

DCIP VS. AECOM PRICING SUMMARY HIGHLIGHTS

SUMMARY OF COST ANALYSIS BASED ON CIPMO INCLUDING SELF-PERFORM DESIGN

Description	AECOM	DCIP	DIFFERENCE
Program Management	\$38,578,826.00	\$26,969,814.00	\$11,609,012.00
Construction Management Services	\$14,988,611.00	\$17,764,289.00	-\$2,775,678.00
Self-Perform Design	\$20,017,902.00	\$16,050,995.00	\$3,966,907.00
Bond	\$10,000,000.00	\$3,995,675.00	\$6,004,325.00

TOTAL AMOUNT PER COMPANY	\$83,585,339.00	\$64,780,773.00	\$18,804,566.00
---------------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------

INCREASED AMOUNT THE RATE PAYERS WILL PAY AECOM FOR CIPMO PROGRAM (DIFFERENCE
BALANCED COMPARISON BETWEEN SCOPE & COST) **\$18,804,566.00**

PERCENTAGE THE THE RATE PAYERS WILL PAY AECOM FOR CIPMO PROGRAM (DIFFERENCE BALANCED
COMPARISON BETWEEN SCOPE & COST) **29.03%**

DCIP VS. AECOM PRICING SUMMARY HIGHLIGHTS

DWSD CIP Bid Comparison	AECOM Self-Perform Design	AECOM Cumulative	DCIP Self-Perform Design	DCIP Cumulative
Program Management	\$ 15,995,181	38,578,826	\$30,823,934	26,969,814
Administration	\$ 15,995,181			
Planning Oversight & Assessment	\$7,081,933			
Engineering Oversight	\$891,684		Included	
CM Oversight	\$4,362,682		Included	
Public Outreach	\$3,220,180		Included	
Policies and Procedures	\$1,393,462		Included	
Sustainable Program	\$4,110,028		Included	
Advanced Metering	\$121,788		Included	
Asset Management	\$1,401,888		Included	
Reduction for scope included in DCIP costs for scope not included in AECOM's proposal	N/A		(\$3,854,120)	
Engineering	\$ 20,017,902	\$ 58,596,728	\$ 16,050,995	\$ 43,020,809
Design	\$ 11,774,166		\$ 16,050,995	
Preliminary Design Phase	\$2,354,834		Included	
100% Design Phase	\$6,475,791		Included	
Bid/Award	\$588,708		Included	
Construction Phase	\$2,354,833		Included	
Survey/SUE	\$ 2,997,722		Included	
Surveying and Geotechnical	\$ 749,431		Included	
Easements	\$ 4,496,583		Included	
Construction Management	\$ 14,988,611	\$ 73,585,339	\$17,764,289	\$ 60,785,098
CM Professional Services	\$14,988,611			
Bond	\$ 10,000,000	\$ 83,585,339	\$ 3,995,675	\$ 64,780,773
Bond (5 years)	\$10,000,000			
			AECOM/DCIP balanced comparison between scope and cost Difference	\$ 18,804,566 29.03%

EVALUATION SCORING RFP VS. ACTUAL

RFP – Round II Evaluation Criteria

DWSD Scoring Matrix (Actual)

e. 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 plan 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

DWSD RFP document indicates that the judging criteria would be based on points not percentage as indicated on Round 1 Scoring Matrix. Refer to page 3 in the RFP, it states "Max Points": DWSD actually went to a 1 to 3 ranking system vs. what was indicated in the RFP.

Description	Grading %	GROSS SCORE			WEIGHTED SCORE		
		AECOM	DCIP	Tetra-Tech	AECOM	DCIP	Tetra-Tech
Plan Review	40	3	2	1	0.400	0.267	0.133
Experience Review	20	3	2	1	0.200	0.133	0.067
Confirmation of Fee Proposal	15	1	2	3	0.050	0.100	0.150
Alternate Proposals	15	0	0	0	0.000	0.000	0.000
Presentation Interview	10	3	2	1	0.100	0.067	0.033
					0.75	0.57	0.38

DWSD asked for alternates during base bid submittal and post-presentation. DWSD requested itemized cost for such alternates and now didn't even include in the scoring matrix. DCIP provided 9 total alternates for this project which 7 were NO COST to DWSD

Question: Why didn't DWSD include the 15 points in the Round 2 BAFO Evaluation?

SUBMITTED ALTERNATES

#	Description	Included Base Bid Y/N	Cost to DWSD	Estimated Savings
1	Increased collaboration with DTE & Roads	NO	NO COST	\$3.0 M
2	CCIP Insurance Program	NO	NO COST	\$4.0 M
3	Self-Perform Design & Engineering ***	NO	\$12.2 M	\$3.9 M ***
4A	Transparent Earth	NO	\$0.40 M / Year	
4B	Underground Marker Balls (watermain only)	NO	\$0.20 M / Year	
5	Pilot Program for Lead Service Line Removal	NO	NO COST	\$0.20 M
6	Workforce Development	YES	NO COST	
7	Business Incubation Program	YES	NO COST	
8	Extension of Existing Contracts	NO	NO COST	
9	Bulk Purchasing	NO	NO COST	\$5.0 M
ALTERNATE ESTIMATED SAVINGS TO DWSD RATE PAYERS				\$12.2 M

*** Alternate 3 not included in summary of estimating savings because it is included in cost analysis. A cost savings of \$3.9 M for performing Self-Perform Design & Engineering was captured in our Best & Final Price Offer.

DCIP VS. AECOM PRICING SUMMARY HIGHLIGHTS

SUMMARY OF COST ANALYSIS BASED ON CIPMO INCLUDING SELF-PERFORM DESIGN

Description	AECOM	DCIP	DIFFERENCE
Program Management	\$38,578,826.00	\$26,969,814.00	\$11,609,012.00
Construction Management Services	\$14,988,611.00	\$17,764,289.00	-\$2,775,678.00
Self-Perform Design	\$20,017,902.00	\$16,050,995.00	\$3,966,907.00
Bond	\$10,000,000.00	\$3,995,675.00	\$6,004,325.00

TOTAL AMOUNT PER COMPANY	\$83,585,339.00	\$64,780,773.00	\$18,804,566.00
---------------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------

INCREASED AMOUNT THE RATE PAYERS WILL PAY AECOM FOR CIPMO PROGRAM (DIFFERENCE
BALANCED COMPARISON BETWEEN SCOPE & COST) **\$18,804,566.00**

PERCENTAGE THE THE RATE PAYERS WILL PAY AECOM FOR CIPMO PROGRAM (DIFFERENCE BALANCED
COMPARISON BETWEEN SCOPE & COST) **29.03%**

DWSD CIP Bid Comparison	AECOM Self-Perform Design	AECOM Cumulative	DCIP Self-Perform Design	DCIP Cumulative
Program Management	\$ 5	18,978,826	\$	26,969,814
Administration	\$25,995,181		\$30,823,924	
Planning Oversight & Assessment	\$7,081,933			
Engineering Oversight	\$691,684		Included	
CM Oversight	\$4,362,682		Included	
Public Outreach	\$3,220,180		Included	
Policies and Procedures	\$1,393,462		Included	
Sustainable Program	\$4,110,028		Included	
Advanced Metering	\$122,738		Included	
Asset Management	\$1,401,886		Included	
Reduction for scope included in DCIP costs for scope not included in AECOM's proposal	N/A		(\$5,854,100)	
Engineering	\$ 5	20,017,902	\$ 5	16,050,995
Design	\$ 5	11,774,156	\$ 5	16,050,995
Preliminary Design Phase	\$2,354,634		Included	
100% Design Phase	\$6,475,791		Included	
Bid/Award	\$586,708		Included	
Construction Phase	\$2,354,633		Included	
Survey/SLE	\$ 5	2,997,722	Included	
Surveying and Geotechnical	\$ 5	749,451	Included	
Essentials	\$ 5	1,296,553	Included	
Construction Management	\$ 5	14,988,611	\$ 5	517,764,289
CM Professional Services	\$14,988,611		\$17,764,289	
Bond	\$ 5	10,000,000	\$ 5	1,995,675
Bond (5 years)	\$10,000,000		\$3,985,675	
AECOM/DCIP balanced comparison between scope and cost Difference				
			\$ 5	18,804,566
				29,075

EVALUATION SCORING RFP VS. ACTUAL

RFP – Round II Evaluation Criteria

DWSD Scoring Matrix (Actual)

6. 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 of disadvantaged Business Programs. • Level of understanding of DWSD's goals and objectives. • Soundness of methodology for each part. 	40
2. Experience Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verification of Staff Experience. • Verification of firm Experience. • Soundness of organization's history & PMO. • Quality of reference of each. 	20
3. Confirmation of Fee Proposal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reasonable and comprehensive of total cost. 	15
4. Alternate Proposal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation 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

DWSD RFP document indicates that the judging criteria would be based on points not percentage as indicated on Round 1 Scoring Matrix. Refer to page 3 In the RFP, it states "Max Points". DWSD actually went to a 1 to 3 ranking system vs. what was indicated in the RFP.

Description	Grading %	GROSS SCORE			WEIGHTED SCORE		
		AECOM	DCIP	Tetra-Tech	AECOM	DCIP	Tetra-Tech
Plan Review	40	3	2	1	0.400	0.267	0.133
Experience Review	20	3	2	1	0.200	0.133	0.067
Confirmation of Fee Proposal	15	1	2	3	0.050	0.100	0.150
Alternate Proposals	15	0	0	0	0.000	0.000	0.000
Presentation Interview	10	3	2	1	0.100	0.067	0.033
					0.75	0.57	0.38

DWSD asked for alternates during base bid submittal and post-presentation. DWSD requested itemized cost for such alternates and now didn't even include in the scoring matrix. DCIP provided 9 total alternates for this project which 7 were NO COST to DWSD

Question: Why didn't DWSD include the 15 points in the Round 2 BAFO Evaluation?

SUBMITTED ALTERNATES

#	Description	Included Base Bid Y/N	Cost to DWSD	Estimated Savings
1	Increased collaboration with DTE & Roads	NO	NO COST	\$3.0 M
2	CCIP Insurance Program	NO	NO COST	\$4.0 M
3	Self-Perform Design & Engineering ***	NO	\$12.2 M	\$3.9 M ***
4A	Transparent Earth	NO	\$0.40 M / Year	
4B	Underground Marker Balls (watermain only)	NO	\$0.20 M / Year	
5	Pilot Program for Lead Service Line Removal	NO	NO COST	\$0.20 M
6	Workforce Development	YES	NO COST	
7	Business Incubation Program	YES	NO COST	
8	Extension of Existing Contracts	NO	NO COST	
9	Bulk Purchasing	NO	NO COST	\$5.0 M
ALTERNATE ESTIMATED SAVINGS TO DWSD RATE PAYERS				\$12.2 M

*** Alternate 3 not included in summary of estimating savings because it is included in cost analysis. A cost savings of \$3.9 M for performing Self-Perform Design & Engineering was captured in our Best & Final Price Offer.