

STATEMENT OF SERVICES

APPENDIX B

Background:

Location and Access

The City of Aniak (the community) is in the Bethel Census Area on the south bank of the Kuskokwim River. It lies approximately 92 miles Northeast of Bethel and 315 miles west of Anchorage. The current population is 498 with approximately 70 percent identifying as Alaska Native.

The community is not on the road system and is primarily dependent on planes for travel to and from the community and for outside goods.

Water Supply and Wastewater Services

The community currently does not have a piped public water supply. Most residents reportedly get water from individual wells. Residents without private water wells in their homes obtain water from a sink at the Community Hall, from a water spigot located outside the health clinic during the summer, or at the high school during emergencies. Water from the wells in the community is reportedly very hard and not palatable. Most residents reportedly drink bottled water that is brought into Aniak at significant expense which results in additional solid waste burden at the community landfill.

Originally constructed in 1982 and expanded in 2005 and 2010, the central piped wastewater collection system with six lift stations serves most residents in the community. Aniak Light and Power, a privately owned utility, provides electricity to the community; it has been reported that electric service in the community is unreliable and brown outs, which cause backups at wastewater lift stations, commonly occur.

The wastewater is treated in a lagoon system located on land leased by the Aniak Airport from the Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities, near the Kuskokwim River (Attachment A, 2006). The community believes that the proximity of the lagoon system to the airport runway is limiting the type of air service available to Aniak.

The wastewater percolates in the stabilization cell instead of filling and providing treatment prior to overflowing into the percolation cell as designed. Laboratory analysis of water samples collected in January of 2006 from three monitoring wells near the lagoon reported nitrate concentrations greater than 5 milligrams per liter (mg/l), which could be indicative of seepage of insufficiently treated wastewater.

Project Objectives

This project seeks to evaluate options for improving the community water quality and access and improving the wastewater system. The objective of this project is to inform the community members and leaders of the options, costs, and benefits of 1) improving the community's potable water quality and access and 2) improving the wastewater system to ensure both vital services will be sufficient for meeting the long-term needs of the entire community for the next 20 years and beyond, factoring in potential impacts of growth.

The preliminary engineering report (PER) resulting from this project must describe the engineering evaluation of the current conditions and overall future community needs for water consumption and wastewater management. Deficiencies of the water and sewer services in Aniak are to include, but are not limited to, the differences between the community needs compared to existing services. The PER shall present options to address the deficiencies and meet the project objectives. The PER shall identify and evaluate alternatives to 1) improve potable water access and water quality and 2) to improve the wastewater collection and treatment system. Both sections PERs shall consider services for residences within city limits and beyond the city limits for the entire community of Aniak (Attachments B-Z, 1979-2001).

Alternatives for providing potable water shall range from no action to the construction of a water treatment plant and piped water service. At minimum, alternatives for improving the wastewater treatment shall include no action, rehabilitation of the lagoons and advanced treatment systems. The alternatives must also evaluate the costs and benefits of keeping wastewater treatment system at the existing lagoon location versus relocation of the treatment system off the airport property to property(ies) owned by the City of Aniak. Wastewater collection system deficiencies must be identified and options for addressing the deficiencies must be presented, including options to mitigate the known lift station backup incidents that have resulted from electrical brownouts. Options to relocate the wastewater treatment system shall address whether or how the relocation would affect the type of flight service to the airport as part of the non-monetary factors, and documentation of the related research to support the findings shall be included as an appendix to the PER.

The outcome of this project shall be planning documents that the community can use to pursue Capital Improvement Program (CIP) construction project funding which requires approval of the PER by the Review Committee. The planning document shall, in separate sections, 1) describe the comprehensive investigation of the potential water sources and potable water deficiencies within Aniak and present the evaluation of community water system alternatives to improve water access and quality; and 2) describe the comprehensive investigation of the existing wastewater collection and treatment system in Aniak and present the evaluation of alternatives to improve the wastewater collection and treatment systems.

SCOPE OF WORK

The contractor shall prepare, at minimum, an Alternatives Memo, a Preliminary Engineering Report (PER), and an Environmental Review (ER) that comprise planning documents. Alternatives must meet current State of Alaska regulatory standards for drinking water and wastewater.

The Alternatives Memo, PER, and ER each have their own review and approval requirements at different stages of development, as described under each task. In addition to the VSW Engineer and Environmental Analyst, the reviewers include the Community, the regional health organization, where applicable, and the Multi-Agency Review Committee (Review Committee). The Review Committee is comprised of representatives from state and federal funding agencies, as well as Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) programs that perform plan review for sanitation improvement projects and/or have regulatory oversight of drinking water, wastewater, and solid waste facilities. Revisions to address comments from reviewers shall be incorporated into each successive deliverable. Final approval of the ER is provided by the Indian Health Service and United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Rural Development.

The PER shall include the following as part of the scope of work:

- House-to-house survey presented as a mapped inventory of buildings in the community, including general information and all aspects of funding eligibility: ownership, use, design occupancy, frequency of occupancy, year-round occupancy, occupancy type, condition of the homes, and presence of indoor plumbing, thermostatically controlled heat, electrical power, and room for a bathroom.
- Estimate of future water consumption and wastewater management needs through the next 25 years based on documented interviews with staff of the City offices and, where they exist, tribal housing and planning agencies.
- A records search for boring logs and well construction diagrams of existing geotechnical boring logs and water wells in and around the community, along with their associated water quality test results, where applicable and available.
- Water sampling and testing of potential surface water sources and current groundwater sources within the community for quantity and quality data.
 - The number of water quality samples need to be sufficient to represent the source water quality, for the regulated parameters with primary standards (maximum contaminant levels, or MCLs) as appropriate for the source water, and for parameters with secondary standards for aesthetic qualities such as taste and odor under the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) which dictate appropriate water treatment strategies.
 - The number and geographic distribution of water quantity samples need to be sufficient to evaluate the feasibility of the candidate water source to adequately serve the community through the planning period.
- An evaluation of the conditions and the capacity of the existing wastewater lagoon system, considering the amount of sludge build-up and erosion risk, to provide a projection of the remaining length of useful service life.
- The respective cost estimates of each alternative shall include the costs of monitoring and reporting under:
 - 1) the SDWA for potable water improvements; or
 - 2) the Clean Water Act for wastewater treatment improvements that would result in a discharge to surface water and thus require a discharge permit from either the United States Environmental Protection Agency or DEC.
- The identification of and estimation of costs to obtain other permits appropriate and necessary for each evaluated alternative.

Fully evaluated means evaluation and inclusion of the content as described under “4) Alternatives Considered” of USDA Bulletin 1780-2, e.g., operation and maintenance, environmental impacts, land requirements.

1) Alternatives for water improvements must consider and include, but are not limited to:

- Full evaluation of a “No Action” alternative. The No Action alternative is to be based on the existing sources and delivery methods of water as determined during the site visit (Task 1).
- Full evaluation of potential water supply sources, including surface and subsurface. The water source evaluation must include an assessment of water quality as well as producible water quantity.

- Full evaluation of treatment strategies for the water source(s) to meet primary and secondary standards established under the SDWA.
- Full evaluation of options for delivering the water, including:
 - One or multiple watering points, with and without washeteria(s);
 - Distribution lines to provide piped water service to homes within and outside of Aniak city limits; and
 - A combination of the prior options.

2) Alternatives for wastewater system improvements must consider and include, but are not limited to:

- Full evaluation of a “No Action” alternative. The No Action alternative is to be based on the existing conditions of the wastewater collection and lagoon treatment system as determined during the site visit (Task 1).
- Full evaluation of options to mitigate wastewater backups at wastewater lift stations resulting from electrical brown outs.
- Full evaluation of rehabilitating the current lagoon system to correct deficiencies as needed to function as designed, with or without expansion, as appropriate to meet the projected needs of the planning period.
- Full evaluation of relocating wastewater treatment facilities to location(s) that may minimize impacts to the operation of the Aniak Airport.
- Full evaluation of other wastewater treatment options, along with any appurtenant changes and additions that would be needed to implement the option(s).

Task 1 – Site Visits

The contractor shall perform two site visits. During the first site visit, the contractor will meet with representatives of the City, Aniak Tribe, and DEC to tour the community and gather information that must be considered to successfully accomplish the project objectives. The second site visit will be for presenting the results of the 65% Draft PER to the community and responding to questions during a public meeting held in the community.

The contractor must coordinate with the necessary personnel (i.e., city administrator, water system operator, VSW Engineer, Community-assigned Remote Maintenance Worker) and provide a minimum notice of 7 days prior to each site visit to ensure a successful site visit.

Task 1 – Site Visit Deliverables

Document Type	Format
Trip Report(s)	Emailed Microsoft Word and PDF (Electronic versions)

Task 2 – Alternatives Memorandum

The contractor shall prepare a single Alternatives Memorandum providing statements of deficiencies and summary of alternatives to be considered for evaluation in each PER. The Alternatives Memorandum should not be longer than 8 pages. Feasible options will be addressed and developed in the PER, and impractical options shall be mentioned in the PER for completeness but dismissed from further evaluation. The Alternatives Memo shall identify which options will be deemed feasible for further development in the PER and which options will be dismissed from further evaluation. The Alternatives

Memorandum is reviewed by the VSW Engineer, the Community, the Remote Maintenance Worker of the Regional Health Organization where applicable, and the Review Committee. A meeting with the VSW Engineer, Community, Regional Health Organization where applicable, and the contractor will occur as needed before and after the Alternatives Memorandum is prepared.

Task 2 – Alternatives Memorandum Deliverables

Document Type	Format
Alternatives Memo	Electronic versions

Task 3 – PER

The contractor shall prepare the PER in accordance with the structure and content of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Bulletin 1780-2, Preliminary Engineering Reports for the Water and Waste Disposal Program (Attachment 1). In addition to the content required by USDA Bulletin 1780-2, the contractor shall include the following in the PERs:

- “VSW Project Nos. ANI0002 – 24RV47 and ANI0003 – 24AV78” on the PER cover pages along with notation to identify the document version as 65% Draft, 95% Draft or Final.
- An executive summary with a statement of the deficiency, the alternatives considered, and a summary of the preferred alternative, and estimated capital cost.
- Evaluation and mapping of the stratigraphy in the area and inclusion of all project-acquired boring logs and well construction diagrams as an appendix.
- Tabulation of key laboratory analytical results for collected well water samples; mapping of key parameters to support alternative development and selection; and inclusion of all project-generated analytical laboratory reports as an appendix.
- Responses to comments, meeting minutes and/or agendas, and trip reports as Appendices.
- Two cost estimates for each alternative: one including Build America, Buy America (BABA) Act requirements and one without. At the planning phase of a project the source of construction funding is unknown and if construction of this project is federally funded, a cost analysis based on BABA requirements of the Infrastructure and Jobs Act is required. See General Conditions, Appendix A. Additional information is provided by the EPA, available at <https://www.epa.gov/system/files/documents/2022-11/OW-BABA-Implementation-Procedures-Final-November-2022.pdf>.
- Where applicable, the cost estimates should include remote monitoring.
- User fees for each alternative to ensure the necessary revenue for operations and maintenance costs is met. The user fees should be determined for service only to those homes within city limits and then service to all homes, including those outside city limits. If any subsidy is anticipated the costs with and without subsidy must be provided.
- Justification for any cost estimate contingencies greater than 10%.
- A description of the anticipated wastes generated during demolition and construction of the recommended alternative, along with a statement regarding their proposed proper disposal.
- Documentation of consultation of the proposed alternatives with the appropriate ADEC regulatory staff and other necessary consultations for environmental impacts.

- For each alternative, identification of any necessary associated geotechnical evaluation work and any site control issues, including potential impacts from coastal erosion.
- Operator Certification requirements of each alternative.
- Cost and lead time estimate of permitting requirements of each alternative.
- All labor-related capital cost estimates developed as part of any planning document will be based on a progressive, graduated scale of the current Minimum Rates of Pay published by the Alaska Department of Labor (<http://labor.alaska.gov/lss/pamp600.htm>).
- A statement of community preference, with supporting documentation, and description of any construction challenges in the Non-Monetary Factors for the Selection of an alternative.
- The table of contents shall have clickable links to each of the sections.

Revisions based on the Review Committee’s comments, as well as other comments provided by the Village Safe Water (VSW) Engineer, shall be incorporated into each PER at the next submittal.

- Each 65% Draft PER submittal shall include development of relevant options identified in the Alternatives Memo and incorporate responses to comments for the Alternatives Memo. The 65% Draft PER shall include an executive summary, as well as identify and describe the selected alternative. The 65% Draft PER will include all the field work findings associated with the project. It will include capital and operational cost estimates with a 25% level of confidence. The 65% Draft PER shall include the chapter addressing environmental effects, which is included in the PER outline. A meeting with the VSW Engineer, Community, Community-assigned Remote Maintenance Worker of the Regional Health Organization where applicable, and the contractor will occur after submission of the 65% Draft PER. The 65% Draft PER is subject to review by the Review Committee.
- The 95% Draft PER submittal shall include an executive summary, nearly final report, and final cost estimate. It will incorporate responses to comments on the 65% Draft PER. The 95% Draft PER must be free of all spelling and grammatical errors before submittal. A meeting with the VSW Engineer, Community, community-assigned Remote Maintenance Worker of the Regional Health Organization (where applicable), and the contractor will occur after submission of the 95% Draft PER, if necessary, as determined by the VSW Engineer in consultation with the identified representatives. The 95% Draft PER is subject to review by the Review Committee.
- The Final PER shall address and/or incorporate any comments from the 95% Draft PER. The Final PER is subject to review by the Review Committee, if the 95% Draft PER was not approved.

Task 3 – PER Deliverables

Document Type	Format
65% Draft PER	Electronic versions
95% Draft PER	Electronic versions
Final PER	In addition to the electronic versions, one (1) double-sided comb-bond paper copy sent to the community, and where used, native GIS shapefiles and CAD files of figures and maps presented within the PER.

Responses to comments on the Final
PER, if any

Electronic versions

Task 4 – ER

A single ER will be completed for the selected alternatives upon approval of the 95% Draft PER. The contractor shall complete the USDA RD Alaska Rural Villages Grants (RAVG) Program, State of Alaska Environmental Review Guide to Comply with 7 CFR 1970 form (USDA RD Environmental Review form Attachment 2) for the selected alternative and provide necessary supporting documentation. This form is to be used in lieu of the previously required Environmental Report and will be used to determine whether the project meets the criteria for categorical exclusion or if an Environmental Assessment (EA) is required. The contractor shall include the following in the ER:

- “VSW Project Nos. ANI0002 – 24RV47 and ANI0003 – 24AV78” on the ER cover page along with notation to identify the document version as Draft or Final.
- The Draft ER submittal shall include preliminary information described in the form and maps of the areas to be disturbed. The Draft ER is subject to review and comments by the VSW Environmental Analyst.
- The Final ER shall address and/or incorporate any comments from the Draft ER submittal. The Final ER must be free of all spelling and grammatical errors before submittal. The Final ER is subject to review and approval by the VSW Environmental Analyst and USDA Rural Development.

Task 4 – ER Deliverables

Document Type

Format

Draft ER

Electronic versions

Final ER

One (1) double-sided comb-bond paper copy sent to the community in addition to the electronic versions.

MILESTONES AND DELIVERABLES

The contractor is invited to propose a schedule based on the deliverables and milestones identified below. Note, however, as emphasized below, the intent is that the 95% Draft PER is to be submitted no later than the deadline for review and approval to support the community’s planned 2025 CIP Construction Project Funding application, the date of which is to be announced in 2025 and is anticipated to be in early March 2025. Contractors can expect a minimum of 30-day review time on all submittals to allow for review by the VSW engineer, community, Remote Maintenance Worker of the regional health organization (if applicable), and the Review Committee. Calendar days are used unless indicated otherwise.

Aniak Community Water Service and Wastewater System Preliminary Engineering	
Milestones and Deliverables:	Est. Calendar Days

Initial Project Kickoff Meeting	7 days after award
E-mail updates	14 days after award, and every two weeks thereafter
Trip Reports and Photos	7 days after site visits
Alternatives Memorandum	By July 15, 2024
65% Draft PER	42 days after comments are provided for the Alternatives Memorandum
95% Draft PER	28 days after comments on the 65% Draft PER are provided. <i><u>To be submitted no later than the deadline for review and approval to support the community's planned 2025 CIP Construction Funding application, date to be announced in 2025 and anticipated to be in early March 2025.</u></i>
Final PER and responses to comments on 95% Draft PER	21 days after comments for the 95% Draft PER are provided
Draft ER	15 days after comments on the 95% Draft PER are provided
Final ER	15 days after comments for the Draft ER are provided

BUDGET

The budget for the project is \$200,000.00 for the Site Visit, Alternatives Memo, PER and ER (Task 1 through Task 4). Cost proposals that exceed \$200,000 for Task 1 through 4 shall be deemed non-responsive.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Proposals shall be evaluated and scored as outlined below: There are 100 available evaluation points. Technical proposals shall not exceed 8 pages in length. The cost proposal does not count towards the technical proposal page count.

1. Project Understanding 25
points:
Offerors shall submit narrative statements describing their understanding of the community, its wastewater history and issues, the project needs, and scope of services.
2. Project Approach and Work Plan 35
points:
Offerors shall submit narrative statements regarding the planned approach to developing solutions including the project schedule, submittal of deliverables and availability of principal staff.
3. Relevant Experience 30
points:

Offerors shall submit narrative statements describing their experience with issues to be addressed in this PER such as water source and system capacity, wastewater treatment, permitting, and geotechnical investigations.

4. MBE/WBE Preference 5
points:
5. Cost proposal (1 page) 5
points:
 - i. Offerors shall use the attached cost proposal form and submit with their technical proposal as a separate attachment. Proposal costs shall be a fixed fee. Proposal costs identified as time and material shall be deemed non-responsive.
 - ii. Upon award the offeror shall submit a schedule of values, which shall coordinate with the SOW Task outline. Cost proposal shall include amount of hours for each task and hourly rate for each staff member and total hours for each task must be commensurate for the job function they are performing. Rates shall include all direct and indirect costs.

The Offeror with the highest scoring proposal will be issued a WO for the services outlined in this RFP. If the Offeror with the highest scoring proposal cannot complete the RFP, the Offeror with the next highest proposal score will be awarded a WO. The VSW Program reserves the right to add terms and conditions during contract negotiations or work order so long as they are within the scope of the RFP and will not affect the proposal ranking.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Cost Proposal Form
2. USDA Bulletin 1780-2 for the Water and Waste Disposal Program, 4/4/2013