

**Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority  
Inland Empire Brine Line  
Request for Proposals (RFP) for  
Engineering Services for the Reach 4D Rehabilitation Work Plan**

**Pre-Proposal Conference  
(Non-mandatory)**

January 10, 2018

**Attendees**

Veronica Alvarez - ProPipe

Kate Palmer - Dudek

Toby Weickert - Pure Technologies

Chris Mote - Stantec

Luis Leon - HDR

Terry Krie - ARCADIS

Tony Medina - SPEC Services

David Ruhl - SAWPA

Carlos Quintero - SAWPA

Regina Patterson - SAWPA

**Introductions**

The Pre-Proposal Conference for Engineering Services for the Reach 4D Rehabilitation Work Plan commenced at 1:30 p.m. at the Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority offices located at 11615 Sterling Avenue, Riverside, California. Introductions were made.

**Brine Line Overview**

SAWPA Engineering Manager David Ruhl provided an overview of SAWPA, its member agencies, the Inland Empire Brine Line System and its purpose.

**Project Overview**

David displayed a map overview of Reach 4D which begins in Chino and runs about 21 miles east tying into Reach 4E in the City of Colton. The length is approximately 22 miles with upper end pipe size of 36-inch and runs down to 42-inch constructed in the early 1990s. This RFP is a subject of the lower portion of Reach 4D the connection to Reach 4A in Chino and then running north and then east to the corner of Hamner and Riverboat Drive (formerly Schleisman) approximately 7 miles. Past project Contracts 1 and 2 were constructed in 1990s. Those were constructed with 270 degree T-Lock liner on the inside of the pipe, leaving the invert of the pipe exposed to the concrete. David provided two figures of work done in 2011 which revealed deterioration of concrete at the interface between the PVC liner and the concrete. We believe this problem is along the entire 7 miles Reach 4D Contracts 1 and 2.

David briefly discussed the current discharger connections and the need to limit the amount of time for shutdowns. All dischargers will not be able to be shutdown. Due to costs, efforts will be made to avoid bypass pumping. We need to get the flow down so that the investigation can be done. We can reduce flows to about 1.2 MGD. Discussions with dischargers are currently taking place to get additional flow reduced.

---

## Scope of Work

David presented Tasks 4.1 through 4.7 and briefly discussed each. A full description of each Task is included in the RFP.

- Task 4.1 Project Management
- Task 4.2 Background (**existing field conditions, as-built drawings access**)
- Task 4.3 Field Investigation (**putting plan together and coordination with dischargers regarding necessary shutdowns to do work**)
- Task 4.4 Assess Structural Integrity (**based on information from 4.2 and 4.3 you will tell us what you think the estimated life is of the pipeline based on what we find**)
- Task 4.5 Evaluate Rehabilitation Methods (**based on whether it's a structural rehab or corrosion protection will determine what that task entails. All alternatives will be reviewed looking at all the factors associated with that.**)
- Task 4.6 Estimate Duration of Construction Activities
- Task 4.7 Work Plan (**a detailed cost estimates is a critical component because SAWPA will base its capital improvement budget over the next several years on it. It includes the pipeline estimated life, recommended repair method, project schedule and cost estimate.**)

## Proposal Requirements

David stated the proposal is limited to 15 pages including the information from Section 7 of the RFP. The fee proposal is to be delivered in a separate sealed envelope. The Proposal Authorization form is to be completed. Please submit seven (7) copies and one (1) electronic copy no later than 3:00 p.m. on January 19, 2018.

## Evaluation Criteria and Selection

David detailed Section 9 of the RFP regarding project evaluation criteria and selection process to be used as follows: 1) understand project requirements and identification of critical elements and key issues for successful project implementation; 2) technical and innovative approach; 3) relevant qualifications and experience; 4) schedule; 5) quality control procedures; 6) results of reference checks; and 7) clarity of proposal and compliance with proposal requirements.

The selection committee will consist of SAWPA Staff and SAWPA member agency staff. The committee will evaluate the proposals, interview with the top proposing firms, and review the fee proposal of the top three firms. SAWPA may negotiate a contract with most qualified firm or firms.

## Available Documents

David reported that access has been provided to the following reference documents:

1. Reach 4D (Contracts 1 – 5) Record Drawings
2. Reach 4E Record Drawings
3. Schleisman Relocation Record Drawings
4. Photo Documentation
5. GIS Database MAS Structures Coordinates and Depths

---

## Schedule

Ruhl presented the following project schedule:

### RFP

- Proposals Due Jan 19, 2018
- Interviews Jan 31, 2018
- Recommend Award Feb 20, 2018
- Notice to Proceed Feb 26, 2018

### Project

- Kick-off will be one (1) week following issuance of notice to proceed (NTP)
- Field investigation and final work plan is expected within 16 weeks

## Questions

*Question:* What does 1 MGD equate to in regards to depth of flow?

*Response:* Over 6 inches. Flow line is above the liner/concrete interface.

*Question:* Is there a master plan data regarding future flows available that would require minimum sizing with regard to the future recommendation?

*Response:* There are flow projections. SAWPA will research and provide what is available. See Phase 1 Salinity Management Plan Technical Memorandum, January 2010, on the SAWPA website at the following link: [http://www.sawpa.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/7.-SAWPASalinityMgmtPlan\\_FinalPh1TechMemoJan2010.pdf](http://www.sawpa.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/7.-SAWPASalinityMgmtPlan_FinalPh1TechMemoJan2010.pdf)

*Question:* Is the only option rehabilitation? Would you consider replacing?

*Response:* That is not preferred, but if the investigation determines the pipe is not structurally sound, replacement may be a viable option.

*Question:* Are samples still available?

*Response:* No. They are all destroyed. Relocation work was performed in 2011.

*Question:* Were any of those tested?

*Response:* No.

*Question:* In an earlier project there were issues regarding segmental slip-lining pipe getting stuck. Is there any concern for offset joints in the reaches? Are there any record drawings with that information? No known offset or conflicts other than what we find?

*Response:* The project referred to is behind Prado. The conditions were different there. We are not aware of offset or settling of the pipe. Your assessment will help answer those questions.

*Question:* Did you mention that at 1 MGD you thought the pipe would not flow full?

*Response:* No. At 1 MGD we would be still be above that T-Lock concrete interface.

*Question:* The RFP mentions that CCTV has happened before.

*Response:* Yes. We may have done CCTV and tried to reduce the flow, but would not have seen the problem. There may have videos that can be made available if you want to see what T-Lock liner looks like.

---

*Question:* How clear is the water?

*Response:* There is a mix that includes desalter water that is not very clear. An area was displayed on the map of an industrial area that has a combination of high brine industry and domestic from warehouses that are connected to the Brine Line. There is no other sewer line that serves that area. It's grayish and most likely cannot see through it. Not at this location.

*Question:* Have you ever found any debris at the bottom of the pipe?

*Response:* Two locations of sedimentation basins were displayed. It is cleaned approximately every 3 to 4 months. It's a large structure about 10-feet deep, 20-feet wide and 30-feet long. We get about 24 inches of sediment on the bottom plus floating material. There are three siphons. The location at the Euclid syphon is 600 feet. There is a short siphon across the street from California Institute for Women. There is another one at the Schleisman siphon where Prado comes in at Chino Creek and a long one under Cucamonga Channel.

*Question:* What is the greatest distance from access point to access point? There shouldn't be any more?

*Response:* Approximately 1,000 feet, maybe slightly more.

*Question:* Do you know the approximate diameter size of the access?

*Response:* See record drawings as part of available documents in Section 11 of the RFP.

*Question:* What about connection to the pipe? Is it a full size T?

*Response:* It is a standard manhole opening. It is not sealed at the bottom like other locations. It is just a gravity line not a pressure line. The invert of the manholes are exposed too. See record drawings.

*Question:* Would the manholes be part of the assessment while we're there?

*Response:* Yes.

*Question:* Will siphons be excluded because they are always flooded?

*Response:* Yes.

*Question:* You could have done the pipe assessment by going through some of these manholes. It would be a lot of stops to look at every manhole for traffic control. Do you want the entire manhole assessed? Or just capture what you can get done through a CCTV effort if possible? If that is desired at every manhole it would be a lot of labor? Is there availability of maintenance records from your own inspection?

*Response:* The consultant should make the recommendation in their proposal.

*Question:* The short windows. Is there an estimate on how long those windows can be?

*Response:* We do not, but would say no more than one day. We would have to sit down with the dischargers to determine shutdowns. There are some that cannot shut down. They need to produce potable water. That may be no more than 2 hours. Under other conditions a time can be determined. Some discussion ensued regarding particular dischargers.

---

*Question:* Can you do multiple windows if required?

*Response:* Yes

*Question:* When you did the investigation before and photos were taken, did you see any damage in the reinforcing structure?

*Response:* Do not have any record of visual inspection of reinforcement. Depth of corrosion was roughly 5/8 inch and some portions were 1 ¼ inches.

*Question:* What methods are used for pipe cleaning?

*Response:* Jet only.

*Question:* Does the pipe have to be perfectly round with the repair method?

*Response:* Consultant would evaluate those things.

*Question:* Is there the ability to flush the line with clear water during an inspection?

*Response:* There are no potable water connections.

*Question:* For manhole access and safety standards, is there a protocol or do we develop that on our own? Is there a need to go in or do we assume everything will be done from above?

*Response:* There may be a need to do an in-pipe inspection. The consultant would make that recommendation. The consultant/sub-consultant would need a safety plan. Certificates of training will need to be provided upon request.

SAWPA currently does not have permits with the Cities of Chino or Eastvale for maintenance. That should be factored in.

*Question:* Do they require signed traffic control or do they allow maintenance set up?

*Response:* If it is something straightforward, do your traffic control per WATCH manual or MUTCD. It may not be unnecessary for field investigation. For the fix, it would probably be required. Some cities require whoever is doing the inspection to get a second permit. That will have to be investigated.

*Question:* Will you provide requirements for manhole inspection?

*Response:* The consultant should provide a recommendation. If there is a concern for costs, inspection could be included as an optional item.

*Question:* If it was possible to do spot assessments at manholes like temporarily blocking flow, would that be enough information to make the profiles consistent rather than CCTV the whole project?

*Response:* We would ask you to make the recommendation and provide the advantages and disadvantages.

David encouraged any additional questions that may arise prior to the proposal due date, be sent to him by email.

The meeting ended at 2:05 p.m.

**PRE-PROPOSAL MEETING  
RFP  
INLAND EMPIRE BRINE LINE  
ENGINEERING SERVICES for REACH 4D REHABILITATION WORK PLAN**

January 10, 2018

*For purposes of our records, we would like you to sign in. However, section 54953.3 of the California Government Code states that you, as a member of the public, are not required to do so as a condition of attendance.*

\*\* Please Print \*\*

*Phone  
CELL*

NAME	REPRESENTING	EMAIL	PHONE CELL
1 Veronica Alvarez	PROPIPE	veronica.alvarez@pro-pipe.com	626 4237222
2 Kate Palmer	Dudek	kpalmer@dudek.com	760.514.3523
3 Toby Weickert	PURE TECHNOLOGIES	toby.weickert@puretechhd.com	619-548- 8145
4 Chris Mote	STANTEC	christopher.mote@stuntec.com	626-201- 1034
5 Luis LEON	HDR	LUIS.LEON@HDRINC.COM	
6 Terry Kere	ARCADIS	terry.kere@arcadis.com	7143055223
7 Tony Medina	SPEC Services	jmedina@specservices.com	714 589-9206
8 Carlos Quintero	SAWPA	cquintero@sawpa.org	951-354-4234
9 David Ruhl	"	druhl@sawpa.org	951-354-4223
10 Regina Patterson	"	rpatterson@sawpa.org	951-354-4246
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			



**Request for Proposals (RFP)  
Inland Empire Brine Line  
Engineering Services for Reach 4D Rehabilitation Work Plan**

January 10, 2018

SAWPA  
11615 Sterling Avenue  
Riverside, California 92503  
(951) 354-4220  
[www.sawpa.org](http://www.sawpa.org)

---

**Agenda**

1. Introductions
2. Project Overview
3. Scope of Work
4. Proposed Requirements
5. Evaluation Criteria and Selection
6. Available Documents
7. Schedule
8. Questions