

**Town of Stonington**  
**152 Elm Street**  
**Stonington, CT 06378**



## **Request for Proposals (RFP)**

---

### **Maritime Environmental Services for Stonington Harbor Wharf/Breakwater Restoration**

<u>Key RFP Dates</u>	
Issued:	February 6, 2015
Information Exchange:	February 13, 2015
Submit Questions By:	February 18, 2015
Submit Proposals By:	February 25, 2015
Oral Interviews:	March 9, 2015
Tentative Project Start Date:	March 30, 2015

RFP packages should be addressed to: Scot Deledda, Stonington Town Engineer, 152 Elm Street, Stonington, Connecticut 06378. All packages must be received in the Stonington Public Works Department no later than 3:30 p.m. on February 25, 2015. Responses received after said time will not be considered.

**RFP**

**Maritime Environmental Services for Stonington Harbor Wharf/Breakwater Restoration**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. Introduction.....	2
II. Scope of Services.....	4
III. Instructions to Bidders.....	4
IV. Proposer's Minimum Qualifications.....	6
V. Proposal Format and Content.....	6
VI. Evaluation and Selection.....	7

**Maritime Environmental Services for Stonington Harbor Wharf/Breakwater Restoration**

I. **Introduction**

A. History and Status of the Old Stonington Harbor Wharf/Breakwater

The so-called “Monsanto Breakwater” in Stonington Harbor is actually what is left of a stone pier built by the Federal Government in an undertaking that began only 13 years after the Battle of Stonington.

As Army Corps of Engineers records reveal, in 1827 Congress appropriated \$200 to plan a “pier.” A year later, \$20,000 was appropriated not only to build the pier, but in so doing, to create a structure that would have the added purpose of making Stonington “a good and secure harbor.” In 1830, with construction underway, a second appropriation of \$16,491.67 was made, with the note that, while the project would be located as planned, the “width on the top [was] being made but 12 feet, instead of 20 feet, as first proposed.”

This project was part of an ongoing Federal effort to make more Atlantic coast harbors commercially viable. However, from the first, when the designed width of the new structure was reduced, it is obvious that what was being built in Stonington was only seen in part as a commercially useful wharf. It was also (perhaps primarily) meant to be a breakwater — a barrier to protect the (deeper) east side of the harbor that, along with a natural barrier called Penguin Shoal to the west, would provide shelter from storm-driven waves for the harbor as a whole.

This pier / breakwater / shoal design was later deemed by Army Corps personnel to be ill judged in relation to its commercial objective. In 1871, Maj. G. K. Warren reported that although the “pier or breakwater” the Corps had built forty years earlier “has stood well...[it] would be more valuable if it had been built some place farther out on the point” because the location chosen (across from Penguin Shoal) makes the harbor “too contracted” for best commercial use. In the same year, the ACOE’s surveyor proposed that the old breakwater be physically moved to run west from Stonington Point, toward the new Wamphassuc Point breakwater the Corps was about to build. A petition signed by Borough Warden G. D. Stanton and 22 other leading local citizens supported this proposal, but a relocation never happened.

Whether or not it had been ideally located, that same survey reported that the structure built 40 years earlier was in good shape. It measured 12 feet wide, stood 8 ½ feet above mean low water, and was topped by seven courses of split granite. Stone mooring bollards ran down its length, and it was smoothly paved with cut stone. A handsome tower for a navigational light stood at its west end. For seventy more years the “pier / breakwater” remained a Stonington landmark, featured in prints and postcards of that era, a symbol of the community and a popular destination for walkers, artists, boaters and casual fishermen.

Then, nearly a half-century after the original pier / breakwater was created, the Corps built the two newer, outer breakwaters we see today as part of a “harbors of refuge” scheme. Much later, they not only abandoned maintenance of the old structure, but removed its natural “west arm” by blasting / dredging away Penguin Shoal so as to provide more anchorage space and a broader channel. The implicit, but unstated, assumption of the Corps in removing the shoal and abandoning the old structure must have been that the new outer breakwaters to the south made the combination of the shoal and old breakwater no longer necessary.

## RFP

### Maritime Environmental Services for Stonington Harbor Wharf/Breakwater Restoration

One result of that decision is that the old breakwater is today in abject disrepair. It is now effectively flush in many places with the sea at high water. Why? Not only has the structure been falling to pieces, but there has also been a rise in sea level — which, among other consequences, has reduced the efficacy and durability of *all* breakwaters, including those to the south. This change cannot be thought minor. Since the construction of the old pier / breakwater, the US Environmental Protection Agency estimates that mean sea level in this area has risen by a foot, and the historical rate of increase is expected to double by 2050 (\*). Battered by higher seas and unmaintained, the old “pier / breakwater” is crumbling. It is overtopped at places during ordinary spring tides, and the entire structure can become submerged during major storms. At such moments, storm driven surges that overwhelm the outer breakwaters (but the original structure once could bar) are no longer significantly impeded. The old pier / breakwater has ceased to be an effective source of protection for the harbor’s east side.

This process of deterioration has not only ended the structure’s utility as a pier (and with that, its once-popular use as a place to tie up watercraft, walk, and fish), but its other original purpose — to provide storm protection for vessels and structures on the east side of the harbor — is vanishing. The result: at times of strong southerly winds, most of the wharves on the east margin of Stonington Harbor are no longer considered safe places to moor vessels (even the south side of the newly reconstructed southern commercial-fishing pier has been found to be unsafe in such conditions). This risk is not “possible;” it is *present*. Storms Irene and Sandy in 2011 and 2012 resulted in the destruction and consequent removal of the outer half of “Skipper’s Wharf,” the first large dock to the north of the old breakwater. The worries of owners of shorefront properties about the danger that would result from breakaway floating docks have led to citizen action to prevent such docks from being built on the east side of the Harbor. And as a consequence of damage to (and resulting from) breakaway moored boats since Hurricane Bob in the early 1990’s, it has been assumed that many moorings in the Harbor are no longer secure in a serious storm. These outcomes give notice that the original purpose of Congress in 1827 to make Stonington “a good and secure harbor” is being compromised.

Stonington Harbor is a place of unique value. Geography made Stonington Harbor important, commercially, strategically, and recreationally. Located just inside the reefs and islands at the eastern end of Long Island Sound, geography continues to make the Harbor a special kind of resource. As a result of its location and water depth, the east side of Stonington Harbor remains the home of Connecticut’s last commercial fishing fleet. Even if foreign navies are no longer likely to attack Stonington, its strategic placement remains sufficiently important to justify the Department of Homeland Security’s recent grant to the Town for a new, state-of-the-art harbor-security Police Boat. And for the same geographic reasons, Stonington is also one of the Atlantic coast’s foremost havens for pleasure boats. It is home to nearly 500 of these vessels each summer, and hosts at least as many transient boats.

In all these ways, a “good and secure” Stonington Harbor is no less important for the well-being of the communities that surround it (and for the state and nation) than it was in 1827. That abiding practical objective — and the responsibility we all have to preserve what amounts to a major historic monument dating from the youth of our Republic — makes restoration of the harbor’s oldest — and still needed — protective structure imperative.

\* *Climate Change Indicators in the U.S.*, US EPA, 9/13/2013.

## RFP

### Maritime Environmental Services for Stonington Harbor Wharf/Breakwater Restoration

#### II. **Scope of Services**

##### A. Overview

1. The Town of Stonington in partnership with Stonington Harbor Wharf/Breakwater Task Force (Representing the Stonington Borough and the Stonington Harbor Management Commission) is seeking Maritime Environmental Engineering Services to frame a plan of restoration for the "Monsanto Breakwater" in Stonington Harbor so that it will obtain a Certificate of Permission from DEEP and a Category 1 Permission from the Army Corps of Engineers and liaison with the US Coast Guard (due to the presence of a navigational aid on the existing structure).
2. The ideal Service Provider shall, in addition to the assets described in section IV, have professional experience in the Stonington area or its immediate region, and with projects requiring approval by the relevant state and federal agencies (such as the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection, and the United States Army Corps of Engineers).
3. The Service Provider will report directly to the Town of Stonington's Director of Public Works and the Stonington Harbor Wharf/Breakwater Task Force. All written correspondence will be received by the Town of Stonington, Department of Public Works.

- B. Goals: to develop and present a detailed plan / permitting process for the restoration and reconstruction of the historic Stonington Harbor Wharf. This plan will be designed to provide the best possible combination of improved public access to the water, enhanced protection from storms, and durable construction, while conserving the historic appearance and character of the original structure.

##### C. Services

1. The Service Provider shall perform these services:
  - a. Conduct a site evaluation to observe and document existing relevant conditions, take photographs and compile pertinent tidal data.
  - b. Arrange for a topographic and bathymetric survey of the structure and waters within a hundred feet.
  - c. Prepare conceptual plans of the proposed work which shall be developed so as to support the fullest possible public understanding of the project in its historic as well as immediate and practical contexts.
  - d. Conduct preliminary coordination of conceptual project plans with the US Army Corps of Engineers and CT DEEP.
  - e. Prepare and submit USACOE and CT DEEP Certificate of Permission permit application documents.
  - f. Respond to comments during the permitting process to obtain a final determination of approval and conditions for the proposed restoration.
  - g. Final deliverables will be determined during the preparation of the final professional contract.

#### III. **Instructions to Bidders**

- A. Information Exchange Meeting. The Town and Harbor Wharf/Breakwater Task Force will conduct an Information Exchange meeting on February 13, 2015 at 4:00 PM at the Stonington Town Hall located at 152 Elm Street, Stonington CT 06378. The purpose of

## RFP

### Maritime Environmental Services for Stonington Harbor Wharf/Breakwater Restoration

this meeting is to cover the requirements to submit your proposal and give a brief review of the Scope of Services. All prospective Proposers are encouraged to attend.

- B. Examination of Proposal Documents. By submitting a proposal, the Proposer represents that it has thoroughly examined and become familiar with the work required under this RFP, and that it is capable of performing quality work to achieve the Town and Harbor Wharf/Breakwater Task Force's goals.
- C. Questions. Questions or comments regarding this RFP must be submitted electronically to [sdeledda@stonington-ct.gov](mailto:sdeledda@stonington-ct.gov) no later than February 18, 2015. Inquiries received after the date and time stated above shall not be accepted.
- D. Addenda. If changes to the RFP are required, the Town will issue an addendum to all Proposers via email. All Addenda, if any, must be acknowledged.
- E. Submission of Proposals. All Proposers are required to submit eight (8) copies of their proposal. Proposals must be submitted before the closing time set forth in this RFP or as changed by addenda.
- F. Required Documents:
  - 1. The proposal shall contain the following items in order and placed at the front of the proposal:
    - a. Response Cover Letter
    - b. Proposers Subcontractors
    - c. Fee Schedule
    - d. Statement of Qualifications
  - 2. The Town and Harbor Wharf/Breakwater Task Force will conduct a preliminary review of the proposals to determine if the above items and copies are included as required in the RFP. If a proposal does not include all items fully completed, the proposal may be considered not responsive.
  - 3. The Proposer shall provide in the Response Cover Letter the name of the authorized representative who has the authority to enter into a binding agreement if selected. The cover letter shall also summarize why the Proposer believes they should be selected by the Town and Harbor Wharf/Breakwater Task Force to provide subject services.

G. Agreement Type:

The Agreement services shall be compensated on a negotiated basis as established in the Fee Schedule. The anticipated start date is March 30, 2015 and all work must be complete by June 30, 2015, in accordance to the conditions of the grant. This project is being funded through a \$30,000 grant provided by Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection, Bureau of Water Protection and Land Reuse, Office of Long Island Sound Programs. The selected firm must meet all requirements of the State Grant Contract.

**Maritime Environmental Services for Stonington Harbor Wharf/Breakwater Restoration**

**IV. Proposer's Minimum Qualifications**

General Qualifications. The Proposer shall have sufficient experience and comprehensive knowledge of maritime engineering and environmental services to perform the work as described in the scope of services.

- A. Proposer shall possess required certifications, licenses, and equipment required to complete the work. This shall be clearly identified in the Proposal.
- B. Proposer must demonstrate relevant experience in four (4) projects performed in the last ten (10) years. Particular relevant projects requiring USACOE and CT DEEP Certificate of Permission permit applications and maritime structure restoration.
- C. References from these four (4) projects with similar requirements in the last ten (10) years must be provided.

**V. Proposal Format and Content**

**A. Format**

- 1. Proposers shall include the required items stated in Section III Instructions to Bidders, Paragraph F, Required Documents.
- 2. Proposals shall be typed, as brief as possible, and not include any unnecessary promotional material.
- 3. The Proposal shall be printed using standard 8-1/2 x 11" paper.
- 4. The nature and form of the response are at the discretion of those responding, but shall include the information listed below.

**B. Content**

- 1. Experience of Proposed Staff. Resume and experience of principal, project managers and key engineers and designers who would be assigned to the project;
  - a. Indicated the extent of training the members of the Team have received relevant to the project.
  - b. Provide examples of where the proposed team members have been assigned to similar projects.
  - c. Sub-Contractor qualifications and roles, if any.
  - d. Identify which services would be provided in-house and those by Sub-Contractor if any. Proposer must present an organizational chart of its planned staff (internal and external) including resumes, biographies where appropriate.
  - e. The Proposer shall identify how they would staff this project. The Proposer shall identify project team members by name, location, specific responsibilities on the project and the estimated person-hours of participation.
  - f. The Proposers key personnel shall be identified and will be an important factor considered by the Selection Review Panel. There can be no change of key personnel once the proposal is submitted, without the prior approval of the Town.
- 2. Approach to the Project. The proposer shall present a well-conceived work plan that establishes the Proposers understanding of, and ability to satisfy Town's objectives and work requirements. Proposer shall succinctly describe the proposed approach for addressing the required work, outlining activities that would be undertaken in completing the various tasks, and specifying who would perform them. Include a timetable for completing all work specified in the Scope of Services. The Proposer

## RFP

### Maritime Environmental Services for Stonington Harbor Wharf/Breakwater Restoration

may also suggest technical or procedural innovations that have been used successfully on other projects and which may facilitate the completion of this project.

3. Capability to Perform
  - a. Ability to complete work within required time. Availability and continuity of staff during course of the project.
  - b. This section shall include a brief description of the Proposer and Sub-Contractor's qualifications and previous experience on similar or related projects. Description of pertinent project experience shall include a summary of the work performed, the total project cost, the percentage of work the firm was responsible for, the period over which the work was completed, and the name, title, and phone number of clients to be contacted for references. Give a brief statement of the firm's adherence to the schedule and budget for each project.
4. Cost/Pricing Information. Proposer shall submit a fee schedule in their submittal including the proposed required labor classifications/position titles and a rate schedule with fully burdened hourly billing rates for positions listed in form.
5. Firm's Relevant Experience. The Proposer should describe its relevant experience in each of the following areas:
  - a. Description of services similar to those proposed above, and with ongoing appropriate contracts to agencies of comparable size.
  - b. Experience in each of the areas noted in the Scope of Services.
  - c. This section shall include a brief description of the firm's size and structure.

#### VI. Evaluation and Selection

- A. Evaluation Criteria/Matrix. The following criteria and matrix shall be used to evaluate proposals:
  1. Experience of Proposed Staff. Experience of Project Manager with similar scope of services. Experience of project team with similar scope of services. Years staff has been assigned to similar scope of services. Level of education, training, licensing. Certification of staff. Proposer's sub-contractor qualifications and roles, if any.
  2. Approach to the Project. Demonstrated understanding of the Town and Task Force's needs and solicitation requirements. Approach is well organized and presented in a clear, concise and logical manner. Availability and proposed use of technology and methodologies. Quality control and thoroughness is well defined
  3. Capability to Perform. Ability to complete work within deadlines. Availability and continuity of staff during the course of the agreement, if selected.
  4. Cost and Price. Reasonableness of the total price and competitiveness of this amount with other offers received; adequacy of data in support of figures quoted; reasonableness of individual rates; basis on which rates are quoted.
  5. Firms Relevant Experience. Experience in performing similar services for organization of similar size to the Town. Experience with public agencies. Years of experience with these types of services.

## RFP

### Maritime Environmental Services for Stonington Harbor Wharf/Breakwater Restoration

#### B. Evaluation Procedure

1. A Selection Review Panel, generally made up of Town and Task Force staff, will review the proposals and establish a list of finalists based on pre-established review criteria. The names of the Selection Review Panel members are not revealed prior to the interviews. The Selection Review Panel may interview the finalists. If interviews are conducted, the proposer should allow approximately 1 hour for the oral interview and a question and answer session. The Project Manager must lead a 15 minute presentation before the Selection Review Panel. Interviews may be conducted on March 9, 2015. Each Proposer is asked to keep these dates open. No other interview dates will be provided.
2. The Selection Review Panel will evaluate the proposals. The rating and evaluation forms prepared by Panel members will not be revealed. The scores in the evaluation matrix shown below DO NOT indicate a "winning score" and the highest score is not guaranteed selection. The final decision is at the discretion of the Town and is based on the scores, reference checks, negotiated pricing, and further analysis of the proposals including any risks associated with selecting any proposal. The Proposer providing the best value to the project will be selected and not necessarily the lowest cost.

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	FIRM A		FIRM B		FIRM C	
		Score	Total	Score	Total	Score	Total
Experience of Proposed Staff	10						
Approach to Project	9						
Capability to Perform	8						
Cost and Price	6						
Firm's Relevant Experience	7						
Totals							

- C. Award. When the Selection Review Panel has completed its work, the Town may negotiate for the extent of services to be rendered and the method of compensation. Because Town may award without conducting negotiations, the proposal submitted shall contain the Proposer's most favorable terms and conditions.