



**PUBLIC UTILITIES
REVENUE BOND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
AGENDA**

**Public Utilities Commission Building
525 Golden Gate Ave., 2nd Floor, Yosemite Room
San Francisco, CA 94102**

Monday, November 18, 2013 - 9:00 AM

Regular Meeting

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Seat 1 Holly Kaufman
Seat 2 Kevin Cheng, Chair
Seat 3 Vacant
Seat 4 Larry Liederman
Seat 5 Kevin W. Harper
Seat 6 Emily Brownlow
Seat 7 John Ummel, Vice Chair

- 2. Public Comment:** Members of the public may address the Revenue Bond Oversight Committee (RBOC) on matters that are within the RBOC's jurisdiction but are not on today's agenda. (No Action)

3. Chair's Report:

- A. San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) Staff Report: Update on Sewer System Improvement Program (SSIP), Level of Services and Summary of Existing Projects. (Discussion)
- B. San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) Staff Report: Quarterly Report on Water System Improvement Program (WSIP) and Update on the Calaveras Dam. (Discussion)
- C. San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) Staff Report: Adjustments to Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Costs Due to New Capacity and Infrastructure with WSIP. (Discussion)
- D. RBOC Account Statement and Review/Approval of Invoices for Ongoing Approved Engagements. (Discussion and Action) (Attachment)

4. **Revenue Bond Oversight Committee Preliminary Request for Proposals - Scope of Work regarding “Evaluation of Lessons Learned” and “WSIP Disputed Costs”.** (Discussion and Action) (Attachment)

Issue /Action: Discussion ensued at the October 21, 2013, RBOC meeting on whether the evaluation of disputed costs should go forward. (You may recall that RBOC reviewed two potential consultant assignments; one involving lessons learned and the other involving disputed costs.) Two main concerns were raised regarding disputed costs. First, whether the consultant would be able to determine the root cause of a claim or dispute without interviewing the contractor. Second, whether the SFPUC could provide information about the extent of the claim/dispute problem in order to justify RBOC’s decision to task a consultant with this assignment.

In consultation with sub-committee members Cheng and Kaufman, the scope/RFP was revised to include only one primary task; that involving lessons learned. However, since the handling of claims and disputed costs are an important part of any lessons-learned assignment, a good portion of the original claims/disputed cost component was retained as a sub-task. (You may recall that when RBOC was examining potential consultant assignments, it was WSIP Director Julie Labonte that expressed her support for this particular task.) Hence, it has been embedded in the lessons learned RFP/scope pending further review by the RBOC. See attached. In addition, on October 22 the Vice-Chair (Ummel) requested further information regarding the quantity and/or estimated dollar value of claims/disputes surrounding WSIP. As of November 12, 2013, this information had not arrived. The Vice Chair has requested that someone from WSIP staff attend Monday’s meeting to provide some insight on this subject so RBOC can determine whether the disputed cost sub-task is worth pursuing. RBOC should review the revised draft scope/RFP, take into consideration any input provided by the SFPUC, and grant authority to Contracting Working Group (CWG) to make any necessary changes to the scope. If scope changes are minimal, the CWG could be further directed to submit a final scope/RFP to Contracts Administration for purposes of expediting the RFP process. (A draft of the scope/RFP has been sent to Contracts Administration for a “fatal flaw” check in order to expedite a final scope/RFP in the near future.) Alternatively, the CWG could be directed to make any necessary changes to the scope/RFP and bring it back to the full RBOC at a future meeting (possibly December) for final approval before it is “put on the street

5. **Approval of RBOC Minutes of October 21, 2013.** (Discussion and Action) (Attachment)
6. **Announcements, Comments, Questions, and Future Agenda Items.** (Discussion and Action)
7. **Adjournment.**

Agenda Item Information

Each item on the agenda may include: 1) Department or Agency cover letter and/or report; 2) Public correspondence; 3) Other explanatory documents. For more information concerning agendas, minutes, and meeting information, such as these document, please contact RBOC Committee Clerk, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102 – (415) 554-5184.

Audio recordings of the meeting of the Revenue Bond Oversight Committee are available at:
http://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=97

For information concerning San Francisco Public Utilities Commission please contact by e-mail RBOC@sfgov.org or by calling (415) 554-5184.

Public Comment

Public Comment will be taken before or during the Committee's consideration of each agenda item. Speakers may address the Committee for up to three minutes on that item. During General Public Comment, members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on the agenda.

Disability Access

RBOC meetings will be held at the Public Utilities Commission, 525 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA. The Committee meeting room is wheelchair accessible. The nearest accessible BART station is Civic Center (Market/Grove/Hyde Streets). Accessible MUNI Metro lines are the F, J, K, L, M, N, T (exit at Civic Center or Van Ness Stations). MUNI bus lines also serving the area are the 5, 6, 9, 19, 21, 47, 49, 71, and 71L. For more information about MUNI accessible services, call (415) 701-4485.

The following services are available on request 48 hours prior to the meeting; except for Monday meetings, for which the deadline shall be 4:00 p.m. of the last business day of the preceding week: For American sign language interpreters or the use of a reader during a meeting, a sound enhancement system, and/or alternative formats of the agenda and minutes, please contact Mike Brown at (415) 487-5223 to make arrangements for the accommodation. Late requests will be honored, if possible.

In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals.

Know Your Rights Under the Sunshine Ordinance

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review.

For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact by mail: Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102; phone at (415)554-7724; fax at (415) 554-7854; or by email at sotf@sfgov.org.

Citizens may obtain a free copy of the Sunshine Ordinance by printing Chapter 37 of the San Francisco Administrative Code on the Internet , at <http://www.sfbos.org/sunshine>.

Cell Phones, Pagers and Similar Sound-Producing Electronic Devices

The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices.

Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance [SF Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code §2.100, et. seq] to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the Ethics Commission at: 25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220, San Francisco, CA 94102; telephone (415) 581-3100; fax (415) 252-3112; web site www.sfgov.org/ethics.

#30

RBOC Account Summary November 2013

Funding Sources (\$)

Series	5W Water	5C Wastewater	5T Hetchy Power	Total
2006 A Bonds	223,310	-	-	223,310
2008 CREBS	-	-	3,163	3,163
2009 A Bonds	236,598	-	-	236,598
2009 B Bonds	206,000	-	-	206,000
2010 A Bonds	28,473	23,525	-	51,998
2010 B Bonds	208,860	96,258	-	305,118
2010 D Bonds	35,680	-	-	35,680
2010 E Bonds	172,100	-	-	172,100
2010 F Bonds	90,480	-	-	90,480
2010 G Bonds	175,735	-	-	175,735
2011 A Bonds	301,358	-	-	301,358
2011 B Bonds	14,488	-	-	14,488
2011 C Bonds	16,798	-	-	16,798
2011 QECBS	-	-	-	-
2012 NCREBS	-	-	4,146	4,146
2012A Bonds	-	-	3,300	3,300
2012B Bonds	295,805	-	-	295,805
2012B Bonds	8,260	-	-	8,260
2013B Bonds*	-	165,793	-	165,793
A Subtotal Sources - All	2,013,943	285,576	10,609	2,310,127

Charges Against Budget (\$)

Actual Charges

WSIP Expenditures & CP (2006)	59,370	-	-	59,370
Financial Review of WSIP (2007)	92,050	-	-	92,050
WSIP Sunset Reservoir (2009)	71,890	-	-	71,890
CSA Controller's Audit (2011/2012)	86,219	29,750	-	115,969
Independent Review Panel (IRP) (2011/2012)	116,010	-	-	116,010
LADWP for IRP (2011/2012)	11,489	-	-	11,489
IBBS Consulting for IRP (2011/2012)	47,000	-	-	47,000
CSA Audit - Final Bill Q3 12	29,625	-	-	29,625
RM Block WSIP Evaluation - (invoice for Nov 12 - Apr 13)	284,838	-	-	284,838
B Subtotal Actual Charges	798,492	29,750	-	828,241

A - B Available Funds Before Pending Charges

1,215,451	255,826	10,609	1,481,886
------------------	----------------	---------------	------------------

Pending Charges

C Subtotal Pending Charges	-	-	-	-
-----------------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------

A - B - C Available Funds After Pending Charges

1,215,451	255,826	10,609	1,481,886
------------------	----------------	---------------	------------------

* No change from prior month

4

Revenue Bond Oversight Committee (RBOC) Proposed Evaluation of Lessons-Learned

CS-???

Revised 11/7/2013

DATE:

TO: Prospective Consultants

FROM: SFPUC Contract Administration Bureau

DEADLINE: Submission instructions are at the end of this document. All submissions must be received before 11:00 AM PST on _____. All requests for information concerning this RFP must be in writing and directed to the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission at rfp@sfgwater.org. ATT: CS-???

On behalf of the Revenue Bond Oversight Committee (RBOC), the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) requests the services of a construction management or project management consultant. To be eligible to submit a proposal, a Prime Proposer or all JV Partners (if an Joint Venture) must be prequalified under Project Type 1 on the Office of the Controller's Construction Contract Audit and Project Consulting Services List as of _____, 2013. Information on the Construction Contract Audit list can be found at the following website address: http://_____.

Firms that worked on the SFPUC's Water System Improvement Program (WSIP) or Sewer System Improvement Program (SSIP) involving pre-planning, planning, environmental review, final engineering design, construction management, project controls or project communications are not eligible to participate on this project.

I. Introduction: In 2012, the Revenue Bond Oversight Committee contracted with RW Block to conduct an evaluation of various aspects of the Water System Improvement Program (WSIP). This culminated in a report in March 2013: *Evaluation of WSIP Program – Project CS-254*. Subsequent recommendations by RW Block included an examination of program delivery (soft) costs incurred in WSIP (Water System Improvement Program) and application of lessons learned to SSIP (Sewer System Improvement Program). The RBOC Working Group (Ummel, Cheng, and Kaufman) recommends a follow-up review dealing with lessons-learned in order to better understand those program/project management elements* that worked well under WSIP or could be improved upon with a particular eye towards application to the SSIP. The SFPUC has received numerous awards for its WSIP program and reviews/audits by RW Block, the City's Controller, and an Independent Review Panel suggest that despite the size and complexity of a program this size, the WSIP is well managed. Should RBOC expect no less from SSIP?

II. Description of Services: By examining the SFPUC's lessons-learned *process* and the degree to which various program and project elements* under WSIP were successful, the consultant will be able to identify those lessons-learned that may have applicability under SSIP. For example, could the lessons learned regarding the program management structure under WSIP be useful to SSIP for purposes of

leveraging resources in order to achieve a more lean approach to project delivery? Among the program/project elements examined, special emphasis will be placed on disputed costs; identifying the root cause of the most significant claims/disputes, resolution procedures used, and extent to which disputed costs are included in the SFPUC's forecasting methods. Besides understanding the lessons learned process used by the SFPUC, this effort will also require the consultant to hold interviews with key staff/consultants of both programs to better understand the program management differences and similarities of the two capital programs. Finally, a cursory examination of the SSIP projects involved will assist the consultant in identifying which lessons learned on WSIP might be applicable to SSIP.

III. Objective: This task is designed to provide information in three areas. First, a description of the SFPUC's lessons-learned process. Second, an assessment of which program/project management elements* worked well or didn't on WSIP and whether improvements were made as a result of lessons-learned with a particular emphasis on disputed costs. Finally, an examination of which lessons-learned on WSIP might be applicable to SSIP.

**Project/Program elements include but are not limited to organizational/management framework, budgetary and accounting controls, financing, design, bidding process, environmental mitigation, dispute resolution, scheduling, forecasting, public outreach, agency coordination, project personnel, reporting regimens, QA/QC, risk management, change order process, delivery methods, etc.*

IV. Scope of Work: In order to meet the objectives as stated above the consultant will conduct this review to include (but is not limited to) the following review requirements:

- A. Describe and assess the SFPUC's lessons-learned process.
- How and when does the SFPUC go about capturing, documenting, and conveying lessons-learned; either as it applies to the WSIP program or other capital programs?
 - Identify the personnel and/or positions involved in the lessons-learned process and their respective roles.
 - Assess how stakeholders and personnel involved view the SFPUC's lessons-learned process; a "report card", if you will, of how well those involved in the process believe it to be adding value.
 - Provide recommendations for improving / institutionalizing the process for the SFPUC's capital programs.
- B. Provide examples of lessons-learned involving the SFPUC's capital project/program elements.
- What problems were encountered and what happened to the project/program as a result of the problem? For example, did the problem interfere with meeting project/program goals?
 - What caused this problem to occur and/or why was the problem undetected? For example, what project/program circumstances were not anticipated?
 - What program/project elements were most impacted? Least impacted? In other words, among the project/program elements, where did the SFPUC excel; fail to execute?
 - How were lessons-learned used; how was the process used to avoid future problems or reduce the impact should the problem reoccur?
 - Identify any lessons-learned involving soft costs. Are there opportunities to save significant soft costs in the remainder of the WSIP? How much? What would you recommend?
 - It seems soft costs as a percent of the program should be much less under SSIP than the WSIP because projects are all within SF. SSIP has initially chosen to use WSIP's soft cost factor of 43%. Is this appropriate; why or why not? What would you recommend?

C. Assess the SFPUC's processes and procedures for managing and reaching resolution of disputed costs before and after disputes arise.

- Assess SFPUC's processes and procedures for dispute avoidance and resolution, including an evaluation of the SFPUC's real time or jobsite dispute resolution measures (e.g., adequate authority on-site) designed to get disputes resolved during construction.
- For past/closed and current on-going significant disputes/claims, identify the root cause and the factors which prevented (are preventing) resolution in a timely manner. In determining the root cause of a dispute/claim, consultant's review is limited to the review of existing documents; i.e., consultant will independently opine on the root cause without the benefit of interviewing the contractor/owner. The types of disputes/claims under consideration by the consultant include contractual claims as defined in the construction contract, change orders which the contractor refuses to execute or reserves rights, and changes/work issued under construction directive by the owner. The consultant and the SFPUC will agree ahead of time in establishing a dollar threshold or some additional parameter for identifying a subset of disputes/claims for the consultant to review.
- Is the SFPUC following up accordingly to recover related costs where appropriate, for example, from the designer, or addressing the issue where associated with in-house design errors?
- Provide a flow diagram that illustrates the SFPUC's administrative/organizational framework for dealing with disputes. Include information regarding the role of persons or positions involved.
- Gauge the performance (quantitatively and qualitatively) of the SFPUC's overall process for mitigating/resolving disputes.
- Where applicable/feasible, report the impact a major disputed cost has had on budget and/or schedule.
- Where applicable/feasible, report the hierarchy of dispute resolution. For example, how many disputes were resolved by negotiation versus the Dispute Resolution Board (DRB) versus a mediation/legal process?
- To what degree are disputes or claims occurring as a result of said projects being fast-tracked or schedule-driven because late completion is projected. Review claim history of selected projects to assess this parameter.
- Compare and contrast those selected projects with major disputes with those selected projects with no or minimal disputed costs/claims. Among the latter, what factors appear to be contributing to a no or low dispute environment?
- To what degree, if any, has the past/recent favorable bidding environment led to disputes?
- To what degree, if any, have contractors sought to identify problems that resulted in change orders and claims in order to drive additional work over the original contract?
- Review to determine if claims paid by the SFPUC as a result of disputed costs have reasonably reflected the cost of work done and not inflated for expediency purposes to keep projects on schedule.

- Examine how and when major disputed costs are included in cost and schedule forecasting models. Where applicable/feasible, report on how many of the disputed costs were anticipated in the trend/risk register for each project; accuracy of the trend/risk register in terms of gauging cost. Conversely, were there any disputes that should have been anticipated at some early stage in development of the trend/risk register but were not?

D. Identify applicable lessons-learned that have been or should be incorporated to the SFPUC's other capital programs; specifically the Sewer System Improvement Program (SSIP).

- Gain familiarity with the SSIP management / organizational process. Interview key personnel and assigned roles.
- Become familiar with the size and scope of the SSIP program.
- Identify similarities and differences between SSIP and WSIP for purposes of understanding where lessons-learned might help and/or might not be applicable.
- Identify the most successful lessons-learned from WSIP that might be transferrable to SSIP or have already been considered/incorporated. (Note: there should be particular emphasis placed on the dispute resolution process and applicability to SSIP or other capital programs.)
- As a result of this lessons-learned review, provide recommendations to RBOC on future follow-up studies or audits specific to the SSIP program.

V. Consultant Qualifications and Requirements

A Prime Proposer or all JV Partners (if a Joint Venture) must be prequalified under Project Type 1 on the Office of the Controller's Construction Contract Audit and Project Consulting Services List as of March 15, 2012. **Submissions from non-prequalified firms will be rejected at the initial screening stage and will not be evaluated by the Selection Panel.** The successful RFP submittal shall demonstrate that the consultant/firm has the appropriate professional and technical background as well as access to adequate resources to fulfill the stated scope of services.

Required professional expertise, knowledge and skills include, but are not limited to the following, all in relation with large public infrastructure programs and projects:

- a. All aspects of program, project and construction management.
- b. Schedule and cost control and forecasting, with strong emphasis on construction costs and schedules.
- c. Budgeting, scheduling, cost control and cost estimating.
- d. Earn value management (CPI, SPI, and other indicators)
- e. Construction contract administration/oversight.
- f. Public utility governance and financing.

Desirable professional experience, knowledge and skills include, but are not limited to the following:

- a. Planning, design and construction of large and complex potable water projects and programs.
- b. Construction risk assessment/management.
- c. Environmental regulations/requirements and their impacts on project delivery.
- d. Stakeholder relations.
- e. Feasibility analysis and analysis for construction projects and programs.
- f. Delivery of public infrastructure projects.

- g. Lessons learned processes and procedures
- h. Familiarity with the SFPUC's Water and/or Waste Water capital programs/projects

The consultant's proposal will include all necessary expertise and personnel required to successfully complete the scope of services.

VI. Deliverables: The consultant will provide the SFPUC and RBOC with a complete *preliminary draft* report. The SFPUC, RBOC and interested stakeholders will provide feedback on the consultant's preliminary draft report for the consultant's consideration. Comments received on the preliminary draft and any subsequent responses made by the consultant shall be included in a *final draft* report presented to RBOC at a public meeting. The final draft report will be provided both electronically and in hard copy including all key backup information used to substantiate the consultant's findings/recommendations. Depending on the outcome of this meeting, RBOC may request the consultant to incorporate certain changes into a *final report*. See timeline below.

VII. General Information

1. As part of the proposal process, the consultant is required to review the most current SFPUC WSIP and SSIP project/program information generally accessible to the public as well as the most recent report by RW Block. This information is posted on the SFPUC website.
2. Consultants can submit additional follow-up written questions to better understand the breadth and specifics of the defined tasks by 5:00pm, _____. Technical or other substantive questions will **not** be accepted after _____. All questions should be sent to rfp@sfgwater.org.
3. **In order to be considered for the work described herein, a consultant must submit a proposal to the SFPUC Contract Administration Bureau by 11:00 am on _____.** The final consultant fee will be negotiated to a not-to-exceed amount.
4. The selected consultant will be required to sign a non-disclosure agreement.
5. Consultants or firms that have worked on WSIP involving Preplanning, Planning, Environmental Review, Final Engineering Design, Construction Management, Project Controls or Project Communications are not eligible to participate on this project.
6. The selected consultant will enter into a contract with RBOC and shall be responsible directly to RBOC. RBOC shall appoint a representative to serve as a point of contact for the consultant throughout the review.
7. The SFPUC will also provide a contact person that will facilitate the consultant's access to information, key SFPUC staff, SFPUC consultants, construction contractors and/or other needed contacts.
8. The consultant shall keep RBOC's representative informed of key requests for information made to the SFPUC and any delays in response.
9. The consultant will confer with SFPUC staff on establishing a review schedule that accommodates the WSIP and SSIP staff but recognizes the consultant's timeline for meeting reporting milestones.
10. The consultant's review and analysis will culminate in a *preliminary draft* and subsequent *final draft* before a *final report* is issued. The SFPUC, RBOC, and interested stakeholders will have the opportunity to provide written comments regarding the consultant's preliminary draft. Comments received on the preliminary draft and any subsequent responses made by the consultant shall be included in a *final draft* report presented to RBOC at a public meeting.
11. The consultant will provide one oral progress report to the full RBOC and/or its working group sub-committee at approximately 30 days after NTP or as determined by RBOC and the

consultant. This progress report can be delivered via teleconferencing. In addition, the consultant will provide weekly progress updates (via email) to the RBOC representative. Finally, the consultant will provide an oral report, in person, to the full RBOC upon submittal of the *final draft*.

VIII. Estimated Timetable:

Issue/Advertise RFP: By December 1, 2013

Proposals Due: By December 20, 2013

Proposals Scored: By January 17, 2014

Award of Contract/NTP*: By February 1, 2014

Oral Progress Report: By March 1, 2014

Preliminary Draft: By March 31, 2014

Final Draft: By April 30, 2014

Final Report: By May 15, 2014

IX. Proposal Contents and Submission Instructions

Proposals are due no later than 11:00 AM on December 20, 2013 and can be delivered to the following location:

San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Contract Administration Bureau
RE: CS-??? RBOC Evaluation of Lessons Learned
525 Golden Gate, Customer Services, 1st Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Proposals may be mailed to the following location:
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Contract Administration Bureau
RE: CS-??? RBOC Evaluation of Lessons Learned
525 Golden Gate, Customer Services, 8th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Note: Mailed proposals must arrive by the 11:00 AM deadline on December 20, 2013 or it will be rejected. Late submissions will not be accepted. Faxed or emailed proposals will not be accepted. Postmarks will not be considered evidence of delivery.

The text in the main proposal report, excluding any appendices (e.g., resume), shall not exceed twenty-five (25) pages. Proposers shall print their proposal double-sided (one double sided page counts as two pages) and use a minimum font of 10 pts. Every page shall be numbered, beginning with the cover

letter. The proposer shall submit one original unbound proposal plus one electronic version of the proposal and any supporting documentation on a CD in pdf format.

The proposal shall contain the following:

- A. A cover letter signed by an individual authorized to obligate the Proposer to fulfill the commitments contained in the Proposal. The cover letter must include 1) a statement identifying the Lead Proposer if a JV responding to this RFP; 2) a contact for all communications pertaining to the Proposer's Proposal; 3) a statement of the Proposer's overall ability and qualifications to conduct the work; 4) and a statement that the Proposer, if selected, agrees to sign a non-disclosure agreement.
- B. Proposer Qualifications. Demonstrate that the Prime Proposer (or JV Partner), Non-Leading JV Partner (if applicable), and sub-consultants meet all the qualification requirements outlined in Section VI. Provide sufficient information in the proposal for the Selection Panel to evaluate Proposer's ability to successfully complete the work outlined in the Scope of Services which may include:
 - Description and background summary of firm
 - A description of a minimum of three construction/project management assignments your firm has been involved with. Each project description shall include a scope summary, proposer's role and responsibilities, client references, dates when the project was performed, and dollar value of the engagement. Proposers should indicate if the project/assignment was performed on schedule and on budget. Ideally, the CM/PM assignments described should be those involving projects/programs of a similar nature, size and/or complexity as found in the WSIP.
- C. Team Member Organization, Availability, Qualifications, and Resumes. Demonstrate that team members are able to work the amount of time specified by the Proposer and have the background and experience to perform the work. Briefly describe the role, responsibilities, and qualifications of each team member as it applies to Sections IV, V and VI. Attach resumes of *key* team members.
- D. Work Plan. Using the scope of work as outlined in Section IV, describe your approach in conducting the review. Explain any unique approaches you believe are relevant and would result in a better work product. Include the names of the team members who will be doing the work and estimated number of person-hours required. Lack of a detailed work plan may render the proposal non-responsive.
- E. Project Schedule. Delineate a timetable for work completion based on the work plan which must meet the timeline outlined in Section VIII.
- F. Fee Proposal. The fee proposal shall show the estimate cost to complete the review. Include estimated hours by each team member involved, respective hourly rates, and all applicable indirect costs/charges. The final consultant fee will be negotiated to a not-to-exceed amount. RBOC's estimate to complete the lessons learned review, inclusive of all charges, is \$175,000 to \$200,000.

X. Evaluation and Selection Criteria. Prior to submitting proposals to a Selection Panel for review, SFPUC staff will review each proposal for initial determinations on responsiveness and responsibility. Proposals found to be responsive and submitted by responsible proposers based on this initial screening will be forwarded to the Selection Panel for evaluation per the evaluation process described below. Proposals found to be non-responsive or that were submitted by Proposers who do not meet minimum qualification requirements will be rejected and will not be considered. Elements reviewed during the

initial screening include, without limitation, proposal completeness, compliance with format requirements, verifiable references, and compliance with minimum qualification requirements.

The Selection Panel will be comprised of individuals who are knowledgeable on the subject and may include staff from the SFPUC, RBOC, or other City agencies/organizations.

Each responsive written proposal must obtain a minimum score of 45 points out of 75 (60%) to be considered. The written proposals will be scored using the following point scale:

Work Plan: 25 points

Proposer Qualifications: 20 points

Team Member Organization, Availability, Qualifications, and Resumes: 30 points

The Proposer with the highest total score will be identified as the highest-ranked Proposer eligible to proceed with the award of an Agreement with RBOC.

END OF DOCUMENT



**PUBLIC UTILITIES
REVENUE BOND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
MINUTES - DRAFT**

Public Utilities Commission Building
525 Golden Gate Ave., 2nd Floor, Yosemite Room
San Francisco, CA 94102

Monday, October 21, 2013 - 9:00 AM

Regular Meeting

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call**

Seat 1 Holly Kaufman
Seat 2 Kevin Cheng, Chair
Seat 3 Vacant
Seat 4 Larry Liederman
Seat 5 Kevin W. Harper
Seat 6 Emily Brownlow
Seat 7 John Ummel, Vice Chair

The meeting was called to order at 9:15 a.m. On the call of the roll, Member Liederman was noted absent. There was a quorum.

2. **Public Comment:** Members of the public may address the Revenue Bond Oversight Committee (RBOC) on matters that are within the RBOC's jurisdiction, but not on today's agenda.

Public Comment: None.

3. **Chair's Report:**

- A. **San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) Staff Report: Update on Sewer System Improvement Program (SSIP) and Level of Services.** (1:25:00 – 1:27:00)

Jeet Bajwa (SFPUC); presented information concerning the matter and answered questions raised during the hearing.

Public Comment: None.

B. San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) Staff Report: Update on Water System Improvement Program (WSIP) and Cost Containment Measures. (0:02:00 – 1:12:00)

Julie Labonte and Dan Wade (SFPUC); presented information concerning the matter and answered questions raised during the hearing.

Public Comment: None.

C. RBOC Account Statement and Review/Approval of Invoices for Ongoing Approved Engagements. (1:12:00 – 1:13:00)

Mike Brown (SFPUC); presented information concerning the matter and answered questions raised during the hearing.

Public Comment: None.

4. RBOC Proposed Scope of Work for Future Audits. (1:13:00 – 1:14:00)

Public Comment: None.

No action taken. The matter was tabled.

5. RBOC 2014 Meeting Schedule. (1:14:00 – 1:19:00)

Members of the RBOC discussed the meeting scheduled for 2014.

Public Comment: None.

Member Kaufman, seconded by Member Harper, moved to rescheduled the December 16, 2013, meeting of the RBOC to December 9, 2013, and adopt the proposed 2014 meeting schedule. The motion passed by the following vote:

Ayes: Kaufman, Cheng, Harper, Brownlow, Ummel.

Noes: None.

Absent: Liederman.

6. Approval of RBOC Minutes of September 16, 2013. (1:19:00 – 1:25:00)

Members of the RBOC discussed the minutes of the RBOC September 16, 2013, meeting.

Public Comment: None.

Member Kaufman, seconded by Member Brownlow, moved to adopt the RBOC September 16, 2013, minutes. The motion passed by the following vote:

Ayes: Kaufman, Cheng, Harper, Brownlow, Ummel.
Noes: None.
Absent: Liederman.

7. **Announcements, Comments, Questions, and Future Agenda Items.**

Julie Labonte (SFPUC) – Quarterly report for the Water System Improvement Program (WSIP) to include the Calaveras Dam – November 2013.

SFPUC Update – Bioregional Habitat – December 2013.

SFPUC Update (Jeet Bajwa) – Sewer System Improvement Program (SSIP), level of service, and summary of existing projects.

Adjustments to Operations and Maintenance (O&M) costs due to new capacity and new infrastructure with WSIP.

Vacant seats on the RBOC information available on the SFBOS.org website for those interested in applying.

Public Comment: None.

8. **Adjournment.**

The meeting adjourned at 10:42 a.m.

Agenda Item Information

Each item on the agenda may include: 1) Department or Agency cover letter and/or report; 2) Public correspondence; 3) Other explanatory documents. For more information concerning agendas, minutes, and meeting information, such as these document, please contact RBOC Committee Clerk, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102 – (415) 554-5184.

Audio recordings of the meeting of the Revenue Bond Oversight Committee are available at:
http://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=97

For information concerning San Francisco Public Utilities Commission please contact by e-mail RBOC@sfgov.org or by calling (415) 554-5184.

Public Comment

Public Comment will be taken before or during the Committee's consideration of each agenda item. Speakers may address the Committee for up to three minutes on that item. During General Public Comment, members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on the agenda.

Disability Access

RBOC meetings will be held at the Public Utilities Commission, 525 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA. The Committee meeting room is wheelchair accessible. The nearest accessible BART station is Civic Center (Market/Grove/Hyde Streets). Accessible MUNI Metro lines are the F, J, K, L, M, N, T (exit at Civic Center or Van Ness Stations). MUNI bus lines also serving the area are the 5, 6, 9, 19, 21, 47, 49, 71, and 71L. For more information about MUNI accessible services, call (415) 701-4485.

The following services are available on request 48 hours prior to the meeting; except for Monday meetings, for which the deadline shall be 4:00 p.m. of the last business day of the preceding week: For American sign language interpreters or the use of a reader during a meeting, a sound enhancement system, and/or alternative formats of the agenda and minutes, please contact Mike Brown at (415) 487-5223 to make arrangements for the accommodation. Late requests will be honored, if possible.

In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals.

Know Your Rights Under the Sunshine Ordinance

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review.

For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact by mail: Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102; phone at (415)554-7724; fax at (415) 554-7854; or by email at soff@sfgov.org.

Citizens may obtain a free copy of the Sunshine Ordinance by printing Chapter 37 of the San Francisco Administrative Code on the Internet, at <http://www.sfbos.org/sunshine>.

Cell Phones, Pagers and Similar Sound-Producing Electronic Devices

The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices.

Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance [SF Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code §2.100, et. seq] to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the Ethics Commission at: 25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220, San Francisco, CA 94102; telephone (415) 581-3100; fax (415) 252-3112; web site www.sfgov.org/ethics.