

CITY OF LOS ANGELES

CALIFORNIA



ERIC GARCETTI

MAYOR

June 1, 2015

BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS MEMBERS

—
KEVIN JAMES
PRESIDENT

MONICA RODRIGUEZ
VICE PRESIDENT

MATT SZABO
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

MICHAEL R. DAVIS
COMMISSIONER

HEATHER MARIE REPENNING
COMMISSIONER

BUREAU OF SANITATION

—
ENRIQUE C. ZALDIVAR
DIRECTOR

TRACI J. MINAMIDE
CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER

VAROUJ S. ABKIAN
ADEL H. HAGEKHALIL
ALEXANDER E. HELOU
ASSISTANT DIRECTORS

LISA B. MOWERY
CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

—
WASTEWATER ENGINEERING SERVICES DIV.
2714 MEDIA CENTER DRIVE
LOS ANGELES, CA 90065
FAX: (323) 342-6210 OR (323) 342-6211

ELECTRONIC MAIL

To: 25 Pre-Qualified On-Call Contract Consultants of LA Sanitation

LA SANITATION ON-CALL CONSULTANT SERVICES CONTRACTS ISSUANCE OF TOS SN-28 – TECHNICAL SERVICES, RESEARCH & ANALYSIS REGARDING WASTEWATER FLOW GAUGING USED TO CHARGE BURBANK FOR WASTEWATER SERVICE

The City is soliciting responses from 25 Prime Consultants on Pre-Qualified On-Call List. Attached are details of the Task Order Solicitation (TOS) required services.

There is no pre-proposal meeting for this TOS. All questions regarding this TOS must be submitted in writing via e-mail to the LA Sanitation Project Manager, Susan Rocha, by Friday, June 5, 2015.

The deadline for proposal submittal is **Monday, June 29, 2015**. If your firm is interested in this TOS, please submit an electronic copy of proposal via e-mail to the following LA Sanitation's staff, no later than 2:00 P.M. on the indicated due date, to:

- Susan Rocha, susan.rocha@lacity.org
- Thu-Van Ho, thu-van.ho@lacity.org

Thank you for your interest and we look forward to receiving your response to this TOS.

Sincerely,


Ali Poosti, Division Manager *for*
Wastewater Engineering Services Division
LA Sanitation

AP:tvh

c: Abdul Danishwar, WESD
Scott Hare, WESD
Thu-Van Ho, WESD
Dale Burgoyne, FMD
Susan Rocha, FMD

**City of Los Angeles
Department of Public Works**

On-call Consultant Services Contracts

Task Order Solicitation (TOS) SN-28

For

**Technical Services, Research and Analysis Regarding the Wastewater Flow
Gauging used to Charge Burbank for Wastewater Service**

June 2015

1. Introduction

The City of Burbank's agreement with the City of Los Angeles to provide treatment and disposal of a portion of Burbank's wastewater was executed in 2003. Because the wastewater discharged from Burbank to Los Angeles includes upstream wastewater from Los Angeles entering Burbank, Burbank's service charges are based on the flow and strength of measured and estimated flows of both parties.

Wastewater flow from Los Angeles sewers into Burbank is determined by adding estimated flows to the gauged flows at five stations, LTM-06, LTM-07, LTM-08, LTM-09 and LA-12. These flows are either discharged directly to the North Outfall Sewer (NOS) or into Burbank sewers. Burbank's net flow is quantified by subtracting LA's flow from Burbank's flow measured at a single flume located downstream where the NOS crosses from Burbank to Los Angeles. The calculation does not directly consider Burbank's individual discharges to the NOS upstream of the flume or the discharge of treatment sludge from the Burbank Water Reclamation Plant to one of Burbank's sewers, tributary to the NOS. When the calculation was agreed upon by the two cities, it was assumed that subtracting LA's flow from Burbank's flow in a single sewer was a representative way of quantifying Burbank's net flow. In addition, Los Angeles has gauged the flow in the NOS at LTM-14 adjacent to the flume.

In FY 2008-09 and in subsequent years, the net flow from Burbank was calculated as a negative number. Representatives of Burbank and Los Angeles have been unable to agree on how to calculate Burbank's net flow. The two cities have agreed to jointly hire a consultant to determine the reasons for the calculated negative flow and strength and to determine a representative way to calculate Burbank's net flow and strength under this TOS. Results will be used as the basis for negotiations to determine fair and equitable charges to Burbank for past and future services provided by Los Angeles.

This TOS will be used to obtain technical services only and does not include the services of Judicial Arbitration and Mediation Services, if needed.

2. Scope of Services

Task 2.1 Interview staff of Burbank and Los Angeles and thoroughly review the service agreement between the two cities and other pertinent documents and data.

Task 2.2 Investigate possible reasons for Burbank's net negative flow.

- a. Determine if the net flow calculation accurately represents physical flows coming from Burbank, which is the basis of Burbank's charges.
- b. Determine the effect of unlike gauging (area-velocity measurements for Los Angeles' wastewater; flume for Burbank's wastewater).
 1. Research studies and consult with experts.
 2. Determine if the different gauging methods have different error rates.
 3. Determine if the different errors are random or consistent.

Task 2.3 Determine if there are specific problems at Los Angeles' flow gauges.

- a. Determine if there is sediment that would interfere with the gauging.
- b. Determine if the calculation of the flow properly accounts for the pipe cross section.
- c. Determine if the calibration is done properly. Also, perform a calibration of all LA's area-velocity meters associated with this agreement.
- d. Determine if the calibration schedule is appropriate for the type of equipment. Also, perform a field investigation of Los Angeles' area-velocity meter installations to verify that they are in the proper locations and in good working condition to meet the manufacture's requirements.
- e. Determine the effect on the reported flows of any gauging problems identified in this task.
- f. Determine if Los Angeles' gauging and net flow and strength calculation to date complies with the agreement.

Task 2.4 Determine if there are specific problems at Burbank's flume.

- a. Determine if the flume is calibrated correctly and if the flume equation reflects the calibration.
- b. Perform a flume calibration and prepare a flume equation based on the calibration. Compare the new flume equation with the existing equation used by Burbank and with the equation used by Los Angeles before 2003.
- c. Perform a field investigation to determine if there is any deterioration or uneven settling of the flume that would affect the accuracy of the flow gauging.
- d. Determine if the calibration schedule is appropriate for this type of equipment.
- e. Determine the effect on the reported flows of any gauging problems identified in this task.
- f. Determine if Burbank's gauging and net flow and strength calculation to date complies with the agreement.

Task 2.5 Determine the magnitude of errors for each type of gauging at LA-12 and Burbank's flume, and compare them with the net flows from Burbank using the historical gauging data.

Task 2.6 Evaluate if negative net flow is possible (mathematically and contractually due to penalties added to the gauged flow) if the gauging is accurate.

Task 2.7 Evaluate the feasibility of gauging and/or estimating Burbank's flows at its discharge points to the NOS rather than at the flume.

- a. Identify the discharge points.
- b. Estimate the cost of determining Burbank's flows at the discharge points.
- c. Evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of determining the flows at the discharge points instead of at the flume, in terms of cost, accuracy of the calculated net flow, etc.

Task 2.8 Develop recommendations for potentially changing the calculation of Burbank's net flow for future billings and for recalculating the past unpaid billings, and develop recommendations of any agreement modifications that may be needed to implement the recommended changes to the calculations.

Task 2.9 Prepare a report of the findings of the investigation.

Task 2.10 Receive and incorporate comments from the two cities.

Task 2.11 Provide further technical support services if needed as the parties negotiate their differences regarding the gauging and determination of Burbank's net flow.

3. Communication

This section details the means of communication between the Consultant and the two cities.

- a. Communication related to the administration of the TOS will be directed to the Project Manager (PM).
- b. Concurrence between both cities will be required for the approval of payment of the Consultant's invoices and for any changes in scope, schedule or budget.
- c. Primary means of contact between the Consultant and both cities will be in the form of emails sent to both cities.
- d. All email communications will be sent to both cities.
- e. In the course of preparing work and the Consultant needs to communicate verbally with a person at either city, the consultant will memorialize the conversation/communication via email to both cities.
- f. The point of contact will be the PM, and the PM will ensure that concurrence is met between both cities.

4. Term of Engagement

The term of engagement is twelve (12) months from the issuance date of NTP. It is estimated that the cost ceiling for this TOS is approximately \$145,000.

5. Solicitation Schedule (Tentative)

- Issue TOS.....Date of cover letter.
- Receive Solicitation Responses.....As indicated in cover letter.
- Conduct Interviews if necessary.....5 weeks after issuance of TOS.
- Select and Negotiate.....7 weeks after issuance of TOS.
- Issue Task Work Order.....9 weeks after issuance of TOS.

6. Solicitation Response Requirements

Solicitation Responses shall not exceed twenty (20) pages, exclusive of cover, dividers and resumes. Solicitation Responses shall be submitted to the following LA Sanitation's staff via e-mail, no later than 2:00 pm of proposal the due date indicated in cover letter:

- Susan Rocha, susan.rocha@lacity.org
- Thu-Van Ho, thu-van.ho@lacity.org

Solicitation Responses shall include:

- A resume demonstrating that the candidate is capable of meeting the requirements of the Scope of Work. The resume shall include work experience history with dates, and references from past employers, owners, and/or organizations.
- A proposed individual cost breakdown by tasks.
- A breakdown of estimated time for completion of task.
- The proposed Hourly Billing Rate Summary for the proposed candidate with all respective direct and indirect costs, markups, expenses, overhead rates and profit. (Sample Attached).
- MBE/WBE/ SBE/EBE/DVBE/OBE subcontractors utilized and the percent utilization.
- Copies of valid MBE/WBE/SBE/EBE/DVBE certifications of MBE/WBE/SBE/EBE/DVBE sub-contractors utilized.
- Statement pertaining to the candidate's availability.

7. Selection Criteria

The selection team will evaluate the proposals with the following criteria:

- Expert knowledge in flow gauging analysis.
- Familiarity and understanding of gauging errors associated with flumes and area-velocity gauges.
- Experience and track record in gauging analysis including field work.
- Verbal and oral communication skills as indicated by the proposal and interview.
- Experience in providing technical support for negotiations.
- The value offered to the City considering cost in comparison to capabilities and experience of the candidates.

8. Suggested MBE/WBE/SBE/EBE/DVBE/OBE Participation Levels

The City had set anticipated participation levels (APLs) for sub-consultants as follows: 18% MBE, 4% WBE, 25% SBE, 8% EBE, and 3% DVBE. The Prime Consultants are encouraged to utilize these sub-consultants wherever feasible.

Note: Sub-consultants that are not listed on Schedule A in your contract cannot be added and/or utilized without the performance of the outreach and approval of the LA Sanitation.

9. Contract Manager

The City's On Call Contract Manager is:

Ali Poosti, Division Manager
Wastewater Engineering Services Division
Phone: (323) 342-6228

The Project Manager for this designated TOS is:

Susan Rocha, Environmental Engineer
Financial Management Division
Phone: (213) 485-2328

10. Disclaimer

The City may or may not decide to award any or part of this task order based on its sole convenience and shall not be responsible for any solicitation response costs.

HOURLY BILLING RATES

(To be submitted for each Task Order Solicitation)

FIRM	Status	Last Name	First Name	Position	Rate (\$/hr)	Approved Overhead Rate	Approved Profit	Billing Rate (\$/hr)	Effective Date	Notes
Prime Firm	Prime									
Prime Firm	Prime									
Prime Firm	Prime									
MBE Firm Name 1	MBE									
MBE Firm Name 2	MBE									
MBE Firm Name 3	MBE									
WBE Firm Name 1	WBE									
WBE Firm Name 2	WBE									
SBE Firm Name	SBE									
EBE Firm Name	EBE									
DVBE Firm Name	DVBE									
OBE Firm Name 1	OBE									
OBE Firm Name 2	OBE									

Firm Name	Status	Fee	%Fee
MBE Firm Name 1	MBE		
MBE Firm Name 2	MBE		
MBE Firm Name 3	MBE		
WBE Firm Name 1	WBE		
WBE Firm Name 2	WBE		
SBE Firm Name	SBE		
EBE Firm Name	EBE		
DVBE Firm Name	DVBE		
OBE Firm Name 1	OBE		
OBE Firm Name 2	OBE		

Summary	Total Fee (\$)	% Fee
Prime		
MBE		
WBE		
SBE		
EBE		
DVBE		
OBE		
Total		