

E Environment Committee

Special Meeting date: November 19, 2008,

For the Metropolitan Council Meeting of December 10, 2009

ADVISORY INFORMATION

Date: November 12, 2008

Subject: Authorization to Negotiate and Execute an Agreement for Architectural/Engineering Services for the East Bethel Water Reclamation Facilities, Contract Number 08P119, MCES Project Number 801620

District(s), Member(s): District 9, Natalie Steffen

Policy/Legal Reference: Council Policy 3-3, Expenditures

Staff Prepared/Presented: Jim Roth 651-602-1123/Bryce Pickart 651-602-1091

Division/Department: MCES c/o William G. Moore 651-602-1162

Proposed Action

That the Metropolitan Council authorize its Regional Administrator to negotiate and execute an architectural/engineering services agreement with Bonestroo for East Bethel Water Reclamation Facilities Contract No. 08P119, MCES Project No. 801620, in an amount not to exceed \$397,000.

Background

This contract is to provide facility planning, Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) preparation and permitting assistance for water reclamation facilities for groundwater recharge and spray irrigation in East Bethel. The contract also provides design and construction phase services for the groundwater recharge and spray irrigation facilities. Four proposals were received. The proposals were evaluated on the following criteria:

- The quality of the proposal
- The qualifications of the proposer
- The experience of the proposer
- The price of the proposal

The evaluation committee ranked the proposals in the following order:

1. Bonestroo
2. Wenck Associates, Inc
3. URS
4. Landform

The price of the top-ranked proposal, Bonestroo, is \$347,000. The range in price of the proposals is \$325,944 to \$551,334.

There were no MBE/WBE/SBRA participation goals for this contract. The evaluation committee rated Bonestroo as the top proposer. The evaluation committee rated Wenck Associates, Inc. slightly higher than Bonestroo on the basis of quality of the proposal, qualifications and experience. The differentiating factor between the two proposals was price. Other factors supporting the selection were Bonestroo's experience on Council projects, successful facility planning experience and EAW efforts, and experience in spray irrigation and rapid infiltration design in Minnesota.

The committee recognizes that the RFP scope of services was relatively brief and narrowly stated with respect to such issues as the private well assessment strategy, special challenges associated with individual groundwater recharge sites and spray irrigation sites, and the public information needs of this project. Therefore, it is recommended that a \$50,000 contingency be included in the contract for services which will be defined and authorized as the project progresses. This will bring the proposed contract amount to \$397,000.

Rationale

Professional service contracts with an amount exceeding \$250,000 require Metropolitan Council authorization.

Funding

BUDGET INFORMATION

Annual or Capital	Project No.	Estimated Project Cost	Current Auth.	Unencumbered Funds	Requested Amount
Capital	801620	\$20,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$4,400,000	\$397,000

Known Support / Opposition

None known at this time.