

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**  
**FOR**  
**Determination of United States Withdrawn Lands**  
**FOR THE**  
**Ashley and Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest**



**CENTRAL UTAH WATER**  
**CONSERVANCY DISTRICT**

April 17, 2017

Central Utah Water Conservancy District  
355 West University Parkway  
Orem, UT 84058-7303

**This Page Intentionally Left Blank**

## **REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**

The Central Utah Water Conservancy District (CUWCD), United States Bureau of Reclamation (BOR), and the United States Department of the Interior (DOI), as Joint Lead Agencies (JLAs), announce a Request for Proposals (RFP) for preparing a determination of United States Withdrawn Lands in the Ashley and Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forests. The following paragraphs summarize the scope of work to be accomplished and the nature of the proposal requested.

### **PROJECT BACKGROUND**

Both pre-and post creation of the United States Forest Service (USFS) and the delineation of National Forest boundaries, the DOI/BOR had withdrawn lands for building water projects to benefit the DOI/BOR. Benefits included water storage and delivery, power generation, and mineral rights. Although the status of many of those lands remained unchanged, some of those withdrawn lands were revoked or proposed for revocation back to the jurisdiction of Bureau of Land Management (BLM). BLM has the overarching duty of maintaining records regarding land ownership.

Unfortunately, during this time the documentation and records of the BOR, BLM and USFS have led to incongruent interpretations of clear ownership. In addition, in some cases, it appears that paperwork to complete some of the amendatory actions on these lands was completed by one of the agencies, but the results were never officially recorded concurrently by all the agencies. One of the problems may lie in the age of some of the records ( $\geq 100$  years old). It may also be that each agency has maintained a different set of records. Nonetheless, this has left the DOI/BOR major land discrepancies when compared to the maps and descriptions from the BLM or USFS. Often, more than one federal agency claims jurisdiction of the same parcel (overlapping withdrawals, inconsistent records to accurately reflect reality, requested revocations that were never processed, etc.).

### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

A kickoff meeting with all affected agencies (BOR, CUWCD, DOI, BLM, and USFS) will be required to establish a framework to describe how coordination and collaboration would occur. In addition, periodic meetings will need to be held to look at issues as they arise and to find a pathway forward.

The selectee will need to research, at a minimum, the following records or data sets to develop and clearly document the rationale and justification for ownership (or the lack thereof) by the BOR and/or DOI throughout the Ashley and Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forests:

- All Public Land Orders
- Federal Register
- BLM master title plat
- Plat records for all three agencies (BOR, BLM, USFS)
- FBMS records from BOR
- GIS records

- County records
- All other electronic or hard copy documentation and/or correspondence in office files (BOR, BLM, USFS)

Location and entity where most work and records will occur: Bureau of Reclamation, Provo, Utah; Central Utah Water Conservancy District, Orem, Utah.

The result will be the correct identification of issues for all withdrawn lands controlled by the DOI/BOR within the defined forest lands. The DOI/BOR will be provided with information identifying their jurisdiction and the remaining problems or issues that need to be resolved.

**PROJECT OBJECTIVES**

The objective of this project is to deliver to BOR, DOI and CUWCD scanned documentation and GIS shapefiles that prove or disprove ownership and documentation of any competing interests.

**RFP and PROJECT SCHEDULE**

The following is the RFP schedule:

RFP Released.....	April 17, 2017
RFP Advertised in newspapers .....	April 18 and 25, 2017
<b>Proposals Due .....</b>	<b>May 8, 2017</b>
Consultant Presentation (optional) .....	May 17, 2017
Approval to Award Contract (CUWCD Board Meeting) .....	May 24, 2017
Project Kick-off Meeting with Agencies.....	June, 2017
Delivery of Final Product.....	June, 2018

**PROPOSAL SUBMISSION DEADLINE**

To be responsive to this RFP, interested consultant firms must submit six (6) copies of their proposal no later than **4:00 P.M., on May 8, 2017.** The proposal should not exceed 20 pages in length, including Statement of Qualifications.

Proposals should be addressed to:

Central Utah Water Conservancy District  
 355 West University Parkway  
 Orem, Utah 84058-7303  
 Attn: Kirk D. Beecher, P.E.

For questions regarding this RFP contact:

Kirk D. Beecher, P.E.  
 801-361-3946  
[kirk@cuwcd.com](mailto:kirk@cuwcd.com)

## **SELECTION PROCESS**

The selection committee will review and evaluate the submitted proposals and will rank each on a set of predetermined criteria. The consultant selection may be based exclusively on the submitted proposals. However, if the selection committee determines that consultant presentations are needed to determine final rankings, then presentations will be included in the selection process for those consulting firms with the highest ranked written proposals. In this case, final rankings will be determined by the average of the selection committee members' scores from the written proposals and consultant presentations. Consulting firms are required to meet the May 15, 2017 date set for the consultant presentation (if needed). A consulting firm will be considered non-responsive if they are asked to give a presentation (scheduled for May 15, 2017) but are unable. The selection committee will provide the consultant presentation format when the consulting firm is notified.

### **Evaluation of Proposals**

The selection committee will evaluate submitted proposals based upon the qualifications presented and the selection criteria set forth by the committee. The selection criteria include:

1. **Evaluation of the Proposal (35 Points Maximum)**
  - a. Responsiveness to the RFP and the objective(s) described herein
  - b. Description and adequacy of methods and approach
  - c. Familiarity with Ashley and Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forests
  - d. Familiarity with U.S. Forest Service (USFS), Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and or Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) procedures
  - e. Project schedule showing key dates, project milestones, and critical path issues with a completion date
  
2. **Evaluation of the Consulting Firm's (including sub-consultants) Experience and Approach to the Proposed Project (50 Points Maximum)**
  - a. **\*\*Demonstrate consultant's knowledge and experience of researching land records and GIS shapefile creation.**
    - Description and summary of comparable documents (include projects that are similar in nature to the proposed project)
    - Agency (or agencies) the project was completed for
    - References associated with the projects listed
  - b. **\*\*Project team organization chart showing:**
    - Consultant Project Manager
    - Key team members and their roles
    - Resumes for key team members
    - Sub-consultants (if any) and their roles
  - c. Understanding of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation withdrawn lands procedures and policies

**\*\* This information may be summarized in a table showing proposed key individuals, their roles on similar projects, experience, etc....**

### **3. Firm Resources (15 Points Maximum)**

- a. Identify the location of the main office where the project work will be conducted
- b. Sufficient resources and availability to complete project within schedule
- c. Consultant firms (and sub-consultants) quality control and quality assurance plan

### **Cost Proposal**

The cost proposal shall be submitted at the same time as the project proposal. It must be sealed in a separate envelope. The cost proposal should contain a breakdown of the total estimated fees by individual task and personnel for the proposed work. The cost proposal of the top ranked firm will be opened to determine the reasonableness of the fee. However, selection will be made based on qualifications.

### **AWARD OF CONTRACT**

After the selection committee has reviewed all proposals and selected the most qualified consulting firm based on qualifications, the District will immediately enter negotiations with that firm to prepare a draft agreement. If an agreement cannot be reached, the District will immediately enter negotiations with the second most qualified firm. Once an agreement has been negotiated it will be presented to the District Board of Trustees for approval. Upon approval from the Board, the selected consulting firm will be notified. The firms not selected will also be notified.