## Metropolitan Domestic Water Improvement District Board of Directors Meeting

#### June 13, 2011

### **Award of Miscellaneous Water Resources Consulting Services Contract**

#### **Synopsis**

The Board of Directors is requested to approve the selection of a consultant for annual Miscellaneous Water Resources Consulting Services Contract. The not-to-exceed \$119,700 contract is for as needed projects related to our water resources portfolio. The District has water resources that comprise groundwater, remediated groundwater, effluent and Central Arizona Project water. Specific projects for FY2011/2012 consist of technical assistance on the Magee Trail Well; review of ADEQ groundwater remediation plans, and with the Metro-Southwest Designation of Assured Water Supply application.

#### **Background**

The purpose of the contract is to assist staff in solving water resources supply, planning or management problems in a timely manner. This annual contract was first implemented in FY1996/1997 under the title of Miscellaneous Hydrogeological Services. Given the District only had groundwater supplies, the District used the annual contract for those purposes such as to evaluate the feasibility of modifying the existing Alcott well to reduce sanding problems, to assist with well redevelopment at Chapala well, to evaluate nitrate levels at Latamore South well, and review draft well impact reports for the new CIP wells. The contract was also used for the emergency drilling, testing and equipping of Hub Well 5A when a contractor's negligence filled Hub Well 5 with cement grout.

In recent years, the breadth of scope of the contract has expanded into effluent and CAP water recharge. For recharge projects, the contract has been used to evaluate the recharge feasibility of the BKW Siphon Project, recommending monitoring options of the long-term recharge rates of the Cañada del Oro Wash and completing a mounding analysis for the District's managed effluent recharge project. The CDO basin monitoring options task helped the District and Oro Valley secure \$300,000 from the Arizona Department of Water Resources for evaluating the unsaturated zone in the CDO Recharge and Recovery Project area.

Most recently, work has included soils investigation for effluent recharge at BKW Farms and improving the infiltration rate at Basin 4 for the Avra Valley Recharge Project. Additionally, the former contractor was retained to assist with the project management of the drilling, development and testing of the Magee Trail Well, but the project has been delayed because of Pima County and the consultant's three year-term contract will expire on June 30, 2011.

Past annual budgets have ranged from \$5,000 to \$292,000, with the larger cost associated with the drilling, testing and equipping of Hub Well 5A. Funding for the estimated \$64,700 in Magee Trail Well work is from the Pima County agreement. The Capital Projects budget contains \$50,000 in the FY2011/2012 budget for the Metro-Southwest AWS work. If the ADEQ completes the groundwater remediation plan, the \$5,000 budgeted under Miscellaneous Water Resources Services would be used.

#### **Issues**

An advertisement to solicit Statement of Qualifications (SOQ) to provide Professional Services for Miscellaneous Water Resources Consulting Services was published on April 27, 28, and 29, 2011 in *The Daily Territorial*. Twenty-five consultants requested the proposal package and five firms/teams responded to the District's request for Statement of Qualifications (SOQs). Three District staff evaluated the proposals. Individual scores are attached for review along with the selection criteria.

Clear Creek Associates ranked first with a total score of 311 points among the reviewers, and Golder Associates placed a close second with a total score of 290 points. Hydro Geo Chem had the third highest score of 245 points.

Clear Creek Associates rated the highest in the Groundwater Supply (Designation of Assured Water Supply), Recharge and WQARF/Wellhead Protection portions of the SOQ, while Golder Associates rated equally strong in the Recharge and WQARF/Wellhead Protection portion but Golder Associates rated higher in Municipal Well Services under Groundwater Supply.

Statutory requirements (A.R.S. § 34-603) regarding the procurement of professional services prohibits requesting any cost information in the selection process. The selection of professional services must be based on demonstrated competence and qualifications only. The City of Tucson and Pima County follow this requirement but will often select two or more firms for annual professional services contracts. The SOQ states the Board of Directors may award the contract to one or more firms or may split the assigned tasks. Splitting Task 1 (Groundwater Supply) may be a desirable approach given the assistance with the Designation of Assured Water Supply application for Metro-Diablo and Magee Trail Well work are expected to total approximately \$114,700. Furthermore, awarding the contract to two firms also allows the District to get competitive quotes for task orders for Recharge and WQARF/Wellhead Protection tasks, since the firms ranked equally in those categories.

If the top two firms are selected by the Board of Directors, staff will then request labor rates from the two firms. Staff will review the rates and fees supplied by the two consultants and determine if those rates are consistent with current rates within the industry.

Additionally, staff will discuss with each firm any conflicts of interest for the anticipated work under this contract. For example, conflicts because of past WQARF work under contract with the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality at the El Camino del Cerro and Shannon-Rillito WQARF sites or for any other work that may occur in the Metro-Main, Metro-Hub,

Metro-Southwest and Metro-West service areas.

#### **Staff Recommendation**

With two firms so close in the ranking, the Board could choose to select the highest ranked firm, select both highest ranked firms, or subdivide the contract by project type based on each firm's strength.

Staff recommends that the Board of Directors award the annual Miscellaneous Water Resources Consulting Services Contract to Clear Creek Associates and Golder Associates. The District should award Clear Creek Associates the portion of Task 1 work assisting with Designation of Assured Water Supply for Metro-Diablo and award Golder Associates the portion of Task 1 assisting with Municipal Well Services. Clear Creek Associates and Golder Associates would compete for work under Tasks 2 and 3, which would help bring the best cost to the District.

### **Suggested Motion**

I move that the Board of Directors approve the award of the annual Miscellaneous Water Resources Consulting Services Contract to both Clear Creek Associates and Golder Associates. Clear Creek Associates' contract will be for not more than \$55,000 and be assigned Task 1 work associated with the Designation of Assured Water Supply application for Metro-Diablo and any assigned work under Tasks 2 (Recharge) and 3 (Groundwater Protection/Abandonment). Golder Associates' contract will not exceed \$70,000 and be assigned Task 1 work to assist the District with Municipal Well Services and any assigned work under Tasks 2 and 3. Clear Creek Associates and Golder Associates would equally compete for work under Tasks 2 and 3. Both contracts will expire on June 30, 2012 unless one or both are annually renewed by the Board of Directors for up to two years.

I concur with the above recommendations.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark R. Stratton, P.E. General Manager

# MISCELLANEOUS WATER RESOURCES CONSULTING SERVICES SCORE SHEET

FIRM'S NAME:	
SCORE'S NAME:	
DATE:	

	Selection Criteria/Justification ude comments on how you justify score)	Total Points Possible	Task 1 Score	Task 2 Score	Task 3 Score	Total Score
1)	Project Understanding 5% of total score	6				
2)	Project Approach 8% of total score	9				
3)	Specific Project Approach 30% of total score	33				
4)	Team Qualifications and Organization Experience 8% of total score	9				
5)	Staff Experience 27% of total score	30				
5)	Availability of Staff and Project Response Time 8% of total score	9				
6)	Equipment 5% of total score	6				
	SUB SCORE	102				
7)	Report Example 7% of total score	8				
	TOTAL SCORE	110				

## TOTAL SCORES ON PROPOSALS

(From Highest to Lowest)

Firm	Reviewer A	Reviewer B	Reviewer C	Total Score	Rank
Clear Creek Associates	103	106	102	311	1
Golder Associates	95	99	96	290	2
Hydro Geo Chem	79	88	78	245	3
Hargis + Associates	63	92	76	231	4
Montgomery & Associates	55	98	72	225	5

TASK 1
TOTAL SCORES ON GROUNDWATER SUPPLY PORTION OF PROPOSALS
(From Highest to Lowest)

Firm	Reviewer A	Reviewer B	Reviewer C	Total Score	Rank
Clear Creek Associates	32	33	28	93	1
Golder Associates	26	31	27	84	2
Hargis + Associates	21	31	26	78	3
Montgomery & Associates	18	32	21	71	4
Hydro Geo Chem	19	25	21	65	5

TASK 2
TOTAL SCORES ON RECHARGE PORTION OF PROPOSALS
(From Highest to Lowest)

Firm	Reviewer A	Reviewer B	Reviewer C	Total Score	Rank
Clear Creek Associates	30	33	33	96	1
Golder Associates	31	31	30	92	2
Montgomery & Associates	16	30	23	69	3
Hydro Geo Chem	23	25	20	68	4
Hargis + Associates	17	28	20	65	5

TASK 3
TOTAL SCORES ON WQARF/WELLHEAD PROTECTION PORTION OF PROPOSALS
(From Highest to Lowest)

Firm	Reviewer A	Reviewer B	Reviewer C	Total Score	Rank
Clear Creek Associates	33	33	33	99	1
Golder Associates	32	31	33	96	2
Hydro Geo Chem	30	31	32	93	3
Hargis + Associates	21	28	26	75	4
Montgomery & Associates	16	29	21	66	5

# REPORT EXAMPLE (From Highest to Lowest)

Firm	Reviewer A	Reviewer B	Reviewer C	Total Score	Rank
Clear Creek Associates	8	7	8	23	1
Hydro Geo Chem	7	7	5	19	2
Montgomery & Associates	5	7	7	19	2
Golder Associates	6	6	6	18	3
Hargis + Associates	4	5	4	13	4