



THE CITY OF
BEAVERTON
M I C H I G A N

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS

PLANNING SERVICES-P001

PROPOSALS DUE: 3:00 P.M. OCTOBER 3, 2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. Summary.....3
- II. Project Overview.....3
- III. Preliminary Scope of Work.....4
- IV. Grant Administrator Requirements.....5
- V. Tentative Project Schedule.....6
- VI. Response Requirements.....7
- VII. Selection Process & Evaluation Criteria.....7
- VIII. Submittal of Responses & Other Information.....9

I. Summary

The proposed project area is in the City of Beaverton, situated in Gladwin County in mid-Michigan. Beaverton has historically been classified as a low/mod income community. The current ACS low/mod metric for Beaverton is 63.24%. This small community depends on its tourism as well as its hydroelectric dam to enhance its small budget. At around 15%, this funding is critical to the financial stability of the community.

The City of Beaverton owns and operates a hydroelectric dam which is located directly downstream from the Chappel dam, which did not fail due to emergency action preceding the May 2020 floods, and directly upstream of the Edenville and Sanford dams, which breached and caused massive flood damage. While the Beaverton dam was damaged during the event, insurance repairs have been completed bringing the hydroelectric generator back online in the late spring of 2023. Additional significant dam and property repairs are in the planning stages under a grant from the Federal Emergency Management Administration. Critical to the continued safe operation of the dam, safety programs and subsequent necessary safety studies and data are critical in preventing breaches and developing emergency planning to prevent flooding-related casualties and damage. The purpose of this project is to complete several studies necessary to know more about the over century old structure, and studies around maximum flows as an example, and to determine added safety measures at the facility. Many of these studies will also be immensely helpful in meeting ongoing requests for information and requirements of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) and Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR).

II. Project Overview

The need for this project is driven by the 2020 floods and the catastrophic infrastructure and inland waters damage that ensued across mid-Michigan, including the City of Beaverton and Ross Lake. Ross Lake is an impoundment of the Beaverton Hydroelectric Dam, encompassing 294 acres fed by four river systems. Ross Lake is a critical ecological and economic component supporting the Beaverton Community. The lake brings important and valuable tourism dollars through recreational, and vacation use particularly since the flooding and dam breaks of the surrounding region. The Beaverton Hydro Dam is a critical financial resource for the impoverished City's operating budget each year constituting nearly 15% of the small general fund. However, the lake and dam infrastructure are desperately in need of major repairs and upgrades to ensure the sustainability of this system following the flood of 2020. With the rise in flood waters in the rivers, Ross Lake and the impoundment behind the dam rose to record breaking levels damaging an aging hydroelectric dam and infrastructure within the city. Work will

be done over the next several months to repair damage caused by the flooding event under a grant from the Federal Emergency Management Agency. However, there remains a strong need for analytical data on the facility and area to mitigate the likelihood of a similar disaster in the City of Beaverton. The plans outlined under this proposal will address ongoing inquiries by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and Michigan Department of Natural Resources along with providing valuable information for ongoing repairs required by the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

III. Preliminary Scope of Work

The City of Beaverton is proposing the creation and/or updates of the following documents to follow current regulations and to ensure the safety of its citizens and the resiliency of its dam. The city has engaged Geosyntec to provide a list of necessary documents and to provide their expertise in writing and/or updating the necessary documents. The governing regulation is 18 CRFR Part 12 which is attached.

1. Dam Safety Surveillance and Monitoring Plan (DSSMP) and Report (DSSMR)- This preventative measure is a proactive step in a dam safety program. It ensures that the Owner and those responsible for surveillance are looking at the dam in the correct way to identify early indicators of a dam safety problem and know the protocols for communication and making decisions relative to monitoring and/or intervention. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) recommended that Beaverton update its DSSMP and DSSMR. This plan and report is recommended in Chapters 6, 9, and 14. See FERC attachments.
2. Updated Inflow Design Flood (IDF) Probable Maximum Flood (PFM) Analysis- The current IDF/PMF estimates appear to be from the 1980's or 90's and do not appear to be in accordance with current guidelines. An updated assessment of the IDF, including the PMP, is critical for the safe operation of the hydro plant and characterization of dam safety risks associated with the ability to safely pass incoming design flows based on the hydraulic capacity of the existing spillway without overtopping the dam. This analysis is recommended in Chapters 2 and 8. See FERC attachments.
3. Updated Dam Breach and Consequence Estimate. Following an updated understanding of the potential inflows, a dam breach model should be performed which includes current topography and structure inventory.
Typically, the breach model will be performed for 'sunny day' failure and failure for the IDF. A key component of this is the identification of flooding consequences downstream, typically characterized by Potential Lives Lost (PLL).
While a structure may be inundated, a consequence analysis may be used to help determine if lives are likely to be impacted. This estimate is recommended in Chapter 6. See FERC attachment.
The prior Dam Breach analysis (see original maps) was performed in 1985 with NWS DAMBRK. Since 1985, many technological advances in dam breach modeling have

occurred and NWS DAMBRK is no longer a recommended software for inundation studies. In addition to technological advances, physical changes in the watershed (development, etc.) and river system (downstream changes caused by the Edenville dam breach, any new culverts, bridges, etc.) have an impact on the floodwave produced by a dam breach. As illustrated by the Edenville and Sanford dam failures, a dam breach can be highly destructive to property and the environment. Without a proper understanding of the anticipated location and timing of the floodwave, it can be difficult to effectively plan for the notification procedures and evacuation routes that are needed to save lives. A dam breach and consequences study allow the City to understand risks and consequences associated with a dam a breach at the Beaverton Dam, and utilize this information to mitigate flood risks.

4. Supporting Technical Information Document (STID). During an emergency or an issue evaluation, the STID is a vital resource to the Owner and support contractors/consultants. Maintaining the document is an industry standard for all FERC regulated projects.

The City of Beaverton currently does not have a document that reflects the current guidelines. This document is recommended in Chapter 15. See FERC attachment.

5. Potential Failure Modes Analysis (PFMA). The purpose of the PFMA is to help identify all the ways something could go wrong with the dam and then facilitate identification of Risk Mitigation Measures. This is a proactive step aimed at identifying the ways in which the dam is a high risk to the city before a flooding disaster occurs. Then based on the joint team's (FERC, City, and Consultant) assessment of the likelihood of identified PFMs, informed decisions can be made relative to dam safety risk mitigation measures and prioritization. This analysis is recommended in Chapter 17. See FERC attachment.

6. Emergency Action Plan (EAP) Update. FERC has reviewed the Beaverton Dam EAP and is not requiring an update to meet FERC guidelines at this time; however, based on a preliminary review, it does not meet current industry guidance and the Gladwin County Emergency Manager indicated a more robust plan would be preferred. The EAP is critical to make sure the correct decisions and notifications are made during an emergency to limit the downstream risks to the public. This plan is recommended in Chapter 6. See FERC attachment.

The Emergency Action Plan (EAP) is a foundational dam safety document that is supposed to identify potential emergency conditions at a dam and specify preplanned actions to be followed to minimize flood-related property damage and loss of life. The City's current EAP primarily consists of a notification plan. It does not include adequate information for other key components of an EAP, including Emergency Detection, Evaluation, and Classification; Preparedness Activities; or Inundation Maps. For example, an EAP is expected to address the following flood-related safety activities which are not currently included in the Beaverton dam's EAP; Identification of critical facilities and sheltering; Specific evacuation procedures, including flood wave travel time considerations (e.g. evacuation of special needs populations and lifting evacuation orders); Distance and routes to high ground; Traffic control measures and traffic routes; Potential impact of weather or releases on evacuation routes, such as flooding of portion of the evacuation route before the dam incident occurs; and Vertical

evacuation/sheltering in place. An EAP also typically addresses emergency supply of stockpiles/equipment and repair processes that can be implemented to prevent an imminent dam failure. The current EAP does not address detection or response related to emergency repairs. The EAP also provides plans and processes to consider the impacts of related facilities, such as the Chappel dam and Edenville dam (once repaired) upstream and downstream in flooding scenarios.

Additional Standards (Dam Breach and Consequence Estimate may include Engineering Guidelines for Risk Informed Decision Making R22- estimation of Life Safety Consequences; US Bureau of Reclamation's – Reclamation Consequence Estimating Methodology: Guidelines for Estimating Life Loss for Dam Safety Risk Analysis, and FEMA-P-946- Federal Guidelines for inundation Mapping of Flood Risks Associated with Dam Incidents and Failures.

The plans are inter-related so if FERC is asking for an Emergency Action Plan that meets Chapter 6, the Probable Maximum Flood Analysis and the Dam Breach and Consequences Estimate need to be performed. If FERC requires a DSSMP that follows Chapter 14, a Supporting Technical Information Document and Potential Failure Mode Analysis are developed as part of the process.

IV. GRANT ADMINISTRATOR REQUIREMENTS

The engineering company will be proposing a separate amount for the grant administration for this project this FRQ.

GRANT ADMINISTRATOR RESPONSIBILITIES CDBG-DR

NOTE: This process is for Community Development Block Grant Disaster Recovery Projects only and not to be used not be used on other CDBG funded projects.

Community Development Block Grant Disaster Recovery Funds (CDBG-DR) may be available to assist the unit of General Local Government (UGLG) with the management of its CDBG-DR Grant Agreement. When procuring for Engineering Services, the city will also include grant management as part of the RFQ. The Grant Administrators assists the UGLG with meeting CDBG-DR compliance requirements including federal and state statues regulations, and policies. The MEDC provides administrative funding to assist the UGLG and MEDC with administration of a CDBG-DR project. Administrative dollars are not available for UGLG employees. Federal regulations do not allow CDBG funds to be used to supplant local funds.

From the list below, the city determines responsibilities to be administered by the city and which ones are to be included as part of the Engineering Contract:

Procurement/Contracts. Labor Standard Insert, Wage Determinations (General Contractors, Sub-Contractors)

- A. Provide required procurement reports and assist the UGLG in obtaining approvals from MEDC as appropriate.
- B. Collect and File procurement records including selection process, advertisements, reasons for selections, minutes of bid openings, etc.
- C. Collect and file contract agreements between UGLG and the Selected Contractor. Collect and file insurance documentation related to the selected contractor.
- D. Provide SAM and HUD Limited Deniability Checks related to selected contractor.
- E. Collect and File Section 3 documentation.

Labor Standards. Payroll Review: Davis Bacon Wages and Fringe, Employee Interviews

Non-Davis Bacon Projects:

- A. Assist project architect or engineer in bid document preparation to ensure bid specification documentation is consistent with state and federal regulations.
- B. Check payroll documentation.
- C. Review Contractor Payment Application materials and ensure that Supplies and Labor Amounts are present on all categories for reimbursement.
- D. File contractor clearances, specific to applicable Lead and Asbestos Abatement
- E. Monitor administrative paperwork to ensure compliance with equal opportunity, labor provisions, and Section 3 requirements.
- F. File any inspection reports related to the project.

Davis-Bacon Projects:

- A. Assist project architect or engineer in bid document preparation consistent with state and federal regulations.
- B. Secure the Department of Labor's federal wage decision and include it in the bid documents.
- C. Review construction contracts to ensure they comply with state and federal regulations. Examples of regulations include the following: Conflict of Interest, Access to Records, Copeland Anti-Kickback Act, Safety Standards, Architectural Barriers, Flood Insurance, Clean Air and Water Act (for contracts over \$100,000), HUD Handbook (6500.3), 24 CFR 85.36, Section 3, Section 109, Title VI, Civil Rights Act, EO 11246 (for contracts over \$10,000), Section 504, etc.
- D. File contractor clearance(s), specific to applicable Lead and Asbestos Abatement.
- E. Check weekly payrolls and complete Payroll Review Worksheet to ensure compliance with federal wage decision(s) with wage and fringe benefit information. Review payroll documents to ensure the following supplemental documents are provided, if applicable: Apprentice Compliance, Independent Contractors, Payroll Restitution.
- F. Conduct on-site interviews and compare the results with the appropriate payrolls.
- G. Monitor administrative paperwork to ensure compliance with equal opportunity, labor standards provisions, and Section 3 requirements.

Grant Reporting Documentation. Prepare, receive, and submit signed grant metric reports from the UGLG. Those reports can include: Audit Reports, Job Creation Reports (if applicable), Progress Reports and Milestones.

Payment Submittal. Provide support documentation for Disbursement Requests. Support documentation can include, but are not limited to the following:

- 8A Disbursement Request Form
- 8B Invoice Summary Report
- Invoices/Proof of Services detailing Labor and Supplies Amounts
- Contractor Statement or Contractor Waiver
- 10-N Payroll Deduction Authorization (as applicable)
- 10-0 Record of Employee Interview (as applicable)
- SAM and HUD Deniability List Information for New Subcontractors on the Project
- Review Change Orders submitted by the UGLG.

Monitoring and Close Out

- A. Attend and Assist UGLG during the MEDC’s monitoring visit(s).
- B. Assist with close-out documentation.

V. Tentative Project Schedule

- Date RFQ Issued: September 6, 2024
- Deadline for Requests for Clarification on this RFQ: September 18, 2024
- City Issues Response to Requests for Clarification by email: September 25, 2024
- RFQ Submissions Due: October 4, 2024 by 3:00 p.m.
- RFQ Evaluations by City Staff/Possible Short List of Interviewees:
October 11, 2024
- Potential Interviews, if City elects to conduct interviews*:
October 14, 2024
- Award Contract: City Council Meeting October 21, 2024

**The City is unlikely to conduct interviews for this RFQ but reserves the right to do so.*

VI. Response Requirements

Respondents to this RFQ shall provide adequate information demonstrating that they are qualified and capable of effectively accomplishing the project. Submittals shall observe the following requirements:

- *Include a cover letter, not to exceed two pages in length, stating interest, contact information for the team, and a statement that the proposal will be valid for six months after submittal.*
- *Include a narrative not to exceed five pages in length, that describes:*
 - *An understanding of the City’s planning needs;*

- o Description of firm's/individual's experience in land use planning, with a particular focus on work in smaller communities in Michigan, providing the services identified in this RFQ;
 - o Team members' roles and hourly rates (including any known reimbursables); and
 - o Availability – i.e., when can the firm begin this work, and how many hours per week will the affected individuals be able to devote to Beaverton on an ongoing basis; how would the firm provide planning services when the lead individual is unavailable (e.g., out of country travel).
- The City encourages resumes and examples of recent relevant experience, including client contact information. These materials are not subject to any page limit.

VII. Selection Process & Evaluation Criteria

The City intends to appoint an Evaluation Committee to evaluate responses to this RFQ. The Evaluation Committee will perform an initial review of the responses to this RFQ using the criteria stated herein. Depending on the number of responses and their relative responsiveness to the selection criteria, the Committee may conduct interviews of a “short list” of firms/teams, and then recommend one of those firms/teams for contract negotiations to perform the work. In the event that these negotiations are not successful, the Committee may opt to negotiate with the second-ranked firm/team, or instead may opt to issue a new RFQ.

Proposals will be considered only from firms/teams that can demonstrate extensive experience providing land use planning services in communities similar to Beaverton, and which specifically address the following criteria:

| | | |
|---|---|-----------|
| 1 | Criteria Description of the City's needs, challenges, and opportunities; as demonstrated in the proposes scope and in the utilization of staff with demonstrated relevant experience. | 25 Points |
| 2 | Demonstrated degree of interest and responsiveness in undertaking the project. | 15 Points |
| 3 | Overall Quality of the response. | 15 Points |
| 4 | Demonstrated ability to provide planning services efficiently and in a cost-effective manner. | 15 Points |
| 5 | Relevant qualifications and experience of key staff and sub-consultants who will participate in the work. | 20 Points |
| 6 | Proposal Cost - hourly rates and other anticipated costs. | 10 Points |

| | |
|-------|---------------|
| TOTAL | 100 Points |
|-------|---------------|

VIII. Submittal of Responses & Other Information

Please deliver digital copies in PDF format to:

Shannon Sirpilla, City Manager, ssirpilla@beavertonmi.org

or in a sealed envelope to:

Shannon M Sirpilla
Beaverton City Manager
128 Saginaw Street
Beaverton, MI 48612

Office: (989) 435-3511 ext 4

The RFQ submittal must be received no later than 3:00 P.M. on October 3, 2024. Please mark subject: "Beaverton Planning Services." Any submittals received after this specified time will not be considered.

Please address any questions, comments, or concerns regarding the project directly to Melanie Wagner (information above).

The City will enter into a contract with the selected firm/s.

In evaluating the proposals and selecting a firm/team, the City reserves the right in its sole discretion to the following:

- To cancel this RFQ in whole or in part at any time, or otherwise reject any and all submissions for reasons deemed by the City that such an action would be in the City's best interest;
- To enter into contracts with more than one firm;
- To conduct interviews of a short list of respondents to this RFQ, or elect to not conduct interviews;
- To elicit further information from any and all respondents as part of the evaluation process;
- To contact former clients of firms for reference checks;

- To reject any and all proposals not in compliance with all prescribed public procurement procedures and requirements;
- To reject any or all proposals, without cause;
- To opt to not award a contract for requested services;
- To waive any irregularities or informalities in any proposal;
- To accept the response that the City deems most beneficial to the public; and
- To negotiate with any applicant to further amend or refine the proposal.