

Subject: **Reservoir Committee Meeting****9:30 AM–12:00 PM**Location: Sites Project Authority
122 Old Highway 99 West, Maxwell, CA 95955Call in: 1-800-201-7439
Code: 644237

Chair: Thad Bettner (Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District)

Vice Chair: Doug Headrick (San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District)

Treasurer: Jamie Traynham (Davis Water District)

MEETING MINUTES

ROLL CALL & QUORUM: Roll was called (see Attachment A), which resulted in 23 eligible representatives. This equates to 92% of the current participation percentage being in attendance, which is greater than the 50% needed to have a quorum of the Reservoir Committee.

ATTENDANCE: See Attachment B.

CALL TO ORDER: Chairman Bettner called the meeting to order at 9:32 AM followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

AGENDA APPROVAL: It was moved by Traynham and seconded by Vanderwaal to approve the March 16, 2018 Sites Reservoir Committee Agenda. The motion was approved unanimously.

MEETING MINUTES APPROVAL:

Approval of February 15, 2018 meeting minutes was moved by Headrick and seconded by Hartwig with no changes. The motion was approved unanimously.

INTRODUCTIONS

PERIOD FOR PUBLIC COMMENT:

Mike Salmon (WSP USA) provided flyers for a P3 Water Summit on April 3-4, 2018.

1. Chairpersons' Report:

Bettner & Headrick

1.1 Introductory remarks

1.2 Follow-up presentation by John Bischoff (AECOM) regarding Turnkey as an alternative delivery method

John Bischoff presented Turnkey procurements as an alternative delivery method (See Attachment C). In summary, Turnkey may be a viable alternative if project financing is needed. However, the use of this method may be limited due to the project's significant permitting requirements, need to acquire property in a timely manner, and the design must be well-developed at the time of bid to minimize contractor

Action items serve as meeting minutes

Status: Issued for Use
Purpose: Informational
Caveat 1 Subject to changeVersion: 0
Date: 2018 Mar 17
Ref/File #:

Participation by phone is not counted in quorum or voting.

Caveat 2

Page: 1 of 4

contingencies and total project cost; which will limit the Owner's ability to provide input after award.

2. Manager's Report:

Watson

- 2.1 Informational discussion of project status for the month of February 2018. *(Attachment 2-1)*

Staff has been advancing procedures and processes for reporting finances and continues to work on procurements.

The WSIP appeal was submitted on February 23, 2018.

A risk workshop was held in early February and the Risk Management Work Group is currently reviewing an unmitigated risk report put together by AECOM.

- 2.2 Report on February 26, 2018 Sites Project Authority Board of Directors meeting *(Attachment 2-2)*

The meeting provided a legislative update of activities in Washington DC and testimony was provided to the House Subcommittee regarding the benefits of low-interest financing.

On the state level, staff attended Capitol Day and spoke with representatives of the state's legislature.

The Agenda for the upcoming Sites Project Authority meeting will be posted on the website.

The Reservoir Committee was informed the Authority approved a contract with Flechter and Company to provide financial auditing services.

- 2.3 Discussion and possible direction to staff regarding the Phase 1 Completion Schedule *(Attachment 2-3)*

After significant discussion of the schedule, budget, retention of a financial advisor, and the \$60/acre-ft. in the Phase 1 agreement, it was motioned by Headrick and seconded by Vanderwaal to approve the time extension from end of July 2018 to the end of December 2018. The motion was approved unanimously.

Further, direction was given to staff to evaluate the implications of increasing the current Phase 1 revenue; which is based on \$48.50/acre-ft of Class 1 water.

- 2.4 Report on Regulatory Agency coordination activities

Staff has previously met with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). NMFS, staff will prepare an outline for a biological assessment work plan.

3. Ad Hoc Finance & Economics Work Group:

Traynham

- 3.1 Review Payment of Claims and Treasurer's Report (Attachment 3-1)
and consider approval to the Authority Board

Traynham provided an overview and review of the Treasurer's Report as of February 28, 2017. It was motioned by Vanderwaal and seconded by Cheng to approve the Payment of Claims and Treasurer's Report. The motion was approved unanimously.

- 3.2 Consider approval of a recommendation to the Sites Project Authority Board of Directors to award the Municipal Financial Advisory services contract to Montague DeRose and Associates, LLC.

Representatives from the Reservoir Committee and Authority's Board conducted interviews of firms that had submitted proposals, and selected Montague DeRose and Associates, LLC, to take on the municipal financial advisory role, for recommendation to the authority. It was motioned by Cheng and seconded by Hartwig to approve the recommendation to the Authority. The motion was approved unanimously.

4. Ad Hoc Document Review Work Group:

Bettner/Thomson

- 4.1 Report on Prop 1 WSIP application status and activities.
No action was taken.

The work group reviewed the appeal, which was submitted on February 23, 2018. The appeal included a 20-page summary with attachments. The document submitted to the California Water Commission (CWC) addressed all comments, including questions on anadromous fish, refuges, and temperature benefits. The CWC staff has not corresponded with the Authority since submittal of the appeal. Staff expects to hear back prior to April 20, 2018, when Water Commission staff will release their decision. Commissioners will ultimately assign funding to the projects, not staff, at the upcoming Water Commission meetings on May 1 - 3, 2018.

5. Ad Hoc Reservoir Operations Work Group:

Kunde & Ruiz

Report on activities to define the Phase 1 rebalancing process as an input to the Phase 2 participation agreements.

No Action was taken. A meeting is scheduled for the following week to continue discussions on the rebalancing process.

6. Ad Hoc Water Facilities Work Group:

Watson on behalf of Arita

- 6.1 Discussion and possible direction to staff regarding the proposed Phase 2 procurement plan. (Presentation)

No Action was taken.

The procurement plan that was presented (see Attachment D), builds from the December Reservoir Committee meeting, where members provided input regarding their values; which was presented at the January meeting. The February meeting

included a presentation summarizing different delivery methods. The current plan consists of 9 "services lines" that will be needed in Phase 2 as well as the need to retain specialized services. An updated timeline was also provided.

Headrick suggested that a panel of experts with large capital infrastructure projects be assembled that can advise on the packaging and provide lessons learned. Vanderwaal's concern is that several participants in the Reservoir Committee don't have experience managing such projects. He would like to hear from owners of projects (not just consultants).

7. Ad Hoc Siting Work Group: Azevedo

No Report

8. Ad Hoc Risk Management Work Group: Vanderwaal

8.1 Report on progress to develop risk-adjusted project cost and schedule

No action was taken.

An initial draft risk assessment has been reviewed to obtain input on potential mitigation strategies that could be used to manage the key risks. Based on this input, an updated report will be provided to the work group.

9. Recap & Adjourn Bettner/Headrick

9.1 Agenda topics for next meeting?

- A "deep dive" on lessons learned by owner's who have completed large capital infrastructure projects.
- Agenda topics for Workshop at ACWA (May 8):
Members proposed to have a presentation and an industry outreach session to talk to consultants and provide outreach to participating agency board members

9.2 Upcoming Reservoir Committee meetings:

Regular Monthly meeting: 2:00 PM on April 19, 2018 at
Tsakopoulos Library Galleria (East Meeting Room)
828 I Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

ADJOURN

Meeting adjourned at 12:19 PM.


Chairperson
Thad Bettner


General Manager
Jim Watson

2018 April 19

Attachment A to Meeting Minutes**Current Voting Committee Participants (27):**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>Pct</i>	<i>Participant</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>Pct</i>	<i>Participant</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1.93	4M Water District	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4.96	Metropolitan WD
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2.31	American Canyon, City	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5.15	Orland-Artois WD
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2.11	Antelope Valley-East Kern WA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3.10	Pacific Resources MWC (2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4.03	Cal Water Service	<input type="checkbox"/>	2.35	Proberta WD
<input type="checkbox"/>	1.91	Carter MWC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5.15	Reclamation District 108
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5.32	Coachella Valley WD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7.78	San Bernardino Valley MWD
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3.50	Colusa County	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3.69	San Geronio Pass WA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7.14	Colusa Co. WD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5.00	Santa Clara Valley WD
<input type="checkbox"/>	1.90	Cortina WD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2.51	Santa Clarita Valley WA (2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2.18	Davis WD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2.43	Western Canal WD
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0.00	Department of Water Resources (non-voting)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5.97	Westside WD
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2.70	Desert WA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4.47	Wheeler Ridge-Maricopa WSD
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2.68	Dunnigan WD	P	0.00	US Bureau of Reclamation (non-voting)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2.10	Garden Highway MWC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4.47	Zone 7 WA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5.15	Glenn-Colusa ID			

23 Voting members present (See Note 1)**91.2 % Participation percentage in attendance**

Representation has been delegated as follows:

- (1) To Trimble (Western Canal WD)
- (2) to Kunde (WRM-WSD)
- (3)
- (4)

NOTE 1: Participation by phone are not counted in quorum or voting.Status:
Purpose:

Meeting Record

Caveat 1

Caveat 2

Subject to revision

Version: 0

Date: 2018 Mar 17

Ref/File #: 12.221-210.018

Page: 1 of 1

NOTE 2: Additional participants were on the phone but did not identify themselves.

Attachment B to Meeting Minutes - Attendance**Current Voting Reservoir Committee Participants (27):**

<i>Participant</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>Representative</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>Alternate</i>	<i>Others</i>
4M Water District	<input type="checkbox"/>	Wade Mathis	<input type="checkbox"/>		
American Canyon, City	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Steve Hartwig	<input type="checkbox"/>	Jason Holley	
AVEK WA	<input type="checkbox"/>	Dwayne Chisam	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Dan Flory	
Cal Water Service	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mike Hurley	<input type="checkbox"/>	Rob Kuta Dan Flory	
Carter MWC	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ben Carter	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Coachella Valley WD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Robert Cheng	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ivory Reyburn Dan Charlton	
Colusa County.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Azevedo, Mike	<input type="checkbox"/>	Gary Evans	
Colusa Co. WD	<input type="checkbox"/>	Shelley Murphy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Joe Marsh	
Cortina WD	<input type="checkbox"/>	Jim Peterson	<input type="checkbox"/>	Chuck Grimmer	
Davis WD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jamie Traynham	<input type="checkbox"/>	Tom Charter	
Desert WA	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mark Krause	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Steve Johnson	
Dunnigan WD	<input type="checkbox"/>	Donita Hendrix	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Garden Highway MWC	<input type="checkbox"/>	Nicole Van Vleck	<input type="checkbox"/>	Jon Munger	
Glenn-Colusa ID	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Thad Bettner	<input type="checkbox"/>	Don Bransford	
Metropolitan WD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Randall Neudeck	<input type="checkbox"/>	Arlene Arita	
Orland-Artois WD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	John Erickson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Emil Cavagnolo	
Pacific Resources MWC	P	Preston Brittain	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Proberta WD	<input type="checkbox"/>	Dan Jones	<input type="checkbox"/>		
RD 108	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Bill Vanderwaal	<input type="checkbox"/>		
San Bernardino V MWD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Doug Headrick	<input type="checkbox"/>	Bob Tincher	

NOTE 1: Participation by phone is not counted in quorum or voting.

NOTE 2: Additional participants were on the phone but did not identify themselves.

Status: Meeting Record

Purpose:

Caveat 1

Caveat 2

Meeting Record

Subject to revision

Version: 0

Date: 2018 Mar 17

Ref/File #: 12.221-210.018

Page: 1 of 3

<i>Participant</i>	✓ <i>Representative</i>	✓ <i>Alternate</i>	<i>Others</i>
San Geronio Pass WA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jeff Davis	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Santa Clara Valley WD	<input type="checkbox"/> Cindy Kao	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Eric Leitterman	
Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency (Formerly Castaic Lake WA)	P Dirk Marks	<input type="checkbox"/> Rick Viergutz	
Western Canal WD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ted Trimble	<input type="checkbox"/> Greg Johnson	
Westside WD	<input type="checkbox"/> Allan Myers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dan Ruiz <input type="checkbox"/> Blake Vann	
Wheeler Ridge-Maricopa	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rob Kunde	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Zone 7 WA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amparo Flores	<input type="checkbox"/> Jarnail Chahal	

Non-Voting Committee Participants (2):

<i>Participant</i>	✓ <i>Representative/Other</i>	✓ <i>Alternate/Other</i>	
Dept of Water Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Rob Cooke	<input type="checkbox"/> David Sandino	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Alexander Volovichenko
	<input type="checkbox"/> Ajay Goyal	<input type="checkbox"/> Jim Wieking	<input type="checkbox"/> Dave Arrate
Bureau of Reclamation	<input type="checkbox"/> Richard Welsh	<input type="checkbox"/> Don Bader	
	<input type="checkbox"/> David Van Rijn	P Mike Dietl	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> John Menniti
	<input type="checkbox"/> Shana Kaplan	<input type="checkbox"/> Mike Mosley	<input type="checkbox"/>

Pending Reservoir Committee Participants (1):

<i>Participant</i>	✓ <i>Representative</i>	✓ <i>Alternate</i>
LaGrande WD	<input type="checkbox"/> Matt LaGrande	<input type="checkbox"/> Dennis Zachary

Authority, Non-Signatory (7):

<i>Participant</i>	✓ <i>Representative</i>	✓ <i>Alternate</i>
Glenn County	<input type="checkbox"/> John Viegas	<input type="checkbox"/>
Maxwell ID	<input type="checkbox"/> Mary Wells	<input type="checkbox"/>
PCWA	<input type="checkbox"/> Ed Horton	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ben Barker <input type="checkbox"/> Darin Reintjes
Roseville	<input type="checkbox"/> Sean Bigley	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sacramento, City of	<input type="checkbox"/> Jim Peifer	<input type="checkbox"/> Dan Sherry
Sacramento County WA	<input type="checkbox"/> Kerry Schmitz	<input type="checkbox"/> Michael Peterson
Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority	<input type="checkbox"/> Jeff Sutton	<input type="checkbox"/>

Staff & Consultants:

✓	Name	Representing
P	Barbieri, Janet	JB Comm
<input type="checkbox"/>	Barnes, Joe	AECOM
<input type="checkbox"/>	Black, Lyna	Ch2m
<input type="checkbox"/>	Brown, Scott	LWA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bruner, Marc	Perkins Coie
<input type="checkbox"/>	Carlson, Nik	AECOM
P	Conant, Ernest	Young Wooldridge
<input type="checkbox"/>	Davis, Kim	Sites Project Authority
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Herrin, Jeff	AECOM
<input type="checkbox"/>	Johns, Jerry	Johns
<input type="checkbox"/>	Kuney, Scott	Young Wooldridge

✓	Name	Representing
<input type="checkbox"/>	Oliver, Mark	Ch2m
<input type="checkbox"/>	Nicholas, Rebeca	Nicholas Communications
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Qazi, Shayann	AECOM
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Spesert, Kevin	Sites Project Authority
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Thomson, Rob	Sites Project Authority
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Trapasso, Joe	Sites Project Authority
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tull, Rob	Ch2m
<input type="checkbox"/>	Van Camp, Marc	MBK
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Watson, Jim	Sites Project Authority
<input type="checkbox"/>		

Other Attendees: *(An email address is required to be added to the distribution list)*

Name	Representing	Contact (Phone & E-mail)
John Bischoff	AECOM	
Marttin McIlroy	Shannon & Wilson	
Stan Boyle	Shannon & Wilson	
John Buttz	HDR	
Paul Marshall	Stantec	
Monique Briard	ICF	
Arun Parsons	Black & Veatch	
Barry Scott	GEI Consultants	
Phil Dunn	GEI Consultants	
Linc To	HDR	
John Spranza	HDR	
Russell Ryan	MWDSC	
Mark Salmon	WSP USA	
Brian Bullock	Psomas	
Brain Person	AECOM	

TURNKEY CONTRACTING

As a Potential
Alternative for
Delivering the Sites
Project

John Bischoff (AECOM)


March 16, 2018



COMPREHENSIVE ENGINEERING, ENVIRONMENTAL, AND CONSTRUCTION SERVICES

Spectrum of Owner and Contractor Risk Allocation

- Who holds the project Contingency?
- Risk extremes are "D/B" and "D-B-B"




Agenda

- What is Turnkey Contracting
- Advantages/Disadvantages of Turnkey Contracting
- Summary


Spectrum of Owner and Contractor Risk Allocation

- Who holds the project Contingency?
- Risk extremes are "D/B" / "Turnkey" and "D-B-B"



Turnkey Contracting

- Who holds the project Contingency?
- Risk extremes are "D/B" / "Turnkey" and "D-B-B"



What Is a Turnkey Contract?

With a Turnkey Contract, the Contractor :

- Is fully responsible for both Design and Construction
- Delivers project at an agreed-upon Lump Sum price and by an agreed-upon fixed date.
- Typically provides project financing and sometimes land acquisition

Turnkey contracting is often used when owner does not have adequate expertise, resources, or financing for implementing and managing the detailed design and construction of a project.

Turnkey Contracts Include at Least 3 Components?

1. Contractor is fully responsible for design **and** performance of the Project.
2. The technology components of the project (i.e. patents, user rights, etc.) are Contractor's responsibility.
3. Contractor "owns" the Construction (i.e. Site, Materials, Equipment, etc.) until project is "turned over" to the Owner



Key Elements of A Turnkey Contract

A Turnkey Contract is essentially the same as a Design-Build Contract - - but typically includes project financing (and sometimes lease-back of Project to Owner).

- Designer and contractor on the same team (either as a JV or Prime-Sub) to deliver project
- All risk is allocated to contractor/designer
- Owner often has **little to no influence** on detailed design
- Contractor responsible for all permits and local controls
- Works best where risks are well defined **and** schedule is limited
- Performance disappointment is not uncommon particularly if design changes are needed



Turnkey Contracting

Bid Phase

- Typically Contractor/Designer teams are short-listed
- Owner's design concept is usually not fully developed at time of bid
- Bidders usually fund up-front design work, but Owner sometimes provides a design allowance
- Limited geotechnical baseline information
- Limited time for design and bidding
- Strong inducement for cost saving innovations to be competitive



Turnkey Contracting

Design Phase (After Award)


- Design is typically fast-track
- High risk of data gaps with fast track geotechnical & environmental investigations
- Little time (or incentive) to improve the concept design
- Limited innovation because focus is typically on refining previously delivered projects
- Early constructability reviews by contractor team member can help focus design and construction approach.
- Schedule advantages result from ability to initiate construction prior to completing all detailed designs



Turnkey Contracting

Construction Phase

- High risk of cost increases if design changes are needed.
- Active Owner's Site representative can help manage risk and monitor quality of Construction
- Contractor builds project with limited interference by owner
- Problems must be resolved in a timely manner
- Fast paced with a strong schedule incentive
- Little to no opportunity for Contractor claims against owner - - as long as Owner fulfills its obligations



Advantages of Turnkey Contracting

- **Single Source Responsibility.** Provides single source of responsibility for design and/or construction defects.
- **Protection Against Design Deficiencies.** Contractor bears additional cost of defective or inadequate plans prepared by his engineer.
- **Project Performance.** Contractor must meet performance specifications in addition to building project.
- **Schedule.** Project can be completed in a shorter time period.
- **Reduced Bid Cost.** Contractor's increased control over schedule and design details may result in reduced cost, but not necessarily total project cost.
- **Cost Certainty.** Greater total cost certainty with Lump Sum pricing.

Disadvantages of Turnkey Contracting Versus Traditional Design-Bid-Build Contracting

- **Comparing Contractor Bids.** It is often difficult for Owner to compare preliminary designs submitted by Turnkey Contractor.
- **Limited Design Input.** Owner's input to detailed design is extremely limited and finished facility may not be as envisioned.
- **Increased Total Project Cost.** Total lump sum project cost will likely be greater because of risks associated with limited design details (at bid time), project financing, and Contractor Contingencies included in Bid to cover uncertainties.
- **Cost of Design Changes.** Changes in design during construction can result in significant cost increases.
- **Designer Independence.** Independence of Design Professional will be illusory in a dispute.
- **Form of Contract.** The Turnkey contract must be **carefully** drafted to achieve the ultimate certainty of the Lump Sum Price.

SUMMARY

- Turnkey Contracting may be a viable alternative if project financing is needed.
- Design must be well-developed at time of Bid to minimize Contractor Contingencies and Total Project Cost.
- Owner's ability to provide input to detailed design is limited.
- Use of Turnkey Contracting method for delivery of all or part of the project will depend on:
 - Project size, complexity and inherent risks
 - Project-specific cost and schedule constraints
 - Need to manage risk and allocate risks fairly

Phase 1 Completion Schedule


Reservoir Committee Meeting


March 16, 2018



Phase 1 Completion Schedule

(Working Draft)





***Proposed* Phase 2 Procurement Plan**

Reservoir Committee Meeting

March 16, 2018

Phase 2 Procurement Plan

- What is the need?
- Why are we doing this now?
- How does this fit with the overall process?
- Is this the 'right' way to meet the need?
- Will we get the 'correct' products, within time and budget?
- How does this fit with 'Rebalancing'?



This Plan

Describes what, when, & how

- What
 - what is the need?
 - How does it fit with Phase 1?
 - How does it fit with Subsequent Phases?
- When
 - Selection and Delivery schedules
- Who
 - Fits with the current organization
- How
 - RFQ, reviews and selection



The Draft Work Plan

- Scope of work
- Organization
- Schedule
- Responsibility Matrix
- Draft RFQ



Business Drivers/Best Practices

- Staffing & appropriate span of control
- Provides checks and balances
- Early price certainty (affordability)
- Achieve best value
 - ✓ Competitive selection
 - ✓ Equitable risk allocation
- Flexibility to adjust
 - ✓ Adjust to schedule delays – external & internal
 - ✓ Ability to off-ramp
 - ✓ Sufficient bench strength (& succession planning)
- Diverse participation (includes small, local, DVBE, others)




General Contract Concepts

- Evaluate new contracts for all required service
- Existing providers may be selected to continue to provide that service
- Respondents can compete for multiple scopes
- Contracts may be stopped at Phase 2b or be extended into Phase 3+
- Contracts may be modified to serve as Authority's representative for Phase 3 or 4
- Contracts are “umbrellas”. Work and budget managed by task order
- Awards are based on qualifications of the firm and their team
 - ✓ Allows use of alternative delivery methods (start of Phase 2B)
 - ✓ Provides flexible task order service contracts
 - ✓ Addresses administrative needs




Overall Schedule:




Overall Phase Spending Plan

Phase	Start	Finish	Estimate (\$million)
Phase 2A	June 2018	December 2019	\$177
Phase 2B	January 2020	December 2021	\$149
Phase 3A	January 2022	December 2022	\$529
Phase 3B	January 2023	December 2023	\$691
Phase 4	January 2024	January 2030	\$3,812
TOTALS (includes estimate of finance)			\$5,358



Phase-level Funding Concept (Local, WSIP, WIIN, & Other)



What is the Authority buying?

1. Project Integration
 2. Project Controls
 3. Communications
 4. Reservoir Operations Planning
 5. Environmental Analysis - EIR/S
 6. Permitting & Agreements
 7. Real Estate
 8. Engineering Design
 9. Geotechnical Engineering
- + specialized contracts (e.g. legal, independent review boards)




1. Project Management Integration

- Reports to the Project Operations Manager
- Provides:
 - ✓ Integration of the Project's components and other needs
 - ✓ Quality Management,
 - ✓ Risk Management,
 - ✓ Seismic performance
 - ✓ Geographic Information System
 - ✓ Health & Safety,
 - ✓ Staff support to Owner's Representatives



2. Project Controls & Contract Administration

- Reports to the Project Operations Manager
- Provides:
 - ✓ Scheduling,
 - ✓ Budget,
 - ✓ Cost Tracking,
 - ✓ Contract administration & compliance support,
 - ✓ Reporting & documentation
 - ✓ Document Management & Control,
 - ✓ Administrative Support



3. Communications and Facilitation

- Reports to the Real Estate & Outreach Manager
- Provides:
 - ✓ Landowner coordination support
 - ✓ Stakeholder & *local* agency coordination
 - ✓ Government affairs & legislative support
 - ✓ Public outreach & community relations
 - ✓ Media affairs & strategic communications
 - ✓ Project website and social media platforms



4 Reservoir Operations Simulations

- Reports to the Environmental Planning & Permitting Manager
- Provides:
 - ✓ Model simulations, in river & in-reservoir
 1. Final EIR/S
 2. Permits applications, and acquisition
 3. Agreements
 4. Financing & repayment
 - ✓ Coordinate with preliminary engineering designs development



5. Environmental Analysis – EIR/S

- Reports to the Environmental Planning & Permitting Manager
- Provides:
 - ✓ Responses to comments on the Draft EIR/S
 - ✓ Prepares Final EIR/S
 - ✓ Coordinates with other CA and federal agencies
 - ✓ Prepares draft notices, MRMP, and findings



6. Permitting and Agreements

- Reports to the Environmental Planning & Permitting Manager
- Provides:
 - ✓ Prepare permitting plans and permit applications
 - ✓ Collect environmental field data (e.g.; wetland surveys)
 - ✓ Coordinate with permitting agencies
 - ✓ Prepare draft agreements.
 - ✓ Support permit acquisition



7. Real Estate

- Reports to the Real Estate & Outreach Manager
- Provides:
 - ✓ Obtains temporary access agreements
 - ✓ Support permanent real estate acquisition actions
 - ✓ Interim land management
(post acquisition through Construction)



8. Preliminary Engineering Design

- Reports to the Engineering, Procurement & Construction Manager
- Provides:
 - ✓ Optimization & preliminary plans & specifications
 - All facilities
 - Grid interconnection
 - Recreation
 - Hydropower
 - ✓ Common platforms (Hydraulics, topographic survey & controls)
 - ✓ Incorporates refined geotechnical
 - ✓ Cost and construction schedule estimates
 - ✓ Support to environmental planning and permitting efforts
 - ✓ Provides requirements to real estate




9. Geotechnical Engineering

- Reports to the Engineering, Procurement & Construction Manager
- Provides:
 - ✓ Investigates geotechnical conditions at key facilities location
 - ✓ Geotechnical Data Report




Phase 2 Consultant Packages




**How will these services fit into the
Authority's structure**

Phase 1 Organization





Phase 2 Organization




**How will the Phase 2 services
be delivered?**

Traditional Package







Example A Package




Example B Package




Example C – Separate Environmental Package



Example D – Independent Design & Environmental Packages



Contract Packaging Example - Dams



When:

Phase 2 Consultant Selection – (Jan 18 Workshop)

A. RFQ published	Early April 2018
B. Contractor Questions	April 16
C. Answers Deadline	April 27
D. SOQ Submission Deadline	May 14
E. Completion of review of SOQ	June 1
F. Interview Dates	June 11 – June 20
G. Recommendation of Selection	August 20
H. Service Contract Selection (Intent to Award)	Sept 17
I. Contract Task Orders Funded (Phase 2 initial funding)	Dec 21



Phase 2 Consultant Selection - Delayed

Document Development (staff):	April 1
Work Group:	April 18
Reservoir Committee:	May 18
Authority:	May 21
A. RFQ published	Early July 2018
B. Contractor Questions	July 12
C. Answers Deadline	July 18
D. SOQ Submission Deadline	August 10
E. Complete review of SOQs	August 31
F. Interview Dates	Sept 10- Sept 30
G. Selection Recommendation	Oct 18
H. Service Contract Selection	Nov 19
I. Execute contracts & NTP with early task orders	Dec '18– Feb '19

Intent to Award

Phase 2 initial
funding

