Agenda Report Details (With Text)

File #:	2021-1638	**Version:**	1	**Name:**	
Type:	Consent			**Status:**	Passed
File created:	5/6/2021			**In control:**	OPERATIONS COMMITTEE
On agenda:	5/26/2021			**Final action:**	5/26/2021
Title:	ANNUAL PROFESSIONAL DESIGN SERVICES AGREEMENTS, CONTRACT NO. FE21-00-XX				
Sponsors:	Kathy Millea				
Indexes:					
Code sections:					
Attachments:	1. Agenda Report, 2. FE21-00-01 - AECOM Award Package, 3. FE21-00-02 - Arcadis Award Package, 4. FE21-00-03 - Black and Veatch Award Package, 5. FE21-00-04 - Brown and Caldwell Award Package, 6. FE21-00-05 - CDM Smith Award Package, 7. FE21-00-06 - Civiltec Award Package, 8. FE21-00-07 - Dudek Award Package, 9. FE21-00-08 - GHD Award Package, 10. FE21-00-09 - HDR Award Package, 11. FE21-00-10 - IEC Award Package, 12. FE21-00-11 - Kennedy Jenks Award Package, 13. FE21-00-12 - Kleinfelder Award Package, 14. FE21-00-13 - Michael Baker Award Package, 15. FE21-00-14 - Projectline Award Package, 16. FE21-00-15 - Spec Services Award Package, 17. FE21-00-16 - SVA Architects Award Package, 18. FE21-00-17 - Tetra Tech Award Package, 19. FE21-00-18 - Woodard and Curran Award Package				

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
5/26/2021	1	BOARD OF DIRECTORS		
5/5/2021	1	OPERATIONS COMMITTEE	Recommended for Approval	

FROM: James D. Herberg, General Manager
Originator: Kathy Millea, Director of Engineering

SUBJECT:

ANNUAL PROFESSIONAL DESIGN SERVICES AGREEMENTS, CONTRACT NO. FE21-00-XX

GENERAL MANAGER'S RECOMMENDATION

RECOMMENDATION:

A. Approve Annual Professional Design Services Agreements (PDSA) with the following firms for professional engineering design and construction support services commencing July 1, 2021 with a maximum annual fiscal year contract limitation not to exceed $600,000 for each Annual Professional Design Services Agreement; and

	FIRM	CONTRACT NO.
1	AECOM Technical Services, Inc. (AECOM)	FE21-00-01
2	Arcadis U.S., Inc. (Arcadis)	FE21-00-02
3	Black & Veatch Corporation (Black & Veatch)	FE21-00-03
4	Brown & Caldwell	FE21-00-04
5	CDM Smith, Inc. (CDM Smith)	FE21-00-05

6	CIVILTEC Engineering, Inc. (CIVILTEC)	FE21-00-06
7	Dudek	FE21-00-07
8	GHD, Inc. (GHD)	FE21-00-08
9	HDR Engineering, Inc. (HDR)	FE21-00-09
10	Infrastructure Engineering Corporation (IEC)	FE21-00-10
11	Kennedy Jenks Consultants, Inc. (Kennedy Jenks)	FE21-00-11
12	Kleinfelder, Inc. (Kleinfelder)	FE21-00-12
13	Michael Baker International, Inc. (Michael Baker)	FE21-00-13
14	ProjectLine Technical Services, Inc. (ProjectLine)	FE21-00-14
15	SPEC Services, Inc. (SPEC Services)	FE21-00-15
16	SVA Architects, Inc. (SVA Architects)	FE21-00-16
17	Tetra Tech	FE21-00-17
18	Woodard & Curran, Inc. (Woodard & Curran)	FE21-00-18

B. Approve two additional one-year optional extensions for each PDSA.

BACKGROUND

Ordinance No. OCSD-52 (Purchasing Ordinance) authorizes procurement of professional design services less than $300,000 through task order-based Annual Professional Design Services Agreements (Annual PDSAs). The Purchasing Order, and the Annual PDSAs, limit task orders awarded to a single firm in a fiscal year to $600,000. There are currently three sets of Annual PDSAs for design services issued in 2012, 2015, and 2018. The sets for 2012 and 2015 have expired, and the set from 2018 expires on June 30, 2021. When an Annual PDSA expires, any existing and active task orders remain valid, but no new task orders can be issued.

When the need for professional design services for a specific project are identified, and the anticipated value of the services is less than the $300,000 task order limit, staff issues a request for task order proposal to at least two, but typically three, of the prequalified firms. The proposals are scored and ranked per the selection criteria included in the request for task order proposal, and negotiations are conducted with the selected firm. The process of procuring design services through task orders is significantly quicker and more cost effective for both the Orange County Sanitation District (OC San) and the competing consultants than for stand-alone agreements.

RELEVANT STANDARDS

- Sound engineering and accounting practices, complying with local, state, and federal laws
- California Government Code §4526: Select the “best qualified firm” and “negotiate fair and equitable fees”

PROBLEM

The process of soliciting and selecting consultants for individual professional design service agreements on smaller projects is slower and costlier for both OC San and the consultants competing for projects.

PROPOSED SOLUTION

Approve Annual PDSAs with a prequalified list of design consultants per the Purchasing Ordinance.

The following table lists project types for which each of the consultants are prequalified.

	Firm	Type 1: Building and Safety	Type 2: Linear	Type 3: Process	Type 4: Electrical and I&C
1	AECOM	X		X	X
2	Arcadis	X			
3	Black & Veatch		X	X	
4	Brown & Caldwell		X	X	X
5	CDM Smith		X	X	X
6	Civiltec		X	X	
7	Dudek		X	X	
8	GHD		X	X	
9	HDR	X		X	X
10	Infrastructure Engineering		X		
11	Kennedy Jenks			X	
12	Kleinfelder		X		
13	Michael Baker			X	
14	ProjectLine	X			
15	SPEC Services			X	X
16	SVA Architects	X			
17	Tetra Tech			X	X
18	Woodard & Curran		X	X	

TIMING CONCERNS

The current Annual PDSAs expire on June 30, 2021. If new Annual PDSAs are not issued, staff will not be able to issue task orders to procure design services for small projects.

RAMIFICATIONS OF NOT TAKING ACTION

Without these Annual PDSAs, OC San would need to conduct full solicitations for the design of each small project, delaying completion of those projects, and increasing administrative costs. The relatively high proposal costs versus the potential project profit tends to limit the number of proposers for these smaller projects.

PRIOR COMMITTEE/BOARD ACTIONS

N/A

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Consultant Selection:

On December 17, 2020, OC San issued a request for qualifications (RFQs) for Annual PDSAs, Contract No. FE21-00, and a notice was sent to multiple categories of firms registered in OC San's purchasing database. The RFQs defined four categories of projects and invited interested consultants to pursue qualifications for any or all of those categories.

The following evaluation criterion were described in the RFQ and used to determine the most qualified consultants.

CRITERION	**Weighting**
Consultant Team Resources	20%
Delivery Capabilities	20%
Related Project Experience	30%
Staff Qualifications	30%

On February 10, 2021, 28 statements of qualifications (SOQs) were received. The following table lists the firms that submitted SOQs and for which of the four project types they submitted qualifications.

Firm	**Type 1: Building and Safety**	**Type 2: Linear**	**Type 3: Process**	**Type 4: Electrical and I&C**
AECOM Technical Services, Inc. (AECOM)	X	X	X	X
Arcadis U.S., Inc. (Arcadis)	X		X	X
Austin Design & Building, Inc. (Austin)	X			
Black & Veatch Corporation (Black & Veatch)		X	X	
Brown & Caldwell		X	X	X
Cannon Corporation (Cannon)		X	X	X
CDM Smith, Inc. (CDM Smith)		X	X	X
CIVILTEC Engineering, Inc. (CIVILTEC)		X	X	
Commonwealth Associates, Inc. (Commonwealth)			X	X
D R Consultants & Designers, Inc. (D R Consultants)			X	X
Dahl, Taylor & Associates, Inc. (Dahl Taylor)	X	X	X	X
Dudek		X	X	
Fluor Enterprises, Inc. (Fluor)			X	X
Gekko Engineering (Gekko)			X	X
GHD, Inc. (GHD)		X	X	
HDR Engineering, Inc. (HDR)	X	X	X	X
IDS Group, Inc. (IDS Group)	X		X	X

Infrastructure Engineering Corporation (IEC)		X		
Kennedy Jenks Consultants, Inc. (Kennedy Jenks)		X	X	X
Kleinfelder, Inc. (Kleinfelder)		X	X	
Michael Baker International, Inc. (Michael Baker)	X	X	X	X
ProjectLine Technical Services, Inc. (ProjectLine)	X			X
RTM Engineering Consultants (RTM)	X	X		
SPEC Services, Inc. (SPEC Services)			X	X
SVA Architects, Inc. (SVA Architects)	X			
Tetra Tech		X	X	X
Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions, Inc. (Wood Environment)	X	X	X	X
Woodard & Curran, Inc. (Woodard & Curran)		X	X	
Total SOQs Submitted	**11**	**18**	**23**	**18**

The SOQs were evaluated in accordance with the process set forth in the Purchasing Ordinance by a preselected Evaluation Committee consisting of one Engineering Manager and four Engineering Supervisors. The Evaluation Committee also included two non-voting representatives from the Contracts Administration Division.

Each member of the Evaluation Committee scored each SOQ for each project type submitted using the evaluation criterion listed above. The following four tables summarize the scoring and ranking for each project type.

PROJECT TYPE 1: BUILDING & SAFETY

Building and Safety projects are those where most of the work involves building, occupied spaces, or safety improvements. Of the 11 firms submitting qualifications for Building and Safety projects, the Evaluation Committee recommended five firms be awarded Annual PDSAs for those projects. Given the relatively small number of Building and Safety task orders that are typically issued, staff considers a pool of five firms appropriate.

Firm	**Consultant Team Resources** (Max. 20)	**Delivery Capabilities** (Max. 20)	**Related Project Experience** (Max. 30)	**Staff Qualifications** (Max. 30)	**Total Score** (Max. 100)	**Rank**
AECOM	16.3	14.0	22.5	21.8	74.6	**1**
HDR	15.4	14.7	19.0	22.8	71.9	**2**
ProjectLine	15.0	13.9	21.1	21.3	71.3	**3**
Arcadis	15.4	14.6	21.0	19.9	70.9	**4**
SVA Architects	14.6	14.1	19.8	21.5	70.0	**5**
Michael Baker	15.0	15.6	15.1	21.3	67.0	6

IDS Group	14.0	11.3	20.3	21.0	66.6	7
Wood Environment	14.5	14.7	14.7	21.3	65.2	8
RTM	13.9	12.7	15.8	18.6	61.0	9
Dahl Taylor	14.6	12.1	15.4	16.6	58.7	10
Austin	14.8	10.9	12.6	17.4	55.7	11

PROJECT TYPE 2: LINEAR

Linear projects are those where most of the work involves installation, rehabilitation, or repair of buried piping outside of the two treatment plants. Of the 18 firms submitting qualifications for linear projects, the Evaluation Committee recommended nine firms be awarded Annual PDSAs for those projects. Given the typical number of linear small projects, staff considers a pool of nine firms appropriate.

Firm	**Consultant Team Resources** (Max. 20)	**Delivery Capabilities** (Max. 20)	**Related Project Experience** (Max. 30)	**Staff Qualifications** (Max. 30)	**Total Score** (Max. 100)	**Rank**
Brown & Caldwell	17.1	17.5	26.7	24.5	85.8	**1**
Woodard & Curran	15.3	16.8	24.9	24.3	81.3	**2**
GHD	15.9	15.9	24.6	24.1	80.5	**3**
IEC	15.3	16.5	24.5	23.7	80.0	**4**
Dudek	16.1	15.3	22.6	25.0	79.0	**5**
CIVILTEC	15.7	14.3	25.7	22.9	78.6	**6**
Black & Veatch	15.6	15.5	22.8	23.7	77.6	**7**
Kleinfelder	15.0	15.6	23.3	23.1	77.0	**8**
CDM Smith	15.7	16.1	21.4	22.5	75.7	**9**
Wood Environment	14.9	14.7	21.0	23.1	73.7	10
Kennedy Jenks	15.6	15.0	20.0	23.0	73.6	11
Michael Baker	15.6	16.0	19.9	21.9	73.4	12
Tetra Tech	15.4	14.0	22.4	21.1	72.9	13
HDR	15.8	15.1	18.4	22.2	71.5	14
RTM	13.9	12.7	21.2	21.0	68.8	15
Cannon	13.7	13.9	19.3	19.6	66.5	16
AECOM	15.9	13.6	17.7	18.2	65.4	17
Dahl Taylor	14.6	12.0	13.0	16.7	56.3	18

PROJECT TYPE 3: PROCESS

Process projects are those that do not fit in the criteria for Building and Safety, Linear, or Electrical and Instrumentation & Control projects where most of the work involves pumping, wastewater treatment, odor control, chemical storage, associated power distribution, on-site central generation, or SCADA controls. Of the 23 firms submitting qualifications for Process projects, the Evaluation Committee recommended 13 firms be awarded Annual PDSAs for those projects. Most of the smaller projects fall into the Process category, and a larger pool of consultants is likely to be needed since no more than $600,000 in task orders can be awarded to a consultant in a fiscal year.

Firm	**Consultant Team Resources** (Max. 20)	**Delivery Capabilities** (Max. 20)	**Related Project Experience** (Max. 30)	**Staff Qualifications** (Max. 30)	**Total Score** (Max. 100)	**Rank**
Brown & Caldwell	17.5	17.5	24.3	25.1	84.4	**1**
Black & Veatch	16.8	15.9	24.6	26.1	83.4	**2**
Dudek	16.1	15.7	24.7	24.7	81.2	**3**
Tetra Tech	15.8	14.8	24.8	23.8	79.2	**4**
GHD	15.9	15.9	22.8	23.3	77.8	**5**
CIVILTEC	15.3	14.3	25.1	22.6	77.3	**6**
Kennedy Jenks	15.7	15.0	22.4	23.5	76.6	**7**
Woodard & Curran	13.3	16.0	24.0	22.5	75.8	**8**
AECOM	15.9	14.8	23.1	21.8	75.6	**9**
SPEC Services	16.3	15.5	21.9	20.7	75.4	**10**
HDR	15.7	15.1	21.1	22.9	74.8	**11**
CDM Smith	15.3	16.1	21.1	21.9	74.4	**12**
Michael Baker	15.4	15.6	20.5	22.5	74.0	**13**
Wood Environment	14.3	14.7	20.4	23.1	72.5	14
Kleinfelder	15.0	15.6	18.5	22.5	71.6	15
Gekko	15.3	14.9	19.6	21.5	71.3	16
Arcadis	15.0	15.4	19.1	20.6	70.1	17
IDS Group	15.2	11.7	17.3	21.0	65.2	18
D R Consultants	13.9	13.9	15.8	18.7	62.3	19
Cannon	12.5	13.5	14.5	20.2	60.7	20
Dahl Taylor	14.6	12.5	13.6	16.6	57.3	21
Fluor	15.7	13.0	10.3	16.1	55.1	22
Commonwealth	9.6	10.3	12.6	12.0	44.5	23

PROJECT TYPE 4: Electrical and Instrumentation & Control

Electrical and Instrumentation & Control projects involve only those specific disciplines. Projects that would fall into this category include switch gear replacement, relay replacements or upgrades, and SCADA-only projects. Of the 18 firms submitting qualifications for Electrical and Instrumentation &

Control, the Evaluation Committee recommended six firms be awarded Annual PDSAs for those projects. Given the relatively small number of Electrical and Instrumentation & Control task orders that are typically issued, staff considers a pool of six firms appropriate.

Firm	**Consultant Team Resources** (Max. 20)	**Delivery Capabilities** (Max. 20)	**Related Project Experience** (Max. 30)	**Staff Qualifications** (Max. 30)	**Total Score** (Max. 100)	**Rank**
Brown & Caldwell	17.5	17.5	24.9	25.1	85.0	**1**
Tetra Tech	15.4	14.8	23.6	24.1	77.9	**2**
AECOM	17.1	15.2	22.5	22.4	77.2	**3**
HDR	15.7	15.9	22.1	23.4	77.1	**4**
SPEC Services	17.1	16.9	21.3	21.3	76.6	**5**
CDM Smith	15.3	16.1	22.9	21.9	76.2	**6**
Michael Baker	15.4	15.3	21.5	22.5	74.7	7
Wood Environment	14.1	14.7	22.2	23.1	74.1	8
Gekko	15.3	14.9	19.6	22.1	71.9	9
Kennedy Jenks	15.5	15.0	19.4	21.1	71.0	10
IDS Group	15.2	11.7	20.9	22.2	70.0	11
ProjectLine	14.7	13.0	19.3	22.5	69.5	12
Arcadis	15.0	15.0	15.5	20.0	65.5	13
Cannon	13.3	13.5	16.9	20.2	63.9	14
Dahl Taylor	14.6	12.1	16.6	17.8	61.1	15
D R Consultants	13.9	13.8	14.0	18.0	59.7	16
Fluor	15.6	13.0	11.5	16.8	56.9	17
Commonwealth	8.8	10.3	13.2	12.6	44.9	18

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

This request complies with authority levels of OC San's Purchasing Ordinance. Budget for these task orders is included in the Small Construction Projects Program, Project No. M-FE (Adopted Budget, Fiscal Years 2020-21 and 2021-2022 Budget, Section 8, Page 48).

ATTACHMENT

The following attachment(s) may be viewed on-line at the OC San website (www.ocsan.gov) with the complete agenda package:

- Professional Design Services Agreement

JM:dm:sa:gc