road</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dam Site 12 216th &amp; Fort Street</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dam Site 19 192nd &amp; Giles Road</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Papio 1 180th &amp; Fort Street</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Papio 2 180th &amp; Giles Road</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Papio 4 204th &amp; Schram Road</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL COST</strong></td>
<td><strong>$57.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$34.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coordination Process for Section 404 Permitting

**Participants**
- USACE/Applicant
- Applicant
- USACE/Resource Agencies/Applicant
- EPA/USACE/Applicant

**Project Impacts**
Are impacts significant? (Individual Permit verses Nationwide Permit)

**Coordination**
Scoping Meeting

**Define Project Purpose and Need**

**Coordination**
Agency Scoping Meeting

**Project Scoping**
- Identify issues that could effect permit type
- Review Technical Data Requirements

**Range of Alternatives Formulation**
Review Agency scoping and identify alternatives that avoid or minimize impacts to Waters of U.S.

**Review Range of Alternatives**
Also review Purpose and Need and discuss methodology for screening

**Coordination**
Progress Meeting #1

**Alternative Practicability Screening**
Review Alternatives based on:
1. Purpose and Need
2. Practicability for cost, logistics, and technology

**Coordination**
Progress Meeting #2

**Review Screening**
Discuss environmental evaluation parameters

**Alternate Evaluation**
Evaluate each practicable alternative for impacts and benefits to aquatic resources, including short-term, secondary, and cumulative effects
Select Technically Preferred Alternative and consider minimization alternatives

**Coordination**
Progress Meeting #3

**Review Alternative Evaluation**
Also discuss minimization alternatives and mitigation options

**Coordination**
Progress Meeting #4

**Finalize 404 Application**

**Review Application**

**Submit Application**