FILE: LOS OSOS CSD

TRANSMITTAL

WALLACE GROUP

CIVIL ENGINEERING
CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE
MECHANICAL ENGINEERING
PLANNING
PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION
SURVEYING / GIS SOLUTIONS
WATER RESOURCES
WALLACE SWANSON INTERNATIONAL

Date: February 7, 2006 **Project Number:** 0384-0011 (0020)

To:
Prospective Consultants

From: **Robert S. Miller, P.E.**
District Engineer
Wallace Group
4115 Broad St, Suite B-5
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Phone: 805 544-4011
Fax: 805 544-4294
Email: robm@wallacegroup.us

Subject: **Los Osos Community Services District – Request for Proposal**

To Whom It May Concern:

Attached please find a Request for Proposal for the Los Osos Community Services District (District) Wastewater Facilities Project Report Update. The District's goal is to retain a team of experts to prepare an update to its Wastewater Facilities Project Report (March, 2001) for the implementation of a wastewater collection, treatment, and effluent/water management system for the community of Los Osos in San Luis Obispo County, California.

PROPOSALS ARE DUE MARCH 3, 2006, 5 p.m. local time.

Appendices A & B as outlined in the RFP will follow within one week to interested consultants. Questions or concerns regarding this RFP and proposal requirements may be directed to the following:

Mr. Dan Bleskey, P.E.
Interim General Manager
Los Osos CSD
(805) 528-9370
dbleskey@losososcsd.org

Mr. Robert S. Miller, P.E.
District Engineer
Wallace Group
(805) 544-4011
robm@wallacegroup.us

Information/document requests may be made to:

Ms. Lonnie Hughes
Project Analyst
Wallace Group
(805) 544-4011
lonnieh@wallacegroup.us

Thank you for your time and consideration on this request.

Sincerely,

Robert S. Miller, P.E.
District Engineer

WALLACE GROUP
A California Corporation

4115 BROAD ST
SUITE B-5
SAN LUIS OBISPO
CALIFORNIA 93401

T 805 544-4011
F 805 544-4294

www.wallacegroup.us

Sent Via: ___ Fax ___ Mail ___ Hand Delivery ___ Overnight x Email
Originals Mailed: ___ Yes x No ___ Number of Pages (Including Cover): 15

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
LOS OSOS COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT
WASTEWATER FACILITIES PROJECT REPORT UPDATE

The Los Osos Community Services District (District) has prepared this Request for Proposals (RFP) with the goal of retaining a team of experts to prepare an update to its Wastewater Facilities Project Report (March, 2001) for the implementation of a wastewater collection, treatment, and effluent/water management system for the community of Los Osos in San Luis Obispo County, California.

Proposal Due Date: March 3, 2006, 5 p.m. local time. Any proposals received after this date/time will be returned to the proposer un-opened. It shall be the proposers' responsibility to verify and confirm receipt of the proposals by the specified due date and time.

Proposal Delivery Location: 2122 9th Street, Suite 102, Los Osos, CA 93402. To safeguard against pre-mature opening, all proposals shall be in sealed envelopes/containers, with a label containing proposal title, bidder name, and proposal due date and time.

Number of Copies of Proposal to be Provided: 15

Contact: Dan Bleskey, P.E., Interim General Manager, Los Osos Community Services District, (805) 528-9370 for details and information regarding this RFP and proposal requirements.

BACKGROUND

Los Osos is an unincorporated, un-sewered community in San Luis Obispo County, with approximately 14,600 residents. Los Osos is located approximately 3 miles south of the City of Morro Bay, and 12 miles west of the City of San Luis Obispo. The Los Osos Community Services District was formed in 1998 and thereafter assumed responsibility for wastewater management within the community. Los Osos has been under a building moratorium by the Regional Water Quality Control Board since 1988. This moratorium was issued by the Regional Board based on its premise that septic tanks are a primary source of nitrate contamination in the upper aquifers of the underlying groundwater basin.

In August 2005, the District commenced construction on a wastewater system that was designed and permitted based on the 2001 Wastewater Facilities Project Report and subsequent studies. The wastewater project, though permitted by applicable agencies, became increasingly controversial in the community due primarily to the proposed location of the 1.4 mgd treatment plant near the center of the community. The political controversy resulted in a voter initiative known as Measure B and a recall of three District board members. Measure B prohibits the installation of a Centralized treatment plant in a residential area and provides for certain voting requirements for any proposed Los Osos wastewater project. Measure B was passed by the voters in September, 2005, thereby amending the District's sewer ordinance and requiring a

modified project. Prior to the cessation of construction activities, a small portion (between 1 and 2%) of the gravity collection system in the community was completed.

In addition to relocation of the Wastewater Treatment Facility as required by Measure B, the District desires to accomplish the following additional goals and tasks during preparation of the Wastewater Facilities Project Report Update (Update):

- Improve the level of water supply sustainability with the updated project, including consideration of supply-conserving disposal methods such as agricultural exchange and extensive re-use of treated effluent. The benefits of alternative disposal methods on required treatment plant performance should be analyzed.

- Improve the cost effectiveness of the project from the perspective of both capital cost and operations & maintenance. The consultant's attention is directed to State Water Board Resolution 2005-0006, which formally incorporates sustainable practices into the State's wastewater policy (see http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/resdec/resltn/2005/rs2005-0006.pdf). Natural treatment technologies such as pond systems that can fully comply with regulatory requirements at a lower life cycle cost should receive strong consideration. A range of aesthetic and odor mitigations should be considered consistent with the location of each analyzed site. Natural, low cost aesthetic screening using landscaping and constructed earthen berms should be among the analyzed approaches.

- Analyze the feasibility of alternative collection system technologies. Alternative, small-diameter collection technologies have been analyzed in previous reports. However, new technologies and recent input from various vendors warrant additional review of the potential cost savings for both collection and treatment.

- Avoid the deferral of important infrastructure and issues such as sludge treatment/disposal, management of percolated effluent in the groundwater basin, and effluent disposal capacity. The consultant should review the Value Engineering Report referenced in Appendix A for additional information on deferred items.

- Provide increased flexibility for future treatment plant modifications, reclaimed water storage, and sludge solids management by selecting a site with adequate area for future needs. The selected site should include adequate area for emergency wastewater storage in order to ensure protection of downstream properties under a reasonable worst-case scenario.

- Review the feasibility, performance, and cost of decentralized and on-site treatment units for each developed property in lieu of a centralized collection and treatment system.

The wastewater collection, treatment and disposal system may be funded in part by a low interest loan, known as the State Revolving Fund (SRF), which is administered by the State Water

Resources Control Board (SWRCB). As a result, the Update shall be prepared in compliance with applicable and current SRF requirements. In parallel with the preparation of the Update, the District intends to prepare and adopt a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR). The Regional Water Quality Control Board has adopted Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR) including a total nitrogen limitation of 7 mg/l (as N), for the District's wastewater project as listed in Appendix A. Agricultural exchange programs, zero discharge, and full water recycling/reclamation may be implemented to enhance water resource sustainability, and such programs must be consistent with Section C, "Recycled Water Specifications" of the WDR.

INFORMATION AVAILABLE

Proposing consultants are required to review current available project-related information listed in Appendix A to this RFP and available electronically upon request to the District's office, located at 2122 9th Street, Suite 102, Los Osos, California 93402. Consultants must contact Dan Bleskey, Interim General Manager, at (805) 528-9370, to receive an electronic copy of the documents.

INQUIRIES DURING PROPOSAL PERIOD

Consultants must direct all inquiries to the District in writing, via mail or facsimile (805-528-9377), or by e-mail (dbleskey@losososcsd.org), to the attention of Mr. Dan Bleskey, Interim General Manager. All inquiries will be responded to in writing, and questions and responses will be disseminated to all consultant teams for their consideration. The origin of the questions will not be disclosed. **All inquiries must be received no later than February 22, 2006 (close of business) in order to receive responses from the District.** Inquiries received after this deadline will not be considered or responded to.

Each proposal team will be allowed one 1-hour meeting with the District, separate from the pre-proposal meeting, to get further acquainted with the Project and District staff. Arrange for such a meeting through the District Administrative Assistant, Ms. Ann Kudart. Individual meetings with subconsultants will not be accommodated.

MANDATORY PRE-PROPOSAL MEETING

A mandatory pre-proposal meeting will be held on Friday, February 17, 2006, from 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m., at Sea Pines Golf Course, Los Osos, California 93402. Attendance is mandatory for all prime consultants, but is not mandatory for subconsultant team members. The District will present an overview of the project and will review the proposal requirements. The District will answer any questions from attendees during the meeting. Consultants are encouraged to visit the community at any time during the proposal period to become acquainted with the project.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
LOS OSOS COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT
WASTEWATER FACILITIES PROJECT REPORT UPDATE

DISTRICT BUDGETARY GOALS

It is the District's intent to award the proposed project on the basis of team qualifications and other criteria described in "Proposal Ranking Criteria" below.

ADDENDA TO RFP

Throughout the course of the proposal development, consultants may raise questions concerning the RFP, which may impact proposals. The District will issue addenda as necessary to further clarify the requirements and expectations of the RFP. The District reserves the right to issue addenda up to 4 business days prior to the due date of the proposal, without time extension of the proposal due date. At the time each addendum is issued, consultants shall acknowledge receipt by immediately faxing the acknowledgment form (included with the addendum) to the District.

PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

Submit One Proposal. Prime consultants shall be limited to only one proposal/project team for the Project. Subconsultants, however, may be included in multiple proposals with various prime consultants.

Proposal Rejection or Withdrawal. Late proposals (submitted after the specified due date/time) shall be rejected by the District, and returned un-opened to the Proposer. The District reserves the right to accept or reject any or all proposals. Proposals may be withdrawn by a signed written request submitted to the District at any time prior to 5 p.m. of the due date of the proposal.

District Engineer. The District's Engineer, Wallace Group, San Luis Obispo, California, may respond to questions from time to time on behalf of the Interim General Manager. Wallace Group contacts include Robert Miller and Steve Tanaka at (805) 544-4011.

Project Manager. The Project Manager shall be the same person named as Project Manager in the Proposal, and shall be dedicated to this Project as appropriate to execute the project in a timely and effective manner. Should the designated Project Manager not be able to fulfill this commitment during the course of the Project, the Consultant shall notify the District within 10 working days of proposed personnel change, and shall submit the qualifications of the new proposed Project Manager, subject to approval by the District.

Agreement. Consultants shall review the District's standard Agreement, liability and insurance requirements, included as Appendix B to this RFP. Each individual firm submitting a proposal shall meet all of the terms and conditions contained in the Agreement. By virtue of its proposal submittal, the consultant acknowledges agreement with and acceptance of all Agreement conditions.

Agreement Execution. The selected consultant shall execute the written contract included in Appendix B with the District within 10 working days after Notice of Award has been granted by the District. Failure to accept and execute said Agreement will cancel the Notice of Award, and the District will continue negotiations with the next highest ranked firm.

Proof of Insurance. Consultant shall provide proof of insurance in the form, coverages, and amounts specified in the Agreement within 7 working days following notice of contract award. Such insurance proof shall be a pre-condition of contract execution.

PROPOSAL FORMAT

General. Proposals shall be prepared in accordance with the format specified in this section. Proposals that do not follow this format will be subject to rejection by the District. Provide proposals in the following format:

- **Provide your proposed fees in a separate sealed envelope, clearly marked with the proposer's company name and address, and labeled "Proposed Fees for Los Osos Community Services District Wastewater Facilities Project Report Update." Prime consultant fees shall be broken down by manhours per task, in accordance with the labor classifications and rates specified.**

- **Letter of Transmittal.** Provide a brief transmittal letter (2 pages maximum) transmitting the proposal to the District.

- **Table of Contents.**

- **Section 1. Project Understanding and Approach.** Provide your team's understanding and approach to the overall project. Discuss issues and concerns, and express your ideas and methodology on how best to approach and execute the project. Include your approach to project management, teamwork, communications, quality assurance/control, public input, and cost and schedule controls.

- **Section 2. Project Team/Qualifications.** Provide an organization chart showing the proposed team, team organization/lines of communication, and team member qualifications germane to this project. Clearly state your proposed project manager and corresponding qualifications. The proposed Project manager must be a California licensed Professional Engineer. Include all subconsultants as part of the proposed team, and describe your past working relationships with each subconsultant. Full resumes shall be placed in Appendix A. Team member references shall be included in Appendix B. Provide a minimum of three references each for the proposed Project Manager, and state the contact/agency name, brief title/description of project, and contact telephone number.

- **Section 3. Relevant Project Experience**. Provide your team's relevant project experience as it relates to the nature of this project, including the experience of proposed subconsultants. Include planning, design, and construction management projects of similar nature, magnitude and complexity to this project. Provide the year(s) the Work was performed, and identify key team members and their roles on the project. Projects listed should be specifically relevant to key aspects of the Los Osos wastewater project.

- **Section 4. Scope of Services**. Provide a detailed scope of services for the project. Embellish on the scope outline in this RFP. Verbatim re-iteration of the scope of services is discouraged.

- **Section 5. Manpower Estimate**. Provide a manpower estimate, broken down by hours and task, that demonstrates your understanding of the scope of work and level of effort required to accomplish all tasks. Differentiate prime consultant's level of effort from that of proposed subconsultants. Manhours for each subconsultant are required. The manpower estimate shall be broken down by task and subtask, with personnel classifications indicated. Provide the standard billing rate sheets for the prime consultant and each subconsultant, and include such billing rate sheets in Appendix C.

- **Section 6. Project Schedule**. Provide a detailed project schedule, in graphic format, along with a written explanation of assumptions, or specific details, issues or concerns regarding the proposed schedule. Show graphically and clearly indicate all schedule components, those schedule items for District and agency review, and other items as deemed necessary. Include in the schedule all anticipated time allotments for agency reviews, public participation, and other schedule provisions. Clearly state all assumptions and basis for the proposed schedule. It is the District's intent to adopt the Update by **August 10, 2006** with the following intermediate milestones:

  - Community workshops regarding treatment plant location and technology: July 6, 2006 through July 13, 2006 or as soon as possible. It is the District's intent to pursue critical path tasks aggressively. The consultant shall consider expedited completion of its work on Task 3 (WWTP Technology/Site), including preparation of an interim and focused report on this item, as part of its schedule submittal. The consultant's attention is directed to the consultant selection criteria, which includes schedule.

  - Submittal of draft Update for community review: July 28, 2006.

The proposal and project award schedule is as follows:

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
LOS OSOS COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT
WASTEWATER FACILITIES PROJECT REPORT UPDATE

Item	Date
Proposal Due	March 3, 2006
District Review of Proposals	March 6 through March 10, 2006
District Issue of Short-List (3 firms)	March 10, 2006
Interview Firm No. 1	March 14, 2006
Interview Firm No. 2	March 14, 2006
Interview Firm No. 3	March 15, 2006
District Recommendation of Selected Firm	March 17, 2006
Consultant Notice of Contract Award	March 23, 2006 pending successful contract negotiations with Consultant.

- Appendix A. Team Member Resumes
- Appendix B. References
- Appendix C. Billing Rates
- Additional Appendices as deemed appropriate

Proposal Length. Written text within proposals shall be limited in length to 40 pages. The page limitation shall exclude figures and charts, transmittal letter, table of contents, fly sheets, and appendices. Text pages with embedded figures or tables shall constitute a full text page in the page count. Consultants shall use discretion to include only pertinent information relevant to the project.

Other Requirements. Proposals shall be comb-bound or in 3-ring binders. **Minimum font size for text shall be 12 point, except for headers, footers, footnotes, etc.**

PROPOSAL RANKING CRITERIA

Proposals will be ranked by the District based on established ranking criteria. The value of each criterion is stated immediately following each criterion. Criteria and relative "point" values are as follows:

- Project Understanding and Approach, 30 points
- Team qualifications, 35 points
- Project Schedule, 10 points
- Responsiveness to RFP, 10 points
- Local Experience, 5 points
- Manpower Estimate, 10 points

All proposals will be ranked on these criteria, and a short-list of three firms will be chosen. The District will select the interview times at random, and will notify each team as to their respective time slots for interviews. The interviews will consist of a one-hour presentation by the project team, followed by a half-hour question and answer period. The top three candidates will be interviewed, and the top firm will be selected based on the outcome of the respective proposals and interviews. The top-ranked firm will then enter contractual and fee negotiations with the District, and should the District and top-ranked firm not satisfactorily negotiate the agreement, the second-ranked firm will enter negotiations, and so forth. For clarification purposes, the manpower estimate criterion will be evaluated based on the consultant's demonstrated understanding of the level of effort required for the various tasks (not price).

OVERVIEW OF SCOPE OF SERVICES

Consultants shall prepare a scope of services to provide for the preparation of a comprehensive Update that addresses the District's goals and complies with regulatory requirements. The scope of services shall include the following:

Task 1: Project Management

This task shall be based on the consultant's proposed scope and schedule for providing services. It shall include day-to-day coordination and management, a project kick-off meeting, on-going progress meetings, design review meetings, technical workshops, wastewater committee meetings, and community meetings. The project manager shall be required to attend approximately 10 District Board meetings and 6 wastewater committee meetings throughout the course of the project, and shall prepare an update on project status and address project-related matters as coordinated with the Interim General Manager. The Project Manager shall also provide detailed written monthly status reports to the District, including, at a minimum, the status of project budget, schedule, issues and concerns, work completed, and work scheduled for the next period.

Task 2: Wastewater Collection System

The consultant shall provide an analysis of the configuration, feasibility, and cost of various collection system methods including the following:

- Gravity collection and pumping consistent with Coastal Development Permit conditions and utilizing the 100% design drawings prepared by MWH unless justification is provided for alternative designs.

- Septic Tank Effluent Pump (STEP) and Septic Tank Effluent Gravity (STEG) collection systems shall be analyzed. The consultant should review previous reports on the subject prepared by Questa Engineering (1997 Analysis for SLO Co.) and MWH (2001 Project Report). Several vendors have also provided equipment and cost information for

potential STEP, STEG, and low-pressure (grinder pump) sewer solutions as listed in Appendix A. Additional contact with these and other potential vendors may be made during the proposal and Update preparation process.

- The analysis of small diameter collection technologies such as STEP/STEG shall include consideration of key feasibility issues such as septic tank replacement requirements, SRF requirements for STEP/STEG if SRF loan funds are proposed, higher cost of borrowing if non-SRF funds are used, the installed cost to individual property owners, the need for odor control devices in the collection system, and benefits / impacts to the treatment facility.

- The life cycle cost analysis shall include capital, operations, maintenance, and replacement. Consideration should be given to various construction methods including trenchless technologies. The consultant's attention is directed to Addendum 5 of the MWH final construction plans, which describes the extent to which disturbed pavement must be repaired if substantially damaged. Extensive information is also available in the soils reports on groundwater conditions, which could impact both gravity system installation and new septic tank installation. The consultant shall take into account the cost of implementing Capacity, Management, Operation, and Maintenance (CMOM) measures in the evaluation of life cycle costs. The implementation of a mandatory Spill Prevention Plan shall also be included in the cost analysis. The various collection methods shall be compared in terms of the risk of spills, violations, and administrative civil liability.

- The collection system analysis shall take into account work already completed on the collection system. In addition, the analysis shall acknowledge the existing gravity collection systems at the Bayridge Estates, Vista De Oro, and Monarch Grove subdivisions.

- The consultant shall separately analyze the cost and feasibility of collecting existing developed areas outside of the prohibition zone but within the District. The analysis shall include an evaluation of the incremental cost of collection, treatment, and disposal. The estimates shall be configured to facilitate an evaluation of the cost of connection for individual areas, such as Cabrillo Estates and Bayridge Estates.

Task 3: Wastewater Treatment Technology and Site Location

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
LOS OSOS COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT
WASTEWATER FACILITIES PROJECT REPORT UPDATE

The Update shall include an analysis of various potential project sites that comply with Measure B requirements. The consultant shall assemble revised ranking criteria in coordination with the District Board and Wastewater Committee. The analysis shall include the following:

- Alternative project sites shall be analyzed in terms of the cost of raw wastewater and effluent transmission, community acceptance, flexibility for future activities and expansion, visibility from viewing corridors, environmental issues as provided by the District's environmental planning consultant, schedule for permitting and development, civil site constraints such as drainage, and other criteria that could impact the cost, schedule, permitting, and operations of the facility.

- The consultant shall screen available properties and select a minimum of 2 alternative project sites in coordination with the District. The District will purchase and provide Preliminary Title Reports for each feasible site to identify easements or other property constraints.

- The consultant shall provide a visual and community acceptance analysis of each site including a range of potential options for aesthetic and odor mitigation. At a minimum, all odorous unit processes such as headworks and sludge facilities shall be covered and odor scrubbed. This analysis shall be coordinated with Coastal Commission Staff and the District's environmental planning consultant. The potential cost of environmental mitigation shall be a component of the cost analysis.

- Alternative wastewater treatment technologies shall be analyzed and compared with the partially buried MBR process proposed in the 100% MWH design. Consideration shall be given to natural, sustainable, low-cost technologies that comply with the regulatory requirements. It should be noted that alternative disposal processes such as agricultural reclamation might not require the same level of total nitrogen removal as percolation disposal. One pond technology utilizes equipment integrated by Nelson Environmental, Inc. as described in various publications and video presentations listed in Appendix A.

- When analyzing pond systems or other low cost technologies, the consultant shall provide sufficient case studies, review of existing treatment plants, vendor data, and other information necessary to demonstrate the feasibility of compliance with the current Waste Discharge Requirements, or compliance with alternative requirements if the method of disposal supports such an alternative. This information may be submitted by the District to the RWQCB and SWRCB staff for review. An evaluation of redundancy and reliability shall be included with the analysis of each technology or process train.

- In addition to the MBR technology, other conventional technologies shall also be considered in the Update, including oxidation ditch technology at a minimum.

- Project costs shall address items that were previously deferred, including sludge management processes. As indicated previously, one District goal is to avoid deferred infrastructure where feasible. With respect to sludge management, the consultant should become familiar with existing and draft San Luis Obispo County Ordinances concerning sludge management and applicable restrictions.

- The cost analysis shall include the total life cycle cost of the five site alternatives and technologies applicable to each site. In addition, based on the approved ranking system developed in this task, the consultant shall provide a recommendation for both a site and treatment technology.

Task 4: Effluent Water Management System

The Update shall provide an integrated approach to effluent disposal and treatment with the goal of maximizing the sustainability of the community's water supply. Groundwater is currently the sole source of water supply for the community, and the Consultant is encouraged to review the District's Salt Water Intrusion Study (2005) and Condition 34 of the Coastal Development Permit to obtain a perspective on the complexity and urgency of community water supply issues. The 100% MWH plans reflect an effluent disposal system that utilizes percolation in selected areas with adequate groundwater separation. Approximately 0.8 mgd was scheduled to be distributed in a sub-surface leach field at the southern end of the community, at a location known as the Broderson effluent disposal site. The following items shall be provided with this task:

- Analysis of the cost, benefits, and feasibility of alternative disposal methods including extensive reclamation in developed and undeveloped areas, agricultural exchange using either effluent or upper aquifer groundwater, periodic discharge to Los Osos Creek, and alternative percolation disposal areas. Constructed wetlands restoration projects should be considered.

- The consultant team should include an expert in the field of groundwater hydrology with experience in the Los Osos area, and an expert in agricultural exchange and reclamation.

- The finished analysis shall include a full life cycle cost evaluation of alternatives, including combinations that include elements of the disposal system designed by MWH.

- Creative water management strategies that meet District goals could include the use of upper aquifer "harvest" water for landscape irrigation, deferred pumping of agricultural supplies, and dual plumbing for reclaimed water use in developed or undeveloped areas. Wet weather period disposal shall be considered and addressed through engineering solutions such as reclaimed water storage and seasonal percolation disposal.

Task 5: Decentralized and/or On-site Wastewater Treatment System Alternatives

The number of on-site treatment technologies available for total nitrogen removal has grown rapidly in the last few years. The performance of various technologies was studied in detail by the State Water Resources Control Board in 2002 as indicated in the following publication:

http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/ab885/technosite.html

The cost and feasibility of this alternative shall be analyzed as part of the Update. Existing technologies shall be reviewed and screened for performance and cost, and a minimum of three viable technologies shall be analyzed in detail in terms of life cycle cost, reliability, regulatory acceptance, and other criteria. It should be noted that Task 5 is related to Tasks 2 and 4 for high groundwater areas. Specifically, in order for an on-site option with leach field disposal to be viable in shallow groundwater areas, the shallow groundwater zone may need to be managed through pumping. Alternatively, limited areas may need to collected and discharged to small cluster systems. The analysis shall also address the following issues:

- Some areas in the community are connected to large community septic systems, which will result in a different cost per user.
- The cost and availability of financing may impact the monthly fees associated with capital debt financing. Available funding sources should be screened, and favorable programs should be highlighted.
- Lease/operate and franchise options may be viable for some technologies. The pros and cons for these alternative financing methods shall be reviewed.

Note: Special Legislation (AB 2506) to provide on-site septic management program authority is anticipated.

Task 6: Comprehensive Project Schedule and Budget for the Selected Project

As indicated in previous tasks, schedule and budget factors must be considered in the selection of any alternative. However, the level of detail required for comparative analysis is substantially less than the detail needed for the selected alternative. After the District conducts public workshops and selects a project, the Consultant shall prepare a detailed schedule and budget for project implementation including the following items:

- In conjunction with the District's environmental planning consultant, prepare a graphical critical path schedule that displays important project tasks including required elections under Measure B or Proposition 218, design, permitting, funding, and construction. Consideration shall be given to the parallel completion of tasks where possible, particularly those that are subject to legal challenge.

- A detailed project budget shall be prepared for the selected project. The budget shall reflect experience gained by the District from awarded construction contracts, including

street restoration work. All costs shall be inflated to the mid-point of construction. The consultant shall coordinate with the District's Assessment Engineer and Revenue Plan consultants to determine the required form for cost breakdowns, such as collection system components (trunk, collector, lateral, etc). Costs that are not eligible for SRF loan funding shall be identified separately.

- The consultant shall work closely with the District's claims experts and financial consultants to prepare a comprehensive project cost analysis that includes the budget for the selected project, sunk project costs, budgets for claim resolution, land purchases or sales, and a budget for potential litigation. This information will be used by the District's financial consultant to prepare a funding plan and cash flow analysis.

- Alternative project delivery methods such as design/build and design/build/finance shall be analyzed in terms of schedule, feasibility, potential funding sources, and other advantages/disadvantages. The consultants attention is directed to Section IX-K of the State's SRF Policy Guidelines available at the following link: http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/funding/docs/srf/srfpolicyonly.pdf

Deliverables

This section describes a preliminary list of deliverables and the requirements thereof. This list is not a complete list, and does not relieve the consultant from the required deliverables throughout the course of the project for SRF funding, agency requirements, and others. Consultants shall enhance and refine this list of deliverables as part of their respective proposals. A list of intermediate deliverables designed to enhance community participation and buy-in shall be developed. This list shall address such as:

- Initial screening of treatment plant sites prior to detailed review
- Project selection and decision criteria and ranking process prior to publication of a draft report
- Initial screening of on-site treatment options and process for selecting three feasible vendors prior to completing a detailed review of each of the three technologies
- Technical review of natural technologies (ponds, wetlands, etc) in terms of historical performance and the ability to comply with discharge requirements prior to submittal of a draft report

All deliverables and displays shall be provided in both hard copy (20 copies) and electronic (PDF) format. Additional required deliverables are as follows:

1. Draft Project Report Update
2. Draft Schedule and Budget Analysis

3. Final Project Report Update, incorporating Schedule and Budget Analysis