

**Request for Proposals
Evaluation of Nutrient Cycling in Willard Spur,
Great Salt Lake, Utah**

**Utah Department of Environmental Quality
Division of Water Quality**

PURPOSE OF REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

The purpose of this Request for Proposals (RFP) is to enter into a contract with a qualified State university or federal agency to evaluate nutrient cycling within the Willard Spur ecosystem of Great Salt Lake. The goal of the study is to better understand the key processes that regulate nutrient cycling and to identify indicators that the Division of Water Quality (DWQ) can use to assess the condition of the Willard Spur wetlands. It is anticipated that this RFP may result in a contract award to a single offeror.

This RFP is designed to provide interested offerors with sufficient basic information to submit proposals meeting minimum requirements; however, it is not intended to limit a proposal's content or exclude any relevant or essential data. Offerors are encouraged to expand upon the specifications included here to describe service capabilities that may add value under any contract agreement.

PROJECT BACKGROUND

The DWQ, the Willard Spur Steering Committee (SC), and the Willard Spur Science Panel (SP) worked throughout 2011 to develop a research program that would answer the question: *What water quality standards are fully protective of the beneficial uses of Willard Spur as they relate to the proposed publically owned treatment works (POTW) discharge?* During 2011, these groups prepared and executed a baseline sampling plan and developed research objectives for subsequent years. The baseline sampling plan, sampling operating procedures (SOPs), meeting summaries, and Proposed Research Plan can be found at the project website: www.willardspur.utah.gov. The Proposed Research Plan includes three different research areas to be phased over a 3-year period (see Proposed Research Plan, dated October 27, 2011).

This RFP is for the work to be completed for Research Area No. 3 – Eutrophication Responses. This work is intended to better understand how nutrients are cycled within Willard Spur and identify critical thresholds in response. These relationships will be important inputs to work completed by others in the other two research areas, as well as to the overall program objective.

DWQ and the Jordan River/Farmington Bay Water Quality Council have previously completed important work to understand how nutrients are cycled in Great Salt Lake wetlands (Cavitt, 2006; CH2M HILL, 2004 and 2006; Gray, 2005, 2009, and 2010; Miller and Hoven, 2007; Miller et al. 2011; Rushforth and

Rushforth, 2006a and 2006b; and DWQ, 2009). While much has been learned, much work remains to understand the natural nutrient cycle in impounded or open water wetlands of Great Salt Lake. The SP feels it is important to first understand if and when natural responses occur before beginning to then investigate critical thresholds that trigger an induced change in response in these wetlands.

The objective of Research Area No. 3 – Eutrophication Responses is to understand the key processes that regulate nutrient cycling and to identify indicators that DWQ can use to assess the condition of Willard Spur wetlands.

ISSUING OFFICE

CH2M HILL Engineers, Inc. is serving as Project Manager for this effort and is the issuing office for this RFP and all subsequent addenda relating to it, on behalf of DWQ. The contract and funds for the work proposed as part of this RFP will be directly with the State of Utah, DWQ.

ELIGIBLE INSTITUTIONS

Collaborative efforts are encouraged, but due to purchasing rules the primary offeror must be affiliated with a State of Utah university or the United States Geological Survey (USGS)—who has a previously established financial relationship with DWQ for conducting Great Salt Lake research. Any contract resulting from this RFP will be directly between the State of Utah university or federal agency and the State of Utah using the State of Utah’s standard terms and conditions.

SUBMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

Upon receipt of this RFP, all offerors are required to notify Sandy Schut/CH2M HILL at sandra.schut@ch2m.com by email that it is the offeror’s intent to submit a proposal. This shall be done by February 10, 2012 and will facilitate dissemination of possible addenda to this RFP or answers to questions.

Final proposals must be received by 5:00pm MDT, Friday, March 2, 2012. Proposals received after the deadline will be ineligible for consideration.

The preferred method for submitting proposals is electronically by email to Sandy Schut/CH2M HILL at sandra.schut@ch2m.com . However, if hard copies are submitted, please include one (1) original and six (6) identical copies, along with a CD containing an electronic copy of your proposal. Proposals must be received and recorded at the following address by the same deadline identified above:

CH2M HILL
215 South State Street, #1000
Salt Lake City, Utah 84115

When submitting a proposal electronically through email, please allow sufficient time to complete the online forms and upload documents and the combined size of attachments cannot exceed 10MB. You may send multiple emails but each email cannot exceed 10MB in size. The solicitation will end at the closing time listed above as marked as the receipt time on the email received.

All materials submitted become the property of the State of Utah. Materials may be evaluated by anyone designated by the State as part of the proposal evaluation committee. Materials submitted may be returned only at the State's option.

LENGTH OF CONTRACT

The Contract resulting from this RFP will be for a period of 4 years. The contract may be extended beyond the original contract period on a year-to-year basis for up to 2 additional years at the State's discretion and by mutual agreement.

PRICE GUARANTEE PERIOD

All pricing must be guaranteed for 6 months. Following the guarantee period, any request for price adjustment must be for an equal guarantee period and must be made at least 30 days prior to the effective date. Requests for price adjustment must include sufficient documentation supporting the request. Any adjustment or amendment to the contract will not be effective unless approved by the DWQ. The State will be given the immediate benefit of any decrease in the market, or allowable discount.

QUESTIONS

All questions must be submitted through email to Sandy Schut/CH2M HILL at sandra.schut@ch2m.com . Answers will be given via email and provided to all offerors.

DETAILED SCOPE OF WORK

PURPOSE AND INTENT

The primary objective of this project is to understand the key processes that regulate nutrient cycling and to identify indicators that DWQ can use to assess the condition of Willard Spur wetlands. This information will be important input to nutrient budget and food web models developed in other elements of DWQ's Willard Spur research program.

Tasks to be performed by the offeror under the Research Area No. 3 – Eutrophication Responses project are detailed below.

TASK 1. COORDINATION AND REPORTING

The offeror will prepare a Work Plan that includes the Scope of Work, schedule, level of effort, budget, deliverables, communication plan (e.g., lines of communication), safety plan, and change management plan (e.g., methods to proactively identify and manage change) for the information of DWQ and review by the SP. Draft and final SOPs and Data Quality Objectives (DQOs) for studies to be completed in Tasks 3 and 4 per EPA (2006) will be developed prior to beginning field or laboratory work. The offeror will maintain and update the Work Plan, SOPs, and DQOs as required.

DWQ has prepared a draft Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) and draft Great Salt Lake SOPs that will be reviewed and implemented by the offeror. The offeror should provide any comments to DWQ and

gain endorsement of any changes in methods from DWQ and the SP prior to implementation. All SOPs will be documented prior to beginning work for review by DWQ, the SP, and possibly an outside, independent peer reviewer.

Required coordination includes the following:

- Facilitate a kickoff meeting with DWQ to discuss the Work Plan (including Scope of Work, schedule, budget, and deliverables), coordination, safety, and change management.
- Inform DWQ of any changes that may affect the Work Plan as soon as practicable after they are identified.
- Provide laboratory analytical data to DWQ for integration into the program database (database to be managed by DWQ). The offeror is responsible for meeting the requirements of DWQ's QAPP and SOPs. Data will be made public after review and acceptance by SP after the conclusion of the project.
- Make monthly telephone contact with DWQ's project manager to provide an overview of progress.
- Attend a quarterly project coordination meeting facilitated by DWQ to coordinate efforts among the program's offerors. It is assumed that DWQ will facilitate coordination among the various program offerors.
- Coordinate activities with other offerors as required; include DWQ's project manager in all e-mail correspondence.
- Provide a quarterly progress update to DWQ and the SP at quarterly SP meetings.

It is assumed that laboratory analysis of water, sediment, and macroinvertebrate samples will generally be completed through a separate DWQ contract to help ensure comparability with related research efforts on Willard Spur.

Provide draft and final deliverables as described in the tasks below. It is assumed that all data and draft deliverables will be reviewed by DWQ, the SP, and possibly an outside, independent peer reviewer. The offeror will work with DWQ and the reviewers to discuss review comments and identify changes to be included in the final datasets and documents. DWQ will rely upon the SP for final acceptance of work products.

DELIVERABLES

1. Work Plan
2. Review comments for DWQ's QAPP and SOPs (as pertaining to this Scope of Work)
3. DQOs for proposed experiments
4. Detailed SOPs
5. Laboratory QAPP and SOPs if using laboratories for items not specified above
6. Meeting summaries
7. Quarterly progress updates at DWQ coordination meetings and SP meetings

TASK 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The objective of the literature review is to provide an overview of significant literature published on the interaction and effects of nutrients in the water column and sediment on primary producers (e.g., submerged aquatic and emergent vegetation, epiphytes, algae, etc.) and macroinvertebrates in freshwater open water wetland systems that are similar to the ecosystem found in Willard Spur. The focus of this review will be on identifying information and analytical, experimental, and sampling methods that will help identify critical response thresholds to nutrients in Willard Spur.

The literature review should be completed using typical methods of chain-of-citation and electronic database searches and consultation with leading researchers. The offeror will use the Zotero interface (www.zotero.org) to collect, organize, cite, and share the identified literature. Electronic or hard copies of the original documents will be provided to DWQ. Annotations will be captured as notes within Zotero to describe how each piece of literature confirms or redirects the proposed experimental/sampling approach for Tasks 3 and 4. The offeror will prepare a Technical Memorandum that includes a summary of methods, an annotated bibliography from Zotero, and key recommendations pertinent to later work elements. A draft will be submitted to DWQ for review by DWQ and the SP. Comments will be discussed with the offeror and incorporated by the offeror into the final document.

DELIVERABLES

1. An electronic or hard copy of the original documents included in the literature review
2. Draft and Final Technical Memorandum (3 hard copies and an electronic copy)

TASK 3. BASELINE UNDERSTANDING

As described above, the SP is interested in first understanding if, when, and why natural responses or changes occur in the water, sediment, macroinvertebrates, and vegetative communities of Willard Spur wetlands. Significant changes were noted in the water column of Willard Spur during the months of August – October 2011. Experiments are envisioned for the first year (2012) that will provide this understanding as well as indicate how changed water nutrient concentrations could trigger a response and how sediment with much higher nutrient/organic content (e.g., as found in Farmington Bay wetlands) could influence these relationships. This understanding will provide a baseline of the “natural, existing condition” that can be used to inform experiments completed in Task 4.

The offeror will work to answer the following question: *How do internal nutrient processes (i.e., uptake, storage, and release) vary in Willard Spur wetlands throughout the growing season (April – October,) and how might increased water column nutrients and sediment nutrients affect these processes?* To answer these questions, DWQ requests that the offeror propose and complete an experimental study(ies) to understand: 1) how existing nutrient cycling processes and *in situ* conditions change during the 2012 growing season, 2) how increased water column nutrient concentrations might trigger responses in these internal processes and subsequently to the biological indicators identified in Tasks 1 and 2 above, and 3) the relative influence of sediment vs. water column nutrients and organics in triggering these responses.

Offerors are encouraged to propose creative experimental approaches that are collectively aimed at establishing cause and effect relationships between increased nutrients and potential deleterious responses to biological indicators. For instance proposed experiments may include, but may not

necessarily be limited to, manipulated enclosures within Willard Spur and potentially within similar wetland with higher concentrations of nutrients and organics. (e.g., in Farmington Bay impounded wetlands). Descriptions of the experimental approaches proposed for 2012 should be as descriptive as possible, including: size and design of experimental units, number of replicates, and analytical methods.

If needed, DWQ will assist the offeror in identifying and securing the agreements required to complete the experimental study in Willard Spur and in an impounded wetland site in Farmington Bay if needed. The offeror cannot rely upon DWQ to provide transportation to project sites. While a habitat with a water depth of 12 to 24 inches and fresh water is the preferred focus, DWQ requests the offeror to provide a recommended approach.

The offeror will prepare an Interim Report summarizing methods, observed responses and conditions, and possible trigger mechanisms for conditions observed in experiments conducted in 2012. The Interim Report should also recommend and prioritize possible indicators that can be used to assess wetland conditions (see defining characteristics of indicators in Sutula, et al, 2011). The offeror will present the Draft Interim Report to the SP in January 2013, along with recommendations for possible triggers to be investigated as part of Task 4.

DELIVERABLES

1. Draft and Final Interim Report (7 hard copies and an electronic copy)

TASK 4. DEFINING THRESHOLD VALUES

The objective of Task 4 is to investigate the viability of a minimum of three indicators, identified by work completed in Task 3, for use in assessing the biological integrity of Willard Spur wetlands. Experiments will be conducted to define possible threshold values for these indicators that identify concentrations or loads of nutrients that can be expected to result in the degradation of key water quality indicators.

The offeror will propose and complete experimental studies that further investigate and define three possible indicators, as identified in Task 3. The offeror should, at a minimum, identify and propose an approach, i.e., Scope of Work, in their proposal to address the following three possible indicators: macroinvertebrates, phytoplankton biomass and productivity, and macroalgal biomass and cover. It is assumed that the actual indicators to be addressed, as well as the Scope of Work for Task 4, could change based upon the results of Task 3. The approach should include the experimental and analytical requirements to define possible threshold values for thresholds, if any, where increased nutrients can be anticipated to trigger a deleterious response in water quality indicators.

The offeror will prepare an Interim Report summarizing the results of the studies completed for Task 4, as well as conclusions and recommendations to the SP. The Interim Report should, at a minimum, address the following:

- The viability of each indicator to be used for assessing wetland conditions
- Factors that may affect the viability of each indicator
- Determination of the uncertainty related to each indicator

- Threshold values for each indicator that would trigger a direct response to nutrients
- Suggestions for additional primary or secondary indicators and associated research to investigate their viability

The offeror will present the Draft Interim Report to the SP in January 2014, along with recommendations for possible triggers to be investigated as part of Task 4. It is assumed that analysis of water and sediment samples will be completed through a separate DWQ contract. The offeror is responsible for meeting the requirements of DWQ's QAPP.

DELIVERABLES

1. Draft and Final Interim Report (7 hard copies and an electronic copy)

TASK 5. FINAL REPORT

The offeror will integrate the Interim Reports (Tasks 3 and 4) into one Final Report and submit it to DWQ. A 5- to 10-page Executive Summary will be included as part of the Draft and Final Report. It is assumed that results and data from this project will be integrated and used by DWQ, along with results and data from other offerors, for the purposes of this research program.

The offeror will attend at least quarterly coordination meetings with other offerors through December 2014 and at least two 1-day workshops in the spring of 2015 to discuss results with the other offerors and the SP.

DELIVERABLES

1. Draft and Final Report (25 hard copies and an electronic copy)
2. Copy of all field forms, models, and analytical data

All information, reports, models, tables, data, and supporting documents shall become property of the DWQ upon delivery.

PROJECT SCHEDULE

The overall Willard Spur research program will be phased over a 3-year period beginning in March 2012 and ending in 2015. Time is of the essence, and it is critical that the offeror prepare a detailed schedule for review and acceptance by DWQ and meet all agreed-upon milestones. The offeror will be expected to coordinate with the project team on a regular basis. Any issues that could affect reaching any milestone will be communicated to DWQ as soon as they are identified. DWQ will work with the offeror to identify and implement contingency plans in the event of delays. The offeror is asked to provide a detailed schedule that corresponds with the following proposed work and required milestones:

- Kickoff meeting: April 15, 2012
- Submit draft Literature Review Technical Memorandum for review: June 30, 2012
- Provide status update and summary of observations to the SP at their meeting: July 12, 2012
- Submit Final Literature Review Technical Memorandum: September 30, 2012

- Provide status update, summary of observations, and preliminary recommendations to the SP at their meeting: October 11, 2012
- Submit draft Task 3 Interim Report: January 18, 2013, final document 30 days after receipt of comments from DWQ
- Submit draft Task 4 Interim Report: January 17, 2014, final document 30 days after receipt of comments from DWQ
- Submit Final Report: June 30, 2014
- Project complete: May 2015

PROJECT BUDGET

DWQ, in consultation with the SP, has identified a maximum budget of \$250,000 for this project. The offeror is encouraged to propose an approach that addresses the objectives identified above and provides for contingencies deemed appropriate by the offeror. It is assumed that the identified contingency funds could be used to address any changes in the Scope of Work or, with the approval of the SP, to investigate additional indicators and/or factors that materially influence nutrient cycling in the Willard Spur wetlands. The offeror is encouraged to leverage DWQ's funds to solicit other funding sources; however, all work completed under this contract must be approved by DWQ and the SP.

PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

Offerors are encouraged to recommend, through their proposed approach and methods, the processes they would employ to efficiently and effectively answer the questions and address the objectives listed in the Scope of Work above. Offerors should, at a minimum, address the tasks and deliverables in the identified Scope of Work. If the offeror recommends a variance to the specified approach, these recommendations should be provided in addition to the required Scope of Work, should be clearly defined as a proposed variance, and should highlight why the proposed variance provides a better result. The proposed work must meet the required schedule and budget and should effectively tie into and support the investigations defined in the Proposed Research Plan identified above.

PROPOSAL RESPONSE FORMAT

Proposals should be limited to a maximum of 25 single-sided pages, not counting the Executive Summary or appendices containing CVs or resumes, applicable publications, or other relevant materials. CVs or resumes should be limited to two single-sided pages for each individual. The proposal should be prepared on standard 8.5 x 11-inch paper but may include up to two single-sided, 11 x 17-inch pages as part of the overall 25-page limit.

All proposals must include the following:

1. **Executive Summary.** The Executive Summary should be no more than two pages in length and should briefly describe the offeror's proposal, highlighting its major features. The reader should be able to determine the essence of the proposal by reading the Executive Summary. The

Executive Summary shall indicate any requirements that cannot be met by the offeror. The Executive Summary will not be included in the overall proposal page count.

2. **Project Team.** Offerors shall clearly identify the Principal Investigator, the project team, and their qualifications for completing the work elements identified in the Scope of Work. The specific role and responsibilities of each individual shall be indicated. Provide a brief description of each person, the university/agency/firm they work for, their location, and their qualifications to complete the work. Identify the availability of the project personnel by showing the percent time the team members have available to work on this project. The education and research experience (i.e., CV or resume) of each project team member should be provided in an appendix to the proposal. Resumes and CVs will not be included in the overall proposal page count but should be limited to two pages per individual.
3. **Project Experience.** Offerors shall convey their understanding and knowledge of and demonstrate experience with researching key processes that regulate nutrient cycling and identifying indicators that can be used to assess the condition of wetlands. Preference will be given to research teams that together have direct experience evaluating nutrient cycling in wetlands. Provide information about other work performed by the team on projects similar to this project and at least three references from other clients with whom the team has performed similar work. If appropriate, provide a copy and/or web URL with links to applicable publications that represent efforts comparable in scope and provide supporting material for the proposal.
4. **Project Schedule.** Offerors shall provide a proposed schedule to complete the project Scope of Work within the milestones identified in this RFP.
5. **Detailed Scope of Work and Approach.** This section should constitute the major portion of the proposal. Offerors shall provide the following information, at a minimum:
 - A complete narrative of the offeror's assessment of the work to be performed, the offeror's ability and approach, and the resources necessary to fulfill the requirements. This should demonstrate the offeror's understanding of the desired overall performance expectations. Clearly indicate any options or alternatives proposed, a list of assumptions pertaining to the effort, and deliverables to be provided to the State.
 - A specific point-by-point response, in the order listed, to each requirement in the RFP.
 - A summary spreadsheet of the amount of time to be spent by each individual on each task identified in the Scope of Work. Link tasks to project schedule.
 - Stated assumptions regarding types and numbers of samples to be analyzed through DWQ contracts.
6. **Cost Proposal.** Cost will be evaluated independently from the technical proposal and will be based upon the cost to DWQ to deliver the Scope of Work defined above. Costs for options or suggestions that are supplemental to the Scope of Work above should be noted in the Cost Proposal. In kind services and/or funds from other sources shall also be defined along with a

reasonable documentation of a commitment of those funds, if applicable. Offerors shall enumerate all costs including delineation of labor and expenses. Labor costs should include the number of hours and applicable hourly rates. Provide a subtotal of labor and expenses by task with a final, total, not-to-exceed cost for the proposed work.

The COST PROPOSAL must be separate from the TECHNICAL PROPOSAL. Do not include any cost information within the technical proposal. Email the cost proposal as a separate attachment if proposal is submitted by email, or include it in a separate, sealed envelope inside the primary envelope with any hard copy proposal submission. This allows the evaluation committee to evaluate technical proposals without cost information included.

SELECTION CRITERIA

Proposals will be reviewed and scored by the selection committee, comprised of DWQ's project manager and the SP. Appendix A to this RFP includes a sample scoring sheet. The cost line item will be calculated by DWQ based upon the proposed cost to DWQ. The SP's recommendation will be reviewed by DWQ and a final recommendation forwarded to the SC for review and approval.

At the sole discretion of DWQ, an oral presentation by an offeror may be required to clarify a proposal. However, DWQ may award a contract based on the initial proposals received without discussion with the offeror. If oral presentations are required, they will be scheduled after the submission of proposals. Proposals and oral presentations are made at the offeror's expense.

REFERENCES

- Cavitt, J.F. 2006. Productivity and Foraging Ecology of Two Co-existing Shorebirds Breeding at Great Salt Lake, Utah: 2005-2006. Report prepared for Utah Department of Environmental Quality, Division of Water Quality. 2006.
- CH2M HILL. 2004. Statistical Analysis of 2004 Data on Wetland Plants and Invertebrates in Farmington Bay, Great Salt Lake, Utah. Technical Memorandum prepared for the Utah Department of Environmental Quality, Division of Water Quality. September 2005.
- CH2M HILL. 2006. Analysis of 2005 Data on Wetland Biota and Water Quality in Farmington Bay, Great Salt Lake, Utah. Technical Memorandum prepared for the Utah Department of Environmental Quality, Division of Water Quality. November 2006.
- Gray, L.J. 2005. Composition of Macroinvertebrate Communities of the Great Salt Lake Wetlands and Relationships to Water Chemistry. Report prepared for the Utah Department of Environmental Quality, Water Quality Management Section. March 2005.
- Gray, L.J. 2009. Macroinvertebrates in the Wetlands of the Great Salt Lake 2007. Completion report for the Utah Division of Water Quality, Dept. of Environmental Quality, Water Quality Management Section.

Gray, L.J. 2010. Macroinvertebrates in the Wetlands of the Great Salt Lake 2009. Completion report for the Utah Division of Water Quality, Dept. of Environmental Quality, Water Quality Management Section.

Miller, T.G., and Hoven, H.M. 2007. Ecological and Beneficial Use Assessment of Farmington Bay Wetlands: Assessment and Site-Specific Nutrient Criteria Methods Development, Phase I. Progress Report to EPA, Region VIII and Final Report for Grant: CD988706-03. April 2007.

Rushforth, S.R., and Rushforth, S.J. 2006a. A Study of the Periphyton Flora of Samples Collected from East-Shore Great Salt Lake Wetlands: Fall 2004. Report prepared for Utah Department of Environmental Quality, Division of Water Quality. May 2006.

Rushforth, S.R., and Rushforth, S.J. 2006b. A Study of the Phytoplankton Flora of Samples Collected from East-Shore Great Salt Lake Wetlands, Summer 2005. Report prepared for Utah Department of Environmental Quality, Division of Water Quality. May 2006.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2006. Guidance on Systematic Planning Using the Data Quality Objective Process. EPA Office of Environmental Information. Report No. EPA/240/B-06/001. Washington, D.C.

Utah Division of Water Quality (DWQ). 2009. Development of an Assessment Framework for Impounded Wetlands of Great Salt Lake. November 2009.

Appendix A – RFP Evaluation Scoresheet Evaluation of Nutrient Cycling in Willard Spur, Great Salt Lake, Utah

Score will be assigned as follows:

Offeror Name: _____
Evaluator: _____
Date: _____

- 0 = Failure, no response
- 1 = Poor, inadequate, fails to meet requirement
- 2 = Fair, only partially responsive
- 3 = Average, meets minimum requirement
- 4 = Above average, exceeds minimum requirement
- 5 = Superior

		Score (0-5)	Weight	Points
1. Scope of Services (50 points possible)				
• Meets Defined Objectives	10 points possible		X 2	
• Technical Approach	30 points possible		X 6	
• Examples of Relevant Past Work	5 points possible		X 1	
• Realistic allocation of hours for each element	5 points possible		X 1	
2. Specific Staff Experience (25 points possible)				
• Expertise of staff involved in project	10 points possible		X 2	
• Direct experience in specific technical area	10 points possible		X 2	
• Demonstrated ability to produce timely deliverables	5 points possible		X 1	
3. Timeframe (5 points possible)				
• Demonstrated ability to complete project within required time	5 points possible		X 1	
4. Cost (20 points possible)				
	20 points possible		*	
TOTAL EVALUATION POINTS		100 points possible	Total*	

* The following cost formula will be used: The points assigned to each offerors cost proposal will be based on the lowest Proposed Price, i.e., cost to DWQ. The offeror with the lowest Proposed Price will receive 100% of the price points. All other offerors will receive a portion of the total cost points based on what percentage higher their Proposed Price is than the Lowest Proposed Price. An offeror whose Proposed Price is more than double (200%) the Lowest Proposed Price will receive no points. The formula to compute the points is: Cost Points x (2-Proposed Price/Lowest Proposed Price).