

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

**July 8, 2010**

A Regular Meeting of the South Orange County Wastewater Authority Engineering Committee was held on Thursday, July 8, 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:

DENNIS CAFFERTY, El Toro Water District  
DR. ROBERT GUMERMAN, Moulton Niguel Water District  
DAVID SHISSLER, City of Laguna Beach  
ERIC BAUMAN, City of San Juan Capistrano

Also Present:

BRIAN PECK, SOCWA Director of Engineering  
CHRISTINE HUTTON, SOCWA Administrative Assistant  
MIKE WISLON, SOCWA Asst General Manager / Director of Operations  
MIKE DEMAREE, SOCWA Director of Finance (arrived at 8:36 a.m.)

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 (May and June '10)**

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Peck noted that the Engineering Committee could not act on the May and June Meeting Minutes as a quorum of the Committee was not present.

ACTION:

Action on the May and June 2010 Engineering Committee Meeting Minutes was deferred until the August Engineering Committee Meeting.

**J.B. Latham Treatment Plant East Plant Improvements Construction Progress Report (PC 2)**

DISCUSSION:

F. T. Ziebarth was here at midnight last night for a cut-over on the new switchgear. This gear is now energized. Over the next two to three weeks the contractor will be working on transferring the motor control centers from the old switchgear to the new switchgear. Ziebarth projects moving on to the excavation for the new raw sewage pump station piping in approximately two months. The project appears to be on schedule.

There are two new proposed change orders for the project. Change Order No. 11 is for \$7,798.00. This change relates to the removal and replacement of a portion of the existing flood control wall on the east side of the raw sewage pump station. This was necessitated by the actual size of a major electrical duct bank that will be mounted on the side of the secondary sedimentation basins. The schematic drawing of the duct bank on the bid documents did not reflect the true size of the duct bank. The actual size is immense; it has a cross sectional area of approximately 6 x 8 feet. The contractor needs to form the wall around the new conduits to create a new stem connection for the flood control gate.

The second change order, Change Order No. 12, has a price of \$672.70. This change order is related to modifications of the dissolved air flotation (DAF) thickener system controls. The design for the facility had shown a simplification of the controls as the start/stop functions would be centralized at the new Motor Control Center 'L'. This allowed the removal of two local control pushbutton stations that were essentially rotting away. However, the operations staff decided that the local control was needed as part of the preventative maintenance program. The change reflects the addition of two local control switches.

The two new change orders bring the total change to contract value at \$60,161.22. The project is still well within budget.

Mr. Bauman questioned on Change Order No. 11 whether the design firm should have properly sized the duct bank. Mr. Peck noted that the schematic design of the duct bank is standard; however, this situation required more detailed due to the impact on adjacent infrastructure. Mr. Bauman questioned whether the design firm should be responsible for the cost of the change order. Mr. Peck noted that the large portion of the cost of the change order would have been included in the bid if fully designed; the work needed to be done in any event. The overall change order cost due to errors and omissions for the project remains less than 0.5% of the construction contract value. Mr. Peck believes that this is a very good errors and omissions rate on a project of this size.

**ACTION:**

The Engineering Committee recommended bringing Change Orders No. 11 and No. 12 to the Board of Directors for approval.

**J.B. Latham Treatment Plant Strategic Plan Proposal Review (PC 2)**

**DISCUSSION:**

The request for proposals (RFP's) was transmitted to five engineering firms. Only one proposal was received as submitted by Carollo Engineers. However, this proposal includes HDR Engineering as a sub-consultant; HDR was one of the five other firms to receive a RFP. Brown and Caldwell declined shortly after indicating that they did not have the right match of skill sets for the project. Black & Veatch informed SOCWA two days before the due date that it

would not be submitting a proposal. Black & Veatch indicated that their key staff members were committed to other projects. CH2MHill was contacted after the submittal deadline when they failed to submit a proposal. The failure by CH2MHill to submit a proposal was a surprise. They spent approximately five hours of SOCWA staff time in interviews during the RFP period. CH2MHill subsequently stated that they believed that their previous work on the AWT project would be detrimental to their team's chances. Mr. Peck had indicated during the staff interviews that the AWT project would be seen in a positive light given the knowledge developed for the facility. Fred Soroushian of CH2MHill intimated that a member of the Engineering Committee had led them to believe that the AWT work would be a negative factor. Mr. Bauman did not recollect having any discussion with CH2MHill. Dr. Gumerman indicated that he did meet with CH2MHill and that the meeting had been very upbeat.

The proposal received from the Carollo / HDR team appears to be strong. Their pricing for the project was approximately \$188,000. Black & Veatch stated that if they had proposed they would have estimated a fee between \$180,000 to \$200,000.

Mr. Bauman asked if resolicitation would expand the number of proposals. Mr. Peck indicated that he had put that question to Black & Veatch. They felt it unlikely that Black & Veatch management would propose as they felt that Carollo would become the favorite in a second round of proposals. Mr. Bauman asked if Black & Veatch would submit a letter indicating that they had reviewed the proposal and that they considered the budget commensurate with the needed work. Mr. Peck indicated that he would ask letters from each of the invited firms.

Dr. Gumerman indicated that he felt it was a good proposal with a strong team. Mr. Peck thought that the proposal provided a rationale for why Carollo and HDR should team together. It also provided a detailed description of what roles the Project Manager and Assistant Project Manager would perform.

Mr. Peck stated that he had reviewed the proposal with Mr. Feron prior to his departure for vacation. Mr. Feron believed that the Carollo proposal was worthy of award. Mr. Peck is scheduled to review the proposal with Mr. Dunbar on Monday, July 12. Dr. Gumerman supported the award of contract to the Carollo team. Mr. Bauman indicated that he wanted a little more time to review the proposal. He will get comments to Mr. Peck by Tuesday, July 13. Mr. Bauman was reluctant to advocate award of contract to Carollo in the absence of competing proposals. Mr. Peck will advise the members of the Project Committee 2 Engineering Committee of the standings after Mr. Dunbar and Mr. Bauman make their final comments.

**ACTION:**

Mr. Peck will (1) request letters from the recipients of the RFP that did not submit proposals, (2) obtain final comments from Mr. Dunbar and Mr. Bauman, and (3) advise members of the Project Committee 2 Engineering Committee of the selection status

**Plant 3A Geotechnical Stabilization Preliminary Design Proposal Review (PC 3A)**

**DISCUSSION:**

Mr. Peck reported that the request for proposals (RFP's) for the Geotechnical Stabilization project also went out to five firms. A single proposal was received from TetraTech. Each of the four non-submitting firms indicated current work load of key staff members as being a reason for failure to submit. Two of the firms expressed a concern that TetraTech would be difficult to compete with for this project. TetraTech prepared an analysis of repairs needed in the dissolved air flotation (DAF) thickening system in 2006. TetraTech's project manager for that work has since left the company. However, the competing firms still believed that this was a significant edge for TetraTech

Mr. Peck indicated that he had contacted TetraTech after reviewing the proposal. Mr. Peck expressed to TetraTech that the amount of time and fee seemed high for the proposed work. TetraTech worked with Mr. Peck to restructure some of the tasks. The proposed fee was reduced by over \$10,000 to \$70,413.

Mr. Peck met Mr. Ferons to review the proposal after the fee had been reduced. Mr. Peck asked Mr. Ferons whether or not he should attempt to further reduce the price. Mr. Ferons expressed concern that a deeper cut might leave SOCWA exposed to a subsequent change order request.

Dr. Gumerman indicated that he was satisfied with the proposal and the reduced fee. He felt that Ninyo and Moore would be a strong component of the team.

**ACTION:**

SOCWA staff is to present a recommendation for the award of contract to TetraTech for a fee of \$70,413 to the Board of Directors

**Coastal Treatment Plant Energy Audit Review (PC 15)**

**DISCUSSION:**

Mr. Peck stated that SOCWA had hired the firm EEC under a small purchase order to perform a limited energy audit for the Coastal Treatment Plant. A copy of that report has been distributed to Project Committee 15 members. This evaluation was intended as a follow-up to an energy audit conducted for the SOCWA facilities eight years ago. SOCWA's desire was for EEC to focus on the mechanical aspects of the aeration system as well as some of the key pumping systems. The inefficient operation of the blower systems has been a point of discussion between SOCWA staff and the Engineering Committee for many years. EEC

elected to focus on process aspects of the aeration process; this was a deviation from their scope of work. EEC went so far as to hire a subconsultant (Wyatt Troxel) without prior discussion with SOCWA.

One of the key aspects of the EEC analysis was the statement that the removal of sulfides could yield significant reductions in blower operations thus resulting in power savings. EEC chose to promote options for chemical addition within the collection systems. Mr. Peck indicated that EEC had been told that this was inadvisable due to (a) difficulty of bulk chemical handling on some of the narrow streets and sites within the City of Laguna Beach and (b) the current operation of sulfide control systems by the City of Laguna Beach. Mr. Shissler registered great displeasure with the wording of the EEC report. The City of Laguna Beach has made a significant investment in the sulfide control systems; test results have shown that sulfide levels are reduced to unmeasurable levels during the day time. Mr. Shissler can not understand how it can be said that there is no beneficial impact on sulfide control at the Coastal Plant. Mr. Peck noted that his was the same input that had been provided to EEC.

Mr. Peck noted that the two chemicals proposed for use in the system were magnesium hydroxide and calcium nitrate. Mr. Peck indicated that he was not familiar with the use of these chemicals in other Southern California wastewater collections systems.

Mr. Wilson noted that there was some confusion in the report regarding whether or not the sulfide levels were in the influent or in the primary effluent. SOCWA is adding 10 to 15 mg/L of ferric chloride before the Coastal Treatment Plant headworks so there is apt to be some reduction in sulfides through the primary clarifiers. Mr. Wilson noted that there were still relatively high sulfides coming into the Coastal Plant. He also stated that testing had revealed that there were relatively high sulfides coming in on both the South Coast Water District and the City of Laguna Beach sides. Mr. Shissler did indicate that historical sulfide levels had been higher at night; the City was modifying its operation to address this issue. Mr. Wilson noted that it was possible that the high sulfide measurements may have correlated to times when the Laguna Beach treatment system was not operating; however, SOCWA staff did not have information regarding when the Laguna Beach system was on or off.

Mr. Peck noted that EEC had already been informed of SOCWA's dissatisfaction with the report. This dissatisfaction focused on EEC's failure to follow scope and EEC's unrealistic recommendation regarding chemical addition in the member agency collection systems. Mr. Peck also stated that EEC had been paid its approximate \$7,700 fee for the work. Although SOCWA disagreed with the conclusions of the report SOCWA did consider that EEC had raised some interesting points. Mr. Peck noted that no action would be made on the recommendations of the report. However, the sulfide issue would be revisited as part of the Coastal Treatment Plant Facility Plan in Fiscal Year '11/'12.

ACTION:

There was no action needed on this item

**Prop 50 SOCWA Repayment Request (PC 2)**

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Peck indicated that SOCWA had been contacted by Zoila Finch with the County of Orange. Ms. Finch indicated that the State of California had rejected the request to allow SOCWA to keep the collected Proposition 50 fund for the cancelled advanced wastewater treatment (AWT). Mr. Demaree is currently checking to make sure that the refund requested by the State matches the amount transmitted to SOCWA. Mr. Bauman asked if the refund amount was \$470,000. Mr. Peck indicated that the requested refund amount was approximately \$681,625. Dr. Gumerman asked why there was such a large discrepancy between the two numbers. Mr. Peck indicated that the County of Orange had originally believed that the State would allow SOCWA to keep \$211,625 based on consideration of matching funds already provided by SOCWA. However, the State elected to pursue a full refund based on SOCWA's failure to complete the project.

Mr. Demaree indicated that \$667,000 had already been collected from the participating agencies; SOCWA would need to collect an additional \$13,625.

ACTION:

SOCWA staff will work with County staff to work out the details of repayment. Mr. Demaree will be in contact with the participating agencies regarding collection of the remaining \$13,625 for the refund.

**Coastal Treatment Plant Headworks Upgrade Construction Progress Report (PC 15)**

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Peck reported that the Coastal Treatment Plant Headworks Upgrade Project was still in the shop drawing phase. A proposed change order for an elevated platform adjacent to the rotary screens had been discussed at the previous Engineering Committee meeting. Mr. Peck indicated that pricing for this change order was still in negotiation with S.S. Mechanical.

ACTION:

There was no action needed on this item.

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

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Peck presented one new change order for the Regional Treatment Plant Headworks Upgrade project. This change order will replace the flashing, gutter and various other miscellaneous metals on the Headworks Building. The reason for the change is to try and make the aesthetic style of the reconstructed roof of the Headworks Building match the other buildings

at the Regional Treatment Plant. The cost for this change order (Change Order No 7) is \$3,480; this brings the total amount of the change orders for the project to \$47,816.84.

**ACTION:**

Dr. Gumerman indicated that the MNWD supported presenting Change Order No 7 to the Board of Directors for approval.

**Public Comments on Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7**

**DISCUSSION:**

Mr. Peck asked if there were any public comments on items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7. There was none.

**ACTION:**

No action needed.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:23 a.m.

/Christine Hutton /

Christine Hutton, Administrative Assistant/Recorder