



**Date:** February 15, 2013  
**From:** Bart Stepp, PE, Public Works Director  
**To:** All Proposers and Technical Advisory Committee  
**Attention:** Addendum #2 for the Scott Avenue Reconnection Project RFP

*Item 1: Attached with this addendum is the latest list of consultants that have requested to be on the consultant list.*

*Item 2: Below are answers to questions about the RFP that have come up this week:*

1) Q: Page 3: 1.3 General Description - 13) Refers to a Project Advisory Group. Is this an existing body, or would the city expect that this group be identified, formed, and facilitated as part of the public involvement task?

A: The Project Advisory Group will be a group of stakeholders consisting of business owners and residents. This group has not been formed yet but the City will assist the selected consultant in identifying interested stakeholders for this group.

2) Q: Page 10: 2.2.1 Proposal Contents  
In the list of what shall be included in the proposal, the "Request for Proposal" and the "Addenda to RFP" are listed. By this do you mean the inclusion of Form A acknowledging receipt of any Addenda?

A: Yes. The RFP and Addenda do not need to be included in the proposal, just acknowledgement that you had received the information.

3) Q: Page 11: 2.2.2 Proposal Organization  
Section 2 Management Team. We would like some clarification as to the definition of the "Management Team". Based on 2.2 Proposal Contents, should we conclude that Section 2 would include the Table of Contents, the organizational chart, and the information about the firms on the team and the firm experience. Is there something else that should be included that is specific to the "Management Team"?

A: To clarify the discrepancies between 2.2.1 and Table 1 please format the proposal in the following manner:

Section 1 will include a letter of transmittal and the table of contents.

Section 2 will include the names of individuals and firms who are proposed to work on this project and their area of responsibility.

Section 3 will outline the specific experience of individuals relative to the project.

Section 4 will include items 7 through 12 in section 2.2.1.

- 4) Q: Page 11: 2.2.2 Proposal Organization Referencing Page 18: 3.6.1 Qualifications Categories in the table under Section 2,3 and 4, it states, "Address each of the six Qualifications Categories as described in Section 3.6.1".

Should we assume this means" those qualification categories applicable to each section". In other words, "Key Personnel Qualifications" would pertain to Section 2 and also to the attached resumes, "Relative Firm Experience" would pertain to Section 1, "Management Team", if our understanding of Management Team is correct per question 2 above, and the last five items on the list would pertain to Section 4, "Project Development".

If this is not correct and all six qualification categories pertain to every section, please give us some guidance as to what information you are requesting per each section.

A: You are correct in your interpretation. Key Personnel Qualifications would pertain to Section 2 and the resumes, Relative Firm Experience would pertain to Section 1, and the last five item pertain to Section 4. Also, Table 1 in Section 2.2.2 states there are six qualification categories but that is incorrect. Table 3 in Section 3.6.1 has seven qualification categories that must be addressed.

- 5) Q: Page 12: 2.2.3 RFP Submittal Quantities  
Can you please confirm that the 6 additional copies can be bound and only the original proposal should be unbound. The text following the initial bullet points is unclear.

A: The original proposal should be unbound but all six copies should be bound. The text that says, "each copy of the Proposal shall be unbound..." is incorrect.

- 6) Q: Section 2.2.1 lists "specific experience of individuals relative to the project" (Item 4), and Section 2.2.2 lists "Resumes..." In Appendix C. Are these different? Similarly, Section 2 (Management Team) and Section 3 (Key Personnel) under Section 2.2.2 ask for qualifications per Section 3.6.1. Can you clarify if resumes belong in Section 2, Section 3, Appendix C, or all of these?

A: Resumes belong in Appendix C. Sections 2 and 3 are to identify personnel working on the project and a brief explanation on their proposed roles and specific experience on similar projects.

- 7) Q: Page 14: Section 2.4, 9) references a "Users Group". Is this the same as the Project Advisory Group on Page 1?

A: Yes

8) Q: Referencing Section 3.6.1, Table 3 –Qualifications Categories, Scoring Elements 2 through 7, will these items be scored by team experience in these categories, scored by understanding and approach to these areas, or both?

A: Scoring element 2, Relative Firm Experience, will be scored by team experience presented in the proposal. Scoring of elements 3 – 7, Highway Design through Value Engineering, will be based on the approach in the proposal and not team experience. In other words, the Scoring Elements 3 – 7 will be based on the Proposer’s response to items 7 – 12 in Section 2.2.1.

*Item 3: On February 15<sup>th</sup> at 10 AM I met with Victor Saleman, Manual Feliberti, and Maggie Buckley from David Evans and Associates about the project. The questions asked at that meeting were:*

1) Q: Is there interest in providing other deliverables through this project like transportation modeling for our comp plan update?

A: The focus of this proposal should be on just this project. Because of the impact a third crossing will have on the City’s overall transportation system the modeling needed will probably be useful to the City for other projects but the City is only looking for deliverables related to this project.

2) Q: Is an IJR expected to be completed under all scenarios?

A: No. The City expects that the transportation alternatives analysis and selection of a preferred alternative or alternatives be completed first. Based on the outcome of that analysis, an IJR may or may not be needed. The alternatives selection will also help determine what environmental documentation is needed to complete the NEPA/SEPA process.

3) Q: The last comprehensive plan update was done in 2005. Will the consultant be using the traffic projections in the comprehensive plan to complete the traffic analysis?

A: No. The School District recently completed a Traffic Impact Analysis for their new high school which conducted traffic counts at various locations throughout the City. They found that traffic in 2012 was the same or slightly less than the existing traffic in the 208 Traffic Infrastructure Strategic Plan. The consultant will be able to use the existing model from the CWCOG and the traffic counts from the high school TIA but it is expected they will also need to conduct additional traffic counts to complete their analysis.

4) Q: Who will be the CA Authority for the project?

A: The City of Woodland has entered into a Letter of Understanding for Project Administration with WSDOT Highways and Local Programs to allow the City of Woodland to operate under an extension of Local Programs Certification Acceptance (CA) Authority.

Ken Hash, SW Region Local Programs Engineer, is the designated CA manager for the Washington State Department of Transportation.

5) Q: How often do you see the Project Advisory Group meeting as part of this project?

A: This group will meet as needed to review design alternatives and other deliverables for this project. They might meet every other month or quarterly depending on the need to keep them adequately informed and enable them to provide timely feedback. The public outreach component will also include open houses or other public events as needed to engage residents and businesses not on this group.

6) Q: Does the City have a GIS system consultants can use?

A: The City does have a GIS system the consultant can use. The City currently uses ArcMap Version 10. Information available includes parcel lines, property information, zoning maps, water and sewer system information, critical area maps, and other information.

7) Q: How involved will the City's Community Development Planner be with the project?

A: The City's Community Development Planner will be part of the Technical Advisory Committee that will review the proposals and meet regularly to review consultant work. The Community Development Planner is not expected to be involved in the project on a day to day basis.

8) Q: How much time do you expect to spend on this project?

A: This project is a very high priority for the City and I will spend whatever time is necessary to complete the project. I also have an Engineering Technician and Engineering Aide that will provide support for this project. To reduce my workload to the extent possible, however, the consultant is expected to provide a strong level of overall project management.

*Item 4: Attached is a revised section 2 of the RFP with some language clarifications in response to the above questions that highlights the changes.*

If you have any questions please call Bart Stepp at Woodland Public Works at (360) 225 -7999.

Sincerely,



Bart Stepp, PE  
City of Woodland  
Public Works Director

Scott Avenue Reconnection Project RFP Consultant List

Business Name	Address 1	Address 2	City	State	Zip	Primary Contact	Primary Phone	Bidding Email(s)	Bidding Fax
AECOM Technical Services, Inc.	710 Second Avenue	Suite 1000	Seattle	WA	98104	Rex Meyer, PE	206-267-7703	<a href="mailto:rex.meyer@aecom.com">rex.meyer@aecom.com</a>	206-623-3793
BergerABAM Inc.	1111 Main Street	Suite 300	Vancouver	WA	98660	Helen Devery	360-823-6114	<a href="mailto:helen.devery@abam.com">helen.devery@abam.com</a>	360-823-6101
						Sam Adams, PE	360-823-6126	<a href="mailto:sam.adams@abam.com">sam.adams@abam.com</a>	
David Evans and Associates, Inc.	1115 W. Bay Drive Northwest	Suite 301	Olympia	WA	98502	Jeff Parker, PE	360-705-2185	<a href="mailto:jalp@deainc.com">jalp@deainc.com</a>	360-705-2187
	415 - 118th Avenue SE		Bellevue	WA	98005	Victor Salemann, PE	425-519-6500	<a href="mailto:vle@deainc.com">vle@deainc.com</a>	425-519-5361
DKS & Associates, Inc.	720 SW Washington	Suite 500	Portland	OR	97205	Deb Ames	503-243-3500	<a href="mailto:dma@dksassociates.com">dma@dksassociates.com</a>	
Ecological Land Services, Inc.	1157 3rd Avenue	Suite 220	Longview	WA	98632	Timothy Haderly	360-578-1371	<a href="mailto:Timh@eco-land.com">Timh@eco-land.com</a>	360-414-9305
Fehr and Peers	1001 4th Avenue	Suite 4120	Seattle	WA	98154	Dan Grayuski	206-576-4220	<a href="mailto:D.Grayuski@fehrandpeers.com">D.Grayuski@fehrandpeers.com</a>	
Gibbs & Olson, Inc.	P.O. Box 400		Longview	WA	98632	Rich Gushman	360-425-0991	<a href="mailto:rgushman@gibbs-olson.com">rgushman@gibbs-olson.com</a>	360-423-3162
GeoDesign, Inc.	15575 SW Sequoia Parkway	Suite 100	Portland	OR	97224	Nikki Johnson	503-726-3173	<a href="mailto:njohnson@geodesigninc.com">njohnson@geodesigninc.com</a>	
Gray and Osborne, Inc.	701 Dexter Avenue North	Suite 200	Seattle	WA	98109	Tamara Nack, PE	206-284-0860	<a href="mailto:tnack@g-o.com">tnack@g-o.com</a>	206-283-3206
Group Mackenzie, Inc.	601 Main Street	Suite 101	Vancouver	WA	98660	Brent Ahrend, PE	360-695-7879	<a href="mailto:Bahrend@grpmack.com">Bahrend@grpmack.com</a>	360-693-6637
Harper Houf Peterson Righellis Inc.	1104 Main Street	Suite 100	Vancouver	WA	98660	Rob VanderZanden, PE	360-750-1131	<a href="mailto:robv@hhpr.com">robv@hhpr.com</a>	360-750-1141
Hatch Mott McDonald	400 SW Sixth Avenue	Suite 914	Portland	OR	97204	Irene Wang, S.E., P.E.	503-243-5001	<a href="mailto:irene.wang@hatchmott.com">irene.wang@hatchmott.com</a>	503-243-5021
HDJ Design Group PLLC	300 W. 15th Street		Vancouver	WA	98660	Greg Jellison, PE	360-695-3488	<a href="mailto:jellison@hdjdesigngroup.com">jellison@hdjdesigngroup.com</a>	360-695-8767
HDR Engineering, Inc.	500 108th Ave NE	Suite 1200	Bellevue	WA	98004	Greer Ulstein	425-450-6224	<a href="mailto:Greer.Ulstein@hdrinc.com">Greer.Ulstein@hdrinc.com</a>	425-453-7107
ICFI, Inc.						Martin Minkoff		<a href="mailto:martin.minkoff@icfi.com">martin.minkoff@icfi.com</a>	
Kittelson & Associates, Inc.	610 SW Alder Street	Suite 700	Portland	OR	97205	Anthony Yi, PE	503-228-5230	<a href="mailto:ayi@kittelson.com">ayi@kittelson.com</a>	503-273-8169
Mackay & Sposito	1325 SE Tech Center Drive	Suite 140	Vancouver	WA	98683	Armine Kalan	360-823-1336	<a href="mailto:akalan@mackaysposito.com">akalan@mackaysposito.com</a>	
Mead & Hunt, Inc.	9600 NE Cascades Parkway	Suite 100	Portland	OR	97220	Kay Van Sickle	503-548-1494	<a href="mailto:kay.vansickel@meadhunt.com">kay.vansickel@meadhunt.com</a>	
Normandeau Associates, Inc.	1010 Washington Street	Suite 260	Vancouver	WA	98660	Bonnie Caouette	360-694-2300	<a href="mailto:bcaouette@normandeau.com">bcaouette@normandeau.com</a>	360-694-2311
						Dena Horton	360-836-1410	<a href="mailto:dhorton@normandeau.com">dhorton@normandeau.com</a>	
						Kent Snyder	360-694-2300	<a href="mailto:ksnyder@normandeau.com">ksnyder@normandeau.com</a>	
						Karen Ciocia	360-601-5360	<a href="mailto:kciocia@normandeau.com">kciocia@normandeau.com</a>	
OBEC Consulting Engineers	1111 Main Street	Suite 401	Vancouver	WA	98660	Timothy Shell, PE	360-314-2391	<a href="mailto:tshell@obec.com">tshell@obec.com</a>	360-433-9705
Otak, Inc.	700 Washington Street,	Suite 401	Vancouver	WA	98660	Richard Darland, PE	360-737-9613	<a href="mailto:rich.darland@otak.com">rich.darland@otak.com</a>	360-737-9651
Parametrix	700 NE Multnomah	Suite 1000	Portland	OR	97232	Lindsay Yamane, PE	503-233-2400	<a href="mailto:lyamane@parametrix.com">lyamane@parametrix.com</a>	503-233-4825
Red Plains Professional, Inc.	1499 SE Tech Center	Suite 290	Vancouver	WA	98683	John Younger, PE	360-448-7999	<a href="mailto:John.Younger@red-plains.com">John.Younger@red-plains.com</a>	360-258-0274
SCJ Alliance			Vancouver	WA		Anne Sylvester, PTE	720-648-0352	<a href="mailto:annes@scjalliance.com">annes@scjalliance.com</a>	360-352-1509
						Scott Sawyer, PE	303-482-3181	<a href="mailto:scotts@scjalliance.com">scotts@scjalliance.com</a>	
Shen Consulting, Inc.	715 S Lane St.	Suite C	Seattle	WA	98104	Glen Chouinard, PE	206-623-0273	<a href="mailto:glenn@shenconsultinginc.com">glenn@shenconsultinginc.com</a>	206-623-0415
Skillings Connolly, Inc.	5016 Lacey Boulevard S.E.		Lacey	WA	98503	Gary C. Richardson, PE	360-491-3399	<a href="mailto:grichardson@skillings.com">grichardson@skillings.com</a>	360-491-3857
Tapani, Inc.						Ross Sarkinen		<a href="mailto:RossS@Tapani.com">RossS@Tapani.com</a>	
URS Corporation	111 SW Columbia	Suite 1500	Portland	OR	97201	Claude Sakr, PE	503-222-7200	<a href="mailto:claudio.sakr@urs.com">claudio.sakr@urs.com</a>	503-222-4292
Wallis Engineering	215 W. 4th Street	Suite 200	Vancouver	WA	98660	Robert Wallis	360-695-7041	<a href="mailto:gwallis@walliseng.net">gwallis@walliseng.net</a>	360-694-1043

## **2.0 REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**

This section describes requirements that all Proposers must satisfy in submitting Proposals. Failure of any Proposer to follow these requirements may result in rejection of its Proposal.

### **2.1 GENERAL SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS**

The City will not accept Proposals by facsimile or electronic transmission. Any Proposal that fails to meet the deadline or delivery requirement will be rejected and returned to the Proposer without having been opened, considered or evaluated.

#### **2.1.1 Proposal Due Date, Time and Location**

The completed sealed Proposal shall be delivered to the following location prior to 4:00 p.m. Pacific Time, no later than the Proposal Due Date as set forth in Section 3.1.1. Final Proposal submissions in connection with this RFP are to be addressed as follows:

City of Woodland  
Attn: Bart Stepp, PE  
Public Works Director  
PO Box 9; 230 Davidson Ave.  
Woodland, WA 98674

All correspondence shall be clearly labeled on the sealed container in the lower left hand corner:

#### **Scott Avenue Reconnection Project**

##### **“To be Opened by the City Authorized Representative Only”**

**Via Courier or Hand-Delivered:** Proposals delivered in person will be received **only** at the City front desk at the address noted above and no later than the Proposal Due Date as set forth in Section 3.1.1. You will need to identify yourself as a “Scott Avenue Reconnection Project Proposer” to have your delivery stamped in.

#### **2.1.2 Signatures Required**

The Proposal Letter (Form A) shall be signed in blue ink by all parties making up the Proposer and shall be accompanied by evidence of signatory authorization as specified in Form A.

#### **2.1.3 Consequences of Failure to Follow Requirements**

Failure to use a sealed package or to properly identify the Proposal may result in an inadvertent early opening of the Proposal and may result in disqualification of the Proposer. Proposer shall be entirely responsible for any consequences, including disqualification of the Proposal, if the City determines that Proposer did not follow the foregoing instructions. It is Proposer’s sole responsibility to see that its Proposal is received as required. Proposals received after the date or

time due will be rejected and returned to the Proposer without having been opened, considered or evaluated.

#### **2.1.4 Requirement to Submit a Compliant Proposal**

If the Proposal does not fully comply with the instructions and rules contained in this RFP, including the exhibits, it may be disqualified.

Each Proposal must be submitted in the official format, which is specified by the City in this RFP. Proposer shall sign the original copy of the Proposal submitted to the City. Multiple or alternate proposals may not be submitted.

Proposals may be considered non-compliant and may be rejected for any of the following reasons:

- 1) If the Proposal is submitted in form other than that specified by the City; if it is not properly signed; if any part of the Proposal is missing from the Proposal package and/or if it otherwise does not meet the Proposal submittal requirements;
- 2) If the City determines that the Proposal contains irregularities that make the Proposal incomplete, indefinite or ambiguous as to its meaning, including illegible text, omissions, erasures, alterations or items not called for in this RFP, or unauthorized additions;
- 3) If multiple or alternate Proposals are submitted or if the Proposal includes any conditions or provisions reserving the right to accept or reject an award or to enter into a Contract following award; and
- 4) Any other reason the City determines the Proposal to be non-compliant.

## **2.2 PROPOSAL RESPONSE, FORMAT REQUIREMENTS AND DELIVERY**

### **2.2.1 Proposal Contents**

A proposal response document shall be submitted and shall include the following:

- 1) A Letter of Transmittal containing a statement addressing the required validity period (see Section 2.3) and a statement that the proposer has received, read and understands this Request for Proposals. See Form A;
- 2) Table of Contents;
- 3) The names of individuals and the names of their firms, who will be working on the Project and their area(s) of responsibility;
- 4) The specific experience of individuals relative to the Project;

~~5) Request for Proposal;~~

~~6) Addenda to RFP (if applicable);~~

~~7)~~ A written response addressing the items listed in Section 1.2, 2.4 and 3.6.2, noting a proposed outline of tasks, products, Project schedule and percentage of involvement of team

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

members required to complete each task or product;

- 8)6) A narrative or outline of the NEPA/SEPA process and experience in completing this task;
- 9)7) A narrative or outline of the IJR process and experience in completing the task;
- 10)8) A narrative of the Proposer’s experience conducting and participating in VE studies;
- 11)9) A narrative on the Proposer’s public and agency (including working with WSDOT and FHWA) involvement strategy; and
- 12)10) A minimum of five (5) relevant client references, stating the name and phone number of the individual to be contacted for each reference. References should include a written description of the work performed and the year. Only recently completed projects will be considered. Do not include projects completed prior to 2005.

The City shall not be liable for any expense incurred in the preparation of responses. All responses and submissions by the Proposer will become City property and will not be returned.

### 2.2.2 Proposal Organization

The Proposer shall organize the Proposal using the following section headings, order of documents, and maximum number of pages:

**Table 1 – Proposal Organization**

Section	Section Title and Required Information	Maximum Pages
1	Letter of Interest <u>and Table of Contents</u>	
	Letter of Interest <u>and Table of Contents</u>	As required
2	Management Team	
	<del>Address each of the six Qualifications Categories as described in Section 3.6. Identify the proposed management team for the project and their responsibilities.</del>	As required
3	Key Personnel	
	<del>Address each of the six qualification categories as described in Section 3.6. Identify key personnel for this project and specific work experience they have that relates to this project.</del>	As required
4	Project Development	
	Address the requirements of Sections 1.3 and 2.4 and <del>each of the six</del> Qualifications Categories <u>3 – 7</u> as described in Section 3.6.1.	As required
	<b>Total maximum number of pages</b>	<b>30</b>
Appendix A	Form A, Acknowledgment of Receipt of Addenda	1
Appendix B	Legal Information	

Formatted Table

Formatted Table

Formatted Table

	Legal structure and supporting documents. If a joint-venture include statement of joint and severable liability. Also include Conflict of Interest Information forms B, C, and D.	As required
Appendix C	Resumes and Project Reference Information	As required

### 2.2.3 RFP Submittal Quantities

Each Proposer must provide the City with the following:

- 1) **One original unbound Proposal** bearing original signatures;
- 2) **One electronic copy of the Proposal in PDF (Adobe Acrobat version 8 or higher) format, on a jump drive**, with the sections and subsections bookmarked; and
- 3) **Six bound hard copies** of the Proposal.

Each Proposal shall be labeled to indicate its contents. The original Proposal shall be clearly identified as “original” on its front cover in colored ink; each copy of the Proposal shall be ~~un~~bound and identified on its front cover, in the upper right-hand corner, shall be sequentially numbered, labeled and bound as “Copy X of 6 Copies.”

- The unbound original, the bound copies, and the CD or jump drive shall be packed together in one sealed package for delivery to the City. The outside of the sealed package shall be clearly identified, labeled and addressed as identified in Section 2.1.1.

Failure to comply with these requirements may result in rejection of the proposal.

### 2.2.4 Format

The Proposal shall contain concise written material that enables a clear understanding and evaluation of both the capabilities of Proposer and the benefits of the Proposal. Legibility, clarity and completeness of the Proposal are essential. The Proposal evaluation process will focus on the body of the Proposal and any required appendices and exhibits.

- **Language:** All information shall be in the English language using English units and measurements in accordance with WSDOT standards.
- **Type Font:** All narrative text shall be in a regular style font at a minimum of 12 points in size (except that tables, figures and schedules may use a 10–point font) and single–spaced. Pages may be printed double–sided. The type style and size of headings and figures are not prescribed.
- **Page Size: All information**, except for charts, exhibits and other illustrative and graphical information, shall be printed on 8.5–inch x 11–inch paper. Charts, exhibits and other illustrative and graphical information may be on 11–inch x 17– inch paper, but shall be folded to 8.5–inch x 11–inch and will be counted as one sheet.
- **Page Margins:** No text, tables, figures or other substantive content shall be printed within 0.5 inch of any page edge.

- **Page Limit:** Page limits are described in Section 2.2.2 of this RFP. The submittal shall only include information required by this RFP. No other information will be considered in the evaluation of the Proposals.
- **Dividers:** Section dividers shall contain the section number and/or section title. Each section, including appendices, exhibits and forms, must be separately and clearly tabbed. No other text is permitted on the dividers. The dividers will not be counted toward the allowable page total.
- **Binding:** Each copy of the Proposal shall be bound separately with all pages in a binder sequentially numbered. The original Proposal shall be unbound with all pages sequentially numbered.
- **Front Cover:** The front cover of each Proposal shall be labeled with the Proposer's name, address and phone number, along with the following language: "Request for Proposal, Scott Avenue Reconnection Project, [date of submittal]" and RFP due date.

### 2.3 VALIDITY PERIOD

The Proposal shall be considered as a current and valid offer to undertake the work, subject to successful negotiation of a contract, for a period of at least ninety (90) days and shall contain a statement to that effect.

### 2.4 UNDERSTANDING OF PROJECT BY PROPOSER

The Proposer shall provide a narrative demonstrating the Proposer's understanding of the Project and the Proposer's role.

The Proposal shall address how the Proposer will complete the following possible tasks:

- 1) Working with the Project stakeholder groups to identify and determine future system demands;
- 2) Developing detailed Project purpose and need statement;
- 3) Developing the Project scope;
- 4) Providing street and highway analysis to support:
  - a) The City's modeling and system analysis of the study area for current, opening year, and the 2035 Project design horizon;
  - b) The Project environmental documentation requirements;
  - c) current traffic counts (am and pm peak) at important intersections in Woodland that would be affected by the project (if not available through the City of Woodland);
  - d) Highway intersection traffic analysis for current, opening year, and 2035 design horizon conditions;
- 5) Developing modifications to the existing street and highway systems that will support the Project goals and the 2035 Project design horizon needs of: improving efficiency, safety, mobility, capacity and providing congestion relief;

- 6) Conducting a Value Engineering (VE) study for the proposed modifications in accordance with 23 CFR 627, FHWA's Value Engineering Policy, the WSDOT Design and Local Agency Guidelines (LAG) manuals;
- 7) Developing NEPA/SEPA documentation, their associated discipline reports, and ultimately obtaining final NEPA/SEPA approval;
- 8) Designing engineering options for the Scott Avenue Reconnection to the level of sufficient detail to support the environmental process selection of the preferred engineering options to obtain final NEPA/SEPA documentation approval;
- 9) Coordinating quarterly updates for the Project Executive Committee, the Technical Advisory Committee, the ~~Users~~ Project Advisory Group and WSDOT;
- 10) Conducting public involvement during the life of the Project; and
- 11) Developing the Project completion timeline.

The Project Manager for the Proposer will be responsible for ensuring that the appropriate Proposer staff and resources are utilized to provide expertise in completing the Project in accordance with the project timeline.

## **2.5 QUALIFICATIONS OF PROPOSER**

The Proposer shall describe the depth of its team's relevant experience and skills, relating that experience to the Proposer's understanding of the Project. The Proposer shall emphasize the direct and related experience of its team's project personnel to the Project.

The Proposal shall include a description of the project team, including the project manager, and an organizational chart showing responsibilities and decision-making authority. Project team members are to be identified by name, job title, fields of expertise, specific responsibilities on the project, as well as estimated percentage of participation in the project. The project manager named in the proposal and present during evaluation interviews shall remain the same, unless a change is approved according to Section 1.10, throughout the length of the Project. Resumes for key Project personnel are to be included.

## **2.6 AVAILABILITY**

A statement of work team availability shall be included that shows how the Proposer intends to schedule work so this project is accomplished on time. Refer to Section 1.7 regarding possible conflict of interest.