PRE-MEETING QUESTIONS July 9, 2024



The following questions have been posed by Commissioners prior to the scheduled Board Meeting on July 9, 2024. Staff responses are included below and are sorted by Agenda topic.

# Consent Calendar

CONTRACTS

# <u>Forth Mobility - for an Electric Vehicle Sharing Program</u> (MCGAUGHEY) In reading the information it appears the users are charged an hourly rate to use the EV's. Is that correct and if so, who gets that money?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, that is correct. Forth's hourly rate for the utilization of these vehicles will be \$5/hour, which is substantially less than other models that charge around \$12 for a similar EV. Forth's model is that they retain the revenue and put it back into the program to reduce operational costs. EWEB received proposals from two vendors and Forth's was over \$200,000 less than the competitor. One way that Forth was able to offer this lower cost was by taking into consideration the revenue from the program. When staff calculated the potential revenue from the program using a best-case scenario of utilization for all four sites, the revenue over the 3-year contract term would have been under \$130,000.

## Is there any follow up on if any of the users subsequently purchased or leased an EV?

**RESPONSE:** Not currently, but staff will be working with Forth to survey users to understand this metric better. Please see the response to the next question for additional context of the goals of this effort.

## How will they determine if this effort is cost effective and is getting people into EV's?

**RESPONSE:** Part of the original intent of the program in 2021 was to provide an opportunity for individuals to evaluate an EV and to bring accessibility to populations who could not afford a vehicle-ownership model. EWEB program data is showing that an EV placed at an affordable housing multifamily (AHMF) location has over 1.5 times more utilization than at a public site. This has provided direction to explore the focus of this program being a social equity effort that brings EV to AHMF sites and provides EV accessibility to these populations who otherwise may not be able to afford an EV.

As it is the case in energy efficiency, social equity and limited income programs are not the most cost-effective and their value and success are measured by the accessibility they bring to populations that otherwise would be left behind. Unlike conservation programs, however, transportation electrification efforts are not funded by ratepayers, so cost-effective or traditional return on investment methodologies can be further explored to assist our underserved customers. Over 30% of EV registrations in EWEB service territory come from ZIP Code 97405, where it can be argued that populations with more access to various means are located. For these populations and other sectors that need a different solution to move them to adopt an EV, efforts such as the future expansion and increase of rebates for multifamily charging infrastructure, and test drive events are and will be available. As a social equity program, the EV car share effort, and its metrics on utilization as well as user feedback show it being a successful program. However, surveys that include potential movement to EV adoption will be integrated to determine those additional benefits.

The pilot cost was \$20K/year for 3 vehicles, this contract is \$125k/year for 7 vehicles, correct? Something doesn't add up here, are there additional services being provided, why such a jump in cost? How many

locations will this expansion support? I only see 1 new one mentioned. If the pilot project closed in September of 2023, what has happened with the operation of this project since then?

**RESPONSE:** The original GoForth CarShare pilot had a total projected cost of \$70,965 for three vehicles over two years, each located at a specific site (Iris Place, Santa Clara Station, and Broadway South Parking). However, Forth received grants that reduced the cost by \$30,000, making the final cost to EWEB \$40,965 for all three vehicles.

No additional services are being provided. After the completion of Forth's GoForth CarShare pilot which included several utilities in Oregon and Washington, Forth communicated they had underestimated costs, resulting in a financial loss on the pilot. For the continuation of the GoForth CarShare effort in 2024, Forth reassessed costs based on the actual expenses from the pilot program. Under the new contract, Forth will provide vehicles to the three original sites plus add an additional vehicle at a new site. The total cost for this three-year program including four vehicles is \$357,080. The budget requested is \$375,000 in case of any contingencies and/or changes.

Please also note that EWEB received proposals from two vendors and Forth's was over \$200,000 less than the competitor's. This program is fully funded by Clean Fuel Credits.

The pilot program had different timelines for vehicles based on when they came online. Iris Place and Santa Clara Station terminated at the end of January 2024 and have been without vehicles since then. The Broadway South Parking location will terminate on July 31, 2024.

<u>General Pacific Inc. – for additional funds for the Sale of Discounted Heat Pump Water Heaters (HPWH) to</u> <u>EWEB Customers</u> (MCGAUGHEY/WADE) Please provide a breakdown of Customer Cost, BPA Reimbursement (I think this is \$800), and net cost to EWEB rate payers on a per unit basis.

**RESPONSE:** Year-to-date, the average project cost for a HPWH under the General Pacific (GP) program is \$1,625. The customer receives an instant \$800 rebate which applies to the project cost, leaving an out-of-pocket expense of \$825 on average. BPA reimbursement (funded by EWEB through BPA rates) for a HPHW is \$800 per unit, covering the entire EWEB approved rebate. EWEB does not pay GP any additional fees under this program. Customers also benefit from the additional services (outlined in the "Contracted Goods or Services" section) GP provides, including having the unit delivered to the customer's home and using the EWEB/GP online portal to receive the instant rebate.

# <u>Mazzetti - for Design and Construction Support for the Bertelsen Property Development</u> (KELLEY/MILOVICH) How much was the Pivot contract for Phase 1?

**RESPONSE:** The original contract amount was \$470k. The current contract amount with change orders is \$500k, which includes (scope):

- 1. Conceptual/Strategic design and alternatives analysis. (all phases/phases 1-6)
- 2. Detailed design (phase 1 =100%, phases 2-3 = 60%)
- 3. Construction administration (phase1 only).

*The <u>attached PDF</u> shows the phasing of the Bertelson property development.* 

## When we get only one bid how do we know it's in line with market expectations?

**RESPONSE:** This contract is the result of an RFP process for design services where estimated costs are developed following review of proposals. The group that submitted the proposal includes all of the same consultants that provided services for Phase 1. The difference is that the civil engineer, Mazzetti, is the lead, which is appropriate given the work. The cost proposal for this contact is based on hourly rates for the design professionals and services. Hours to complete the work by discipline are also estimated. The hourly rates for each of the disciplines are in line with what we expected to see. In addition, during the solicitation/QBS process EWEB's Purchasing

Team provides their input based off of the numerous solicitation responses for similar services. Most of the related market expectations are also vetted/available as part of the regularly administered QBS process.

Lastly please confirm that this work is basically for completing the laydown yard, fencing, lighting, etc. and no building design or engineering.

**RESPONSE:** That is correct. There is no building design or related structural engineering.

I see the list of services that would be provided, but don't fully grasp the big picture of what the goal of the work will accomplish, can someone please help me understand what the final project would do? (i.e. Build \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ # of offices, expand parking for \_\_\_\_\_\_# of cars, develop space to allow for \_\_\_\_\_\_ activities) I see "Phase 1 of the project is currently under construction. Phase 2 and 3 of the development will include expanded exterior laydown yard, security fencing, grading, lighting, and completing the connection to Bertelsen Rd." Is this just yard expansion for storage?"

**RESPONSE:** There are 6 phases of development in the master plan for the Bertelsen property. At full buildout, the development will provide significant storage and laydown space, a secondary access to the ROC from Bertelsen Rd., covered and enclosed storage, enclosed and heated vac-truck storage, and a small building identified as a project facilitation hub. This contract is for design and engineering services for Phase 2 and 3. Phase 2 and 3 will be a continuation of the work in Phase 1 providing storage and laydown space along with access to Bertelsen Rd. Phase 1 is currently under construction. Construction of Phases 2 and 3 is identified in the CIP for 2025-2028. There are no buildings or covered storage in the first three phases. The net product from phase 1 construction is ~70k ft<sup>2</sup> of developed yard/laydown storage, with an access road to ROC, and the base stormwater management facilities. Phases 2-3 will increase the developed area out to ~300k ft<sup>2</sup> and include an access road to N. Bertelsen Rd. Timing and need for Phases 4, 5 and 6 will be evaluated as the project progresses.

Please review the <u>attached PDF</u> which shows the phasing as laid out in the project master plan.

<u>Wildish Building Company - for Habitat Installation in the Trail Bridge and Smith Reservoirs</u> (KELLEY/KRENTZ) Didn't we just approve close to \$900,000 for this project last month and if so, why was not this included in that contract? Were these requirements in place when we did the recent \$900k contract?

**RESPONSE:** \$823,000 was approved by the Board in April. A FERC Dam Safety abrasion specification was mandated after the contract was put in place that increase costs by \$38k. The project was delayed from 2023 in order to complete Dam Safety reviews of strength and stability of the structures. Trees that were previously harvested had degraded to the point where supplemental trees are required to ensure the project is built to the design and regulatory specifications.

# With the fire season and logging restrictions how will we complete this work by the end of September, especially if they stop logging operations?

**RESPONSE:** The habitat in Smith Reservoir is nearly complete. The habitat in Trail Bridge is underway and scheduled to be completed by the end of July in order to avoid construction during spawning season. If for any reason the project is significantly delayed or stopped, we will be out of compliance with the license requirement to complete the habitat in Trail Bridge Reservoir in 2024 and would seek an extension of time.

NASPO ValuePoint Cooperative Contracts – for purchase of Cloud Solutions - Software as a Service (SaaS), Infrastructure as a Service (IaaS), and Platform as a Service (PaaS) vs. Intergovernmental Agreement with Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) – for access to G12 Communications (G12) Broadband Phone Services (KNABE) Please help me understand differences between the services being provided from these two contracts. As a lay person it looks as though we are being asked to purchase two phone systems. I just don't quite understand the nuances of the services being provided by each. **RESPONSE:** EWEB owns and maintains a single phone system and will continue doing so going forward. There are two main components to EWEB's phone system being upgraded. The first is the <u>phone system</u> itself (NASPO Value Point Cooperative Contract), and the second is the <u>phone service</u> (Lane Council of Governments Intergovernmental Agreement).

The phone system controls desk phones, incoming/outgoing calls to and from EWEB and our call tree (Contact Center, Dispatch etc.), this component is the Genesys Phone System with equipment located on-site. The phone service (external phone lines) is currently provided by Lumen (formerly CenturyLink).

The phone system upgrade project includes migrating to a Cloud Based Genesys Phone System replacing our onsite phone system. It will be purchased on the NASPO Cloud Solutions Contract. Additionally, we will migrate our phone service from Lumen to G12 Communications, leveraging the Intergovernmental Agreement with Lane Council of Governments (LCOG).

Procurement Process: The NASPO ValuePoint Cooperative Contracts allows EWEB to benefit from favorable pricing and pre-negotiated terms and conditions that have been accepted by the State of Oregon for our Genesys Phone System. LCOG conducted a competitive bidding process and was able to leverage the economies of scale between four member agencies to secure best pricing. G12 Communications was the lowest bidder. LCOG entered into a contract with G12 Communications with the intention of providing lower rates to LCOG members as a result of the purchasing volume.





SHT #: A009 07/13/22





**ROOSEVELT BLVD** 

ENCE AND GATES	AS	PHALT PAVING		•••	
	UNCOVERED STORAGE		UNC	OVERED STORAGE	
	UNCOVERED STORAGE		UNC	OVERED STORAGE	
	UNCOVERED STORAGE		UNC	OVERED STORAGE	
	UNCOVERED STORAGE		UNC	OVERED STORAGE	
	UNCOVERED STORAGE		AGE G ZONE	UNCOVERED STOP	RAGE
SOUT	TH ACCESS ROAD				
		BAXTER DITCH			



SHT #: A009 07/13/22



# PHASE 3 - ASPHALT YARD and storage EWEB BERTELSEN PROPERTY PLANNING **P**RCHITECTURE

RO	OSEVELT BLVD	
ENCE AND G	ATES ATES ASPHALT PAVING	
	UNCOVERED STORAGE	UNCOVERED STORAGE
	UNCOVERED STORAGE UNCOVERED ST	ORAGE UNCOVERED STORAGE





SHT #: A009 07/13/22



POST PHASE 4 - STORAGE BUILDINGS EWEB BERTELSEN PROPERTY PLANNING

SHT #: A010 07/13/22





**PHASE 5 - PROJECT FACILITATION HUB** P RCHITECTURE EWEB BERTELSEN PROPERTY PLANNING

SHT #: A012 07/13/22





POT PHASE 6 - FUTURE EXPANSION EWEB BERTELSEN PROPERTY PLANNING

SHT #: A013 07/13/22