

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

December 09, 2010

A Regular Meeting of the South Orange County Wastewater Authority Engineering Committee was held on Thursday, December 09, 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:

MIKE DUNBAR, South Coast Water District
DR. ROBERT GUMERMAN, Moulton Niguel Water District
TONI SCHMIDT, Emerald Bay Service District
DAVID SHISSLER, City of Laguna Beach
DAN FERONS, Santa Margarita Water District
DENNIS CAFFERTY, El Toro Water District

Also Present:

BRIAN PECK, SOCWA Director of Engineering
CHRISTINE HUTTON, SOCWA Administrative Assistant
THOMAS ROSALES, SOCWA General Manager
MIKE WILSON, SOCWA Asst 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 (Special Meeting July 22, 2010)

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Peck referenced the July 22, 2010 Special Engineering Committee Minutes. Mr. Peck noted that the spelling of the Emerald Bay Service District ('Service'; not 'Services'). Mr. Peck asked if there were any questions or comments. There were none.

ACTION:

Motion was made by Mr. Ferons and seconded by Mr. Cafferty to approve the provided Engineering Committee minutes. Motion carried unanimously.

AWMA Road Access Bridge Status Report (PC 15)

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Peck recapped the discussion regarding the AWMA Road Access Bridge from the December 8 SOCWA Board of Directors meeting. Mr. Peck reviewed the findings of the structural analysis done by TetraTech. The existing bridge meets the deflection limits for the

structural standards that were in place at the time the bridge was designed (circa 1979); however, the bridge does not meet deflection requirements for current standards. The TetraTech report also noted the natural deterioration of the wood bridge through weathering. Issues were also raised regarding the safety of the existing vehicle barriers. It is the combination of these factors that has led TetraTech to recommend the long term replacement of the bridge. Mr. Rosales has assembled a group of the stake holders to review this issue. TetraTech also recommended a series of four interim improvements:

- posting of a weight limit for traffic on the bridge
- installing speed bumps
- constructing guard rails along the approaches to the bridge
- installing seismic supports on the larger piping supported from the bridge.

The posting of the weight limit will restrict certain types of trucks from using the bridge (e.g. chemical deliveries.) Mr. Wilson has been working with SOCWA's vendors to re-route traffic around the bridge via Knollwood Road. TetraTech has estimated that the cost for the interim retrofits at \$80,000. Mr. Demaree is looking into drawing upon existing accounts to provide an \$80,000 budget. It is believed that it will take four to eight weeks to get these interim improvements completed.

The issue of biker and hiker safety was not addressed in the TetraTech report. It has been proposed to post signs on the bridge that restrict usage. SOCWA staff will review the proper signage with Pat Giannone. Mr. Shissler suggests that any bridge sign should just be a 'warning' sign rather than a restriction sign.

Mr. Peck noted that the construction of any interim improvements might require a permit from the County. Mr. Peck noted that the improvements would be within SOCWA's easement. Several Engineering Committee members indicated that the interim improvements should be installed without the permit; Mr. Ferons indicated that the County should be notified as a courtesy. Mr. Wilson stated that SOCWA had previously indicated signs along the AWMA Road without obtaining a county permit.

ACTION:

No action necessary at this time.

Regional Treatment Plant Clarifier Upgrade Phase I Upgrade Construction Progress Report (PC 17)

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Peck reviewed the status of the Regional Treatment Plant Clarifier Upgrade I project. Work within Secondary Clarifier No.3 is nearing completion; the basin should be returned to service by the end of December. Work can not begin on the next unit (Secondary Clarifier No.1)

until the beginning of April, 2011. Given the amount of extra work needed in Clarifier No.3 there was some question regarding how to proceed with Clarifier No.1. The option is open to replace the equipment in the remaining secondary clarifiers rather than retrofitting and recoating.

Mr. Peck will report on the final status of the change orders for Clarifier No.3 after the basin has been returned to service. At that point, SOCWA staff will make a recommendation about how to proceed with Clarifier No.1.

ACTION:

No action is necessary at this time.

Coastal Treatment Plant Export Sludge Force Main Replacement Environmental Services Proposal Review (PC 15)

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Peck stated that the urgency of the Export Sludge project had been highlighted on Wednesday, December 1 by the failure of one of the two Export Sludge Force Mains. The failure took place in Wilderness Park in the gravel parking on the west side of Alicia Parkway across the street from the Regional Lift Station. Mr. Peck presented a PowerPoint presentation showing the failure location and the repair. Mr. Peck noted that SOCWA was fortunate that the failure had been detected by a Moulton Niguel Water District (MNWD) inspector not long after the failure is believed to have happened. Mr. Peck noted that there had been a discharge into the dry portion of Sulfur Creek but it appears to have been a very small volume. MNWD staff mobilized on site rapidly to install small berms and to utilize a vactor test to pump escaped liquid into a nearby sewer manhole. Mr. Wilson arranged for Jamison Engineering to come to the site to find and repair the pipeline break.

Mr. Peck discussed a series of PowerPoint pictures showing the exposed pipeline failure. Mr. Peck noted that Jamison exposed approximately six feet of the ductile iron pipeline (at a depth of approximately 10 feet) beyond the break which didn't appear to be any signs of weak points. Although there was no sign of any warping, there did not appear to be any significant corrosion along the exterior of the pipelines. A repair clamp was installed by Jamison. The force main was returned to service on Thursday, December 2.

Mr. Wilson noted that this was the first time in over 11 years that there had been a failure of the Export Sludge Force Mains. Mr. Dunbar recalled that the last failure occurred in 1992 or 1993.

Mr. Shissler queried if adding cathodic protection would help prolong the remaining life of the force mains. Mr. Peck responded that adding cathodic protection might be expensive as each length of pipe would need to be bonded. Mr. Peck pointed out that the failure also points out the exposure of the pipeline due to the eroding creek bed along Sulfur Creek. This should be addressed in the forthcoming Environmental Analysis of the force main.

The discussion moved on to the Environmental Services Proposals. Requests for Proposals (RFP's) were transmitted to seven firms: ESA, Michael Brandman, Dudek, Ed Almanza, BonTerra, TetraTech, and Keeton Kreitzer. Kreitzer was the only one of the seven firms that did not attend the pre-proposal meeting. The pre-proposal meeting lasted for two hours; a subsequent two hour site visit was conducted. A significant amount of time was spent with the invited firms to educate them about the project. Several firms questioned whether or not Dudek had a lock on the project given the extent of work that Dudek has done in Aliso Canyon over the past ten years. SOCWA staff told the firms that (a) SOCWA had a reputation among engineering firms for an honest selection process and (b) select members of the environmental community had express concerns about Dudek given that Dudek had already been awarded the preliminary design for the project. Dudek picked up on this issue and elected to serve on the Ed Almanza team as a sub consultant. In the end SOCWA received only two proposals for the project: BonTerra and Ed Almanza. SOCWA staff tried to follow up with the other firms that did not propose. ESA did not respond to e-mails. Michael Brandman felt that they did not have enough background on the project to be competitive. TetraTech was tied up with other proposals.

The proposal by Ed Almanza was unique in that it offered both PCR and Dudek as sub consultants for the same tasks. Subsequent discussion with Mr. Almanza indicated that he had a good working relationship with PCR; however, Dudek had a significant level of experience in Aliso Creek Canyon. Mr. Peck reported that Mr. Almanza's intent was to provide SOCWA with a choice.

Mr. Peck was asked about the relative pricing of the proposals. Mr. Peck stated that the proposed fee for BonTerra was approximately \$305 thousand. The pricing for the Almanza proposal ranged from \$220 thousand to \$285 thousand depending on which sub consultant was used.

Mr. Peck noted that neither of the proposals fulfilled the proposal requirements as set forth in the RFP. Ed Almanza bound his proposal; the RFP asked for plain lettered proposals without binding. The BonTerra proposal failed to offer any comments regarding the base contract as set forth in the RFP. Mr. Peck stated that those were theoretical grounds for rejecting both proposals. Mr. Shissler indicated that he felt that the proposals should be rejected. Mr. Shissler felt it was important to have more than two proposals he also felt that Dudek should have submitted its own proposal given their experience. Mr. Shissler stated that it was inappropriate for one firm to not submit based on the political stance of certain environmental groups.

Mr. Dunbar asked what the time impact of rejecting the proposals and going out for new proposals. Mr. Peck stated that it would be a delay of two to three months.

There was general agreement among the Engineering Committee members that two proposals were not sufficient for a project of this magnitude. Discussion ensued regarding the best way to proceed.

ACTION:

Mr. Peck was directed to (1) reject the two proposals; (2) talk to the invited firms about what changes would be needed to obtain more proposals; (3) talk to Ed Almanza and Dudek about submitting separate proposals; and (4) restructure and reissue the RFP.

Regional Treatment Plant Headworks Upgrade Construction Progress Report (PC 17)

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Peck presented the status of change orders for the Regional Treatment Plant Headworks Upgrade Project.

ACTION:

Dr. Gumerman recommended bringing the noted change orders to the Board of Directors as presented by Mr. Peck.

Public Comments on Items 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Peck asked if there were any public comments on items 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. There were none.

ACTION:

No action needed.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:39 a.m.

/Christine Hutton /

Christine Hutton, Administrative Assistant/Recorder