

Coyote Pumping Plant Adjustable Speed Drives R

Procurement Options

October 12, 2021

COYOTE PUMPING PLANT San Felipe Division-Central Valley Project

constructed by

United States Department of the Interior Bureau of Reclamation

operated by Santa Clara Valley Water District







Attachment 1 Page 1 of 11

Project Overview

- Replacement of major equipment at the Coyote Pumping Plant
- ~90% of the work is electrical
- No change to system capacity
- All work occurs within the existing building or fenced in switchyard



Summary

Staff Recommendation

• Proceed to Request for Proposal (RFP) stage with single proposer

Justification

- Staff and consultant conducted outreach and were unable to obtain confirmation of additional proposers; therefore, potential for additional proposers is highly unlikely
- Re-posting of the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) would likely involve changes to risk allocation between the parties such as:
 - A limitation of liability in the agreement (increased risk to Valley Water)
 - Clarifying language addressing the design-to-budget approach
 - Reducing RFQ submittal requirements





Attachment 1 Page 3 of 11





Attachment 1 Page 4 of 11

Procurement Background

- December 2020: Staff presented on the Coyote Pumping Plant Adjustable Speed Drives (ASD) Replacement Project during the Virtual Open House.
- June 2, 2021: RFQ was posted, with statement of qualifications (SOQs) due on July 29, 2021.
- June 18, 2021: Staff conducted a prequalification meeting, which was attended by 23 people from 14 different contractors/designers/suppliers. Local builder's exchanges also downloaded the RFQ documents.

PLANET BIDS

• July 29, 2021: Only one potential DBE submitted a SOQ for the Project.





Builders' Exchange of santa clara county



valleywater.org

Feedback from Potential Contractors/DBEs Electrical contractors don't want to prime the work

General contractors are very busy and would need to sub out most of the work

Only 1 potential new proposer has expressed interest (no firm commitment)

Valley Water

Attachment 1 Page 6 of 11

Vetted Best Options to Proceed



OPTION A: Proceed to RFP stage with single proposer Ecommended



Option A: Proceed to RFP Stage with Single Proposer

- Proceed to RFP stage of the procurement process as originally envisioned.
- Evaluate proposal for responsiveness, as well as proposer qualifications, proposed team, approach to the work, and to confirm that price elements (proposed fees for general conditions, overhead, and profit) are acceptable.

Pros		Cons	
1. 2.	No/minimal delay to currently planned procurement schedule. VW maintains the risk allocation defined in the RFQ and procurement approach.	1.	VW doesn't have the option to proceed to second highest-ranked proposer if contract negotiations are unsuccessful. Less incentive to provide lowest bid pricing for Phase 1 (design) and fees for Phase 2 (construction).



Option B: Re-issue RFQ with Targeted Changes

- Shift more risk allocation to Valley Water
- Reduction of administrative effort to submit a SOQ
- Conduct additional outreach to potential DBEs to encourage their participation before the RFQ is reissued

Pros		Cons	
1. 2. 3.	Opportunity to qualify multiple proposers. Opportunity to obtain more competitive pricing. Considering future procurements: this is an opportunity to demonstrate that VW is willing to consider suggestions from the proposer community.	1. 2. 3.	Overall project schedule will be delayed. Possible that there is still a single SOQ submitted (or even none). Requires that VW change approach and risk allocation to respond to the market.



Tools to Control Cost

Validate DBE's Phase 1 (design) lump sum and Phase 2 (construction) markups



Design to budget requirement



Competition amongst equipment vendors



Attachment 1 Page 10 of 11



	Option A	Option B
Procurement Process	Proceed with agreement as originally envisioned	Requires revising, reviewing, and re- issuing RFQ documents
Schedule	Proceed with no schedule interruption	Project delay
Pricing and Negotiations	Lack of competition for DBE fees & lack of negotiation leverage	Potential for additional SOQs to increase competition (market outreach indicates limited potential)
Risk/Legal	VW maintains the risk allocation in the original RFQ	Re-posting the RFQ would likely involve changes to the risk allocation between the parties



Attachment 1 Page 11 of 11

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK