

**LAKE ARROWHEAD COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT**

**MEMORANDUM**

**DATE:** JANUARY 28, 2020

**TO:** BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
Lake Arrowhead Community Services District

**FROM:**   
AIDA HERCULES-DODARO, District Engineer

  
CATHERINE CERRI, General Manager

**SUBJECT:** CONSIDER AWARDING A PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING CONSULTING SERVICES FOR SPYGLASS 0.4 MG PRE-STRESSED CONCRETE TANK, PROJECT NO. 179

**A. RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Board of Directors authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Infrastructure Engineering Corporation (“IEC”) for the design, bidding and construction management assistance of the Spyglass 0.4 MG Pre-stressed Concrete Tank, Project No. 179 (“Project”), in an amount not-to-exceed \$183,734.

**B. REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION**

The District has the need for engineering services for design, and assistance during the bidding and construction phases for the Project. On November 20, 2019, staff sent out Requests for Proposals (“RFP”) to seven (7) companies and three (3) submitted proposals on December 6, 2019. The results are shown below:

	<b>Engineering Company</b>	<b>Fee</b>
1	Tidewater	\$ 179,271.68
2	Infrastructure Engineering Corp.	\$ 183,734.00
3	Webb & Associates	\$ 212,267.00

It is the District’s objective to obtain the greatest value for the lowest possible cost. To accomplish this objective and to comply with the requirements of Public Law 92-582 (the Brooks Act), and California Government Code, Sections 4525-4529.5, prospective consultants are selected based on the highest qualifications for each project and at a fair and reasonable price. However, price quotations are not the sole consideration in the selection process.

All firms were ranked according to their project understanding, project approach, scope of work, experience, knowledge of the District, references, conformance to the services agreement terms and budget, for a total of 100 points. IEC and Webb ranked 91 and 90 respectively, and Tidewater ranked 82. The critical areas impacting the ranking were project understanding, scope and references.

Staff sent question/clarification communications to IEC and Tidewater. IEC clarified that their material testing budget could be reduced from the Optional Task considering that the District is providing the material testing through the geotechnical consultant Ninyo & Moore. Tidewater responded/clarified 11 questions. Their proposal shows some tasks referring to another project, others were outside of the required scope of work and other tasks were too vague. Those tasks needed clarification and more detailed explanation. But the most critical ranking is related to the references they provided. While Webb and IEC provided references for three (3) pre-stressed concrete water tanks each, Tidewater provided references for design, permitting and construction of a well; well siting and rehabilitation projects with the District, along with the current on-call contracts for CEQA and inspection services; and a reference from NASA related to the design, permitting and construction of “water systems”. I spoke with the project manager from NASA to clarify the services Tidewater provided to him. Although he spoke highly of Tidewater’s responsiveness and professionalism, the reference on current projects was related to groundwater and environmental cleanup. In the past, Tidewater assisted him with the operations of 3 groundwater treatment plants, reservoir and buildings. The NASA project manager stated that Tidewater designed, managed the construction and operated the reservoirs; however, only one of the reservoirs was concrete.

It is reasonable to mention that Tidewater’s fee was originally 2.4% below IEC’s fee. Later on, when responding to our questions/clarifications request, Tidewater modified and expanded the project understanding and the scope of work while reducing their proposal fee 15.4% below IEC’s.

After reviewing the proposals and considering the ranking, qualifications and references, staff believes that IEC is the most qualified and experienced firm to take this project to completion.

### **C. BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

The existing 300,000-gallon tank was constructed in 1972 on a graded pad and an approximately 1:1 (horizontal:vertical) slope into the hillside. The cut slope varies from 12 to 40 feet and throughout the years, the slope has been failing due to erosion.

In 2018, District staff retained Ninyo & Moore (“N&M”) to provide geotechnical recommendations for repairs of the eroded slope. In February 2018, N&M provided their recommendation to stabilize the slope.

In June 2018, staff sent out a Request for Proposals (“RFP”) for a Preliminary Design Report (“PDR”) and two firms responded; Webb & Associates (“Webb”) and IEC. The Board

of Directors awarded the PDR contract to Webb in August 2018. As requested, Webb provided 5 alternatives and staff selected Alternative 4A, which consists of a retaining wall and a pre-stressed concrete tank partially embedded into the slope to retain a portion of it, and also to make available more ground surface to increase the tank capacity from 0.3 MG to 0.4 MG.

#### **D. FISCAL INFORMATION**

Funding for this project is provided by the Water Capital Improvement Plan (Fund 110). The Budget for Fiscal Years 18/19 and 19/20 include \$1,035,000 for this project; however, it doesn't cover the estimated project cost of \$2,767,000 for Option 4A. Staff will include the remainder of the project cost in the Budget for FY 20/21 to complete the Project.

#### **E. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT**

Under this contract, IEC will be providing the necessary design information and footprint to our environmental consultant which is required to complete the CEQA process.

#### **F. ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1: IEC's proposal dated December 6, 2020



**CONCEPT DESIGN OPTION 4A**  
NEW 0.4 MG CONCRETE TANK (W/RETAINED SOIL - ONE-SIDE) PLUS R.C. RETAINING WALL

