GENERAL MANAGER’S RECOMMENDATION:

That the Otay Water District (District) Board of Directors (Board) award two (2) professional As-Needed Engineering Design Services contracts and to authorize the General Manager to execute two agreements with Psomas and Rick Engineering, each in an amount not-to-exceed $500,000. The total amount of the two contracts will not exceed $500,000 during Fiscal Years 2017 and 2018 (ending June 30, 2018).

COMMITTEE ACTION:

Please see Attachment A.

PURPOSE:

To obtain Board authorization for the General Manager to enter into two (2) professional As-Needed Engineering Design Services contracts with Psomas and Rick Engineering, with each contract in an amount not-to-exceed $500,000 for Fiscal Years 2017 and 2018. The total amount of the two contracts will not exceed $500,000 during Fiscal Years 2017 and 2018.
ANALYSIS:

The District will require the services of two professional engineering design consultants on an as-needed basis in support of Capital Improvement Program (CIP) projects for Fiscal Years 2017 and 2018. It is more efficient and cost effective to issue as-needed contracts for engineering design which will provide the District with the ability to obtain consulting services in a timely and efficient manner. This concept has also been used in the past for other disciplines, such as construction management, geotechnical, electrical, and environmental services.

The District staff will identify tasks and request cost proposals from the two consultants during the contract period. Each consultant will prepare a detailed scope of work, schedule, and fee for each task order, with the District evaluating the proposals based upon qualifications and cost. The District will enter into negotiations with the consultants, selecting the proposal that has the best value for the District. Upon written task order authorization from the District, the selected consultant shall then proceed with the project as described in the scope of work.

The CIP projects that are estimated to require engineering design services for Fiscal Years 2017 and 2018, at this time, are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIP</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ESTIMATED COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P2453</td>
<td>SR-11 Utility Relocations</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2405/P2554</td>
<td>624/340 PRSs at Energy Way/Nirvana Avenue and Heritage Road/Hard Rock Road</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2559</td>
<td>Pressure Vessel Repair and Replacement Program</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2573</td>
<td>Hillsdale Road Pipeline Replacement</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2110</td>
<td>944-1 Recycled Water Pump Station Optimization and Pressure Zone Modifications</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2116</td>
<td>14-inch Recycled Force Main Assessment and Repair</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2033</td>
<td>Sewer System Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total: $475,000**
Staff believes that a $500,000 cap on each of the As-Needed Engineering Design Services contracts is adequate, while still providing a buffer.

Fees for professional services will be charged to the CIP projects or to the Fiscal Year Operations budget.

The As-Needed Engineering Design Services contracts do not commit the District to any expenditure until a task order is approved to perform the work. The District does not guarantee work to the consultants, nor does the District guarantee to the consultants that it will expend all of the funds authorized by the contract on professional services.

The District solicited engineering design services by placing an advertisement on the Otay Water District’s website on January 22, 2016 and with various other publications including the San Diego Union Tribune. Fourteen (14) firms submitted a Letter of Interest and a Statement of Qualifications. The Request for Proposal (RFP) for Engineering Design Services was sent to all fourteen (14) firms resulting in ten (10) proposals received on March 2, 2016. They are as follows:

- Arcadis (Carlsbad, CA)
- Brady (San Diego, CA)
- Carollo (San Diego, CA)
- Hazen and Sawyer (San Diego, CA)
- HDR (San Diego, CA)
- KEH (San Diego, CA)
- Michael Baker International (San Diego, CA)
- Psomas (San Diego, CA)
- Rick Engineering (San Diego, CA)
- West Coast Civil (San Diego, CA)

Firms that submitted Letters of Interest, but did not propose, were AECOM (San Diego, CA), CDM Smith (Carlsbad, CA), CH2M (San Diego, CA), and NV5 (San Diego, CA).

In accordance with the District’s Policy 21, Staff evaluated and scored all written proposals and interviewed the top seven (7) firms on April 12 and April 13, 2016. Psomas and Rick Engineering received the highest scores based on their experience, understanding of the scope of work, proposed method to accomplish the work, and their composite hourly rate. Psomas and Rick Engineering were the most qualified consultants with the best overall proposal. Both consultants currently hold professional engineering agreements with
the District, including Psomas’ current (FY 2015 and FY 2016) as-needed engineering design agreement and Rick Engineering’s Campo Road Sewer design agreement, and both consultants have performed well. Both consultants provide similar services to other local agencies and are readily available to provide the services required. A summary of the complete evaluation is shown in Attachment B.

Psomas and Rick Engineering submitted the Company Background Questionnaire, as required by the RFP, and staff did not find any significant issues. In addition, staff checked their references and performed an internet search on the company. Staff found the references to be excellent and did not find any outstanding issues with the internet search.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**  Joe Beachem, Chief Financial Officer

The funds for these contracts will be expended on a variety of projects, as previously noted above. These contracts are for as-needed professional services based on the District’s need and schedule, and expenditures will not be made until a task order is approved by the District for the consultant's services on a specific CIP project.

Based on a review of the financial budget, the Project Manager anticipates that the budgets will be sufficient to support the professional as-needed consulting services required for the CIP projects noted above.

The Finance Department has determined that the funds to cover these contracts will be available as budgeted for these projects.

**STRATEGIC GOAL:**

This Project supports the District’s Mission statement, “To provide high value water and wastewater services to the customers of the Otay Water District in a professional, effective, and efficient manner” and the General Manager’s Vision, “A District that is at the forefront in innovations to provide water services at affordable rates, with a reputation for outstanding customer service.”

**LEGAL IMPACT:**

None.
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Attachments:  Attachment A - Committee Action
             Attachment B - Summary of Proposal Rankings
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT/PROJECT:</th>
<th>Award of Two (2) As-Needed Engineering Design Services Contracts for Fiscal Years 2017 and 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**COMMITTEE ACTION:**

The Engineering, Operations, and Water Resources Committee (Committee) reviewed this item at a meeting held on May 17, 2016, and the following comments were made:

- Staff recommended that the Board award two (2) professional As-Needed Engineering Design Services contracts to Psomas and Rick Engineering, each in an amount not-to-exceed $500,000. The total amount of the two contracts will not exceed $500,000 during Fiscal Years 2017 and 2018 (ending June 30, 2018).

- Staff noted that this engineering design agreement is one of several As-Needed agreements actively administered by District staff. The current amount under the existing agreements with Arcadis and Psomas is near full commitment and an As-Needed Engineering Design consultant will be needed for upcoming CIP projects in Fiscal Years 2017 and 2018. A detailed list of anticipated projects is provided on page 2 of the staff report.

- Staff discussed the selection process, which is detailed on page 3 of the staff report, and indicated that Psomas and Rick Engineering had the highest scores. Results of the analysis are shown in Attachment B.

- Staff stated that both Psomas and Rick Engineering have local offices in San Diego and that both consultants currently hold professional engineering agreements with the District, including Psomas’ current as-needed engineering design agreement and Rick Engineering’s Campo Road Sewer Design agreement. Staff highlighted that both consultants have performed well.

- In response to a question from the Committee, staff stated the reason Arcadis was not interviewed was due to the quality of their proposal and performance on the current contract.
Following the discussion, the Committee supported staffs’ recommendation and presentation to the full board as a consent item.
## ATTACHMENT B  
### SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL RANKINGS  
**As-Needed Engineering Design - Fiscal Years 2017 and 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUALIFICATIONS OF TEAM</th>
<th>RESPONSIVENESS AND PROJECT UNDERSTANDING</th>
<th>TECHNICAL AND MANAGEMENT APPROACH</th>
<th>INDIVIDUAL SUBTOTAL</th>
<th>AVERAGE SUBTOTAL</th>
<th>RATES SCORING CHART</th>
<th>WRITTEN</th>
<th>ORAL</th>
<th>TOTAL - WRITTEN</th>
<th>ADDITIONAL CREATIVITY AND INSIGHT</th>
<th>STRENGTH OF PROJECT MANAGER</th>
<th>PRESENTATION AND COMMUNICATION SKILLS</th>
<th>RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS</th>
<th>INDIVIDUAL TOTAL - ORAL</th>
<th>AVERAGE TOTAL ORAL</th>
<th>TOTAL SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAXIMUM POINTS</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arcadis</strong></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brady</strong></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carollo</strong></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hazen and Sawyer</strong></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HDR</strong></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KEH</strong></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Michael Baker</strong></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paomas</strong></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rick Engineering</strong></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Coast Civil</strong></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Note: Review Panel does not see or consider rates when scoring other categories. Rates are scored by the PM, who is not on Review Panel.

The fees were evaluated by comparing rates for seven positions. The sum of these rates are noted on the table to the left.

**REVIEWERS**
- **Charles Mederos**
- **Kevin Cameron**
- **Steve Beppler**
- **Bob Kennedy**
- **Dan Martin**
- **Charles Mederos**

**RATES FOR NORMAL CHART**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Baker</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Charles Mederos</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Mederos</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Kevin Cameron</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Beppler</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Bob Kennedy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Kennedy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Dan Martin</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Martin</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Charles Mederos</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Mederos</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Kevin Cameron</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONSULTANT RATES**
- **Michael Baker**
- **Charles Mederos**
- **Kevin Cameron**
- **Steve Beppler**
- **Bob Kennedy**
- **Dan Martin**
- **Charles Mederos**

**ATTACHMENTS**
- **ATTACHMENT A**
- **ATTACHMENT B**
- **ATTACHMENT C**

**TABLES**
- **RATES FOR NORMAL CHART**
- **SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL RANKINGS**

**SCORES**
- **Excellent**
- **Good**
- **Fair**
- **Poor**

**TOTAL POINTS**
- **150**

**TOTAL SCORE**
- **150**

**REFERENCES**