



**CITY OF MORRO BAY
WATER RECLAMATION FACILITY
CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (WRFCAC)
NOTICE OF SPECIAL MEETING**

The City of Morro Bay provides essential public services and infrastructure to maintain a safe, clean and healthy place for residents and visitors to live, work and play.

SPECIAL MEETING AGENDA

June 12, 2018

3:00 P.M.

**Morro Bay Veteran's Memorial Building
209 Surf Street, Morro Bay, CA**

Barbara Spagnola
Vice Chairperson

Paul Donnelly

Doug Rogers

Vacant

Valerie Levulett

Richard Sadowski,
Planning Commission

Stephen Shively,
Public Works Advisory Board

ESTABLISH QUORUM AND CALL TO ORDER

PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

SPECIAL AGENDA MEETING ITEM

I. DESIGN BUILD TEAM SELECTION RECOMMENDATION

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends the WRFCAC recommend to City Council the selection of Filanc/Black & Veatch as the preferred proposer for the WRF Onsite Improvements and provide direction to staff to begin negotiations.

ADJOURN

DATED: 7 June 2018

Barbara Spagnola, Vice Chairperson

This agenda is subject to amendment up to 24 hours prior to the date and time set for the meeting. Please refer to the agenda posted at the Public Works Department, 955 Shasta Avenue, for any revisions or call the department at 772-6262 for further information.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Public Works Department at (805) 772-6262. Notification 24 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.



AGENDA NO: I

MEETING DATE: June 12, 2018

Staff Report

TO: Water Reclamation Citizen Advisory Committee **DATE:** June 7, 2018
FROM: Rob Livick, PE/PLS – Public Works Director/City Engineer
Eric Casares, PE – WRF Program Manager
SUBJECT: Design Build Team Selection Recommendation

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the WRFCAC recommend to City Council the selection of Filanc/Black & Veatch as the preferred proposer for the WRF Onsite Improvements and provide direction to staff to begin negotiations;

ALTERNATIVES

No alternatives are recommended.

FISCAL IMPACT

No additional fiscal impact is proposed within this update. All work is proceeding within the City's fiscal year budget for the WRF and OneWater Plan.

BACKGROUND

In October 2017, the City Council reviewed and approved a request for qualifications (RFQ) for solicitation of design-build (DB) proposers for the WRF onsite improvements. In December 2017, the City received statements of qualification (SOQ) from three (3) DB teams. In January 2018, staff issued a request for proposals (RFP) to the three (3) teams and invited them to submit proposals. On May 08, 2018, a total of two (2) proposals were received from the Filanc/Black & Veatch and AECOM/W.M. Lyles Co. teams.

DISCUSSION

After receiving the proposals, City staff and the program management team met with members of the WRF subcommittee of the WRFCAC to provide them the technical content of the proposals and kick-off the review process. The proposals were initially reviewed by the WRFCAC subcommittee, City staff, and program management team for compliance with the RFP and technical accuracy.

Based on the review of the two (2) proposals, both DB teams were invited to participate in 1.5-hour interviews held at the Fire Station Training Room on June 1, 2018. Following the interviews, the members of the evaluation team met as a group to discuss the proposal review and interviews, and evaluate each against the selection criteria and weights established in the RFP (below).

Prepared By: rl/ec

Dept Review: RL

Criterion	Possible Score
Technical Proposal	
Management Proposal	3
Quality Assurance and Quality Control	3
Schedule and Cost Control	4
Team/City Collaboration and Integration	3
Design Development and Management	3
Project Sequencing and Scheduling	4
Proposed Design and Performance Guarantees	20
Price Proposal and Life-Cycle Cost	60
Total	100

The results of the evaluation are presented in the table below. The DB proposal with the lowest life-cycle cost was awarded the maximum score of 60. The score given to the DB proposal with the higher cost is based on the relative difference between the life-cycle costs for each proposal (i.e., the number of points awarded was 5% lower than the maximum since the life-cycle cost was 5% higher). Rationale for the scores assigned for all technical categories, along with the actual scores, is presented in the table below.

Filanc/Black & Veatch		AECOM/W.M. Lyles Co.	
Rationale	Score	Score	Rationale
Management Approach			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More balanced team between engineering and construction • More cohesive team • Joint venture formed • Ability to competitively procure large subconsultants (i.e., instrumentation and controls) 	3	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint venture formed
Quality Assurance and Quality Control			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • QA/QC plans addressed in proposal, but not highlighted in interview 	1	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • QA/QC plans addressed in proposal, but not highlighted in interview
Schedule and Cost Control			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6-month early completion compared to the baseline schedule • High-level of due diligence demonstrated for costing 	4	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ability to complete the project on schedule
Team/City Collaboration and Integration			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colocation and collaboration highlighted in the interview • Technical team location in proximity to key technical team for program manager (i.e., Walnut Creek) and City • Incorporation of City ideas and concepts • Attendance at both confidential 	3	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance at only a single proprietary meeting

Filanc/Black & Veatch		AECOM/W.M. Lyles Co.	
Rationale	Score	Score	Rationale
meetings			
Design Development and Management			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greater level of design detail (e.g., specific rationale behind selection of biosolids dewatering technology) More operationally friendly site layout 	3	1	
Project Sequencing and Scheduling			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4D model (i.e., 3D model sequenced with time) 	4	2	
Proposed Design and Performance Guarantees			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design innovation from the use of the SAFE process for handling wet weather flows Options for increasing the permitability of the SAFE system (i.e., chemical additional, advanced monitoring, alternative processes) More consistent effluent quality with membrane bioreactor (MBR) Very tight range on performance criteria 	15	14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More conventional process approach More conventional IPR treatment process with sequencing batch reactor and full advanced treatment (i.e., more easily permittable) Less consistent process performance with SBR Greater range for performance criteria
Price Proposal and Life-Cycle Cost			
60		57	
Total			
93		79	

The latest cost estimate information for the WRF Program presented at the September 2017 update to Council included \$89 million for the WRF Onsite Improvements. The construction cost in the Filanc/Black & Veatch proposal for these facilities is approximately \$69 million.

CONCLUSION

Staff recommends that WRFCAC recommend to Council: Select Filanc/Black & Veatch as the preferred proposer and direct staff to enter into negotiations; based on the selection committee’s evaluation of both proposals.