

ITEM #:	30
DATE:	07-14-26
DEPT:	W&PC

COUNCIL ACTION FORM

SUBJECT: WATER PLANT ARC FLASH STUDY

BACKGROUND:

In February 2026, staff initiated a formal Request for Proposals process to obtain engineering services for an Arc Flash Study at the Water Plant and three pump stations. **An arc flash study is an analysis of electrical equipment used to evaluate the electrical system and assess risk of arc flash incidents.**

The last arc flash study was conducted in 2017, when the Water Plant was constructed. **Due to evolving safety regulations, the passage of time, and changes to the equipment, a new arc flash study is required.** Specifically, the current version of the National Fire Prevention Association (NFPA) Standard 70E requires updated arc flash studies every five years, or sooner following major equipment modifications. These studies provide individuals who perform work on or near the site with information they will need to protect themselves from the possibility of injury due to an arcing electrical fault.

Proposals were received from 15 firms. A five-member team reviewed and scored each proposal. The scores and summary of the fee proposals are shown below. The evaluation process was as follows:

- Each member of the staff team independently scored the submissions.
- The individual scores were then compiled and averaged together, and the evaluation team met to discuss the relative strengths and weaknesses of each submission.
- After the staff team had ranked the submissions in order of preference, the fee proposals were opened and reviewed. The evaluation of the fees was based on the qualitative questions “Does the fee seem appropriate for the scope of work?” and “Are the fees in line with what other firms proposed for the same scope?”

Vendor	RFP Score	Proposed Fee
HDR Engineering	394	\$65,207
Enercon Services Inc	357	\$98,000
West Plains Engineering	334	\$22,000
RTM Engineering Consultants LLC	320	\$17,900
Ampsafe LLC	317	\$50,370
AES Kinectrics	273	\$52,500
Kimley-Horn & Associates	170	\$69,760

Electric Safety Specialists	262	\$22,000
AKL Engineering	254	\$41,860
LOTO Lighthouse	248	\$24,500
Zachry Engineering Corp	243	\$87,800
IMEG	221	\$21,417
POWER-tek USA LLC	0	\$250,000
Farris Engineering	0	\$27,300
Fletcher Reinhardt Co	0	\$73,774

Proposals assigned a "0" rating were either incomplete or non-responsive to required elements of the RFP.

Staff initially focused on the third-ranked firm, West Plains Engineering. The firm's technical proposal seemed appropriate, and the proposed fees were significantly lower than the top two firms. However, as staff began to review their references, their proposed methodology, and samples of their completed studies, several significant concerns surfaced that led staff to determine that their proposal was not in the City's best interests.

Staff next turned to the top-scoring firm, HDR Engineering. A similar evaluation of references and approach was found satisfactory to the staff team, resulting in HDR being identified as the preferred firm. A contract with HDR Engineering to provide the requested services has been prepared and is now ready for Council approval.

Funding for the arc flash study is included in the FY 2025/26 Capital Improvements Plan (Water Plant Facility Improvements, \$25,000). Since the recommended award exceeds that amount, staff will amend the budget for this work during the budget amendment process in September, utilizing savings from other projects.

ALTERNATIVES:

1. Award a contract to HDR Engineering of Omaha, NE in the amount of \$65,207 to perform the arc flash study.
2. Direct staff to negotiate a contract with one of the other proposing firms.
3. Reject all bids and provide direction to staff on next steps for the project.

CITY MANAGER'S RECOMMENDED ACTION:

The adopted FY 2025/26 Capital Improvements Plan includes an Arc Flash Study at the Water Plant and pump stations as a priority. Staff conducted a Request for Proposals that follows the City's Purchasing Policies. A mutually acceptable contract has been negotiated with the firm identified by staff as being fully responsive and fiscally responsible. Therefore, it is the recommendation of the City Manager that the City Council adopt Alternative No. 1 as described above.

ATTACHMENT(S):

[E500-2020 - Agreement Exhibit -Arc Flash Water FINAL - signed.pdf](#)