

RFP Contact

Inquiries regarding this RFP should be directed in writing to:

Greg Pierce
SCADA and Programming Supervisor
Weber Basin Water Conservancy District
2837 E Hwy 193
Layton, UT 84040
801-771-1677
gpierce@weberbasin.com

Timeline

The following timeline will be followed with respect to this RFP:

1. RFP advertisement/availability date: Friday, August 23, 2019
2. Response submission deadline: Friday, September 13, 2019 2:30 PM
3. Evaluation committee review period: September 16-20, 2019
4. Anticipated award of contract: Friday, September 27, 2019
5. Completion and acceptance of the project by the District will be February 28, 2020

Purpose of RFP

The purpose of the RFP is to enter into a contract with a qualified contractor to provide SCADA programming, PLC and all ancillary equipment replacement, as well as an HMI upgrade at the District owned Causey Reservoir Hydro Electric Power Plant. This power plant contains one, 1.5 megawatt GE Ahlstrom hydro electric turbine as well as one 500 kilowatt hydro electric turbine. The power plant is located at the base of Causey Dam in eastern Weber County, Utah at an elevation of roughly 5,700 ft. The powerplant was constructed in 1998-1999 with power generation commencing in 1999.

This RFP is designed to provide basic information sufficient to solicit proposals from qualified firms, but (except to the extent expressly provided otherwise) is not intended to limit a proposal's content or exclude any relevant, important, or essential information. This RFP is part of a competitive procurement process which is intended to serve the best interests of the District and its citizens. It also provides each qualified firm responding to this RFP with a fair opportunity for its services to be considered.

Background Information

What is Weber Basin Water Conservancy District? Weber Basin Water Conservancy District is a political subdivision of the State of Utah and has the regional water supply responsibilities for Davis,

Weber, Morgan, Summit, and Box Elder counties. The District wholesales water to and develops additional supplies for cities, districts, and companies within those counties. Those agencies in turn distribute and retail to their respective customers. Within the District's boundaries, there are over 670,000 residents and 2,500 square miles of land. The District is unique in that it provides many categories of water including drinking water, agricultural water, urban secondary water, industrial water, and replacement water. Weber Basin delivers approximately 225,000 acre-feet of water annually: 87,000 acre-feet for municipal and industrial uses and 138,000 acre-feet for irrigation, which includes secondary pressure irrigation systems. The District is governed by a nine-member Board of Trustees.

History. The United States Bureau of Reclamation began planning for the Weber Basin Project in 1942, and Congressional authorization of the Project was received in 1949. The Weber Basin Water Conservancy District was created on June 26, 1950, by a decree of the Second District Court of Utah, under the guidelines of the Utah Water Conservancy Act. The District was formed to act as the local sponsor of the federal project and to further supply water resources to the population within its boundaries.

The original Weber Basin Project was constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation from 1952 through 1969 and includes canals, power plants, irrigation and drainage systems, and six major reservoirs on the Ogden and Weber rivers. Three of the six reservoirs—Wanship, Lost Creek, and East Canyon along with the non-District Echo Reservoir—regulate the flow of the Weber River before it emerges from its mountain watershed to the Wasatch Front. Causey and Pineview reservoirs regulate the flow of the Ogden River before it emerges from its watershed and joins the Weber River. Willard Bay, the largest reservoir, is an off-stream project that stores water from the lower reaches of both the Ogden and Weber rivers for uses and exchanges on the Wasatch Front. Subsequent to the original Project, the District constructed a seventh dam, Smith and Morehouse, on the upper reach of the Weber River in Summit County.

The complex transmission system that was constructed as part of the Project includes facilities such as Gateway Canal and Tunnel, the Weber and Davis aqueducts, Ogden Valley Canal and Diversion Dam, Slaterville Diversion Dam, and Stoddard Diversion Dam as well as dozens of secondary reservoirs and many miles of canals, pipelines, and other laterals. Hydropower stations located at Causey Dam, Wanship Dam, and Gateway Canal generate power for District consumption and excess power sales.

SCADA . Weber Basin Water has one of the largest SCADA systems in the western United States. We operate and maintain 4 drinking water treatment plants, numerous wells, pump stations, and diversion structures, and around 125 remote SCADA sites. The district primarily operates with the GE iFIX system, currently version 5.8. Our more complex sites will utilize Allen Bradley Compact Logix or Micro Logix PLC's.

Scope of Work

Weber Basin is requesting the services of a qualified contractor to complete work at the Causey Hydro Electric Power Plant. This will include at a minimum:

- Replacement of the existing Siemens PLC with an Allen Bradley ControlLogix PLC, to include but not limited to:
 - Rewiring of all I/O's from the existing cards to any new cards installed.
- Replacement of all ancillary PLC rack hardware, including but not limited to:
 - Power Supply
 - Analog and Digital input cards
 - Backplane
- Re-writing of the existing PLC program (supplied by the District) into a compatible program with the new Allen Bradley ControlLogix PLC.
 - A copy of this program shall be delivered to the District upon completion.
- Replacement of the existing HMI
 - A new Allen Bradley Panel View Plus shall be specified.
 - Re-building of all existing screens to be compatible with the new HMI.
 - A copy of all files relating to the screens and HMI shall be delivered to the District upon completion.
 - Connection of the new HMI to the new Allen Bradley ControlLogix PLC. All existing functionality needs to be carried over to the new HMI.

Contents of Proposal

The District requires all proposals to be submitted in **two clearly marked, separately sealed envelopes**. The first document shall be submitted in an envelope clearly marked "Proposal for Causey Power Plant SCADA Services." and will include responder information and requested qualification criteria as outlined in items B and C below and shall be no more than ten (10) 8 ½ x 11-inch pages in length. Resumes of key team members may be attached to the proposal and will not count toward the page limit specified. Copies of the firm's standard agreement will not count toward the page limit. The second document shall be submitted in an envelope clearly marked "Cost Information for Causey Power Plant SCADA Services Proposal" and will be the Cost Proposal, described in item D below, and shall be no more than two (2) 8 ½ x 11-inch pages in length. The font size shall not be smaller than size 11 on both documents.

Proposals shall be submitted following these guidelines:

A. Submission Time, Place and Manner

5 printed copies and an electronic copy in PDF format (sent via email or submitted on a thumb drive in the sealed document) of the Proposal Documents and Cost Proposal, must be received on or before Friday, September 13, 2019 2:30 PM (MDT). Documents may be hand submitted or mailed to the following address:

Greg Pierce
 Weber Basin Water Conservancy District
 2837 E Hwy 193
 Layton, UT 84040

gpierce@weberbasin.com

Late Submission: Proposals received after Friday, September 13, 2019 @ 2:30 pm (MDT) will not be considered. Any mailed proposal received after that date and time will not be considered, irrespective of the date of mailing or any other factor.

B. Responder Information

The first page of the proposal should include:

Title: "Proposal for Causey Power Plant SCADA Services"
Responder information: Firm Name / RFP Contact Person
Address
Telephone
E-mail

C. Response Criteria

The proposal should address the following:

1. Qualifications and ability to provide programming and PLC services:

Qualifications and expertise:

- Provide a brief description of your firm including ownership, volume of business, number of employees, and number of years in business. Also include whether the firm is local, regional, national, or international in operations.
- Explain how your firm meets the District's requirement for a firm with the following:
 - Prior SCADA programming experience.
 - Prior Hydro Electric integration and control experience.
 - Prior Allen Bradley PLC programming experience.
- Describe your firm's strengths in the marketplace.
- What distinguishes your firm and the services you offer from other firms, in relation to the criteria listed above?

Programming Team:

- Describe the team that would assist with this project, specifying the individual who will be the primary contact.
- Describe the expertise, experience, and education of each team member.
- Describe how the team will meet the deadline to have all programming complete, HMI integration finished, and all other tasks by the assigned deadline.

2. Work plan:

Submit a general work plan of your assessment of the work to be performed, your firm's ability and approach, and the resources necessary to fulfill the requirements. The plan should detail the expected number of hours by staff level (**do not include any pricing**). Include discussion of the following:

- Describe work performed for other entities relating to hydro electric power plant PLC programming.
- Industry experience, specialized training or any other qualities that may be pertinent to this engagement.

3. Past performance:

- List references (including a contact person and that person's contact information and title) of 3 entities and who can render an opinion regarding the ability of the responder to provide these services.
- If possible, provide references from past performance with similar water conservancy districts, government entities, other similar local or special service districts. If applicable, include your firm's local (state or regional) experience with hydro electric power plant SCADA systems.

4. Standard Agreement:

Provide a standard contract, including terms and conditions, which your firm uses for programming and service agreements. To be in accordance with District policies, the agreement must allow for the District to cancel the contract at any time.

5. Conflicts of interest:

Indicate whether there are any potential conflicts of interest that would affect the ability of your firm to fairly represent the District. For each potential conflict of interest state:

- The names of the individuals and entities involved;
- The nature of the conflict, and
- The steps that responder will take to mitigate the impact of the conflict

D. Cost Proposal (Separate Document)

In a separate document entitled "Cost Proposal", include all information on cost for programming services and any related items for which the responder may charge. A proposal may be deemed to be nonresponsive if any cost information is included in any portion of the proposal response other than in the "Cost Proposal" document. Please include the following:

1. Cost of programming services, HMI upgrade, and new PLC and all ancillary hardware.
2. Estimated number of billable hours and their billing rates.
3. List other anticipated costs that will require reimbursement, either on an actual cost basis or any other basis, if any.
4. Any other information relevant to cost

Minimum Qualifications

For responsive proposals to be considered, at a minimum, the firm must have at least 10 years PLC programming experience with Allen Bradley PLC's, as well as prior experience with hydro electric facility programming and integration.

Evaluation

An evaluation and selection committee will meet to consider all responsive proposals submitted and rank the proposals based on the criteria stated below. If a responder is eliminated during the evaluation process, the firm will be notified in writing.

Evaluation categories are assigned a maximum number of points for evaluation purposes, with a maximum cumulative total of 100 points. Cost proposals will be retained by the District and will be evaluated only after the basic proposals have been evaluated and ranked. The proposals will be evaluated based on the following factors:

	Criteria	Score (0 - 5) *	Weight	Maximum Points
1	Demonstrated qualifications and ability to provide programming and PLC upgrade services:			
	Qualifications and expertise	5	x 3	15
	Programming and PLC Upgrade team	5	x 4	20
2	Responsiveness of work plan			
	Clearly written proposal which indicates an understanding of the key issues, clearly defines deliverables, and the responder's ability to meet the demands of services, as they arise.	5	x 4	20
3	Past Performance			
	Demonstrated experience (i.e. proven track record). Positive references indicating successful past performance in similar projects.	5	x 4	20
4	Cost Proposal - based on formula below.	5	x 5	25
Total Maximum Score Available				100

The proposal with the lowest cost will receive the maximum points available. All other proposals will receive points determined by the ratio for the lowest proposal's cost to each other proposal's cost with the points being rounded down to the nearest whole number. The ratio is calculated as follows:

the maximum points available for the cost category, multiplied by lowest proposed price from all considered proposals, divided by the proposal price.

Contract

A contract will be awarded (pending successful contract negotiations) to the responder whose proposal is the most advantageous to the District, taking into consideration price and other evaluation factors described in this RFP.

In accordance with Utah Procurement Code, the District reserves the right to award the contract to a technically qualified lower-cost responder that scored lower than the highest scoring responder if, based on a cost benefit analysis required by the Utah Procurement Code, the highest scoring responder will not provide the best value offered to the District.

Schedule and Liquidated Damages

It is imperative that the final completion date of the project by February 28, 2020 be adhered to as this is an operational powerplant that runs at peak capacity during the early spring of each year. As such, please be mindful of this date in your proposals. The District will assess liquidated damages if the project is not completed by the above mentioned completion date. The damages are to be outlined as follows: each day exceeding the completion date up to 30 days over will be assessed at \$840 per day, with each additional day beyond 30 days assessed at \$1,680 per day.

Site Visit

If a visit to the power plant is requested in part to generate an accurate proposal and cost information, a time and date will be established within the proposal period for such visit. Notification of a requested visit to the District is required no later than 5 business days prior to the closing of the proposal period. Site visits will take place no later than 3 business days prior to the closing of the proposal period. For those requesting a site visit, please contact Greg Pierce as listed in the RFP Contact information above.

Other Information

The District can supply supplementary information to this RFP if requested. These include pictures of the PLC cabinet (not containing measurements), a one-line diagram for the power plant, a copy of the currently operating PLC program, and any other information the district can reasonably provide (as determined by the District) to assist in accurate proposal and cost generation. Please contact Greg Pierce as listed in the RFP Contact information above for inquiries.

This solicitation is in accordance with Utah Code Ann. § 63G-6a-Part 7, and is not a solicitation for Design Professional Services as defined in Utah Code Ann. § 13-8-7.

Best and Final Offers

In accordance with Utah Code Ann. § 63G-6a-707.5, the evaluation committee may request best and final offers from responsible offerors who have submitted responsive proposals that meet the minimum qualifications, evaluation criteria, or applicable score thresholds identified in this RFP, if:

1. no single proposal addresses all the specifications stated in the request for proposals;
2. all or a significant number of the proposals are ambiguous on a material point and the evaluation committee requires further clarification in order to conduct a fair evaluation of proposals;
3. the evaluation committee needs additional information from all offerors to complete the evaluation of proposals;
4. the differences between proposals in one or more material aspects are too slight to allow the evaluation committee to distinguish between proposals;
5. all cost proposals are too high or over budget; or
6. another reason exists supporting a request for best and final offers, as provided in established rules.

Best and final offers will then be evaluated and scored by the evaluation committee in accordance with the evaluation criteria and procedures stated in this RFP.