



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

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

Monday, October 21, 2013 - 10:30 AM

Special Meeting

If a quorum of the Public Utilities Revenue Bond Oversight Committee (RBOC) members is present, the chair will hold a Special meeting of the RBOC to discuss items on this Contracting Working Group Agenda.

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

John Ummel, Chair
Kevin Cheng
Holly Kaufman

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

- 3. Revenue Bond Oversight Committee Preliminary Request for Proposals - Scope of Work regarding "Evaluation of Lessons Learned" and "WSIP Disputed Costs".** (Discussion and Action)(Attachments)

Issue/Action: The Contracting Working Group received comments back from Sewer System Improvement Project (SSIP) and Water System Improvement Project (WSIP) management as well BAWSCA on the preliminary scopes of work regarding "Evaluation of Lessons Learned" and "WSIP Disputed Costs". The scopes have been amended modestly to accommodate this input. In addition, WSIP program management raised several issues that should be discussed by the Working Group:

- A. The Disputed Costs assignment calls for an examination of "major disputed costs". While the scope of work provides a definition of "major disputed costs", WSIP management asks:

- Will this involve disputes at various stages of the resolution ladder? **(RBOC Tentative Response: “Yes”)**
 - Might publication of dispute details potentially impact any pending resolution? **(RBOC Tentative Response: “It is suggested that disclaimer language (e.g., “conclusions reached are not intended . . .”) can be inserted in the report to mollify this concern.”)**
 - Will the review include previously disputed costs that have been resolved? **(RBOC Tentative Response: “Yes, probably at a high level summary”).)**
 - Currently there are unresolved disputes heard by the DRB that may require litigation. Will the consultant be examining DRB issues, and, if so, could the consultant’s opinion on the issues be used in litigation; put the SFPUC at a disadvantage? **(RBOC Tentative Response: Yes. The purpose of the dispute evaluation assignment is to evaluate performance against stated practices and ascertain how disputed costs are forecast in trends in order to provide an independent assessment of such to RBOC in its oversight capacity. This effort is not intended to supplant existing DRB processes and does not serve to provide legal binding dispute/claims analysis. RBOC anticipates that appropriate disclaimer language as well as a confidentiality agreement should mollify this concern”).)**
- B. The consultant is charged with examining the “root cause” of the claim (dispute). WSIP management asks: “How will this be done without hearing the contractor’s side?” Having said that, the consultant would not be allowed to interview the contractors. Furthermore, a public report on active projects in dispute could be used by the contractors to the SFPUC’s disadvantage. **(RBOC Tentative Response: Presumably, there are written position statements by both the owner and the contractor that should allow an experienced, independent consultant to determine the root cause. Furthermore, disclaimer language and a confidentiality agreement should mollify this concern. RBOC’s past practice has been to have the SFPUC review and comment on the consultant’s draft report before it is made public. It would be at this juncture that the SFPUC could suggest changes to the language of the report to protect its interests.)**
- C. The Lessons Learned assignment calls for the consultant to identify “successful “lessons learned or which elements “worked well”. WSIP management asks: “What standards or criteria will be used to determine success/what worked well?” **(RBOC Tentative Response: Presumably, the standards or criteria are included in the SFPUC’s stated goals and objectives/policies and procedures. If not, the consultant would be asked to provide such a benchmark.)**

The Contracting Working Group should discuss these comments and tentative responses and determine if they adequately address the SFPUC’s concerns. Furthermore, the Contracting Working Group should review and approve the (attached)

revised RFPs/Scopes of Work; forward them to the full RBOC for approval at the November meeting. (Note: It is anticipated that changes will be made to these scopes as a result of this meeting prior to their submission to the full RBOC.)

4. **Approval of RBOC Contracting Working Group Minutes of July 31, 2013.**
(Discussion and Action) (Attachment)
5. **Future Agenda Items/Meeting Dates.** (Discussion and Action)
6. **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 documents, 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.

REVENUE BOND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (RBOC)

Requests for Proposals

Proposed Evaluation of WSIP Disputed Costs

Revised October 16, 2013

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 report: *Evaluation of the WSIP Program - Project CS-254*. This report found that the SFPUC's standardized methodology to forecast cost and time at completion - based on an evaluation of WSIP's five largest projects - was both reliable and realistic. This evaluation, however, used project data as of September 30, 2012 and the (then) corresponding approved budget of \$4,587M and finish date of July 2016. Since that time, cost and schedule changes on a number of projects - most notably the Calaveras Dam Replacement Project - prompted the SF Public Utilities Commission to adopt a change in schedule and cost. The WSIP is now forecasted to be completed in April 2019 and cost \$4,640 million. Because of this most recent run-up in costs, RBOC believes a follow-up examination of disputed costs and claims on key projects is in order.

II. Services to Be Provided: An examination of major disputed costs/claims among certain current, active WSIP projects will help gauge how much of these disputed costs is being included in trends (projecting costs) and whether such project forecasting methods used by the SFPUC are still appropriate, too conservative, or not adequate. This follow-up examination is to provide a more definitive answer to the original query: Given recent changes to schedule and budget, just how reliable are the SFPUC's cost at completion and schedule at completion forecasts and what changes, if any, in the SFPUC's methodology are in order to ensure more reliable forecasting?

The purpose of this effort is not to audit or create a formal settlement approach to claims but rather to 1) evaluate when and how much of such disputed costs are being included in the SFPUC's forecasting methods and 2) to better understand the underlying root cause of claims (disputes). To the extent improvements in the forecasting methodology are identified as it pertains to identification and inclusion of disputed costs, it is thought such improvements could be useful to the SFPUC's Sewer System Improvement Program (SSIP) and other capital program efforts entertained by the SFPUC (e.g., Hetch Hetchy).

III. Objective: The primary objective of this work is to review major disputed costs and claims among select current, active (i.e., projects which have not been closed out) WSIP projects to determine the degree with which disputed costs were/are included in trends (projecting costs and schedule) and whether the SFPUC's forecasting methods pertaining to disputed costs are appropriate in light of such

conditions. As part of this review, the consultant will also report on the root cause of disputes/claims and assess the SFPUC's procedures/processes for preventing and minimizing disputes.

IV. Scope of Work: The details of the review will include but not be limited to the items listed below. The exact scope of the review may be refined after the consultant becomes more familiar with the task and the number of projects to be included in the evaluation. At a minimum, the consultant will review major disputed costs involving no less than five large projects (over \$50M) and no less than five large projects where disputed costs were minimal (but not more than eight projects under either condition). The selection of projects for review will be arrived at jointly between the consultant and WSIP management prior to contract award.

A. Describe and evaluate the SFPUC's procedures and processes 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.
- 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?
- Under what circumstances or size of project would the SFPUC's dispute resolution process make no sense/add no value?
- 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 or qualitatively) of the SFPUC's overall process for mitigating/resolving disputes.

B. Examine the size, frequency, and nature of major disputed costs*. Among those projects with major disputed costs:

- Identify the root cause of the dispute and the factors which prevented (are preventing) resolution in a timely manner.
- 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 versus a mediation/legal process?
- 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?

- 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 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.

C. Examine how and when major disputed costs are included in cost and schedule forecasting models; assess appropriateness of forecasting model.

- Examine how and when major disputed costs are included in cost and schedule forecasting models.
- For the projects selected, how much of the disputed costs and time delays are being included in trends; is such information being included in as timely a manner as possible and how and when is this information conveyed to the public?
- Are there circumstances when it is not prudent to publicly share disputed cost information and possible changes to schedule with decision makers, early in the process?
- Among those projects with major disputed costs examined, is the SFPUC poised to achieve the revised cost and schedule targets for these projects or are there other risks involved that call into question the latest revised schedule and cost estimate?
- In your estimation, are the SFPUC's forecasting methods for cost and schedule still appropriate?
- As a result of this review – and with an eye towards transferring lessons learned - what recommendations do you have that could be applicable to other SFPUC capital programs?
- As a result of this review, provide recommendations to RBOC on future follow-up studies or audits specific to the WSIP/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 _____.** That proposal will be based on the various studies or reports provided, information conveyed at the pre-

submittal conference and any subsequent follow-up. 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 schedule for analysis that accommodates the WSIP and SSIP staff/contractors but recognizes the consultant's timeline for meeting reporting milestones.
10. The consultant's review and analysis of both tasks provided to the SFPUC and RBOC 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. If both assignments (Lessons Learned and Disputed Costs) are awarded to the same contractor, then only one report will be required.
11. The consultant will provide two oral progress reports to the full RBOC and/or its working group sub-committee at approximately 30-45 day intervals or as determined by RBOC and the consultant.

Estimated Timetable: Start: Jan 1, 2014 – Complete: April 2014

Estimated Cost: \$160,000

Estimated Timetable: Start: Nov 2013 – Complete: April 2014

**Major disputed costs are (were) those having a significant impact on cost/schedule; consisting of claims which have not been (or were not) agreed to in pricing and/or scope and which the contractor and the SFPUC are (were) at odds over construction change directives/deliverables.*

\\server\RedirectedFolders\jummel\My Documents\RBOC\RW Block Draft Scope of Work - Disputes.docx

REVENUE BOND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (RBOC)

REQUESTS FOR PROPOSALS

Proposed Evaluation of Lessons-Learned

Revised 10/16/2013

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 applications to SSIP (Sewer System Improvement Program). In addition, the RBOC Working Group (Ummel, Cheng, and Kaufman) recommended a more comprehensive lessons-learned evaluation 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. Services to be Provided: 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? 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. 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; fall down?
- 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; within industry norms?

C. 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.
- 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 _____.** That proposal will be based on the various studies or reports provided, information conveyed at the pre-submittal conference and any subsequent follow-up. 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 schedule for analysis that accommodates the WSIP and SSIP staff/contractors but recognizes the consultant's timeline for meeting reporting milestones.
10. The consultant's review and analysis of both tasks provided to the SFPUC and RBOC 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. If both assignments (Lessons Learned and Disputed Costs) are awarded to the same contractor, then only one report will be required.
11. The consultant will provide two oral progress reports to the full RBOC and/or its working group sub-committee at approximately 30-45 day intervals or as determined by RBOC and the consultant.

Estimated Timetable: Start: Jan 1, 2014 – Complete: April 2014

\\SKYFALL\Folder Redirection\jummel\Documents\RBOC\RBOC RFP Scope of Work -Lessons Learned.docx



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

Public Utilities Commission Building
525 Golden Gate Ave., 4th Floor, San Antonio Room
San Francisco, CA 94102

Wednesday, July 31, 2013 - 9:30 AM

Special Meeting

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call(00:00:00 - 00:00:30)**

John Ummel, Chair
Kevin Cheng
Holly Kaufman

The meeting was called to order at 9:45 a.m. On the call of the roll, Members Ummel, Cheng, and Kaufman were noted present.

2. **Public Comment: (00:00:30 - 00:00:45)**

Public Comment: None.

3. **Future Revenue Bond Oversight Committee Audit Activities(00:00:45 - 00:59:30)**

Issue/Action: The RBOC received RW Block's major report. Recommendations in this report as well as additional suggested audit activities have been forwarded by Mr. Block. In addition, the City Services Auditor (CSA) is in the process of finalizing a scope of work for an audit of the Sunol Valley Water Treatment Plant. Finally, WSIP Director Julie Labonte was asked to opine on RW Block's recommendations and suggest possible follow-up activities. The RBOC has asked the Contracting Working Group to review potential audit activities and bring forth recommendations to the RBOC at a future meeting.

Chair Ummel provided an overview of potential future RBOC audit activities.

Mike Brown (SFPUC); Mark Blake (City Attorney's Office); provided information and responded to questions raised through the discussion.

See Item 5 (Future Agenda Items/Meeting Dates) for proposed hearings and activities.

Public Comment: None.

No Action Taken.

4. **Approval of RBOC Contracting Working Group Minutes of March 18, 2013.**
(Discussion and Action) (Attachment)

Member Kaufman, seconded by Member Cheng, moved to approve the RBOC Contracting Working Group Minutes of March 18, 2013. The motion passed by the following vote:

Ayes: Ummel, Cheng and Kaufman.

Noes: None.

Public Comment. None.

5. **Future Agenda Items/Meeting Dates.**

The RBOC Contracting Working Group requested that the SFPUC report on the following items during the September 16, 2013, RBOC meeting:

1. Cost Containment
2. Sewer System Improvement Program (SSIP) Lessons Learned
3. Calaveras Dam update
4. Sewer System Improvement Program (SSIP) Program Introduction

6. **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 10:50 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 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.