FROM: Cathy Rosen, Public Works Director  
      Eric Johnston, City Engineer

INITIALED AS APPROVED FOR SUBMITTAL TO THE COUNCIL BY:

Jim Slowik, Mayor  
Paul Schmidt, City Administrator  
Doug Merriman, Finance Director  
Margery Hite, City Attorney, as to form

PURPOSE
This agenda bill summarizes the engineering consultant selection process for the wastewater treatment facility project.

AUTHORITY
The authority to enter into agreements for improvements or use of real property is granted to the City of Oak Harbor under RCW 35A.11.020.

The process for the selection and contract negotiations is outlined in OHMC 2.350, a copy of which is attached.

SUMMARY STATEMENT
During development of the Sewer Comprehensive Plan in 2006 and 2007, the need for additional wastewater treatment facilities began to emerge. The sewer plan identifies the need for additional capacity as early as 2017 depending on the level of growth that may occur within the City service area. The need for additional facilities is also driven by the condition of the existing plants and anticipated regulatory changes likely to occur in the next 5 years. Specifically, the RBC treatment plant near Windjammer Park has reached the end of its useful and practical life. Constructed in the early 1970’s, the RBC plant utilizes an outdated process technology and equipment that is no longer supported by the industry.

The condition of the existing treatment facilities and the capacity of the system are only part of the issues facing the City. The Puget Sound Partnership Action Agenda identifies a number of areas targeted for Puget Sound cleanup efforts. A key target of the cleanup effort is ensuring that dissolved oxygen levels are sufficient to sustain marine life. Dissolved oxygen levels drop as the nutrient loading increases. Municipal wastewater treatment plants are identified as significant contributors to nutrient loading in Puget Sound. The addition of nutrient removal from treated wastewater as a condition of discharge permits issued by the Department of Ecology is likely to
occur in the near future as implementation of the Puget Sound Action plan gains momentum. Neither the RBC nor the SPB lagoon plants are capable of nutrient removal without significant investment. Finally, the recent conversion of the Crescent Harbor marsh area from freshwater to salt water habitat has resulted in a significant flooding risk to the SPB lagoon plant that threatens the long term viability of a treatment plant at that location.

In summary, the City of Oak Harbor is looking at the following major issues in relation to wastewater treatment plants:

- Capacity
- Age and condition of the RBC plant
- Pending changes to discharge permits associated with Puget Sound Cleanup
- Flooding risks and habitat concerns at the Seaplane Base Lagoons

The 2010 Wastewater division budget included $500,000 to begin the process that will eventually lead to the construction of a new wastewater treatment plant. The first step in the process is the development of a facility plan. The requirements for wastewater treatment facility planning are contained in WAC 173-240. In its most basic purpose however, a facility plan defines what treatment process will be utilized and where the facility will be located. In addition, to the “What and Where,” the facility plan will examine the long term life cycle costs, financial impacts to rate payers, effluent disposal, solids handling, and public participation. The first step for the City of Oak Harbor in developing the facility plan is the selection of a qualified engineer to assist and take the lead in developing the project.

The selection process for engineering consultants is defined in OHMC 2.35 and RCW 39.80. A copy of OHMC 2.350 as well as summary information published by the Municipal Research Service Center (MRSC) in the “Bidding Book” regarding the selection process required by RCW 39.80 is attached.

In following this prescribed process for selecting the most qualified firm, City staff issued a request for qualifications for the project in September of 2009. From the list of eight firms who submitted, four firms were short listed for further consideration. The short list was based on a staff review and ranking of the submitted statements of qualifications. The four short listed firms were sent a request for formal proposals (RFP). A copy of the RFP document is attached. Each of the four firms short listed were invited to a formal interview in February 2010. Council members Paggao, Almberg and Munns together with Mayor Slowik and City staff formed the interview panel. Based on the written proposal and the interviews, Carollo Engineers was selected as the most qualified engineering firm to assist the City with the development of the wastewater facility plan.

It is worth noting at this point that the RFP document included goals for wastewater effluent quality that are significantly higher that the current permit requirements. The intent was to develop a project that placed a priority on protecting the environment and planning for anticipated permitting requirements. Quoting from the request for proposals:

"Recognizing that the City of Oak Harbor is connected to the pristine waters of Puget Sound, specifically Oak Harbor Bay and Crescent Harbor Bay, the City’s goal is to
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obtain the highest level of water quality practical while recognizing the limitations of the rate payers of the city to fund improvements. A primary goal of the City is the continued protection of the water quality of the waters in and around Oak Harbor to meet the goals outlined in Puget Sound Action Plan developed by Puget Sound Partnership for the cleanup and protection of Puget Sound."

The next step in the process is the development of the scope of work. In addition to the prescribed requirements of the WAC, it is anticipated that the scope of work will include an extensive public process. Input of the citizens of Oak Harbor is critical to the development and acceptance of the facility plan. Input and participation of other stakeholders, including NASWI, Island County, state and federal regulatory agencies (DOE, DOH, Army Corps of Engineers, DFW, NOAA, NMFS, DNR, etc.) is also critical in the development of the facility plan. The environmental review process, the public involvement process, the financial analysis and the engineering design and planning will all factor into the decision making process and development of the facility plan. The scope of work will encompass all of the statutorily required elements with particular attention placed on public involvement. The basic elements of the scope of work are shown in the attached work flow diagram that was included in Carollo’s written proposal, a copy of which is available in its entirety from the City of Oak Harbor website.

Once the scope of work is developed and agreed to by both parties, the consulting engineer will submit the fee schedule to complete the work. The City and consultant will then continue to negotiate until a mutually acceptable contract is approved by the City Council as required by OHMC 2.350.

Staff have notified Carollo Engineers of their selection as the most qualified firm and staff are requesting Council authorization to proceed with contract negotiations with Carollo for the wastewater facility plan project. It is anticipated that a contract will be presented to the Council for consideration in late April or early May.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT
The Public Works standing committee was briefed on the project numerous times and was involved in the consultant interviews. An overview of the selection process was presented to the General Government committee on February 10, 2010.

RECOMMENDED ACTION
Authorize City staff to begin contract negotiations with Carollo Engineers for the wastewater treatment facility project.

ATTACHMENTS
OHMC 2.350
Excerpts from MRSC Bidding Book
City of Oak Harbor Request for Proposals
Excerpt from Carollo written proposal

MAYOR’S COMMENTS
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Chapter 2.350

CONTRACTS FOR ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING SERVICES

Sections:
2.350.010 Purpose.
2.350.020 Definitions.
2.350.030 City’s requirement for architect, engineer and surveyor services – Advance publication.
2.350.050 Procurement of architectural and engineering services – Contract negotiations.
2.350.060 Procurement of architectural and engineering services – Exception for emergency work.

2.350.010 Purpose.

The city hereby establishes a policy consistent with the state requirements under Chapter 39.80 RCW, to publicly announce requirements for architectural and engineering services, and negotiate contracts for architectural and engineering services on the basis of demonstrated competence and qualification for the type of professional services required and at fair and reasonable prices. (Ord. 1470 § 6, 2006).

2.350.020 Definitions.

Unless the context clearly requires otherwise, the definitions in this section shall apply throughout this chapter.
(1) “Architectural and engineering services” or “professional services” means professional services rendered by any person, other than as an employee of the city, contracting to perform activities within the scope of the general definition of professional practice in Chapter 18.08, 18.43 or 18.96 RCW as now in effect or as hereafter amended.

These provisions of the RCW cover architects, professional engineers, surveyors and landscape architects.
(2) “Person” means any individual, organization, group, association, partnership, firm, joint venture, corporation, or any combination thereof.

(3) “Consultant” means any person providing professional services who is not an employee of the city for which the services are provided.
(4) “Application” means a completed statement of qualifications together with a request to be considered for the award of one or more contracts for professional services. (Ord. 1470 § 6, 2006).

2.350.030 City’s requirement for architect, engineer and surveyor services – Advance publication.

The city shall publish in advance the city’s requirement for professional services. The announcement shall state concisely the general scope and nature of the project or work for which the services are required and the address of a representative of the city who can provide further details. The city may comply with this section by:
(1) Publishing an announcement on each occasion when professional services provided by a consultant are required by the city; or
(2) Announcing generally to the public its projected requirements for any category or type of professional services. (Ord. 1470 § 6, 2006).


In the procurement of architectural and engineering services, the city shall encourage firms engaged in the lawful practice of their profession to submit annually a statement of qualifications and performance data. The city shall evaluate current statements of qualifications and performance data on file with the city, together with those that may be submitted by other firms regarding the proposed project, and shall conduct discussions with one or more firms regarding anticipated concepts and the relative utility of alternative methods of approach for furnishing the required services and then shall select therefrom, based upon criteria established by the city, the firm deemed to be the most highly qualified to provide the services required for the proposed project. Minority and women-owned businesses shall be encouraged to apply. (Ord. 1470 § 6, 2006).

2.350.050 Procurement of architectural and engineering services – Contract negotiations.

(1) The city shall negotiate a contract with the most qualified firm for architectural and engineering services at a price which the city determines is
Chapter 2.360

PURCHASE SERVICE POLICIES

Sections:
2.360.010 Definitions.
2.360.020 Policy and application.
2.360.030 Competitive processes.
2.360.050 Administrative rules.

2.360.010 Definitions.
"Purchase services" means services provided by a vendor to accomplish routine, contrary and necessary functions such as operation of equipment, shredding, janitorial services, security, yard maintenance, gardening, computer hardware and software maintenance or data entry. It does not include professional services as defined under Chapter 39.80 RCW, or services such as accounting, legal, medical, planning, management or artistic services. (Ord. 1470 § 7, 2006).

2.360.020 Policy and application.
It is the intent of the city to use competitive processes to the extent possible to procure purchase services. (Ord. 1470 § 7, 2006).

2.360.030 Competitive processes.
Where reasonably possible, the city is directed to use competitive bid processes or competitive solicitation processes for purchase services as in the same manner as is used for purchase of supplies and equipment. (Ord. 1470 § 7, 2006).

2.360.050 Administrative rules.
The mayor may promulgate procedures and rules to implement purchase service solicitations. Procedure promulgation shall comply with OHMC 2.310.030. (Ord. 1470 § 7, 2006).
The Bidding Book
for Washington Cities and Towns

September 2006
Municipal Research and Services Center
Bid Laws That Apply to All Cities and Towns

The bid laws that have been previously discussed are unique for the different classes of cities. However, some bid laws are the same for all classes of cities. All cities must secure the services of architects and engineers by a request for qualifications. No cities are allowed to split bids to circumvent the bid limits. In certain situations, cities must call for bids even when work is performed by private developers. Each of these topics is discussed below.

Architectural and Engineering Services

Although there are no requirements that cities bid competitively for services (except for the official newspaper, as noted above on page 15), cities must follow the procedures set out in chapter 39.80 RCW when contracting for architectural and engineering services.\(^6^5\)

Chapter 39.80 RCW requires that a city publish its need for architectural or engineering services in advance, concisely stating the general scope and nature of the project or work for which services are required.\(^6^6\) The notice must also provide the address of a representative of the city who can provide additional details. Compliance with this requirement may be accomplished by either: (1) publishing an announcement each time the service is needed, or (2) announcing generally to the public the city's projected requirements for any category or type of engineering or architectural service.\(^6^7\)

Cities may advertise for architectural and engineering firms to annually submit a statement of qualifications and performance data. The city then evaluates the qualifications and performance data it has on file along with the information submitted regarding a proposed project. Following the evaluation, the city invites one or more firms to meet with its officials to discuss the project and the relative benefits of various methods of providing the desired services. The city then selects the firm "most highly qualified" to provide the required services from among those firms.\(^6^8\) City procedures and guidelines are required to include a plan to ensure that women and minority (WMBE) firms have the maximum opportunity to compete for the contract. The level of WMBE firm participation must be consistent with their availability within the relevant professional

\(^{65}\) See Contracting for Professional Services, MRSC Information Bulletin No. 485 (Municipal Research and Services Center), April 1994, for more information on these procedures.

\(^{66}\) RCW 39.80.030.

\(^{67}\) Id.

\(^{68}\) RCW 39.80.040.
community. The price or cost of the service may not be considered by the city when determining which firm is the most highly qualified.

After the most qualified firm has been chosen, the city negotiates a contract with that firm for the services at a price that it determines is fair and reasonable, considering the estimated value of the services to be rendered, as well as the scope and complexity of the project. If a satisfactory contract cannot be negotiated, the city formally terminates the negotiations with that firm and attempts to negotiate a contract with the next most qualified firm. The process continues until an agreement is reached or the search is terminated.

The process outlined above for the procuring architectural or engineering services may be dispensed with upon a finding by the city that an emergency requires the immediate execution of the work involved.

Does the city have to hire an architectural or engineering firm for the entire year? No. The city can hire one firm for the entire year, but it can also hire on a project-by-project basis, as long as it follows the procedures in chapter 39.80 RCW for each project.

In its request for qualifications, may a city ask engineering firms for their hourly rates? No. The most qualified firm must be chosen. Only then can the city discuss the cost of the services. If, during the negotiations, the city finds the price is too high, it can then go on to negotiate with the next most qualified firm.

Must a city follow the procedures in chapter 39.80 RCW when procuring the services of surveyors and landscape architects? Yes. In RCW 39.80.020(5), "architectural and engineering services" is defined to mean "professional services ... within the scope of the general definition of professional practice in chapters 18.08 [architects], 18.43 [engineers and land surveyors], or 18.96 RCW [landscape architects]." (Material in brackets added.) See also AGO 1988 No. 14.

Is a two-year retainer with an engineer prohibited? It depends. If the city is hiring this person to act as "city engineer" (but not as a city employee) to perform all the engineering work in the city, a two-year contract is probably not allowed. RCW 39.80.40 provides that cities must publish their requirements for professional services and encourage firms to submit qualifications and performance data annually. However, the city need not change engineers every year. The city can continue to hire the same engineer if the city finds that person to be the most qualified.

If the city has a specific project for which it wishes hire an engineer, and if that project will take two years, the city may hire that person for the duration of the project.

---

69See discussion set out at page 11.
70See AGO 1988 No. 4.
71RCW 39.80.050(1).
72RCW 39.80.050(2).
73RCW 39.80.060.
CITY OF OAK HARBOR
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR
WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING AND
FACILITY PLAN

INTRODUCTION
The City of Oak Harbor is issuing a request for proposals (RFP) for engineering services to
prepare preliminary design and a facility plan for new wastewater treatment system to serve
the projected Oak Harbor Urban Growth Area (UGA) in Island County. This is an
opportunity to plan a modern wastewater treatment and water reclamation system with
either Membrane Bioreactor (MBR) or Conventional Activated Sludge (CAS) treatment
meeting criteria established by the City of Oak Harbor.

BACKGROUND
The City of Oak Harbor currently operates two waste water treatment facilities. The City of
Oak Harbor RBC plant located in Windjammer Park has a .7 mgd limit with the balance of
an approximately 2.0 mgd total flow being diverted to facultative lagoon plant located on
the Naval Air Station Whidbey Island. The two current facilities serve a population of
about 23,000 of which approximately 4,000 are housed at the Naval Air Station and do not
contribute to flow to City treatment Facilities. It is anticipated that future demands will
approach the permit limitations of the facilities in approximately 2017 as described in
greater detail in the City’s comprehensive sewer plan. The City anticipates the need to
have a new treatment facility in operation by 2017. It is anticipated that the new plant will
be constructed to meet in initial demands at the time of construction (~3mgd) and be
expandable to meet the long term demand projections (~6 mgd)

Additional information on the City’s wastewater system and treatment plants can be found
in the documents at the web links below:


The objective of this request for proposals is to obtain a Technical Memorandum
recommending a site for the treatment facilities, a preliminary design of the treatment
facility and an approved Facility Plan in compliance with WAC 173-240-060 and 40 CFR
35.917-1 including the required Environmental Documents.

PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS
Excessively elaborate or lengthy proposals are not desired. Proposals should be limited to no more than 50 (fifty) single sided pages. The proposal should be accompanied by a brief introductory letter stating your firm’s interest in the project. The cover letter should be limited to no more than two single sided pages. The proposal should contain the following elements.

1. **Project Approach:** Provide a clear concise statement of the general approach to be undertaken on the project.

2. **Scope of Work:** The consultant will be required to provide all services and work to complete the required documents and all work described herein. The consultant should include in the scope of work the gathering and analysis of data, periodic meetings with City staff, a minimum of three Public Meetings and coordination with regulatory and permitting agencies as necessary.

The Scope of Work provided with the proposal should include a step by step breakdown of the tasks and subtasks to be performed on a product by product basis. Any tasks or subtasks that you assume to be accomplished by City staff and the general level of participation expected from the City should also be identified and included as tasks or subtasks.

The City assumes that as a minimum, the following Scope of Work is necessary to satisfactorily complete the needed services.

It is anticipated that the scope of work will incorporate at a minimum the following general topics:

1) **Potential Facility Location**
   a. RBC Plant
   b. Lagoon site
   c. Train Wreck Site
   d. Any additional site recommendation developed by the consultant.

2) **Treatment processes design (two minimum)**
   a. MBR
   b. Conventional activated sludge

3) **Solids handling**
   a. Local beneficial use (i.e. composting, land application, etc)
   b. Offsite disposal (i.e. Boulder park)
   c. Regional solids opportunities (North Whidbey Area)
   d. Other yet to be determined process

4) **Effluent Disposal**
   a. Water Reuse
i. Class A injection to groundwater
ii. Irrigation supply
iii. In plant use
   b. Wetland Creation
c. Saltwater outfall

5) 40 year Life cycle cost for options and variations

6) Construction and project scheduling and phasing (dependent on location and process) for option and variations

7) System wide SCADA monitoring
   a. Plant
   b. Collections
   c. Conveyance

8) Project Financing options
   a. Bonding planning and assistance in bond issue preparation
   b. Assistance in identifying possible grant and or loan opportunities.

It is assumed that the consultant will incorporate standard elements of a treatment plant into the facility plan documents. These elements include but are not limited to:

a) Short and long term demand estimates and population based flow projections
b) Disinfection methods
c) HVAC design
d) Fire protection needs
e) Laboratory design
f) Outfall design
g) Staffing plans
h) Power demands
i) Maintenance and operations planning
j) Compliance with DOE regulations and permitting requirements
k) Context sensitive design
l) Urban architecture
m) Sound control
n) Odor control
o) Redundancy and emergency response planning

Recognizing that the City of Oak Harbor is connected to the pristine waters of Puget Sound, specifically Oak Harbor Bay and Crescent Harbor Bay, the City's goal is to obtain the highest level of water quality practical while recognizing the limitations of the rate payers of the city to fund improvements. A primary goal of the City is the continued protection of the water quality of the waters in and around Oak Harbor to meet the goals outlined in
Puget Sound Action Plan developed by Puget Sound Partnership for the cleanup and protection of Puget Sound.

The City has tentatively established the following goals for the development of the new plant:

1) Silver LEED Certified facility
2) Effluent requirements/goals/targets as shown in the chart below and compared with existing permit limitations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RBC plant NPDES permit limit</th>
<th>Lagoon plant NPDES permit limit</th>
<th>New Facility Target/Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total suspended solids</strong></td>
<td>30mg/l</td>
<td>75mg/l</td>
<td>10mg/l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85% removal</td>
<td>85% removal</td>
<td>95% removal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CBOD 5</strong></td>
<td>25 mg/l</td>
<td>25 mg/l</td>
<td>10mg/l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85% removal</td>
<td>85% removal</td>
<td>95% removal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turbidity</strong></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>1 NTU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chlorine residual</strong></td>
<td>0.114 mg/l</td>
<td>0.5 mg/l</td>
<td>No discharge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fecal coli form</strong></td>
<td>200/100ml (monthly)</td>
<td>200/100ml (monthly)</td>
<td>&lt;100/100ml (monthly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nitrogen</strong></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>8mg/l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Phosphorous</strong></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>0.5 mg/l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pathogen barriers</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Miscellaneous Services are expected to include

1) Provide continuing consultation through oral and written communication on all matters relating to the project.

2) Provide monthly progress reports to the City and participate in presentations before the City Council and other public bodies. The City anticipates a minimum of three (3) public meetings.

3) Monthly billings are to detail hours expended by specific consultant personnel by task and subtask.

3. Schedule of Work: The consultant shall provide a schedule for having the initial submission of a Facility Plan to the State Department of Ecology not later than one year after a Notice to Proceed. The schedule should include the time allowed for review by the City and other agencies and should identify a critical path involving any required actions by entities other than the consultant.

4. Consultant Qualifications: Consultant qualifications should include detailed information regarding the Consultant’s experience on similar projects. A statement to the effect that team members and subconsultants will not be replaced without the prior approval of the City shall be included. The Consultant’s qualifications should include the following information:

1) List no more than five projects of similar complexity and magnitude undertaken in the past five years and provide references and a phone number for each reference.

2) Provide resumes of no more than four key members of the proposed project team and no more than four key members of each subconsultant who will work on this project. Each resume should be a maximum of two pages in length.

3) Of the listed reference projects, list the involvement of proposed project team members for whom resumes have been submitted.

4) List subconsultants and specify their involvement on the project. List no more than five projects of similar complexity and magnitude undertaken by the subconsultant in the past five years and provide references and a phone number for each project.
5) The consultant may submit a brochure that provides any further information describing the firm’s qualifications for this project; however it will be included in the maximum allowed page count.

5. **Affirmation as to Form of Agreement:** Provide a statement to the effect that the City Standard Consultant Agreement is acceptable to the Proposer or state exceptions taken. Please be advised that exceptions to Paragraphs 11 and 12 of the General Provisions will not be entertained and will serve to disqualify a proposer from further consideration.

The Agreement can be downloaded at:


7. **Level of Effort:** The Consultant shall prepare a separate Level of Effort spreadsheet that contains line items for each major task and subtask to be performed with the estimated man hours per classification to be expended in that effort

**SELECTION PROCEDURE.**

Subsequent to the deadline for acceptance of proposals, the City will evaluate the Technical Proposal and will determine rankings based upon materials submitted and oral interviews (if deemed necessary by the City) using the selection criteria and weights indicated below. The City will contact the firm with the highest ranked Technical Proposal. The level of effort will be used as a basis to negotiate a contract fee. If an agreement cannot be reached with the top ranked firm, the City will contact the firm with the next ranked Technical Proposal and attempt to negotiate with that firm. The process will be repeated until an agreement is reached. Aside from eventually announcing the successful consultant, the rankings and levels of effort will be kept confidential.

**SELECTION CRITERIA**

The Consulting Team selected for this project should have demonstrated experience in wastewater treatment facility design including site selection, regulatory compliance and preparation of Facility Plans in compliance with WAC 173-240-060 and 40 CFR 35.917-1. Selection shall be based on the following:

1) Consultant’s understanding of the City’s desires and general approach to the project as demonstrated in the project description and scope of work. (up to 20 Points))

2) Completeness of the work elements included in the Proposal. (up to 20 Points)

3). Consultant’s experience with projects of similar complexity and function. (up to 20 Points))
4) Qualifications of the Consultant’s staff being assigned to this project. (up to 20 Points)

5) Demonstrated ability of the Consultant to perform high quality work, to control costs and to meet schedules. (up to 20 Points)

Should the City determine that interviews are desirable, up to 25 additional points may be granted based on those interviews.

Ranking will on a total point basis.

SUBMITTAL DEADLINE

Six copies of the Technical Proposal and Level of Effort should be forwarded to the attention of Mr. Russ Pabarcus, P.E., Project Manager at the following address by 5:00 p.m. on January 8, 2008.

City of Oak Harbor
865 SE Barrington Drive
Oak Harbor, WA 98277

Any proposal received after the specified date and time will automatically be rejected and will not receive any further consideration by the City. Postmarks will not be accepted.

PROPOSAL CONTACT PERSON

All questions regarding this solicitation should be directed to Russ Pabarcus, Civil Engineer at (360) 279-4520 or rpabarcus@oakharbor.org.
ADDENDUM 1 TO CITY OF OAK HARBOR REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING AND FACILITY PLAN

BACKGROUND

The “required Environmental Documents” may include the formal NEPA process or the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) process.

An Environmental Assessment and Biological Assessment is likely to be needed as part of the NEPA process however an Environmental Impact Statement is not anticipated at this time.

Cultural Resource review consistent with Washington State Governor’s Executive order #05-05 will be required. Consideration of potential historic sites on Navy property will also be necessary.

PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

2. Scope of Work: Include the additional requirement for an initial “stakeholders” preplanning meeting to be conducted by the Consultant to identify environmental, permitting and coordination requirements that might result from site and process selection. At a minimum attendees should include the Army Corps of Engineers, State Department of Ecology, Island County, Puget Sound Partnership, City of Oak Harbor, NASWI Public Works and other agencies having environmental or permitting interests in the project. It is anticipated that the consultant would plan and facilitate this meeting as well as provide background information to participants and document outcomes or decisions.

Include effort to assist the City in a public outreach information and education program to inform the public consisting of elected officials, stakeholders, those residing near or using facilities near to potential sites, and the general public concerning the criteria being used and the potential effects of site selection and process decisions. This effort might include visits to exemplary facilities that demonstrate what this project might achieve.

  a) Potential Facility Location - Analysis of Potential facility locations should include an analysis of potential flood protection requirements. Flood protection will be included in the preliminary design and Facility Plan for the selected site if appropriate.
The "Train Wreck" site is generally described to be the area on the NASWI-Scaleplane Base south of Pioneer way, east of Oak Harbor Bay, west of Crescent Harbor Bay and north of the Maylor Point housing area.

b) Public meetings – In addition to the three meetings with the general public it is anticipated that key personnel from the consultant team will be asked to attend three (3) council committee meetings, two (2) council workshops and two (2) city council meetings.

c) Project Financing Options - The City is in the process of finalizing a comprehensive utility cost of service rate study. The rate study analyzed revenues and expenditures as well as cost of service for various customer classes. For the purposes of this RFP, Consultant teams are to assume that as part of the funding strategy that City staff has assumed and included in the rate analysis a $70 million expenditure with a series 30 year bond repayments. The full $70 million in bond repayment would begin in 2018, one year after completion. Additional information related to the rate study is available the in minutes of the council workshop available in PDF format at (INSERT FILE LOCATION)

Given the significant impact to ratepayers the City is anticipating pursuing all opportunities for funding sources that will lessen the impact of such a large capital expenditure.

Awareness or identification of the traditional funding sources (PWTR, SRF, bonds etc) or assistance to the City in completing applications for these types of funding sources will not be a major factor in the selection process. In addition, the City is not expecting that the consultant team will be the lead on pursuing additional funding sources.

Financial analysis or life cycle cost comparisons relating to the comparison of the differing sites, processes and all associated improvements will be a part of the initial scope of work and will be given consideration during the selection process. However, the ability or approach to addressing the direct impact to utility rates will not be given significant attention during the selection process.

d) Decision Process - The City Staff concept of the decision processes leading to submittal of a facility plan to the Department of Ecology is summarized below and in the attached project organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gather information including input from</td>
<td>Consultant and City Technical Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prepare large matrix of site and process options with attendant benefits and liabilities.</strong></td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review by City Technical Group</strong></td>
<td>City Technical Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Present top 4 recommendations to City Council Public Works Committee</strong></td>
<td>City Technical Group and consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Further analysis of top 4 recommendations</strong></td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Present to Council Standing Committee</strong></td>
<td>City Technical Group and consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revise as necessary</strong></td>
<td>Consultant and City Technical Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Present Options to Public</strong></td>
<td>Consultant and City Technical Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revise based on Public input</strong></td>
<td>Consultant and City Technical Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Submit to City Council</strong></td>
<td>City Technical Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision</strong></td>
<td>City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finalize Preliminary Design &amp; Facility Plan</strong></td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authorization to Submit Facility Plan</strong></td>
<td>City Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**e) Add to the list of “standard elements”:**

```
( p) Plant Security and Chemical Safety
```

3. **Schedule of Work**: The requirement for submission of a Facility Plan to the State Department of Ecology not later than one year after a Notice to Proceed is not absolute. If your firm considers that length of time to be unrealistic, provide what you believe to be a realistic schedule. Said schedule would be evaluated as part of Selection Criteria 5).
Preliminary Work Flow Diagram
Wastewater Treatment Plant Preliminary Design and Facilities Plan

STEPS:
1. Develop and Evaluate Alternatives (4 months)
   - Project Plan Confirmed
   - Matrix of Viable Alternatives
   - Final Decision Meeting Approach
   - Shortlist Alternatives for Evaluation (4)
   - Public Input for Detailed Evaluation

2. Refine and Select Preferred Alternative (1 month)
   - Committee/Council Briefing
   - Preferred Alternative
   - Alternative Screening with Council Input

3. Consider Preliminary Plan/Design (1 month)
   - Committee/Council Briefing
   - Alternative Refinement with Public Input
   - Alternative Screening with Council Input

Submitted Facilities Plan

PUBLIC PROCESSES
- Public Meetings
  - Staff Meetings
    - Staff Mtg No. 1
      - Project Background
      - Stakeholder Briefing (Optional)
    - Staff Mtg No. 2
      - Review Project Plan
    - Staff Mtg No. 3
      - Decision Making Approach
    - Staff Mtg No. 4
      - Screen Alternatives (4)
    - Staff Mtg No. 5
      - Screen Alternatives (1)
    - Staff Mtg No. 6
      - Screen Alternatives (1)
    - Staff Mtg No. 7
      - Final Staff Meeting
  - Stakeholder Meetings
    - Stakeholder Briefing (Optional)
    - Stakeholder Pre-Planning Workshop

TECHNICAL MATTERS
- Work Products
  - Technical Management Plan
    - TM 1: Basis of Design
      - Develop Treatment Alternatives
      - Develop Support Facilities
      - Initiative Outfall Assessment
      - Develop Preliminary Site Inventory
      - Develop Site Impact Mitigation
      - Develop Facilities Plan Documentation
      - Refine Preliminary Alternatives
      - Refine Support Facilities
      - Refine Cost
    - TM 2: Process Alternatives Evaluation
      - TM 3: Support Facilities Evaluation
      - TM 4: Outfall Assessment
    - TM 5: Reuse Opportunities
      - Refine Shortlisted Alternatives
      - Refine Opportunities Including Reuse
      - Refine Environmental Documentation
    - TM 6: Recommended System Alternatives
      - Refine Preferred Alternative
      - Develop Facilities Plan Documentation
      - Refine Environmental Documentation

Our three-step approach will complete this project within the 12-month time period, and provide Oak Harbor with the right decision for your community’s future.
Treatment basis of design will be developed with your input during the initial staff meetings to set the stage for the rest of the project.

The preferred alternative will be selected to balance technical, environmental and social criteria with affordability (TBL+).

Our recent work with EPA, Ecology, and the services on Blaine, Lott and Mason County allows us to anticipate likely environmental concerns and assess the benefits/impacts of alternatives throughout project selection and documentation.

Development of strategic community/agency involvement plan up front allows the team to consider and address issues and concerns during siting and process selection, reducing potential delays.

Facilities plan development will use our recent experience on Bellingham and Everett to be ready to apply for project funding within 12 months.