

**Nampa WWTP Phase II/III Upgrades  
Design Review Committee  
Thursday, April 18, 2019  
Nampa Wastewater Treatment Plant | 340 W Railroad St  
7:00 AM – 9:00 AM  
MEETING SUMMARY**

---



**Meeting Overview**

On Thursday, April 18, 2019, the Nampa Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) Phase II/Phase III Upgrades Design Review Committee (DRC) convened its seventh meeting. The objectives of this meeting were to provide updates to the overall Wastewater Program, present the Administration and Laboratory Building design evaluation, and provide more background on progressive design-build delivery. The following is a summary of topics discussed and feedback provided at the meeting. Please see meeting materials for more information.

**Meeting Summary**

*Nampa Wastewater Program Updates*

Bryant Kuechle, facilitator, welcomed DRC members and reviewed the agenda. Nate Runyan, City of Nampa (City), provided an update on the Wastewater Program:

- The reuse permit application was submitted to Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (IDEQ) on March 21, 2019. The City received a Completeness Determination from DEQ, who has begun drafting the reuse permit. The public will have the opportunity to comment on the draft permit when it becomes available.
- City staff will present a summary of the proposed WWTP improvements and the DRC's involvement before the Nampa City Council at a public hearing on May 20, 2019. DRC members are encouraged to attend.
- The City recently won 1<sup>st</sup> Place in Engineering Excellence Stormwater and Wastewater category from the American Council of Engineering Companies Idaho chapter. The City also won Project of the Year over \$3M from the Rocky Mountain Section of the American Public Works Association.

*Administration and Laboratory Building Updates*

Matt Gregg, Brown and Caldwell, provided an overview of the administration and laboratory building analysis. This facility provides key functions including analytical testing to monitor WWTP process performance, inform process control activities, maintain regulatory compliance, and a location for administrative staff, WWTP operations and maintenance staff, and collections system staff. With the Phase II expansion, the facility must provide an increased level of analytical testing and accommodate staff growth within the organization. After analyzing three alternatives, including a new facility relocated to the entrance of the WWTP and renovation alternatives for the existing building. The Technical Team recommends Alternative 2, which would involve renovating the existing building through modifications to the administration side. Alternative 2 best fits the Capitol Improvement Plan and utilizes the existing structure. The DRC approved this recommendation. Please see DRC Briefing #21 for more information.

Questions Included:

- 1) Does this involve purchasing new analytical equipment?
- 2) Is there room for future expansion?

#### *Progressive Design-Build Deep Dive*

Matt Gregg provided an in-depth overview of the progressive design-build (PDB) delivery method proposed by the Technical Team at earlier DRC meetings. The Technical Team based the PDB delivery model recommendation on survey responses provided by DRC members at Meeting #4. The PDB delivery model is a two-phase approach where phase one involves project design, cost estimating, schedule development and guaranteed maximum price (GMP) or lump sum preparation. Phase two, which only begins if the City and design-build firm agree on the GMP or lump sum, includes final design completion, construction, and commissioning.

With this delivery method, one design-build team will be contracted to conduct both the design and construction of the project. The City selects the design-build team based on best value, which considers qualifications, fee, and past project performance. The concurrent design and construction activities reduce schedule, allow for a “design to budget” approach through iterative cost estimate development, provide transparency to the City through open-book cost preparation and review, and provide more risk transfer from the City when compared to traditional design-bid-build. If at the conclusion of phase one an agreement can’t be reached on GMP or lump sum, there is an “off-ramp” where the City can revert to traditional design-bid-build procurement. Matt Gregg discussed the risk transfer details associated with PDB delivery. Please see DRC briefing #22 for more information.

Questions included:

- 1) What is the reality of staying within budget through this process?
- 2) Is this the first time the City of Nampa has used the progressive design-build delivery method?
- 3) How will this process accommodate potential impacts of increased large industry?
- 4) Have we defined parameters?

#### *Phase II/Phase III Upgrades Updates and Next Steps*

Matt Gregg provided an update on the Phase II/Phase III Upgrades budget and schedule estimates, including timing for potential cost savings relative to Phase III upgrades implementation. The current Program financing model does not include Phase III Upgrades. The Phase III Upgrades, which include the recycled water pump stations and pipelines, may be accelerated to occur within Phase II Upgrades and thereby reduce the City’s inflationary cost burden. The Technical Team will be meeting with IDEQ to align the Program cash flow with the State Revolving Fund (SRF) loan. Matt Gregg also provided an update on the Project Group D and E procurments. The Technical Team will present an overview of project packaging and delivery methods to City Council on May 6<sup>th</sup> for approval. The Technical Team will present the recommended project packaging and delivery method for Phase II/Phase III Upgrades for public hearing and City Council approval on May 20<sup>th</sup>.

Questions included:

- 1) Is there enough funding in the SRF loan?
- 2) Are there opportunities to pull projects ahead and work within budget?
- 3) Citizens want to know how their utility bill will be impacted. Is it possible for the public to see the cost savings on their bill?

- 4) Please explain the City's perspective on industrial capacity flexibility.
- 5) How was sole source justified?

#### *Next Steps*

- The next DRC meeting will be Thursday, June 20, 2019, from 7-9 a.m. at the Nampa Public Library.
- The City Council will convene a workshop to review the WWTP Phase II designs and recommendations to date on May 6, followed by a public hearing on May 20.
- Please send questions or concerns to the City as they arise and the project team will work to address these at the upcoming meeting.

---

### **DRC Meeting #7 – April 18, 2019**

#### **Responses to Questions**

##### ***Laboratory/Administration Building Updates***

- 1) Does this involve purchasing new analytical equipment?  
*Majority of equipment will come from the existing laboratory. Some new equipment will be purchased to support in-house testing and reduction of private laboratory contracting expenses.*
- 2) Is there room for future expansion?  
*The building renovation accommodated future expansion, aligning with the Wastewater Program Facility Plan planning horizon of 2040.*

##### ***Progressive Design-Build Deep Dive***

- 1) What is the reality of staying within budget through this process?  
*The Design-build delivery method allows for value engineering and real-time construction pricing early in the project. The progressive design-build model gets its name from its price development technique, which is prepared progressively. This "design to budget" approach helps achieve budget goals by providing continuous price feedback on the project and provides the City opportunity to manage priorities and to make design adjustments prior allocating budget. In traditional design-bid-build, the City has no input or insight to the designer's or contractor's costs except for at a value engineering step, if there is one. Additionally, there are contract mechanisms that incentivize the design-build firm to finish under budget.*
- 2) Is this the first time the City of Nampa has used the progressive design-build delivery method?  
*This delivery method is commonly used for large water and wastewater projects by utilities and municipalities, though it would be the first time for the City of Nampa.*
- 3) How will this process accommodate potential impacts of increased large industry?  
*The Design-Build delivery method allows for accelerated construction schedule, which provides the City flexibility to react to increased large industry. That being said, the Phase II Upgrades include additional wastewater capacity for increased industrial customers and non-industrial/residential customers.*

- 4) Have we defined the 30-day acceptance test parameters? Will it capture seasonality?  
*The 30-day test acceptance period has not been defined yet. The City will have the opportunity to determine when that test is performed once contract negotiations begin. The City will be evaluating the optimal timeframe, including seasonal wastewater influent periods.*

**Phase II Upgrades Updates and Next Steps**

- 1) Is there enough funding in the state revolving fund?  
*IDEQ has committed to funding \$165 million through the SRF program.*
- 2) Are there opportunities to pull projects ahead and work within budget?  
*Yes, the Technical Team is tracking opportunities for accelerating projects. The Design-Build delivery method allows for accelerated construction schedule, as well as construction timing to be aligned with City budget.*
- 3) Citizens want to know how their utility bill will be impacted. Is it possible for the public to see the cost savings on their bill?  
*The City plans to continue providing the community with informational updates related to this project. The Capital Improvements Plan and rate model are established for Phase II Upgrades and will not be changed at this time. This is because accounting for design and construction decisions early and revising rates exposes the project to future risk of budget shortfalls if the project scope expands, construction delays occur, or other future unknown conditions. The rate increases in the current rate model are necessary to achieve the project budget. The cost savings made during design and construction are to be determined.*
- 4) How was sole source justified for Project Group D?  
*Idaho statute for public works projects has a specific set of criteria that the City adheres to on all projects including sole source procurement of services. Project Group C, currently under construction, and Project Group D are both new Primary Digester projects. The City opted to sole-source Project Group D final design because this utilizes a design consultant already providing services during construction for Project Group C. This enables a more efficient procurement process to meet a tight procurement and construction timeline. Project Group D construction will be competitively bid.*