

Procurement Policy Protest Standard



- The DWSD Procurement Policy protest language is as follows:
 - Procurement policy, section (8)(B):
 - *“A bid protest shall only be upheld for[:]*
[1] a breach of this Policy[;]
[2] for error in the evaluation of the successful vendor based on clear
and convincing evidence submitted with the bid protest[;] or
[3] for fraudulent conduct by either the vendor or DWSD in
connection with solicitation.”

Procurement Policy



- Both the RFP and the DWSD Procurement Policy provide for flexibility to alter the scope of work prior to award:

• **Procurement policy, section (1) paragraph 4: “DWSD reserves the right to amend a solicitation prior to award...”**

- CIPMO RFP section 5.b: “DWSD reserves the right to maintain responsibility for issuing POs and making payments directly to design and construction subcontractors...”

CIPMO 5-Year Quoted Cost Summary



5-YEAR TOTAL PRICING COMPARISON REVIEW - CIPMO COSTS

Cost Components (\$ in Millions)	5-Year Total			
	AECOM		AECOM B/(W)	
	DCIP	DCIP	DCIP	DCIP
CIPMO Program Management Costs (1)	\$ 54.3	\$ 52.4	\$ (1.9)	
Self-Performance Design and Engineering (2)	11.8	12.2	0.4	
CIPMO Total Costs Over 5 Years	\$ 66.1	\$ 64.6	\$ (1.5)	

Footnotes:

(1) Includes Construction Management costs

(2) Includes discount for self-performance of design

- Over entire five-year period, the difference in cost quoted per the RFP requirements is \$1.5 million – or an average of \$300,000 per year – which is less than a 2.3% difference between the two proposals.

Round II Evaluation Criteria and Ranking



Round II Evaluation Criteria:

Criteria	Max. Points
1. Plan Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmation of Work Plan. • Confirmation of Transition Plan. • Confirmation of Inclusion/Disadvantaged Business Program. • Level of understanding of DWSD's goals and objectives. • Soundness of methodology for each plan. 	40
2. Experience Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Validation of Staff Experience. • Validation of Firm Experience. • Soundness of organizational chart for CIPMO. • Quality of reference checks. 	20
3. Confirmation of Fee Proposal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reasonableness and competitiveness of total cost. 	15
4. Alternate Proposal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Innovation of alternate proposal. • Level of economic benefit to the City. 	15
5. Presentation/Interview <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation of the plan. • Responses to questions posed during the interview. 	10

Round II Evaluation Results:

	Gross Score		Weight	Weighted Score	
	AECOM	DCIP		AECOM	DCIP
Plan Review	3	2	40%	0.400	0.267
Experience Review	3	2	20%	0.200	0.133
Confirmation of Fee Proposal	1	2	15%	0.050	0.100
Alternate Proposal	0	0	15%	0.000	0.000
Presentation/Interview	3	2	10%	0.100	0.067
Total Technical Evaluation Score				0.75	0.57

- Round 2 evaluation (shown above) was used to make the final selection
- The Evaluation Committee ranked AECOM highest in the “technical” scores
- For the Fee Proposal:
 - Although Tetra Tech was the lowest bid, they did not present a technical proposal nearly as comprehensive as either AECOM or DCIP (Tetra Tech was ranked lowest on technical scores)
 - AECOM and DCIP cost proposals were nearly identical and would not be the “differentiating factor”

Discussion Purposes Only

Best and Final Offer Requests



DWSD Requested Best & Final Offers:



Water Board Building
735 Randolph Street
Detroit, MI 48226

Customer Care: 313-267-7355
Emergencies: 313-267-7355
detroitmi.gov/dwssd

November 22, 2016

Mr. Nils Vitso
Detroit Community Infrastructure Partners
777 Woodward Avenue, Suite 300
Detroit, Michigan 48226

Dear Mr. Vitso:

Regarding: **Proposed DWSD Contract No. CS-1812**
Best and Final Offer Request
"Capital Improvement Program Management Organization"

Please provide the Detroit Water and Sewerage Department with the following items listed below:

1. Please provide your Best and Final Offer ("BAFO") by 4:00 pm on Friday, December 9, 2016.
 - a. In the BAFO please include:
 - i. Any corrections.
 - ii. Any requests based on your CS-1812 interview.
 - iii. Other adjustments you are willing to make around the various economic factors that drive the cost.
 1. Please assume 100% self-performance of design and engineering for the full scope of the project, including the pilot areas.
 - v. Please include the alternatives and any change in costs related to the alternatives.

And DCIP Provided a BAFO...

BEST AND FINAL PRICE OFFER (BAFO)	ITEMIZED AMOUNT
Original Budget without Self-Performed Design (refer to appendix)	\$57,400,000
Bond	\$4,000,000
Alternates Included	
Alternate 1 – Increased Collaboration with DTE and Roads	Included
Alternate 2 – Contractor Controlled Insurance Program (if allowed)	Included
Alternate 5 – Pilot Program for Lead Service Line Removal	Included
Alternate 6 – Workforce Development	Included
Alternate 7 – Business Incubation Program	Included
Alternate 8 – Extension of Existing Contracts	Included
Alternate 9 – Build-Operate-Maintain	Included
BAFO Discount	(\$5,000,000) credit
BAFO Price without Design (refer to appendix)	\$56,400,000
Self-Perform Design (refer to appendix)	\$16,000,000
Discount to BAFO for Self-Perform Design	(\$3,900,000) credit
BAFO with Self-Performed Design (refer to appendix)	\$68,500,000

- DWSD requested best and final offers ("BAFO's") from all parties and DCIP responded with a \$5 million credit to the cost of the program.

Discussion Purposes Only

AECOM Disclosure of Jail Project



DWSD Asked AECOM The Question:



Water Board Building
735 Randolph Street
Detroit, MI 48226
Customer Care: 313-267-8000
Emergencies: 313-267-7401
detroitmi.gov/dwst

October 15, 2016

Mr. Michael Just
AECOM Great Lakes, Inc.
400 Monroe Street Suite 270
Detroit, Michigan 48226

Dear Mr. Just:

Regarding: **Proposed DWSD Contract No. CS-1812**
"Capital Improvement Program Management Organization"

Please see a list of clarifications for the AECOM Great Lakes, Inc. upcoming oral interview on proposed Contract No. CS-1812. Your firm must respond to the questions no later than **4:00 PM, Wednesday, October 26, 2016**. Failure to do so may result in your firm's elimination from further consideration in the evaluation process. Please forward your responses via email to **dwst@detmi.gov**. Your oral interview is scheduled for **Monday, November 7, 2016 at 10:30 AM**. The interview will be held at the DWSD office building located at 735 Randolph Detroit, MI 48226 in the 1st floor conference room. Please confirm this date and time work for you as soon as possible but no later than by Monday, October 24, 2017.

Please clarify the following:

1. Organizational Personnel Matters
 - a. Organizational Charts – handmark the pricing forms to indicate how the names from the proposed organizational charts relate to each of the line items on the pricing forms.
 - b. Provide a summary of each of the team members' history in working with each other (projects, timeframes, etc.)
 - c. Provide a statement or matrix that clarifies the roles of the proposed staff members that worked on the each of the key projects listed in your proposal; the role that each proposed staff member performed and the extent of experience in each case (i.e., number of years)
2. Detroit Executive Order #2014-4
 - a. How did you consider this order, which requires that Detroit residents perform at least 51% of all construction work in your proposal? A copy of the executive order is attached
3. Legal Proceedings Clarifications
 - a. The dispute with Wayne County regarding construction of the new jail was not disclosed, yet the RFP requested a five-year historical window. Please explain.

- DWSD asked AECOM about the Wayne County jail project and AECOM responded with a cogent response. DWSD also performed its own independent research on the project.

Discussion Purposes Only

And AECOM Responded...

3. Legal Proceedings Clarifications

- a. **The dispute with Wayne County regarding construction of the new jail was not disclosed, yet the RFP requested a five-year historical window. Please explain.**

Our response included the disclosure for the proposed contracting entity, AECOM Great Lakes, Inc. (formerly URS Corporation Great Lakes, Inc.). Neither AECOM Great Lakes, Inc. nor the personnel proposed to perform this contract for the DWSD Capital Improvement Program were involved with the project for the Wayne County jail, which entailed architecture and related services. We regret if our response was too specifically tailored to the disclosure request and caused any confusion. With regard to the Wayne County jail dispute, the contract of the AECOM entity involved was never terminated. We also are pleased to state that the dispute has been amicably resolved with Wayne County through cooperative discussions and both sides feel that an equitable settlement was reached.