

## Agenda Report

July 13, 2009

TO: City Council

FROM: City Manager

**SUBJECT:** Authorization to Enter into Contracts with Designated Engineering Consulting Firms to Provide Engineering Services for Projects Included in the Capital Improvement Program in Amounts Not-to-Exceed the Amount Appropriated in the Capital Improvement Program Budget

## **RECOMMENDATION:**

It is recommended that the City Council authorize the City Manager to enter into contracts with Camp Dresser & McKee, Inc, Civiltec Engineering, Inc., and RMC Water and Environment to provide services for projects included in the approved capital improvement program (CIP) budget, and other water system projects for amounts not to exceed those estimated for engineering services on a per project basis as set forth in the adopted CIP and other water system projects; with each contract not-to-exceed three years.

The proposed contracts are exempt from the competitive bidding process pursuant to the City Charter Section 1002 (f), contracts for professional or unique services.

## BACKGROUND:

Due to the volume of capital projects recommended in the Water System Master Plan, Pasadena Water and Power (PWP) has developed a backlog of projects totaling approximately \$28 million. This total does not include the Reclaimed Water Project, a 15-year \$37 million project, or the water main distribution projects. Over the next six years, CIP expenditures will average about \$13 million annually. PWP does not have the in-house engineering staff to meet these demands.

To meet this increased demand, a mix of staff and contract resources are needed. Due to budget constraints, both within PWP and City-wide, requests for additional staff have been deferred to future years. In the meantime, contract resources are needed to complete projects requiring specialized engineering services and of limited durations.

Contracts with Designated Engineering Consulting Firms to Provide Engineering Services July 13, 2009 Page 2 of 3

Historically, PWP obtained outside engineering services on a project-by-project basis, requiring a separate competitive selection and contracting process for each project. In order to efficiently obtain access to the necessary engineering resources, and reduce administrative burden, PWP seeks to pre-qualify and contract with three engineering firms. These pre-qualified firms will provide PWP with a broad range of general and specialized engineering services while reducing the administrative burden and time associated with contracting for engineering services on a project-by-project basis.

A Request for Proposals (RFP) for General Engineering Services was issued on March 4, 2009. The goals of the RFP were to pre-qualify three to five engineering firms to provide a wide range of engineering services related to the CIP on an as-needed or project basis for the next three years. PWP anticipates the total amount of all three contract awards associated with this RFP will be in the range of \$1.5 to \$4 million annually.

The RFP was sent to 49 engineering firms, of which 21 returned proposals. Based on the criteria set forth in the RFP (see attachment), a staff review panel evaluated the proposals and selected seven firms for follow-up interviews. Based on the initial proposal reviews and the interviews, staff determined the following three firms will best meet the City's needs:

<u>VENDOR</u> Camp Dresser & McKee, Inc. (CDM) Civiltec Engineering, Inc. RMC Water and Environment

A table summarizing the outcome of the review is attached to this report.

As project work scopes are identified, PWP will conduct an informal competitive selection process to determine which pre-qualified vendor is best able to provide the engineering services. Each firm will be requested to respond to a scope of services and the firm with the best combination of price and expertise will be issued a Task Order under the contract, which describes the services to be performed.

These pre-qualified vendors are not guaranteed any specific work and will not be eligible for any compensation except to the extent that a task order is issued as described above and the work is performed and completed to the City's satisfaction. Additionally, the City shall reserve the right to self-perform any work or conduct a formal competitive selection process open to others.

The proposed contracts are in compliance with the Competitive Bidding and Purchasing Ordinance PMC 4.08 and the rules and regulations promulgated thereunder.

Contracts with Designated Engineering Consulting Firms to Provide Engineering Services July 13, 2009 Page 3 of 3

## FINANCIAL IMPACT:

Staff will identify and prioritize projects through the CIP process and will implement the projects, which have approved appropriations in the CIP, and funding from the Capital Improvement Charge Fund and Water Fund. Staff anticipates that combined expenditures for all three firms will total between \$1.5 million and \$4 million annually. The contractors are not guaranteed any work and will only receive payment for approved services.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Beck City Manager

Prepared by:

Sim Che Tim Roe

Management Analyst III Water and Power Department

Approved by:

Vigho 57 Cerice

Phyllis E. Currie General Manager Water and Power Department

	Qualifications,	Staff Support and	Cost of	Contract	Local	Small and Micro-	-
	Experience.	Responsiveness	Services	Acceptance	Preference	Business	
VENDOR	References (45%)	(25%)	(15%)	(2%)	(2%)	Preference (5%)	TOTAL
CDM	40.35	21.25	10.71	1.43	5.00	0:00	78.74
BMC	39.00	23.33	2.14	5.00	0.00	0.00	69.47
Civilter	30.15	20.83	12.14	5.00	0.00	0.00	68.12
Lee & Bo	32.10	18.33	8.57	5.00	0.00	0.00	64.00
Carollo	31.20	19.17	2.86	5.00	5.00	0.00	63.23
Tetra Tech	29.85	19.17	5.71	1.43	5.00	0.00	61.16
Pacifica	34.65	13.75	4.29	1.43	5.00	0.00	59.12
MWH	31.05	19.17	3.57	5.00	0.00	0.00	58.79
Stetson Engineers	25.50	17.92	10.00	5.00	00.0	0.00	58.42
Kennedv/Jenks	30.30	17.08	9.29	0.48	0.00	0.00	57.15
RBF Consulting	28.95	15.42	5.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	54.37
G&E Engineering	18.75	14.58	6.43	5.00	0.00	5.00	49.76
GEI	26.55	16.25	0.71	5.00	0.00	0.00	48.51
BCE Consultants	22.95	15.42	1.43	2.86	0.00	5.00	47.66
Wheeler & Grav	10.80	7.92	7.14	5.00	5.00	5.00	40.86
HMK	11.25	10.00	14.29	5.00	0.00	0.00	40.54
H2O Resources	13.50	10.42	11.43	5.00	0.00	0.00	40.35
Willdan	18.90	12.08	7.86	1.43	0.00	0.00	40.27
Aguba Engineering	0.00	5.42	15.00	5.00	0.00	5.00	39.42
Huitt-Zollars	12.60	7.92	12.86	5.00	0.00	0.00	38.38
Utility Systems (US3)	4.50	4.58	13.57	5.00	0.00	0.00	27.65

Table
tion Summary Table
s Evaluation \$
<b>ervices</b>
Seneral Engineering S
General F