

Madison Water Utility

Tom Heikkinen – General Manager Alan L. Larson P.E. – Principal Engineer 119 E. Olin Avenue Madison, Wisconsin 53713 Telephone: 608 266-4651

FAX: 608 266-4426

MEMORANDUM

Date: September 23, 2014

To: Water Utility Board

From: Pete Holmgren, PE

Engineer 3

Al Larson, PE, BCEE Principal Engineer

Re: Unit Well 12 Conversion to a Two Zone Well

Recommendation to the Board for Engineering Services

Background

The 2006 Water Master Plan recommended that Well 12 be converted to a two zone well. This conversion will provide operational flexibility and reliability to the west side supply system. Pumps and a pressure reducing valve will be added to the Well 12 facility to move water from Pressure Zone 7 to Pressure Zone 8 or from Pressure Zone 8 to Pressure Zone 7.

The facility work described here will coincide with a separate Public Works contract for the water main improvements, which will connect a pipeline from the facility to Pressure Zone 8.

MWU Engineering staff advertised for qualified applicants to submit proposals to develop drawings, specifications and contract documents to complete this upgrade and correct an identified deficiency in the system.

Request for Proposal (RFP) and Advertising

A request for engineering design services was prepared for the project. The RFP was electronically transmitted to the standard engineering firm distribution list which includes over 30 different companies. The RFP was also posted on the Utility web page.

Proposals

Three excellent proposals were received on September 12, 2014 and distributed to a review committee of four Water Utility employees with expertise and knowledge of the project: Pete

Holmgren and Al Larson from Engineering; John Larson from Operations and Maintenance; and Joe DeMorett from Supply.

Review

The proposals were all reviewed and rated independently by each member of the committee. The committee then met on Tuesday September 16th. The proposals were evaluated within two main categories:

- 1. Project Understanding
 - a. Why the project is needed
 - b. Schedule
 - c. Understanding of the Madison process
- 2. Project Qualifications
 - a. Project Team
 - b. Work Experience
 - c. Project Management
 - d. Cost controls
 - e. Work samples
 - f. Madison approval process

The committee judged all three of the Firms submitting proposals to be very well qualified for the project. It was a difficult evaluation due to the fact very little separated the proposals and knowing that any of the Firms could provide the Utility with excellent service. Based on all information received, the proposals were ranked as follows:

	#1	#2	#3	#4
AECOM	3	3	3	3
Baxter & Woodman	2	1	2	1
SEH	1	2	1	2

Submitted hours were also considered as a part of the evaluation as a demonstration of the effort expected and as a demonstration of project understanding. These submittals were opened and reviewed following discussion and ranking of the applicants. Submitted hours and costs are as follows:

	Hours	Costs
AECOM	942.0	\$111,128.00
Baxter & Woodman	786.0	\$98,750.00
SEH	748.5	\$81,356.75

Recommendation

Based on all of the information submitted, SEH was agreed by all reviewers to be the most qualified firm for the Well 12 project. They have recent and very relevant experience with

pump station design and construction. Projects listed include: Chippewa Falls WI, Abottsford WI and projects at our own facilities including the Lakeview Reservoir (#113) upgrades and the development of the new Unit Well 31 facility.

SEH provided a comprehensive description of the project and a very detailed work plan that clearly demonstrated their understanding of the project, MWU needs, the challenges that we will face in completing the project and all of the tasks needed to gain approval and acceptance of the project by the regulating authorities and the neighborhood.

The costs and projected hours submitted by SEH with their proposal further reinforced their depth of understanding of the project and the challenges of developing a project that will meet the Utility's needs. Their proposal included the lowest projected hours and cost, and it was supported by the detail provided in the work plan that reflected past experience, background research and evident forethought regarding the anticipated effort to complete this project successfully.

Following a comprehensive evaluation of all materials submitted the committee unanimously recommends the hiring of SEH for the project development, design and construction services for the Unit Well 12 upgrades.