

**NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING
OF THE
SOUTH ORANGE COUNTY WASTEWATER AUTHORITY
ENGINEERING COMMITTEE**

Thursday, May 13, 2010

8:30 a.m.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that a Regular Meeting of the South Orange County Wastewater Authority (SOCWA) Engineering Committee has been scheduled to be held on **Thursday, May 13, 2010 at 8:30 a.m.** at the SOCWA Administrative Office located at 34156 Del Obispo Street, Dana Point, California.

THE SOCWA MEETING ROOM IS WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBLE. IF YOU REQUIRE ANY SPECIAL DISABILITY RELATED ACCOMMODATIONS (I.E., ACCESS TO AN AMPLIFIED SOUND SYSTEM, ETC.) PLEASE CONTACT THE SOUTH ORANGE COUNTY WASTEWATER AUTHORITY SECRETARY'S OFFICE AT (949) 234-5421 AT LEAST SEVENTY-TWO (72) HOURS PRIOR TO THE SCHEDULED MEETING. THIS AGENDA CAN BE OBTAINED IN ALTERNATE FORMAT UPON WRITTEN REQUEST TO THE SOUTH ORANGE COUNTY WASTEWATER AUTHORITY'S SECRETARY AT LEAST SEVENTY-TWO (72) HOURS PRIOR TO THE SCHEDULED MEETING.

AGENDA EXHIBITS AND OTHER WRITINGS THAT ARE DISCLOSABLE PUBLIC RECORDS DISTRIBUTED TO ALL, OR A MAJORITY OF, THE MEMBERS OF THE SOUTH ORANGE COUNTY WASTEWATER AUTHORITY ENGINEERING COMMITTEE IN CONNECTION WITH A MATTER SUBJECT TO DISCUSSION OR CONSIDERATION AT AN OPEN MEETING OF THE ENGINEERING COMMITTEE ARE AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION IN THE AUTHORITY OFFICE, 34156 DEL OBISPO STREET, DANA POINT, CA ("AUTHORITY OFFICE"). IF SUCH WRITINGS ARE DISTRIBUTED TO MEMBERS OF THE ENGINEERING COMMITTEE LESS THAN 72 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING, THEY WILL BE AVAILABLE IN THE RECEPTION AREA OF THE AUTHORITY OFFICE AT THE SAME TIME AS THEY ARE DISTRIBUTED TO THE ENGINEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS, EXCEPT THAT, IF SUCH WRITINGS ARE DISTRIBUTED IMMEDIATELY PRIOR TO, OR DURING, THE MEETING, THEY WILL BE AVAILABLE IN THE ENGINEERING COMMITTEE MEETING ROOM.

AGENDA

1. **Review/Approval of Meeting Minutes (February '10 and March '10)**
2. **Review of Proposals for the Coastal Treatment Plant Primary Upgrade Phase II Design**
3. **Coastal Treatment Plant Headworks Upgrade Construction Progress Report (Project Committee 15)**
4. **Review Status of San Juan Creek Ocean Outfall Junction Structure Upgrade (Project Committee 5)**

NOTICE OF ENGINEERING COMMITTEE

May 13, 2010


Page 2 of 2

5. **J. B. Latham Treatment Plant East Plant Improvements Construction Progress Report (Project Committee 2)**
6. **Review of Proposed Scope of Services for the J. B. Latham Treatment Plant Strategic Plan (Project Committee 2)**
7. **Review of Request for Proposals for Plant 3A Infrastructure Repair Design Services (Project Committee 3A)**
8. **Regional Treatment Plant Headworks Upgrade Construction Progress Report (Project Committee 17)**
9. **Regional Treatment Plant Clarifier Upgrade Phase I Construction Progress Report (Project Committee 17)**
10. **Public Comments on Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9**

I hereby certify that the foregoing Notice was personally emailed, faxed or mailed to each member of the SOCWA Engineering Committee at least 72 hours prior to the scheduled time of the Regular Meeting referred to above.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Notice was posted at least 72 hours prior to the time of the above-referenced Engineering Committee at the usual agenda posting location of the South Orange County Wastewater Authority.

Dated this 3rd day of May 2010.



Thomas R. Rosales, General Manager/Secretary
SOUTH ORANGE COUNTY WASTEWATER AUTHORITY

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE
SOUTH ORANGE COUNTY WASTEWATER AUTHORITY
ENGINEERING COMMITTEE**

February 11, 2010

A Regular Meeting of the South Orange County Wastewater Authority Engineering Committee was held on Thursday, February 11, 2010, at 8:30 a.m. at the Administrative Office located at 34156 Del Obispo Street, Dana Point, California.

The following Engineering Committee Members were present:

DAN FERONS, Santa Margarita Water District
LARRY DEES, Moulton Niguel Water District
DAVID SHISSLER, City of Laguna Beach
MIKE DUNBAR, South Coast Water District
ERIC BAUMAN, City of San Juan Capistrano
NOAH SANCHEZ, Irvine Ranch Water District

Also Present:

BRIAN PECK, SOCWA Director of Engineering
CHRISTINE HUTTON, SOCWA Administrative Assistant
MIKE WILSON, SOCWA Assistant General Manager/Director of Operations
MIKE DEMAREE, SOCWA Director of Finance

Mr. Peck, SOCWA, Director of Engineering, called the meeting to order at 8:33 a.m. and welcomed all those in attendance.

Review/Approval of Meeting Minutes (October and November '09)

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Peck stated that the October 8, 2009 Engineering Committee Meeting was distributed for Engineering Committee review, however, the November Engineering Committee Meeting minutes would not be distributed until the March Meeting. Mr. Peck asked if there were any questions or comments regarding the October Engineering Committee Meeting minutes. There was none.

ACTION:

Motion was made by Mr. Dees and seconded by Mr. Ferons to approve the provided Engineering Committee minutes. Motion carried with all present Engineering Committee members voting aye.

Review of Proposed SOCWA Capital Improvements Budget for Fiscal year '10/'11 (All Project Committees)

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Peck stated that this was the first formal discussion regarding the Fiscal Year '10/'11 Capital Improvements Budget by the Engineering Committee. However, these projects and budgets have been presented to the Committee over the past four months as the 'first year' of the proposed update to the Ten Year Plan.

Mr. Peck reviewed three proposed projects for Project Committee 2 at the J.B. Latham Plant. The most significant project in the capital improvement plan is the construction for the Aeration/Co-Generation Upgrade with a budget of over \$3 million. The second project was the Strategic Plan for the J.B. Latham Plant in which staff will have a detailed scope of work presented to the Engineering Committee for review in April. The final new budget item for the J.B. Latham Plant has the nebulous title of 'Site Preparation'. The now defunct AWT Project included provisions for demolishing several structures on the site as well as relocating the Engineering Department office trailer. SOCWA is proposing to remove the old maintenance shop building followed by installing a set of office trailers in its place. This will require a new foundation, wiring for power, phone and internet, water supply and a sewer connection. However, the most significant part of the project is the building demolition, as past survey work indicated the presence of asbestos in the roof. Mr. Bauman recommended that a survey be done of the building for mercury in the light ballasts and switches. He noted that the City of San Juan Capistrano had determined surprisingly high mercury levels when removing an old trailer.

Next, Mr. Peck reviewed three proposed projects for Plant 3A. The first project is an upgrade to the primary sedimentation basins similar to the projects being performed at the other three SOCWA plants. The work includes the replacement of the sludge collectors, the scum skimmers, and the launders. The second project is an increase in budget to the secondary clarifier recoating. This is based on the recent bid opening for the similar clarifier recoating at the Regional Treatment Plant. The third project is devoted to infrastructure repair. Settlement has increased to the point that the dissolved air flotation thickener (DAF) system is becoming impacted and the failure of underground piping and electrical conduits. A significant rehabilitation project is proposed that would excavate down to eight feet in certain areas. Then a geosynthetic liner would be installed, buried infrastructure would be repaired and the foundation would be reconstructed. This is based on a preliminary concept that was developed several years ago by a geotechnical engineer. We are attempting to do a localized solution rather than a plant-wide repair.

The only proposed item for Project Committee 5 is additional funding for grout stabilization on the reinforcement of the Junction Structure. Mr. Peck noted that the issue was

how to excavate to the base of the structure without destabilizing the pipe and the structure itself. Staff met with a contractor to review methods for grout injection. Mr. Peck deferred this topic for further discussion at the April Engineering Committee Meeting.

Mr. Peck stated that only two additional budget items were being proposed for the coming fiscal year. The first project is the replacement and relocation of the sodium hypochlorite feed system. The Sodium Hypochlorite Project has been continuously shifted back in time within the Ten Year Plan for the past four years. The project is proposed for the coming year to resolve a Uniform Fire Code issue regarding containment. There is a possibility that the new Sodium Hypochlorite facility could also provide disinfectant for the proposed South Coast Water District creek treatment project. Mr. Dunbar indicated that the creek treatment project is currently embroiled in negotiations with the California Department of Fish and Game. Mr. Dunbar believes that they will know more about the status of that project in two months.

The second proposed Coastal Treatment Plant budget item is the additional budget for the West Primary Sedimentation Basin Upgrade. The Ten Year Plan divided this project into two budget years. Staff mailed out Request for Proposals (RFP) to consultants two days ago.

Mr. Peck indicated that the proposed budget for the Regional Plant included an additional \$250,000 for the Chlorine System modifications. Mr. Peck believes that the Malcolm Pirnie estimate for the construction cost of \$1,100,000 is overly conservative. The additional \$250,000 will bring the available budget to approximately \$850,000. Also, the existing SOCWA capital budget includes \$600,000 for the temporary Sodium Hypochlorite Feed System. SOCWA staff is uncertain just how temporary the design is for the hypochlorite feed system. Mr. Peck expressed doubt that there was sufficient budget – even with the \$250,000 addition - to do both the upgrade to the chlorine feed system and a full-scale hypochlorite project. Mr. Peck expressed concern that constructing both projects was wasteful. Mr. Demaree noted that SOCWA had just received a letter from the chlorine provider indicating that that company is getting out of the chlorine gas business. This will leave Jones as the only chlorine gas supplier in Southern California. While Jones has indicated a commitment to remain in the chlorine business, it is apparent that the costs will rise. Mr. Dees suggested that SOCWA staff and MNWD staff should meet with Dr. Gumerman to determine the appropriate direction regarding chlorine and sodium hypochlorite. Mr. Peck added that there still remains a disagreement between the Orange County Fire Authority (OCFA) and SOCWA regarding the containment sizing. However, the OCFA has not corresponded regarding this issue for the past eighteen months.

Mr. Peck then reviewed the Digester Re-coating and Co-Generation Upgrade Design projects for Project Committee 17.

Lastly, Mr. Peck referred to Table 3, which shows a comparison between the values in the FY '09/'10 budget, the proposed FY '10/'11 budget and the previously adopted Ten Year Plan. The proposed FY '10/'11 budget has a minor decrease in the capital improvement budgets for Project Committees 3A, 15, and 17 as compared to the '09/'10 Ten Year Plan. Mr. Peck pointed out that there was a substantial increase for Project Committee 2 budget due to the construction for the Aeration/Co-Generation Upgrade which had been shifted back from FY '09/'10 to FY '10/'11. The combined budget for FY '09/'10 and FY '10/'11 for Project Committee 2 is below the comparable years in the Ten Year Plan. Mr. Ferons stated that SOCWA staff should look at the new k-Turbo and Neuros blower units for the J.B. Latham Plant. The Santa Margarita Water District (SMWD) is looking at these for the Oso Water Reclamation Plant; the payback appears to be 3 to 4 years.

Mr. Peck requested any concerns, questions or problems regarding the proposed budget from the Engineering Committee members before seeking their approval for the Ten Year Plan at the March Engineering Committee.

ACTION:

No action at this time

Review of Draft Ten Year Plan (All Project Committees)

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Peck stated that the target for presentation of the Ten Year Plan to the SOCWA Board of Directors is the normally scheduled April meeting. Mr. Peck has received a few comments from the Engineering Committee on previously transmitted Ten Year Plan materials regarding a few minor math errors found in the spreadsheets. In addition, Mr. Peck noted that he had received a call from Mr. Dunbar inquiring why the administrative costs were higher for Project Committee 15 than Project Committee 17 (although the Regional Plant is larger and more complex than the Coastal Plant). Mr. Peck explained that Project Committee 15 also included the AWMA Road, the sludge force mains, and to a limited extent, Aliso Creek itself. Mr. Peck pointed out that dealings with the County of Orange and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers tended to involve more staff time than conventional plant projects. Mr. Dees inquired if time spent on Aliso Creek projects was also spread to Project Committees 21 and 24. Mr. Peck responded that typically yes but it depended on the location and scope of the Aliso Creek projects. Mr. Dunbar inquired if SOCWA staff time was charge directly to individual projects. Mr. Peck responded that it was not; that time is budgeted as administrative/legal. Mr. Ferons added that it was more typical to capitalize staff time by having a labor code for each project. Mr. Demaree responded that the distribution of time was between liquids, common and solids for the Project Committees 2 and 17. Mr. Ferons speculated that it might not be a significant

issue for SOCWA since it is not using bond funds like the member agencies. Mr. Peck responded that he would take another look at the projected allocation of administrative time.

Mr. Dees noted that the cost loading should be included in the Ten Year Plan. Mr. Peck responded that the cost loading tables for each member agency would be included in the Appendix.

Mr. Peck concluded that if there were any additional questions he would like to receive inquiries by February 25; then, present the final Ten Year Plan at the March Engineering Committee meeting for approval.

ACTION:

No action at this time.

Public Comments on Items 1, 2, and 3

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Peck asked if there were any public comments on items 1, 2, and 3. There was none.

ACTION:

No action needed.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:05 a.m.

/Christine Hutton /

Christine Hutton, Administrative Assistant/Recorder

Engineering Committee Agenda Item

Meeting Date: May 13, 2010

Agenda Item No.: 2

Action Required: Yes

TO: SOCWA Engineering Committee, Project Committee 15

FROM: Brian Peck, Director of Engineering

SUBJECT: Coastal Treatment Plant Primary Treatment Upgrade – Phase II Design Proposals

Scope

The scope for the Primary Treatment Phase II project includes the following items:

- Replacement of sludge collectors in three rectangular primary sedimentation basins
- Replacement of scum skimmers in two rectangular primary sedimentation basins; replacement of scum skimmer drives in five rectangular primary sedimentation basins
- Replacement of covers on three grit basins and five primary sedimentation basins with new aluminum covers
- Miscellaneous structural repairs.

Proposals Received

Requests for Proposals were sent to the following five firms:

- Brown and Caldwell
- Carollo Engineers
- Dudek
- HDR
- Lee & Ro

All five firms submitted proposals.

Proposal Review Materials

The following proposal review materials are attached for Engineering Committee member review:

- Proposals (only to Project Committee 15 members)
- Summary forms comparing the key characteristics of each proposal (e.g. team, total labor hours)
- Proposal evaluation form
- Request for Proposals.

Proposal Evaluation Forms

These forms are provided for your reference and record. We will not total any scores unless we are unable to reach consensus regarding the selected firm.

Requested Action

The Engineering Committee will be asked to review the proposals and recommend a firm for contract award to the Board of Directors.

PROPOSAL SUMMARY



**PROJECT: COASTAL TREATMENT PLANT PRIMARY TREATMENT UPGRADE – PHASE II
DESIGN SERVICES**

FIRM	Brown and Caldwell	Carollo	Dudek	HDR	Lee & Ro
PROJECT MANAGER	Ken Fonda	Dennis Wood	Tom Falk	Guillermo Garcia	Dave Bachtel
PROJECT ENGINEER	Ed Matthews	-	-	Chandrikaa Balendhran	-
PRINCIPAL	Victor Occaino	Doug Lanning	Mike Metts	-	Dhiru Patel
QUALITY CONTROL ADDRESSED?	Mike Anderson identified as lead.	Described on Pages 3 and 4.	Team member identified on Page 6.	Sam Abi Samra identified as lead.	Team members identified on Pages 4 and 5.
EXPERIENCE	Largely reference work for SOCWA	Strong experience shown in clarifiers and concrete repair.	Secondary clarifier work identified for Encina and Coachella	Two strong rectangular clarifier projects referenced.	Three good rectangular primary projects described.
SCHEDULE	Complete project by Aug 31, 2010.	Complete project by Nov 8, 2010.	Complete project by Oct 11, 2010.	Complete project by Aug 10, 2010.	Complete project by Sept 21, 2010.
TOTAL LABOR HOURS	347	472	595	492	544
STAFF AVAILABILITY	On Page 7 simply remark that staff is available.	Sufficient availability noted on Page 7.	On Page 6 simply remark that staff is available.	Sufficient availability noted on Page 2 and 3.	Sufficient availability noted on Page 6.
NO. OF DRAWINGS	17	21	16	15	17
EXCEPTIONS TO GENERAL SOCWA AGREEMENT?	Series of changes proposed on Page 7.	None.	None	None	None
MEET PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

COASTAL TREATMENT PLANT PRIMARY TREATMENT UPGRADE – PHASE II DESIGN

PROPOSAL EVALUATION SHEET

EVALUATOR NAME _____ DATE _____

PROPOSAL STRENGTH COMPARISON
(Scale is 1 to 10 – 10 being high – unless noted otherwise)

CRITERIA	BROWN AND CALDWELL	CAROLLO	DUDEK	HDR	LEE & RO
TEAM AND PM QUALIFICATIONS (1 – 10)					
SIMILAR EXPERIENCE (1-10)					
APPROACH TO WORK (1-10)					
TEAM AVAILABILITY (1-5)					
QUALITY CONTROL (1-5)					
SCHEDULE (1-5)					
ABILITY TO WORK WITH BASIC SOCWA CONTRACT (1-5)					

COASTAL TREATMENT PLANT PRIMARY TREATMENT UPGRADE – PHASE II DESIGN

PROPOSAL EVALUATION SHEET (cont'd)

CRITERIA	BROWN AND CALDWELL	CAROLLO	DUDEK	HDR	LEE & RO
ESTIMATE OF EFFORT (1-10)					
TOTAL					

Note: The final selection will be based on a vote of the participating parties (1 vote each for EBSD, CLB, MNWD, SCWD and SOCWA). The total scoring presented above is for reference and is not binding in the recommendation of a selected firm

RECOMMENDATION AND COMMENTS ADDITIONAL SHEET IF NEEDED

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

(revised per Addendum No.1)

**FOR THE
ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR THE PRIMARY TREATMENT
UPGRADE – PHASE II
AT THE
COASTAL TREATMENT PLANT**

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF SERVICES REQUIRED

The South Orange County Wastewater Authority (SOCWA), a Joint Powers Authority, and several of its Member Agencies intend to retain a qualified FIRM to prepare designs for miscellaneous improvements to the Coastal Treatment Plant. The improvements include the following items:

- Replacement of sludge collectors in three rectangular primary sedimentation basins
- *Upgrade of scum skimmers in five rectangular primary sedimentation basins including the replacement of five scum skimmer drives and three scum skimmers*
- Replacement of covers on three grit basins and five primary sedimentation basins with new aluminum covers
- Miscellaneous structural repairs.

RECEIPT OF PROPOSALS

Eight (8) stapled copies of your proposal, signed by an officer of the FIRM who is authorized to execute legally binding agreements shall be delivered to: Brian Peck, SOUTH ORANGE COUNTY WASTEWATER AUTHORITY, 34156 Del Obispo Street, Dana Point, CA 92629 no later than 3:00 p.m. on March 24, 2010. Late proposals will be returned unopened to the respondent.

PROPOSAL AND SITE INQUIRIES

A pre-proposal meeting will be held at the Coastal Treatment Plant at 10:30 a.m. on March 4, 2010. This meeting allows FIRMS to ask questions of staff and to investigate the site firsthand.

Should a FIRM desire additional information prior to submitting a proposal, please contact Brian Peck at (949) 234-5411.

SOCWA will not be held responsible for any verbal instructions or information that may be provided to prospective respondents. All addenda will be in writing and will be sent to all proposers

BACKGROUND

There are five primary sedimentation basins at the Coastal Treatment Plant. Two of these basins (called E1 and E2) were constructed in 1967. The other three primary sedimentation basins (called W1, W2 and W3) were constructed in 1982. The sludge collector equipment in Basins E1 and E2 were replaced as part of the Primary Treatment Upgrade Phase I project. The second phase of the project is intended to replace both the sludge collector and the scum skimmers in the three west primary sedimentation basins. SOCWA has a goal of standardizing the collector equipment between treatment facilities where feasible.

The covers on the five basins date to the original construction of the basins. SOCWA desires to install new aluminum covers similar to those used at other SOCWA facilities

SCOPE OF UPGRADE

The design is to include the following elements:

- *replacement of sludge collectors in three rectangular primary sedimentation basins*
- *upgrade of scum skimmers in five rectangular primary sedimentation basins including the replacement of five scum skimmer drives and three scum skimmers*
- *electrical design for new collectors and skimmers shall be based on new local control station and manual disconnect (at each device), replacement of power and instrumentation wiring (existing conduit to remain), and new buckets at the motor control center*
- *structural modifications as needed to accommodate new collectors, skimmers and skimmer drives*
- *replacement of covers on three grit basins and five primary sedimentation basins with new aluminum covers*
- *structural repair and removal of fasteners at openings for original covers*
- *repair of spalling and cracking around the grit basins and the primary sedimentation basins – design should be based on minor repairs at 15 locations*
- *repair of leaking joints in wall of Aeration Basin E3*
- *repair joint between grit basins and east primary sedimentation basins*
- *install new aluminum stair and landing at Headworks Building loading dock*
- *repair leaking cracks in exterior of wall in Aeration Basin W2*

- *repair leaking joints at Aeration Basin influent and effluent channels in two locations where the original design accounted for the future expansion of the basins.*

SCOPE OF SERVICES

The following shall be considered to be a preliminary scope of services; your proposal may include those modifications to this scope of services that you deem desirable or necessary based upon your experience or expertise.

Tasks are to include the following:

I. OVERALL PROJECT

- A. Meetings. FIRM shall attend up to three kick-off and/or progress meetings at the SOCWA offices.
- B. General Contract Document Review. The general contract documents will be prepared and submitted by SOCWA to the FIRM at the 50% submittal. FIRM shall review and provide comment for final preparation by SOCWA.
- C. Cost Estimate. FIRM will provide an updated cost estimate with each submittal. Cost estimate will be broken down according to the bid form provided by SOCWA. Cost estimate shall be based on current manufacturer quotes, recent Southern California bid experience and other pertinent information.
- D. Design Drawings. FIRM shall prepare design drawings in AutoCAD as necessary to accurately describe the project for bidding and construction.
- E. Technical Specifications. FIRM shall prepare all technical specifications necessary to accurately describe the project for bidding and construction. SOCWA shall provide all bid forms and Division 0 documents.
- F. 50% Submittal. FIRM will submit eight copies of the 50 percent design documents for review by SOCWA. Submittal will be in the form of half-sized drawings. Responses to comments will be addressed by modification of documents or written response.
- G. 90% Submittal. FIRM will submit eight copies of the 90 percent design documents for review by SOCWA. Submittal will be in the form of half-sized drawings. Two sets of full sized drawings shall

also be submitted. Responses to comments will be addressed by modification of documents or written response.

- H. 100% Submittal. FIRM will prepare and submit one reproducible set each of full and half-size drawings and bidding specifications for printing and issue by SOCWA.

FIRM will submit electronic versions of the Design Memoranda, Drawings (in AutoCAD) and the Specifications (in Microsoft Word).

QUALITY ASSURANCE

The FIRM shall administer a program of QA procedures for producing quality work. Specific procedures shall cover, but not be limited to, planning, checking, reviewing and scheduling the work.

All documents prepared by the FIRM shall be subject to the FIRM's in-house procedures prior to submittal to SOCWA for review. Each submittal shall be accompanied by a written statement from the principal-in-charge of the project stating that documents being submitted have been checked.

Discipline checks shall be made of all design calculations, drawings, specifications, construction cost estimates, and reports. An integrated design review shall be performed for multidisciplinary documents to provide coordination and to avoid conflicts in the documents. Checking shall be performed by qualified individuals who are not directly involved in the design or supervision of the work.

DESIGN EXPECTATIONS

Design Standards

SOCWA does not currently maintain a set of either design or CAD standards. The FIRM shall be responsible for the providing the design documents in sufficient detail and quality to allow accurate bidding and construction of the project. The design requirements include but are not limited to the requirements below.

As-Built Drawings

The as-built drawings of the four SOCWA treatment facilities are of uncertain quality. The design consultant shall perform field measurements as necessary to verify key as-built information. Areas where dimensions can not be verified (e.g. buried facilities) shall be addressed by directing the contractor to pothole at key locations. Field verification is also necessary for power supply systems (including single line diagrams and panel drawings) and control/monitoring systems.

Unless noted otherwise the FIRM shall assume that SOCWA does not possess any electronic versions of either drawings or specifications.

Demolition Drawings

Demolition plans shall show both the removal and the necessary repair. Broad statements in the specifications regarding the repair of damaged facilities shall be deemed inadequate

Site Drawings

Site plans shall be provided as necessary. General civil plans shall be described with one foot contours. The limits of excavation shall be described for new foundation and for pipeline/conduit trenches. Remedial actions for damaged facilities and landscaping shall be identified. The location of new structures shall be established with coordinates.

Material Selection

SOCWA's treatment facilities are located in corrosive environments due both to the wastewater handling and the marine environment. The FIRM is expected to select materials designed for long life in these environments. Where material selection is anticipated to have a significant impact on project the FIRM is to review the cost difference with SOCWA staff.

Control Descriptions

SOCWA does not require the completion of Process and Instrumentation drawings (P&ID's) unless noted otherwise within this Request for Proposals. The design consultant may propose to provide P&ID's if necessary to clarify the construction work requirement. The consultant shall submit Control Descriptions as part of the 30% submittal. The Control Descriptions shall identify the controls, monitoring and alarms available at different locations within the plant. The descriptions shall also identify all automatic control sequences.

Primary Elements

The firm shall be responsible for the design of the primary elements such that the installation is consistent with the listed manufacturers requirements for meeting the listed accuracy. The design shall also reflect the manner in which the instruments are to be removed from service for calibration and cleaning. The FIRM shall also ensure that covers are provided for any outside digital displays that might be impacted by sunlight.

Equipment Data Sheets

The FIRM shall provide equipment data sheets for all devices with motors over 1 horsepower, all motorized or pneumatically controlled valves, all gates and all instruments. These sheets shall be submitted at part of the 30% submittal.

PROPOSAL CONTENTS

SOCWA does not require a specific format for proposals. FIRMS may prepare their proposals in a manner most suited to their particular organization. However, all requirements set forth in the Request for Proposals must be addressed. Proposals shall be concise and shall not exceed eight (8) pages, excluding covers, tabs, and resumes. Proposals shall be stapled and shall not include formal cover. The cover letter shall be included in the count of eight pages. Preprinted and prepared general company advertising literature such as color brochures are discouraged unless they are specifically related to the services requested and referenced as such.

FIRM proposals shall include, at a minimum, the following information:

1. Indication that the FIRM has a clear understanding of each project. This should include a description of the work to be performed, how the project tasks will be accomplished and the problems that may be encountered.
2. Descriptions of previous projects of similar type, scope, and size that the FIRM has completed. The description shall include project name, client, and client references (including telephone numbers).
3. Name, project responsibilities, and experience of designated personnel that will be assigned to work on SOCWA's projects with emphasis on the Project Manager.
4. Resumes of designated personnel, where appropriate.
5. Current workload and future anticipated work of key staff to be assigned to the project.
6. List of all subconsultants proposed to be used by the FIRM.
7. A preliminary project schedule incorporating the milestone dates identified in this RFP. The FIRM should indicate whether or not the milestone dates are feasible.
8. A table of effort is to be included in the Proposal that includes the consultant hours by classification and the total hours for each

subconsultant. This breakout is to be provided for each work item shown in the scope of services.

9. A preliminary drawing list showing the number and title of sheets. This list should also indicate the number of engineer, designer, word processing or clerical, and subconsultant hours allocated to each sheet.
10. A proposed fee and schedule of hourly rates, provided in a separate sealed envelope marked "Estimate Fee – Design Services Proposal" and indicating the FIRM'S name.
11. A copy of the SOCWA's standard engineering contract is attached as Exhibit 'A'. The Proposal is to verify that the submitting firm will maintain the required insurance levels. The Proposal should identify whether or not the submitting firm agrees to the contract language. Any discrepancies should be identified.

LEGAL REQUIREMENTS AND GENERAL CONDITIONS

Interpretation of Documents

A FIRM contemplating submitting a proposal for this proposed contract who is in doubt as to the true meaning of any part of this Request for Proposal or finds discrepancies in or omissions from this Request for Proposal, may submit to SOCWA a verbal or written request for interpretation or correction thereof. Any interpretation or correction of the documents will be made only by addendum duly issued. A copy of such an addendum will be mailed or delivered to each FIRM receiving this Request for Proposal. SOCWA will not be responsible for any explanations or interpretations of the documents other than written addenda.

Submission of a proposal shall be evidence that the FIRM did, in fact, conduct all necessary inspections and is aware of and acknowledges all conditions, restrictions and limitations affecting performance and cost.

Addenda

All addenda issued during the proposal period shall be noted in the FIRM's proposal.

Rejection of Proposal

SOCWA reserves the right to reject any and all proposals, to negotiate with one or more FIRMS, to waive any informality in a proposal, to delete or add items of work prior to award, and to make an award in the best interest of SOCWA.

Contract Award

The selected FIRM shall enter into a written contract with SOCWA binding all terms, conditions, and provisions of the proposal, and other terms, conditions, and provisions negotiated prior to award of the contract. The contract period will be for the duration of the project. A copy of the standard engineering services contract that SOCWA utilizes is attached with this Request for Proposals.

SOCWA's Use of Proposal Material

All material submitted in or with the proposal shall become the property of SOCWA, unless it is clearly marked as proprietary information. SOCWA reserves the right to use any ideas presented in the proposals, without compensation paid to the FIRM. Selection or rejection of the proposal shall not affect this right.

Proposal Development

The cost for developing and submitting the proposal shall be entirely the responsibility of the FIRM.

SELECTION CRITERIA

Proposals will be evaluated on the basis of their response to all provisions of this RFP. The Agency may use some or all of the following criteria in its evaluation and comparison of proposals submitted. The following list of criteria is not intended to be all inclusive and the order is not intended to indicate their relative importance:

- The experience, qualifications and availability of the Proposer's consultant team and, in particular, the Project Manager assigned to the project.
- The experience of the Proposer's team with respect to the rehabilitation of primary clarifiers.
- The Proposer's technical approach and methodology to performing the scope of services will be evaluated based upon completeness, demonstrated capability, responsiveness to the Agency's needs and demonstrated understanding of the work requirements.
- Successful completion of previous work for SOCWA and its member agencies.
- The evaluation will consider the respondent's proposed mechanism for quality control, meeting schedules, method of coordination and cost control and a demonstrated ability to respond rapidly to changes in project

requirements The proposal should identify the individual who will lead QA/QC review teams.

- The organizational structure of the proposed project team.
- Recent references from local clients on similar type work performed by Proposer.
- The proposed effort and fee for completing the scope of services.
- The Proposer's demonstrated ability to meet all of the SOCWA's administrative requirements including insurance, liability, equal opportunity practices and any exceptions taken to the SOCWA's Professional Services Contract.

SELECTION PROCEDURES

Proposals received by SOCWA will be reviewed on the basis of the proposal contents. It is the intent of SOCWA to select the firm based on the proposals. However, SOCWA reserves the right to conduct interviews with one or more firms prior to final selection.

If agreement cannot be reached with the selected FIRM, SOCWA will terminate negotiations with that FIRM and open negotiations with the next ranked FIRM. The compensation discussed with one FIRM will not be disclosed or discussed with another FIRM.

When a final selection and negotiated fee and terms for the contract have been reached, a recommendation for award will be made to the SOCWA Project Committee for approval.

SCHEDULE

- Preproposal Meeting: March 4, 2010
- Final Date for Proposal Submittal: March 24, 2010
- Review by Engineering Committee: April 8, 2010
- Approval of Award by Board: April 22, 2010
- Project Completion: November 11, 2010

Engineering Committee Agenda Item

Meeting Date: May 13, 2010

Agenda Item No.: 5

Action Required: Yes

TO: SOCWA Engineering Committee, Project Committee 2

FROM: Brian Peck, Director of Engineering

SUBJECT: J. B. Latham Treatment Plant East Plant Improvements

Change Order Status

Summary

Two new change orders are presented for review and recommendation:

Change Order No. 9: Repair of Pipeline Leak. A non-potable water pipeline was began leaking adjacent to a duct bank excavation. The pipeline was not identified in the construction documents. Change order cost: \$976.27.

Change Order No.10: Non-Potable Water Pipeline Relocation. This change order involves the installation of a new 3-inch diameter non-potable water pipeline from the basin complex across the perimeter road to the landscaped boundary of the plant. The new pipeline will be installed adjacent to a new duct bank being installed as part of the East Plant Improvements Project. The new pipeline will eventually be used to replace existing piping (for which the route is largely unknown). Change order cost: \$6,402.00.

The total amount of change orders for the project is \$51,690.52. The project remains within budget.

Requested Action

The Engineering Committee will be asked to recommend Change Orders No. 9 and No.10 for Board action.

**J. B. Latham Treatment Plant East Plant Improvements
East Side Electrical System Retrofit (PC 2 Task 78-C)
Change Orders**

Date: 5/6/2010

CO #	CO Item	Description	Change Order Price	Cumulative Change Order	Status	Change Order Reason
1	Upsize Conduits and Handholes	After the completion of the bidding SDG&E requested the addition of two 5-inch conduits and three handholes between the new switchboard and transformer.	\$2,768.28	\$2,768.28	SOCWA Board Approved	SDG&E Request
2	Relocation of Utilities at New Pad	Rerouting of 4-inch plant water pipeline and 6-inch storm water discharge pipeline.	\$14,786.00	\$17,554.28	SOCWA Board Approved	Unexpected Conditions
3	Removal of DIP and ACP Pipelines	Removal of abandoned pipelines necessary for installation of new pad footings and ductbank.	\$12,790.00	\$30,344.28	SOCWA Board Approved	Unexpected Conditions
4	Additional Spare Conduit	Add one spare 3-inch conduit in new duct bank from MCC-D to pullbox mounted on wall.	\$3,681.67	\$34,025.95	SOCWA Board Approved	Design Error or Omission
5	Rerouting Instrumentation Cable To Drainage Sump and Storm Water Pump Engine	Add two 1-inch conduits and cable to reroute signals around new Switchgear Pad.	\$6,874.00	\$40,899.95	SOCWA Board Approved	Unexpected Conditions
6	Relocation of Two Inch Steel Pipeline	Rerouting of 2-inch steel pipeline away from new duct banks adjacent to new Electrical Building.	\$748.85	\$41,648.80	SOCWA Engineering Committee Recommended	Unexpected Conditions
9	Repair 3" PVC Leak	Repair leaking pipe adjacent to work area.	\$976.27	\$42,625.07	SOCWA Staff Approved	Repair
10	3" PVC Non-Potable Water Pipeline Relocation	New pipeline to replace section subject to repeated leaks.	\$6,402.00	\$49,027.07	SOCWA Staff Approved	Owner Request

**J. B. Latham Treatment Plant East Plant Improvements
MCC Replacement (PC 2 Task 96-C)
Change Orders**

Date: 5/6/2010

CO #	CO Item	Description	Change Order Price	Cumulative Change Order	Status	Change Order Reason
7	Extended Temporary Power Cable	SOCWA staff requested longer temporary power cable route to avoid access and security problems.	\$1,918.93	\$1,918.93	SOCWA Engineering Committee Recommended	Owner Request

**J. B. Latham Treatment Plant East Plant Improvements
 Primary Sedimentation Upgrade (PC 2 Task 93-C)
 Change Orders**

Date: 5/6/2010

CO #	CO Item	Description	Change Order Price	Cumulative Change Order	Status	Change Order Reason
8	Basin Flooding	Leakage past broken gate resulting in flooding of basin in which Contractor was mobilized.	\$744.52	\$744.52	SOCWA Engineering Committee Recommended	Unexpected Conditions

Total Cumulative Change Orders	\$51,690.52
---------------------------------------	--------------------

Engineering Committee Agenda Item

Meeting Date: May 13, 2010

Agenda Item No.: 6

Action Required: Yes

TO: SOCWA Engineering Committee, Project Committee 2
FROM: Brian Peck, Director of Engineering
SUBJECT: J. B. Latham Treatment Plant Strategic Plan Scope of Services

General

The draft request for proposals (RFP) for the J. B. Latham Treatment Plant Strategic Plan is attached for review and approval by the Engineering Committee.

Scoping Meeting

One of the review comments regarding the draft scope at the April Engineering Committee meeting proposed that a scoping workshop be conducted at the beginning of the project. This would allow the consultant to provide input regarding the key issues for the development of the Strategic Plan. The scope from the RFP deviates somewhat from that approach. The scoping meeting – Workshop No.1 – occurs after the completion of the following tasks:

- Plant loading evaluation
- Concrete condition assessment
- Seismic risk review
- Regulatory impacts review

SOCWA staff believes that the preparation of the basic components will allow for better focus in the Scoping Workshop. The selected consultant would only be authorized to complete Tasks I through VI. The scope could then be revised if necessary.

Proposed Schedule

The proposed schedule shows Engineering Committee review of the proposals at the July Engineering Committee meeting with the recommended contract to be awarded at the August Board of Directors Meeting. Workshop No.1 would be held at the normally scheduled October Engineering Committee meeting.

Proposed RFP Recipients

SOCWA staff proposes to send the RFP for the Strategic Plan to four engineering firms:

- Black & Veatch
- Carollo Engineers
- CH2MHill
- HDR Engineering

These four firms are suggested based on their overall resources and on their successful past working record with SOCWA.

Requested Action

The Engineering Committee will be asked to review and approve the draft Request for Proposals

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

FOR THE
STRATEGIC PLAN
FOR THE
J. B. LATHAM TREATMENT PLANT

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF SERVICES REQUIRED

The South Orange County Wastewater Authority (SOCWA), a Joint Powers Authority, and several of its Member Agencies intend to retain a qualified FIRM to provide engineering services for the development of a strategic plan for the J. B. Latham Treatment Plant.

RECEIPT OF PROPOSALS

Nine (9) bound copies and one (1) unbound copy of your proposal, signed by an officer of the FIRM who is authorized to execute legally binding agreements shall be delivered to: Brian Peck, SOUTH ORANGE COUNTY WASTEWATER AUTHORITY, 34156 Del Obispo Street, Dana Point, CA 92629 no later than 2:00 p.m. on June 17, 2010. Late proposals will be returned unopened to the respondent.

PROPOSAL AND SITE INQUIRIES

A pre-proposal meeting will be held at the J. B. Latham Treatment Plant at 10:00 a.m. on June 1, 2010. This meeting allows FIRMS to ask questions of staff and to investigate the site firsthand.

Should a FIRM desire additional information prior to submitting a proposal, please contact Brian Peck at (949) 234-5411.

SOCWA will not be held responsible for any verbal instructions or information that may be provided to prospective respondents. All addenda will be in writing and will be sent to all proposers.

BACKGROUND

The J. B. Latham Treatment Plant is a 13 mgd conventional activated sludge treatment located in Dana Point. The liquids portion of the plant was built in four phases: 1964, 1971, 1974 and 1978. The solids portion of the plant includes two dissolved air flotation (DAF) thickeners and four anaerobic digesters which were built in 1971 and 1974. The Energy Recovery Building was constructed with

belter filter presses for dewatering in 1986. The presses were replaced with centrifuges in the late 1990's and early 2000's. The final major new facility, the Effluent Pump Station, was constructed in 1993.

Many upgrade projects have been completed at the Latham Treatment Plant over the past ten years. The recently approved Ten Year Plan has laid out an ambitious set of rehabilitation projects up to Fiscal Year 2019/2020. These projects focus on the preservation and improvement of existing assets.

A Strategic Plan is proposed for the Latham Treatment Plant to consider broader regional and industry wide issues and their projected impact on capital investment in the facility.

SCOPE OF SERVICES

The following shall be considered to be a preliminary scope of services; your proposal may include those modifications to this scope of services that you deem desirable or necessary based upon your experience or expertise.

Tasks are to include the following:

I. Meetings

FIRM will conduct one kick-off meeting at the Dana Point office of SOCWA. FIRM will conduct additional meetings through the course of the project as needed for the proper level of communication with SOCWA.

Note that these meetings are separate and distinct from the workshops described in this Scope of Work.

II. Evaluate Plant Loading

SOCWA will provide the original basis of design for the liquids portion of the Latham Treatment Plant. SOCWA will provide five years of daily average data in an EXCEL format. Data will include the following: influent flow, influent BOD, influent suspended solids, primary effluent BOD, primary effluent suspended solids, primary effluent ammonia nitrogen, mixed liquor suspended solids, RAS flow, final effluent flow, final effluent suspended solids and final effluent BOD. SOCWA will provide limited additional data including total dissolved solids and turbidity. SOCWA will provide eight 48 hour period diurnal flow charts for the dates specified by the FIRM.

FIRM will meet with SOCWA Operations staff to discuss operational and water quality issues.

FIRM will compare current plant loading with original design criteria. FIRM will summarize results of analysis in a technical memorandum. One hard copy and one electronic copy (in *.pdf format) will be transmitted to SOCWA for review and comment.

III. Assess Concrete Condition

SOCWA will loan half size plans of primary as-built drawings to the FIRM. FIRM shall conduct visual inspection of structural condition of facilities. SOCWA will provide FIRM access to inside of one primary sedimentation basin, one aeration basin, one secondary sedimentation basin and one thickener during a one week period. FIRM shall review structural plans where potential weaknesses have been visually observed (see also Task IV). FIRM shall develop a matrix of noted structural deficiencies. These deficiencies shall be categorized according to TYPE (three levels of severity) and REPAIR COST (three orders of magnitude cost levels).

Notes:

1. Evaluation does not include SOCWA Administration Facility.
2. Inspection of digester interiors will not be possible. SOCWA will provide report discussing structural repair of Digester No.3.

IV. Review Seismic Vulnerability

SOCWA will provide FIRM with three geotechnical reports describing conditions at different locations on the Latham Plant site. FIRM shall use these reports and any additional sources that the FIRM can research to describe the potential magnitude and impact of a major seismic event on the Latham Plant site. FIRM shall provide a broad review of plant structural drawings to determine any areas of significant seismic vulnerability.

FIRM will summarize results of Tasks III and IV in a technical memorandum. One hard copy and one electronic copy (in *.pdf format) will be transmitted to SOCWA for review and comment.

Note: This task is not intended to a major seismic and structural evaluation of the treatment plant. However, it is expected that this task may identify areas of the plant that require more detailed analysis.

V. Forecast Potential Regulatory Impacts

SOCWA will provide copies of current permits (including NPDES, AQMD and SOCWA recycled water permits) to the FIRM.

Engineering Committee Agenda Item No.6

FIRM shall develop a matrix of upcoming and potential future regulations that might be anticipated over the next twenty years. Matrix will describe the regulation, the probability of regulation issue, and the potential impact on the Latham Treatment Plant

VI. Workshop No.1

FIRM will conduct workshop with SOCWA senior staff and Project Committee No.2 Engineering Committee members (1) summarizing results of Tasks II through V and (2) reviewing issues for detailed development in the Strategic Plan. Length of the workshop will be limited to 4 hours.

NOTE: The Consultant will only be authorized to perform Tasks I through VI when the contract is awarded. The remaining scope will be reviewed and, if necessary, revised after Workshop No.1.

VII. Modified Liquid Treatment Trains

FIRM shall prepare schematics and simple block site diagrams showing treatment schemes for up to six scenarios. The scenarios shall be based on (1) regulatory impacts identified in Task V, (2) processing of recycled water and (3) consolidation of operating facilities.

VIII. Review Key Liquid Treatment Issues

FIRM shall evaluate five key liquid treatment issues:

- A. Grit Removal. FIRM shall evaluate the need and the approach for expanded handling of grit on the 9 mgd side of the treatment plant.
- B. Advanced Primary Treatment. FIRM shall evaluate advanced primary treatment for that Latham Plant. Basic analysis shall evaluate quantities of chemical and amount of additional solids produced.
- C. Flow Distribution. FIRM shall perform a simplified evaluation of hydraulics in the Primary Effluent Channel to determine potential maldistribution of flow to the aeration basins. FIRM shall develop concepts for improving distribution.
- D. Aeration. FIRM shall evaluate proposed concept for Aeration System upgrade. FIRM shall consider how Aeration System Upgrade relates to alternative liquid treatment schemes identified in Task VII.

- E. AWT. FIRM shall review Value Engineering and Response to Value Engineering for AWT Project (two technical memoranda prepared in 2009) to note how future AWT project would relate to concepts explore in Task VII. FIRM will develop basic estimate for reverse osmosis facility needed to lower effluent total dissolved solids to acceptable level according to the Basin Plan.

FIRM will summarize results of Tasks VII and VIII in a technical memorandum. One hard copy and one electronic copy (in *.pdf format) will be transmitted to SOCWA for review and comment.

IX. Workshop No.2

FIRM will conduct workshop with SOCWA senior staff and Project Committee No.2 Engineering Committee members summarizing results of Tasks VII and VIII. Length of the workshop will be limited to 2 – ½ hours.

X. Review Key Solids Handling Issues

SOCWA will provide five years of daily average data in an EXCEL format. Data will include solids loading associated with Plant 3A and the Oso Creek Water Reclamation Plant. SOCWA and FIRM will work jointly to develop basis of design for existing facility. SOCWA will provide FIRM with white paper describing current existing digester capacity.

FIRM shall evaluate three key solids treatment issues and opportunities:

- A. Thickening. FIRM shall evaluate cost of upgrading existing DAF thickening as compared to replacement with disc thickeners (the latter option would be considered to reduce the space requirement).
- B. Digestion. FIRM will develop basis of design, simple site plan and order of magnitude construction cost for the construction of Digester No. 5 (to be sized the same as Digesters No.1 and No.2). Optional concept would evaluate basis of design and operational sequence if the Plant 3A solids are discharged to the Latham Plant. A second optional concept would evaluate the impact of advanced primary treatment on the digestion system.
- C. Solids Storage. FIRM will evaluate different approaches to on site solids storage to reduce the dependence on contractor transport of dewatered biosolids.

XI. Energy Management

SOCWA will provide five years of daily average data in an EXCEL format. Data will include the following: digester gas production, natural gas usage and electrical power usage.

FIRM shall evaluate the following energy issues:

- A. Enhancement of Digester Gas Production. FIRM shall evaluate options for increasing gas production including but not limited to the import of Plant 3A solids and the implementation of advanced primary treatment.
- B. Private Options for Gas Utilization. FIRM will evaluate the feasibility of utilizing a private contractor on the Latham site to generate power from digester gas using fuel cells, microturbines or other technology.

XII. Odor Control

FIRM shall prepare brief basis for design for Odor Control Scrubber No.3 for the treatment of off-gases from the Aeration Basins. FIRM shall provide site plan showing proposed location for scrubber. FIRM shall provide order of magnitude cost estimate for the third odor control system.

XIII. Workshop No.3

FIRM will conduct workshop with SOCWA senior staff and Project Committee No.2 Engineering Committee members summarizing results of Tasks X through XII. Length of the workshop will be limited to 2 – ½ hours.

XIV. Develop Site Plan Alternatives

FIRM shall develop a minimum of eight different site plans integrating the different concepts evaluated in Task VII through Task XII. Site plans will be submitted in both 24" x 36" and 11" x 17" format.

XV. Develop Sequence of Events

SOCWA shall identify one site plan to the FIRM for final development. FIRM shall develop a series of drawings showing the order of development of different projects to complete the final site plan.

Note: The purpose of this task is to indicate what project must be completed prior to other projects in order to maintain SOCWA's flexibility

to address changing conditions. This sequencing can then be integrated into SOCWA's Ten Year Plan.

XVI. Workshop No.4

FIRM will conduct workshop with SOCWA senior staff and Project Committee No.2 Engineering Committee members summarizing results of Tasks XIV through XV. Length of the workshop will be limited to 2 – ½ hours.

XVII. Draft Report

FIRM shall summarize results of Tasks I through XVI in a draft report. Technical memoranda and matrices may be simply bound into the report to simplify preparation. Five copies of the draft report shall be submitted to SOCWA for review and comment. The FIRM shall respond to all review comments. Ten copies of the finalized memorandum shall be submitted to SOCWA.

XVIII. Final Report

Ten copies of the finalized report will be prepared and submitted to SOCWA. FIRM shall submit an electronic copy of the report in *.pdf format. All figures will be submitted to SOCWA in the electronic format of preparation (e.g. *.dwg). "

QUALITY ASSURANCE

The FIRM shall administer a program of QA procedures for producing quality work. Specific procedures shall cover, but not be limited to, planning, checking, reviewing and scheduling the work.

All documents prepared by the FIRM shall be subject to the FIRM's in-house procedures prior to submittal to SOCWA for review. Each submittal shall be accompanied by a written statement from the principal-in-charge of the project stating that documents being submitted have been checked.

Discipline checks shall be made of all design calculations, drawings, specifications, construction cost estimates, and reports. An integrated design review shall be performed for multidisciplinary documents to provide coordination and to avoid conflicts in the documents. Checking shall be performed by qualified individuals who are not directly involved in the design or supervision of the work.

PROPOSAL CONTENTS

SOCWA does not require a specific format for proposals. FIRMS may prepare their proposals in a manner most suited to their particular organization. However, all requirements set forth in the Request for Proposals must be addressed. Proposals shall be concise and shall not exceed twelve (12) pages, excluding covers, tabs, and resumes. Preprinted and prepared general company advertising literature such as color brochures are discouraged unless they are specifically related to the services requested and referenced as such.

FIRM proposals shall include, at a minimum, the following information:

1. Indication that the FIRM has a clear understanding of each project. This should include a description of the work to be performed, how the project tasks will be accomplished and the problems that may be encountered.
2. Descriptions of previous projects of similar type, scope, and size that the FIRM has completed. The description shall include project name, client, and client references (including telephone numbers).
3. Name, project responsibilities, and experience of designated personnel that will be assigned to work on SOCWA's projects with emphasis on the Project Manager.
4. Resumes of designated personnel, where appropriate.
5. Current workload and future anticipated work of key staff to be assigned to the project.
6. List of all subconsultants proposed to be used by the FIRM.
7. A preliminary project schedule incorporating the milestone dates identified in this RFP. The FIRM should indicate whether or not the milestone dates are feasible.
8. A table of effort is to be included in the Proposal that includes the FIRM hours by classification and the total hours for each subconsultant. This breakout is to be provided for each work item shown in the scope of services.
9. A proposed fee and schedule of hourly rates, provided in a separate sealed envelope marked "Estimate Fee – Design Services Proposal" and indicating the FIRM'S name. An electronic copy of this table shall also be provided.

10. A copy of the SOCWA's standard engineering contract is attached as Exhibit 'A'. The Proposal is to verify that the submitting firm will maintain the required insurance levels. The Proposal should identify whether or not the submitting firm agrees to the contract language. Any discrepancies should be identified

LEGAL REQUIREMENTS AND GENERAL CONDITIONS

Interpretation of Documents

A FIRM contemplating submitting a proposal for this proposed contract who is in doubt as to the true meaning of any part of this Request for Proposal or finds discrepancies in or omissions from this Request for Proposal, may submit to SOCWA a verbal or written request for interpretation or correction thereof. Any interpretation or correction of the documents will be made only by addendum duly issued. A copy of such an addendum will be mailed or delivered to each FIRM receiving this Request for Proposal. SOCWA will not be responsible for any explanations or interpretations of the documents other than written addenda.

Submission of a proposal shall be evidence that the FIRM did, in fact, conduct all necessary inspections and is aware of and acknowledges all conditions, restrictions and limitations affecting performance and cost.

Addenda

All addenda issued during the proposal period shall be noted in the FIRM's proposal.

Rejection of Proposal

SOCWA reserves the right to reject any and all proposals, to negotiate with one or more FIRMS, to waive any informality in a proposal, to delete or add items of work prior to award, and to make an award in the best interest of SOCWA.

Contract Award

The selected FIRM shall enter into a written contract with SOCWA binding all terms, conditions, and provisions of the proposal, and other terms, conditions, and provisions negotiated prior to award of the contract. The contract period will be for the duration of the project. A copy of the standard engineering services contract that SOCWA utilizes is attached with this Request for Proposals.

SOCWA's Use of Proposal Material

All material submitted in or with the proposal shall become the property of SOCWA, unless it is clearly marked as proprietary information. SOCWA

reserves the right to use any ideas presented in the proposals, without compensation paid to the FIRM. Selection or rejection of the proposal shall not affect this right.

Proposal Development

The cost for developing and submitting the proposal shall be entirely the responsibility of the FIRM.

SELECTION CRITERIA

Proposals will be evaluated on the basis of their response to all provisions of this RFP. The Agency may use some or all of the following criteria in its evaluation and comparison of proposals submitted. The following list of criteria is not intended to be all inclusive and the order is not intended to indicate their relative importance:

- The experience, qualifications and availability of the Proposer's consultant team and, in particular, the Project Manager assigned to the project.
- The experience of the Proposer's team with respect to long range planning for wastewater treatment facilities.
- The experience of the Proposer's team with respect to evaluation the structural condition and seismic evaluation of wastewater treatment facilities in Southern California.
- The Proposer's technical approach and methodology to performing the scope of services will be evaluated based upon completeness, demonstrated capability, responsiveness to the Agency's needs and demonstrated understanding of the work requirements.
- Successful completion of previous work for SOCWA and its member agencies.
- The evaluation will consider the respondent's proposed mechanism for quality control, meeting schedules, method of coordination and cost control and a demonstrated ability to respond rapidly to changes in project requirements. The proposal should identify the individual who will lead QA/QC review teams.
- The organizational structure of the proposed project team.
- Recent references from local clients on similar type work performed by Proposer.
- The proposed effort and fee for completing the scope of services.

Engineering Committee Agenda Item No.6

- The Proposer's demonstrated ability to meet all of the SOCWA's administrative requirements including insurance, liability, equal opportunity practices and any exceptions taken to the SOCWA's Professional Services Contract.

SELECTION PROCEDURES

Proposals received by SOCWA will be reviewed on the basis of the proposal contents. It is the intent of SOCWA to select the firm based on the proposals. However, SOCWA reserves the right to conduct interviews with one or more firms prior to final selection.

If agreement cannot be reached with the selected FIRM, SOCWA will terminate negotiations with that FIRM and open negotiations with the next ranked FIRM. The compensation discussed with one FIRM will not be disclosed or discussed with another FIRM.

When a final selection and negotiated fee and terms for the contract have been reached, a recommendation for award will be made to the SOCWA Project Committee for approval.

SCHEDULE

- Preproposal Meeting: June 1, 2010
- Final Date for Proposal Submittal: June 17, 2010
- Engineering Committee Review: July 8, 2010
- Approval of Award by Board: August 5, 2010
- Notice To Proceed: August 12, 2010
- Workshop No.1: October 14, 2010
- Draft Final Report Submittal: January 20, 2011