



# COUNTY OF ANOKA

## PUBLIC SERVICES DIVISION

*-Highway -Parks & Recreation -Surveyor -GIS -Transit -Administration*

*- Integrated Waste Management – License Bureau*

GOVERNMENT CENTER  
2100 3RD AVENUE STE 700 • ANOKA, MN 55303-5024  
(763) 323-5700

**JON G. OLSON, P.E.**  
Division Manager  
Direct #763-323-5789  
Fax #763-323-5682  
Cell #612-850-4106  
jon.olson@co.anoka.mn.us

June 29, 2012

**MEMO TO:** Wetlands Review Committee  
Commissioner Matt Look (Chair) and Commissioner Rhonda Sivarajah

**FROM:** Jon Olson, Public Services Division Manager, on Behalf of the County Ditch #56 Review Committee

**SUBJECT:** Review of Proposals – Diversion of Outlet of CD #56

On May 19, 2012, Anoka County prepared and issued a Request for Proposal for Engineering Services for the Diversion of the Outlet of CD #56 (the Project). Proposals were requested from 6 firms. Of those, 3 submitted proposals.

WSB -	\$37,766 (\$40,766 with geotechnical)
Bolton & Menk -	\$39,600
Houston Engineering -	\$67,000

As with all proposals, each contained some differences and included and excluded other elements.

A review committee was called to review the proposals. The review committee consisted of:  
Ken Johnson, representing the Coon Lake Improvement Association  
Curt Kobilarsik, Anoka County Highway Department  
Jon Olson, Public Services Division Manager

Information was sent out in advance so that reviewers would have the opportunity to read and score the three proposals. The review committee met on June 27, 2012, at 2:00 p.m. at the Anoka County Highway Department. Each reviewer presented their impressions of each proposal without indicating the actual score that they gave. Some of the comments were:

Houston Engineering – Good experience. Grey Cloud Slough Project similar to this project. Did not include additional survey work. Would use SWMM model for determining theoretical effects of project on water levels. Includes two soil borings. Only 32 hours of construction inspection. Permit applications limited to two with no follow-up. The proposal reflected a ‘know-it-all’ attitude. A lot of hours and high cost.

Bolton & Menk – Good proposal. Lists several county ditch projects. No diversion projects. Extensive modeling experience with several programs. Included geotechnical work not to exceed \$5,000. Proposal came in with 60% of the hours that Houston Engineering proposed and is about equal to the WSB proposal. Unrealistic schedule. Included all permit applications and responding to questions. Did not break down tasks by cost.

WSB – Good experience with a couple of very similar projects. Discussion on flow in channel and potential flooding issues to the west. Proposal included completing all applications, tracking applications, answering questions and modifying plans to comply with permit conditions. Did not include geotechnical costs. Realistic schedule was presented with completion in October 2013. Included discussion on coordination with Coon Lake Improvement Association. Projected hours about equal to Bolton & Menk; 60% less than Houston Engineering.

Overall, the review committee felt we had three good proposals and they were scored as follows:

<u>Reviewer</u>	WSB	Bolton & Menk	Houston Engineering
Jon Olson	97	95	76
Curt Kobilarcsik	101	92	99
Ken Johnson	<u>106</u>	<u>87</u>	<u>83</u>
Average:	101	91	86

There were a few concerns about the WSB proposal. I called Pete Willenbring of WSB about those concerns on June 28, 2012.

- 1) What program will you use to do the hydrological analysis? Answer: We would use XP-SWMM or Hydrocad, or if we find an existing model, we would use the same program that model was generated with.
- 2) You did not list any geotechnical firm in your proposal. Answer: We didn’t see much there; perhaps a boring or two for the culvert. For the diversion, we would probably have the contractor drive a test pile and base the pile lengths on that, plus a bit of materials testing; \$3,000 should be sufficient.

- 3) You only show 40 hours of on-site inspection; is that enough? Answer: Well, it's about a 3-4 day project. I feel that a full-time inspector should be there for the underground, but not for the rest. Todd lives near the project and he would stop by in the morning and afternoon and see how it is going, so I think we have enough.
- 4) Could your firm help with any funding possibilities? Answer: I really don't see much potential here. Legacy funds, maybe; but the application and follow-through costs so much that I'm not sure it would be worth it. It would need to be tied to clean water somehow, and this project does not fit that well.

Based on the review committee's evaluation, we recommend that a contract be awarded to WSB & Associates, Inc. in an amount not to exceed \$40,766, pending the availability of funding for the work.

JO:kr

cc: Ken Johnson, Coon Lake Improvement Association  
Curt Kobilarsik, P.E, Engineering Program Manager, Anoka County Highway Department