



## Agenda Report

---

File #: 2020-1210, Version: 1

---

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

**SUBJECT:**

**WAREHOUSE, ELECTRICAL SUBSTATION, AND 12KV SERVICE CENTER REPLACEMENT AT PLANT NO. 2, PROJECT NO. P2-126**

### GENERAL MANAGER'S RECOMMENDATION

RECOMMENDATION: Recommend to the Board of Directors to:

- A. Approve a Professional Design Services Agreement with Stantec Consulting Services, Inc. to provide engineering services for Warehouse, Electrical Substation, and 12kV Service Center Replacement at Plant No. 2, Project No. P2-126, for an amount not to exceed \$4,876,455; and
- B. Approve a contingency of \$487,646 (10%).

### BACKGROUND

The Orange County Sanitation District (Sanitation District) has an approximately 20,000 square foot warehouse at Plant No. 2 constructed in 1998 and used to support Plant No. 2 operations and maintenance activities.

Plant No. 2 receives power from Southern California Edison (SCE) from a single 66kV feed through an on-site SCE substation. The SCE Substation feeds the Sanitation District's 12kV Service Center, which includes electrical equipment to distribute utility power to Plant No. 2 facilities. The 12kV Service Center, built in 1979, is an approximately 5,600 square foot building.

### RELEVANT STANDARDS

- 24/7/365 treatment plant reliability
- Protect Orange County Sanitation District assets
- Comply with the California Government Code Section 4525: Select the "best qualified" and "negotiate fair and equitable fees"

### PROBLEM

The existing warehouse is located where new process facilities for the new Class A Digester Complex will be constructed under TPAD Digester Facility at Plant No. 2, Project No. P2-128. That specific area is required to accommodate process requirements and the long-term implementation

plan for completely replacing the existing digester complex. To avoid a delay to that project, the demolition of the existing warehouse must be completed by June 2025.

The existing SCE substation has one transformer and is fed from a single SCE line. A failure of the incoming SCE feed, or in the substation, could result in an extended SCE power outage. Although Plant No. 2 has a central generation system and standby generators, effluent permit compliance would be difficult to maintain for an extended period. Providing a second SCE feed requires replacement of the existing substation.

Seismic Evaluation of Structures at Plant Nos. 1 and 2, Project No. PS15-06, identified seismic issues with the 12kV Service Center and a potential for liquefaction during an earthquake. These issues can be mitigated, but the high cost of the work is not justifiable given the limited remaining life of the facility.

## **PROPOSED SOLUTION**

Award a Professional Design Services Agreement for Warehouse, Electrical Substation, and 12kV Service Center Replacement at Plant No. 2, Project No. P2-126. This project will replace the Warehouse and 12kV Service Center and improve power reliability at the plant by installing a new SCE substation with redundant transformers and a second 66kV feed. The SCE substation will be designed and constructed by SCE under a separate agreement.

## **TIMING CONCERNS**

The existing Warehouse must be demolished by June 2025 to avoid delaying TPAD Digester Facility at Plant No 2, Project No. P2-128. Any delay in starting the design could delay demolition of the existing Warehouse.

## **RAMIFICATIONS OF NOT TAKING ACTION**

The Class A Digester Facilities being constructed under TPAD Digester Facility at Plant No. 2, Project No. P2-128, would have to be reconfigured to avoid impacting the existing Warehouse. There would continue to be risk of an extended power outage if the single SCE feed were to fail. Seismic retrofits would be required for the 12kV Service Center.

## **PRIOR COMMITTEE/BOARD ACTIONS**

N/A

## **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

### Consultant Selection:

The Sanitation District requested and advertised for proposals for Warehouse, Electrical Substation, and 12kV Service Center Replacement at Plant No. 2, Project No. P2-126, on July 14, 2020. The following evaluation criterion were described in the Request for Proposals (RFP) and used to determine the most qualified Consultant.

CRITERION	WEIGHT
Project Understanding and Approach	40%
Related Project Experience	30%
Project Team and Staff Qualifications	30%

Three proposals were received on August 25, 2020 and evaluated in accordance with the evaluation process set forth in Sanitation District Board of Directors’ Purchasing Ordinance No. OCSD-52 (Purchasing Ordinance) by a pre-selected Evaluation Team consisting of Sanitation District staff including a CIP Project Manager, Senior Engineer, two Engineering Managers, and an Engineering Supervisor. A fourth proposal was received after the deadline and was not accepted.

The Evaluation Team also included two non-voting representatives from the Contracts Administration Division and two non-voting technical advisors from Sanitation District staff.

The Evaluation Team scored the proposal on the established criterion as summarized in the table below:

	Firm	Approach (Max 40)	Related Experience (Max 30)	Team (Max 30)	Total Score (Max 100)
1	Stantec	31	20	21	72
2	Fluor	22	16	16	54
3	Gannett Fleming	21	16	15	52

Based on this scoring, one Consultant was shortlisted for interviews on September 10, 2020. Following the interview, each member of the Evaluation Team scored the Consultant based on both the proposals and interviews using the evaluation criterion and weighting described above. Based on the scoring shown below, Stantec Consulting Services, Inc. was selected as the most qualified Consultant.

	Firm	Approach (Max 40)	Related Experience (Max 30)	Team (Max 30)	Total Score (Max 100)
1	Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.	33	20	24	77

The selected firm presented a clear understanding of the project, the schedule risks, and an innovative approach to the site layout. The proposal also demonstrated an effective plan on how to execute the project and design and construct the new warehouse. The team and previous project experience directly related to replacement of the Warehouse are well-suited to the scope and likely challenges of the project.

Review of Fee Proposal and Negotiations:

Proposals were accompanied by sealed fee proposals. In accordance with the Purchasing Ordinance, the fee proposal of only the highest-ranked firm was opened after approval by the

Director of Engineering of the Evaluation Committee's recommendation.

Staff conducted negotiations with Stantec Consulting Services, Inc. to clarify the requirements of the Scope of Work, the assumptions used for the estimated level of effort, and the proposed approach to meet the goals and objectives for the project. Five negotiation meetings were held with multiple follow up e-mails and calls. The fee decreased due to revisions of the level of effort required by several subconsultants and the reduction in number of project meetings.

	Original Fee Proposal	Negotiated Fee
Total Hours	28,048	27,399
Total Fee	\$4,979,355	\$4,876,455

The Consultant's fringe and overhead costs, which factor into the billing rate, have been substantiated. The contract profit is 5.00%, which is based on an established formula based on the Sanitation District's standard design agreements.

Based on the above, staff has determined that the final negotiated fee is fair and reasonable for the level of effort required for this project and recommends award of the Professional Design Services Agreement to Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.

## CEQA

The Project is included in the Draft Facilities Master Plan Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR), State Clearinghouse Number 2019070998. The PEIR is scheduled for certification by the Sanitation District Board of Directors in December 2020. A Notice of Determination will be filed within five working days of certification.

## FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

This request complies with authority levels of the Sanitation District's Purchasing Ordinance. This item has been budgeted, (Adopted Budget, Fiscal Years 2020-2021 and 2021-2022, Section 8, Page 72) and the project budget is sufficient for the recommended action.

## ATTACHMENT

*The following attachment(s) may be viewed on-line at the OCSD website ([www.ocsd.com](http://www.ocsd.com)) with the complete agenda package:*

- Professional Design Services Agreement
- Presentation

VP:dm:sa:ac