



Legislation Details (With Text)

File #: 2021-0654 **Version:** 0 **Name:** Tinley Creek Stabilization - Consultant Recommendation for Design Engineering Services

Type: MOTION **Status:** IN BOARD OF TRUSTEES

File created: 9/2/2021 **In control:** Board of Trustees

On agenda: 9/7/2021 **Final action:**

Title: Tinley Creek Stabilization - Consultant Recommendation for Design Engineering Services

Code sections:

Attachments: 1. BLA - Proposal, 2. BLA Fee Proposal, 3. BLA Scope of Services, 4. ERA Detailed Fees, 5. ERA - Scope of Services, 6. ERA - Cost Proposal, 7. ERA - Proposal, 8. Farnsworth Group - Updated Fee Document, 9. HRGreen - Professional Fee Proposal, 10. HRGreen - Proposal, 11. HRGreen - Scope of Services, 12. LWC - Scope of Work - Itemized Costs, 13. V3 - Scope & Fee, 14. V3 - Proposal, 15. Cardno - Price Proposal, 16. Cardno - Scope and Budget Clarification, 17. Cardno - Technical Proposal, 18. Michael Baker - Proposal, 19. Michael Baker - Scope & Fee, 20. Michael Baker - Professional Fee Proposal

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
9/7/2021	0	Committee of the Whole	RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL	Pass
9/2/2021	0	Engineering Programs & Services	INTRODUCED TO COMMISSION	

..Title

Tinley Creek Stabilization - Consultant Recommendation for Design Engineering Services

History

A request for proposals (RFP) for Design Engineering Services for the Tinley Creek Streambank Stabilization (RFP #21-015) was issued on February 22, 2021. Proposals were opened on March 29, 2021. The RFP was posted on BidNet. A total of eight (8) responses were received by the Village.

Staff evaluated all responses against the required scope of services and the following evaluation criteria established in the RFP:

- Total Professional Fee 40%
- Firm’s and PM’s experience and example projects 20%
- Overall proposal completeness and project understanding 20%
- Design schedule 10%
- Selection team’s discretion 10%

Proposal Evaluation Scores

The following are the evaluation scores for all responses received by the Village:

Consultant Name Comments	Proposed Fee	Total Score
-V3 Companies	\$366,955	95 Met RFP Specifications

-HR Green	\$383,490	92	Met RFP Specifications
-Engineering Resource Associates, Inc.	\$419,652	81	Met RFP Specifications
-Farnworth Group, Inc.	\$464,100	76	Met RFP Specifications
-Michael Baker, International, Inc.	\$649,460	60	Met RFP Specifications
-Cardno, Inc.	\$785,000	58	Met RFP Specifications
-BLA, Inc.	\$176,662	53	Did Not Meet Specifications
-Living Water Consultants, Inc.	\$276,550	43	Did Not Meet Specifications

Based on the information submitted by BLA, Inc. and Living Waters Consultants, Inc., the staff concluded that these two (2) responses do not meet the minimum project requirements and they will not be able to deliver the required deliverables for the project.

Reasons for Rejecting BLA, Inc. Response:

-The consultant's proposed scope of services does not include obtaining required permits, which would be a significant and time consuming effort for this project. The Village's RFP required that the consultants will be responsible for acquiring all applicable permits.

-Wetland delineations are not included. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers require that any wetland delineation older than five (5) years must be redone. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers permit for this project expired about two (2) years ago.

-The consultant has allocated only twenty (20) hours to review the previous design work completed by MWRDGC. Staff's project understanding and experience demonstrate that this effort is significantly underestimated to complete a proper review of the documents. The RFP requires that the "selected consultant performs a detail review" of MWRDGC original design. This is a necessary step in revising and updating the existing design and cost estimates.

Reasons for Rejecting Living Water Consultants, Inc. Response:

The response includes several exclusions, and staff is most concerned about the following items:

The response includes several exclusions and staff is most concerned about the following items:

- A detail project schedule is not provided in the response, which was a required item in the RFP.

-A maintenance and Management (M&M) plan is not included, which is required to determine ongoing maintenance costs. The M&M plan and costs are required to establish the SSA for long-term creek maintenance.

-Additional soil borings are not included in the project scope. This is required, especially in the added section of the Creek.

-The proposal offers a maximum of “15-percent survey redo” of the survey completed by MWRDGC design, almost ten (10) years ago. This survey limit is very concerning to the staff as staff know the Creek has continued to erode since the original design was completed. Additional surveys are required to complete the design and prepare accurate construction plans and costs for the project.

-The consultant has assumed “all completed engineering plans are available in digital CAD compatible format.” The Village has and will provide electronic files received from MWRD, but there is no guarantee that “all” documents are available in “CAD compatible format.” The consultants are required to develop their own drawings as needed.

-The consultant has offered to reduce its proposed fee by \$45,000 if a “Professional Land Survey is not Necessary to Survey Property Boundary Lines for Individual Parcels (properties in Preparation of the Temporary and Permanent Easements for Individual Parcels.” Staff believes that this statement shows that the consultant does not fully comprehend the project requirements and deliverables. Without a “Professional Land Survey” this project cannot be completed.

Staff has concluded that V3 Companies, Ltd. (V3) has provided the most responsive, responsible proposal. Staff’s engineering estimate for the total professional fee was approximately \$400,000 and V3’s fee is approximately 10% below the estimate. Therefore, staff is recommending to award this project to V3. V3 included the necessary scope of services to complete the project and deliver required documents to meet the requirements of the project.

Financial Impact

Funding for RFP 21-015, Tinley Creek Stabilization, Design Engineering Services is available in the 2021 Capital Improvement Plan for Engineering Programs and Services. Additionally, MWRDGC has committed to reimburse the Village up to \$100,000 in professional engineering services.

Recommended Action/Motion

I move to recommend to the Village Board to award RFP 21-015 for Tinley Creek Stabilization - Design Engineering Services to V3 Companies, Ltd. in an amount not to exceed \$366,955;

And,

I move to recommend to the Village Board to authorize the Village Manager to execute all related contracts and additional services subject to Village attorney review.