

SEWERAGE & WATER BOARD OF NEW ORLEANS

COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 1, 2014

8:00 AM

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Mrs. Kerri Kane, Chair • Mr. Alan Arnold • Dr. Tamika Duplessis • Mr. Joseph Peychaud • Ms. Kimberly Thomas

FINAL AGENDA

ACTION ITEMS

1. Approval of Previous Report
2. Approval of Consultants to Provide Engineering and Consulting Services for the Replacement and Rehabilitation of SWBNO Facilities (R-211-2014)

PRESENTATION ITEMS

- ☐ Overview of Capital Budget Procedures

INFORMATION ITEMS

3. 2014 Committee/Board Meeting Schedule
4. Response to Questions
5. Any Other Matters

REFERENCE ITEMS (In Binders)

- A. Sewerage and Water Board By-Laws
- B. 2014 Operating & Capital Program
- C. Strategic Plan
- D. Tracking Tool for Commitments to the City Council
- E. Bond Rating

APPROVAL OF CONSULTANTS TO PROVIDE ENGINEERING AND CONSULTING SERVICES FOR THE REPLACEMENT AND REHABILITATION OF SWBNO FACILITIES

WHEREAS, at the April 16, 2014 Board Meeting, the Board approved issuing a request for qualification (RFQ) for professional engineering firms to provide engineering and consulting services for the replacement and rehabilitation of Sewerage & Water Board of New Orleans facilities; and

WHEREAS, on July 22, 2014, a mandatory pre-submittal meeting was held with over 120 persons in attendance; and

WHEREAS, the Board issued Addendum 1 on July 25, 2014 and Addendum 2 on August 1, 2014; and

WHEREAS, on August 15, 2014, the Board had received 61 submittal of qualifications (SOQs), of which two SOQs were eliminated for non-compliance to the requirements of the RFQ;

WHEREAS, the remaining 59 SOQ stated that they shall meet or exceed the established DBE participation goal of 35%.

WHEREAS, on September 18, 2014, the selection committee composed of the Deputy Director, General Superintendent, Deputy General Superintendent, Network Engineer and Water Purification Superintendent held a public meeting to evaluate and rank the qualified SOQs, as follows:

<u>Consultant</u>	<u>Total Score</u>
1. AECOM	469
2. CH2M Hill	461
3. Arcadis	452
4. URS Corporation	443
5. Stantec	442
6. MWH	439
7. Burk-Kleinpeter, Inc.	436
8. Trigon	436
9. Stanley Consultants, Inc.	427
10. Black & Veatch Corporation	426
11. BCG Engineering & Consultants	422
12. Jacobs	419
13. HNTB Corporation	387
14. All South Consulting Engineering, Inc.	387
15. Infinity Engineering Consultants, LLC	385
16. CDM Smith	379
17. Meyer Engineers, Ltd.	369
18. Royal Engineering	365

19. AIMS Groups, Inc.	357
20. Evans-Graves Engineers, Inc.	357
21. GAEA Engineering Consultants, Inc.	354
22. Greenpoint Engineering	352
23. ILSI Engineering	351
24. SEF Consulting Engineers	351
25. IMC Consulting Engineers, Inc.	350
26. Bucharthorn, Inc.	346
27. Digital Engineering	344
28. Khafra	342
29. ECM Consultants, Inc	340
30. Neel-Schaffer	337
31. Design Engineering, Inc.	334
32. Veolia Water North America-South LLC	334
33. Hatch Mott MacDonald	333
34. CH Fenstermaker & Assoc. LLC	331
35. Hartman Engineering, Inc.	331
36. NY Associates, Inc.	331
37. Barowka and Bonura	329
38. MSMM Engineering, LLC	326
39. G.E.C., Inc.	324
40. Chester Engineers, Inc	319
41. H. Davis Cole & Associates, LLC	316
42. CSRS, INC	315
43. Rahman & Associates, Inc.	313
44. CB&I Environmental & Infrastructure, INC	311
45. Richard C. Lambert Consultants, LLC	303
46. WDG Architects Engineers	303
47. Waggoner	299
48. Atkins North America, inc.	291
49. Volkert	285
50. FDH Engineering, Inc	281
51. T. Baker Smith	279
52. IMS, PA	274
53. Principal Engineering	270
54. Professional Engineering Consultants, Corp	268
55. Kyle Associates, LLC	267
56. Kenall, INC	250
57. Pinnacle Engineering, LLC	249
58. Pivotal Engineering, LLC	230
59. Artovia Engineering & Management Consulting	216

WHEREAS, staff shall assign projects based upon the ranking contained in the shortlist and per the language contained in the RFQ, based upon the firm's ability to perform the work for the project size and complexity; and

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Sewerage and Water Board of New Orleans that the President or President Pro-Tem approve the shortlist as presented for engineering and consulting services for the replacement and replacement of Sewerage & Water Board of New Orleans facilities and direct staff to enter into negotiations for project(s) with the most qualified candidate based upon the firm's ability to perform the work for the project's size and complexity.

I, Cedric S. Grant, Executive Director,
Sewerage and Water Board of New Orleans, do hereby
certify that the above and foregoing is a true and
correct copy of a Resolution adopted at the Regular
Monthly Meeting of said Board, duly called and held,
according to law, on October 15, 2014.

CEDRIC S. GRANT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
SEWERAGE AND WATER BOARD OF NEW ORLEANS

Sewerage and Water Board of New Orleans

Capital Projects Prioritization Methodology

The Sewerage and Water Board of New Orleans is utilizing a Capital Projects Prioritization methodology which is intended to produce a viable Capital Program within the constraint of available financial resources. The purpose of the procedure is to prioritize all projects included in the 2015-2019 Capital Program.

The methodology is based on the Simple Additive Weighting (SAW) method, where the qualitative criterion is multiplied by a given rating and the sum total provides an overall project score.

- The criteria are customer service, system reliability, system replacement/rehabilitation, system benefits/efficiency, operation flexibility, regulatory compliance, project benefit/impact, system growth and system security. Each criterion has been assigned a relative weight. In this methodology, SWBNO has proposed weighing regulatory compliance as the most important and system growth the least important.
- A guideline has been established to help staff rate each criterion. Rules have also been established to support the methodology. Example: Projects with 100% funding by outside sources are exempt from ranking. However, the projects and cash flows must be listed to provide an accurate picture for the whole Capital Budget.
- The projects are then listed in ranking order, and projects are funded, deferred or remain unfunded according to funding availability.

The procedure shall be reviewed each year prior to developing the Capital Budgets to ensure the methodology, with particular emphasis on the scoring system, is valid.

SWBNO CAPITAL PROJECTS SCORING SYSTEM CRITERIA & RATING GUIDE/SCALE DEFINITIONS

Project Score			
<u>Criteria</u>	<u>SWBNO Criteria Weight</u>	<u>Example Rating</u>	<u>Example Score</u>
Customer Service	0.10	7.50	0.75
System Reliability	0.12	2.00	0.24
System Replacement/Rehabilitation	0.13	5.23	0.68
System Benefits/Efficiency	0.09	4.00	0.36
Operation Flexibility	0.12	3.30	0.40
Regulatory Compliance	0.17	8.00	1.36
Project Benefit/Impact	0.09	2.00	0.18
System Growth	0.08	1.10	0.09
System Security	0.10	2.64	0.26
Project Total	1.00		4.32

CRITERIA			
DEFINITION	RATING GUIDE	RATING SCALE	
Customer Service Provide all SWBNO customers with a wide array of service choices and high levels of convenience, which positively impact customers satisfaction and customer acceptance of the cost of service	Provides significant improvements to service availability, service levels, timeliness, and/or provides new customer choices for service delivery	High	7.50 - 10.00
	Improves some aspects of customer service convenience or choice, definitely perceived by customers as improvements	Median	3.75 - 7.49
	Does not or only slightly impacts or degrades customer convenience or choices for service	Low	0.00 - 3.74
System Reliability Improve or strengthen system reliability, capability or redundancy Allow system changes which in turn allow maintenance downtime without affecting system performance management	Dramatically improves water purification, sewage treatment, water distribution, sewage collections, drainage system, power supply or speed and quality of information delivery to significant group of users	High	7.50 - 10.00
	Improves water purification, sewage treatment, water distribution, sewage collections, drainage system, power supply or speed and quality of information delivery to significant group of users	Median	3.75 - 7.49
	Does nothing or only slightly improves water purification, sewage treatment, water distribution, sewage collections, drainage system, power supply or speed and quality of information delivery	Low	0.00 - 3.74

System Replacement/Rehabilitation

Replacement/rehabilitation of existing systems to extend the life of existing systems to maintain operational value	Risks that will be reduced are clearly identified and significant	High	7.50 - 10.00
Extent to which the project promotes business risk reduction within the context of any operational unit	Risks that will be reduced are probable and worth considering	Median	3.75 - 7.49
	No obvious risk or only slight risk reduction benefit	Low	0.00 - 3.74

System Benefits/Efficiency

Reduce the cost of operating the system through investment or reduction in processing time	Creates measurable, significant increase in productivity of large groups of workers	High	7.50 - 10.00
Reduce life cycle costs	Creates identifiable increase in productivity of some groups of workers	Median	3.75 - 7.49
Provide workers with direct access to information that enhances employee's efficiency and effectiveness	Does not create any obvious productivity benefits	Low	0.00 - 3.74

Operation Flexibility

Provide alternatives in running the system	Supports operations and/or enterprise architecture.	High	7.50 - 10.00
Makes systems easier to run	Good support of operations and/or enterprise architecture. Where support is missing, judged not to interfere with current or future initiatives	Median	3.75 - 7.49
Provide standardization where none existed			
Promotes an IT platform for hardware, software and protocols	Minimal or no support for operations and/or enterprise architecture, a stand alone, non-standard system	Low	0.00 - 3.74

Regulatory Compliance

Ability to meet Federal, State, Parish, City or SWBNO regulations	Risks that will be reduced are clearly identified, and significant. Produces major improvement in compliance or conservation that reduces risk	High	7.50 - 10.00
Reduce compliance and conservation risks/liabilities and supports mission for environmental stewardship and resource conservation	Risks that will be reduced are probable, and worth considering. Produces easily identified compliance or conservation benefits	Median	3.75 - 7.49
	No obvious or only slight risk reduction benefit or contribution to improving compliance or conservation	Low	0.00 - 3.74

Project Benefit/Impact

Impacts the larger community whether external or internal to SWBNO	Rate of return significantly exceeds total life cycle investment, easy to quantify benefits.	High	7.50 - 10.00
Incorporates SWBNO Board and Executive priorities	Rate of return most likely exceeds total life cycle investment, more difficult to quantify benefits.	Median	3.75 - 7.49
Benefit is greater than the investment, reductions in labor, materials, energy or service contracts			
Enhance revenue	Rate of return not likely to exceed total life cycle investments, benefits outweighed by costs	Low	0.00 - 3.74

System Growth

Meet the needs of future demand Increase capability of the system to provide the product or service	Risks that will be reduced are clearly identified and significant	High	7.50 - 10.00
Reduces risk for IT and equipment obsolescence, resource scarcity, vendor viability and reliability	Risks that will be reduced are probably, and worth considering	Median	3.75 - 7.49
	No obvious risk reduction benefit	Low	0.00 - 3.74

System Security

Ability to safeguard the water supply Protect the quality of the SWBNO product Mitigate unlawful acts that affect the system output	Provides major improvements to security in multiple areas of concern	High	7.50 - 10.00
Improve security of information and reduce IT related vulnerabilities Improve the ability to plan, respond and manage security threats and incidences	Provides easily identified improvement to security in one or more areas	Median	3.75 - 7.49
Improve the ability to maintain services without interruption	Does not provide any readily identifiable security benefit	Low	0.00 - 3.74

Sewerage and Water Board of New Orleans Committee & Regular Board Meeting Schedule

2014 Calendar of Events

WEDNESDAY	OCTOBER 1, 2014	8:00 AM	COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE
WEDNESDAY	OCTOBER 1, 2014	10:30 AM	PENSION COMMITTEE
MONDAY	OCTOBER 6, 2014	8:00 AM	OPERATIONS COMMITTEE
TUESDAY	OCTOBER 7, 2014	8:00 AM	FINANCE COMMITTEE
FRIDAY	OCTOBER 10, 2014	9:00 AM	EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY	OCTOBER 15, 2014	9:00 AM	REGULAR BOARD
MONDAY	NOVEMBER 3, 2014	8:00 AM	OPERATIONS COMMITTEE
TUESDAY	NOVEMBER 4, 2014	8:00 AM	FINANCE COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY	NOVEMBER 5, 2014	8:00 AM	COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE
WEDNESDAY	NOVEMBER 5, 2014	10:30 AM	PENSION COMMITTEE
FRIDAY	NOVEMBER 7, 2014	9:00 AM	EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY	NOVEMBER 19, 2014	9:00 AM	REGULAR BOARD
MONDAY	DECEMBER 1, 2014	8:00 AM	OPERATIONS COMMITTEE
TUESDAY	DECEMBER 2, 2014	8:00 AM	FINANCE COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY	DECEMBER 3, 2014	8:00 AM	COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE
WEDNESDAY	DECEMBER 3, 2014	10:30 AM	PENSION COMMITTEE
FRIDAY	DECEMBER 5, 2014	9:00 AM	EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY	DECEMBER 17, 2014	9:00 AM	REGULAR BOARD

NOTE: RECOMMENDATIONS:

OCTOBER – MOVED TO SECOND WEEK DUE TO HOW THE DAYS FALL DURING FIRST WEEK