



Home of the Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)

FEASIBILITY STUDY DOWNTOWN INTERSECTION MONUMENT REMOVAL

Proposals due November 20th, 2015 at 3:00 PM (PST)

www.sherwoodoregon.gov/engineering/page/downtown-monuments-rfp



Owner:

City of Sherwood
22560 SW Pine Street
Sherwood, OR 97140
503-925-2309

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. PURPOSE
- II. BACKGROUND
- III. SCOPE OF WORK REQUESTED
- IV. RFP SCHEDULE
- V. GENERAL INFORMATION
- VI. PROPOSAL FORMAT
- VII. EVALUATION CRITERIA
- VIII. SUBMITTAL DUE DATE & TIME
- IX. EVALUATION & AWARD PROCESS
- X. CITY RESOURCES
- XI. SUPPLEMENTAL TERMS & SPECIAL CONDITIONS
- XII. CERTIFICATION STATEMENTS
- XIII. BACKGROUND INFORMATION & REFERENCE MATERIALS
- XIV. APPENDICES
 - A. Sample Professional Services Contract
 - B. Old Town Monument Location & ID Map

I. PURPOSE

The City of Sherwood is seeking proposals from consultants to evaluate and develop options for modifying or removing twelve (12) large concrete corner monuments from three (3) four-way stop controlled intersections in Downtown Sherwood and to produce construction bid documents for the selected treatment. The work may require the services of a professional engineer to analyze the geometry and layout of the intersection, site distance, as well as bicycle and pedestrian usage and safety.

The purpose of this request for proposal (RFP) is to provide prospective consultants with information needed to prepare and submit comprehensive proposals to the City of Sherwood for consideration and final selection. Once a top candidate is identified, the City and consultant will confirm goals and outcomes before negotiating a specific scope-of-work and associated not-to-exceed fee. A general description of the services requested and desired outcome are summarized in this RFP.

Consultant selection shall be made on the basis of qualifications only as outlined in ORS 279C.110 and the procedures set forth in OAR 137-048-0130 and 137-048-0220 (Informal Selection Procedure).

II. BACKGROUND

Issue at Hand

In 2006 several large concrete monuments were installed at various locations and intersections during the Downtown Streetscapes Improvements Project Phase A. The intersection monuments were omitted from the second phase of the project in 2012 due to safety concerns raised when they were installed during the first phase of the project.

The City has received numerous complaints about the large concrete monuments being unsafe because they block lines of site and make it difficult for vehicles to navigate, especially buses and delivery trucks. The City believes the intersection monuments are in a precarious location and something needs to be done to make things safer. In addition to the safety concerns, the City has received comments that the wayfinding plaques are difficult to read, especially at night.

One solution may be to remove the monuments and foundation systems completely, rebuild each intersection corner, and install new light poles or reinstall those existing. Or maybe there is a less impactful approach that reduces costs while still satisfying project goals, for example removing only portions of the monuments above 2 ½' high and using the remaining portions for planter/urban accessory boxes with small junction boxes for the utilities contained within each monument.

About the Project

The feasibility study project will inventory existing conditions, including but not limited to intersection layout, public & franchise utilities around and within the monuments, traffic control & illumination devices at the intersections, as well as the wayfinding signage and display cabinets affixed to the monuments. During this data collection and review period the consultant and City staff will finalize a format and outline for the study.

The consultant will then evaluate intersection safety with consideration for all modes of transportation, develop strategies & options to address community concerns, provide cost estimates for each option, and coordinate with City staff on a recommendation for decision makers that will be included in the study.

City staff and elected officials will use the results of the study to select an option and allocate funds via supplemental budget process next spring. Once funds have been allocated, the consultant will produce stamped construction bid documents, and assist with the bidding process.

The length of this contract shall be determined through contract negotiations, with the understanding that the Feasibility Study must be completed no later than March 1st, 2016 so the work can be completed by June.

III. SCOPE OF WORK REQUESTED

The services requested are:

Task 1: Data Collection & Review

- a. Meet with City staff to discuss concerns and needs, the roles and responsibilities of City staff, confirm the scope of work, expectations and deliverables as they relate to intersection safety and the wayfinding & event display cabinets affixed to the monuments.
- b. Collect and review all background information made available and submit requests in a timely manner for additional information not yet discovered that may or may not be available.
- c. Create simplified plan sheets, figures and tables to summarize existing baseline conditions, for example intersection dimensions & geometry, type of monument and pole foundation if any, if and which utilities are present in and around a monument, total area of wayfinding signage with inventory of text, and total area and number of display cabinets, with consideration that these plan sheets and exhibits may be integrated into the bid documents at some point.

Task 2: Conduct Analyses

- a. Analyze intersection layout, geometry and traffic control devices and identify any technical standards that may be in violation, giving consideration to the various modes of transportation (i.e. vehicles, transit buses, bicycles, and pedestrians).
- b. Analyze the existing conditions and identify any unique situations, behaviors, perceptions, and local preferences or patterns that could support a decision to remove the monuments.
- c. Analyze the effectiveness of the existing wayfinding plaques and note any technical standards that may be in violation, giving consideration to other areas outside of the monument removal study area.
- d. Analyze the location and orientation of the display cabinets affixed to the monuments in hopes of improving exposure to the various modes of transportation if the monuments are removed or modified.

Task 3: Develop Treatment Options and Prepare Cost Estimates

- a. Evaluate and recommend bookend options that address community concerns.
 - i. One bookend could be to partially remove the monuments and keep the bottom 2 ½' and to add minor intersection treatments in place to address concerns raised (least costly).
 - ii. The other bookend could be to remove the monuments and foundations completely and the light poles as well if they cannot be salvaged in place or relocated (most costly).
- b. Develop options for salvaging and relocating the event display cabinets. Based on the information gathered during initial interviews and goals there could be one or multiple treatment options for the display cabinets.
- c. Develop options for replacing the wayfinding plaques with new compliant signs and strategies for integrating those signs with future local or a potential citywide wayfinding project.
- d. Prepare complete cost estimates for the selected options, including all project management and administrative costs necessary to complete the project. This information will be used for a budget supplement.

Task 4: Recommendations and Prepare Feasibility Study

- a. Select a preferred option that will be recommended at the conclusion of the study.
- b. Meet with staff during data collection work to develop and confirm a format for the feasibility study. Summarize results in an outline.
- c. Prepare the feasibility study document and circulate for review comments. Anticipate two rounds of review, one more detailed and another prior to

finalizing the report, and one meeting for each review to discuss comments.

- d. Present findings at one City Council/URA meeting. A second work meeting may be listed as a contingency task for a work session or other formal meeting.
- e. Pending a decision of the City Council/URA Board, prepare a scope of work and associated fees for Task 5.

Task 5: Prepare Plans, Specifications and Engineer's Estimate (pending funds)

The scope of work will be determined at a later date once a specific treatment option is selected.

IV. RFP SCHEDULE

RFP Schedule

RFP released, DJC notices	November 9 th and 12 th , 2015
Last day to submit questions	November 16 th , 2015, 3:00PM (PST)
Proposals due	November 20 th , 2015, 3:00PM (PST)
Evaluation of proposals & selection	November 20 th -December 7 th , 2015
Notice of intent to award	December 8 th , 2015
City Council/URA Resolution to Award	Dec. 15 th , 2015 or Jan. 5 th , 2016
Execute contract & kickoff meeting	January 6 th , 2016

Note: during contract negotiations the selected consultant and City staff will develop preliminary schedule(s) for the tasks and deliverables with the understanding that the study must be completed by March 1st, 2016.

V. GENERAL INFORMATION

Pre-Proposal Meeting

There will be no pre-proposal meeting or conference for this request, although proposers are encouraged to inspect the monuments in person and submit questions via email.

List of Proposers/Planholders List

A list of potential proposers will not be maintained or posted for this project.

RFP Document Review and Background Materials

The RFP may be downloaded from the RFP website listed on the cover page or may be obtained from the City of Sherwood, Engineering Department, Monday through Friday, 8am to 5pm. Project specific reference and background materials will be posted on the RFP website. Note that City staff may find and post information after the RFP is advertised, so the reference materials could be updated up until 72-hours prior to the proposal due date.

RFP Questions

Please direct questions and inquiries regarding this solicitation via email to Jason Waters at watersj@sherwoodoregon.gov. The deadline for formal questions will be November 16th, 2015 at 3:00 (PST).

Addenda and Acknowledgment of Addenda

It is the responsibility of the proposer to regularly check the RFP website for Addenda, if any. The City accepts no responsibility for proposers who fail to check for Addenda and who submit proposals that fail to acknowledge or lack information requested in an Addendum. The City is not responsible for any explanation, clarification, interpretation, or approval made or given in any manner, except by Addenda.

Proposal Withdrawal

Any proposal may be withdrawn at any time before the proposal due date and time, by providing a written request for the withdrawal of the proposal to the issuing office. A duly authorized representative of the firm shall execute the request. Withdrawal of a proposal will not prejudice the right of the proposer to file a new proposal.

Notices

It is the responsibility of the proposer to regularly check the RFP website for all notices associated with this request. The City accepts no responsibility for proposers who fail to check for notices and submit untimely protests.

VI. PROPOSAL FORMAT

In order to provide a degree of consistency in review of the written proposals, firms are requested to prepare their proposals in a format similar to that specified below.

A. Format

1. Title Page/Cover Sheet

Proposer should identify the RFP subject, prime consulting firm name, contact person and the date of submission.

2. Transmittal Letter

Proposals must include a transmittal letter addressed to the City of Sherwood Project Manager and signed by an official of the firm legally authorized to bind the applicant to its proposal. The transmittal letter must include the name, address, and telephone number of the firm submitting the proposal, and the name, title, address, telephone number, fax number and email address of the person, or persons to contact who are authorized to represent the firm and to whom correspondence should be directed. The letter should not be more than one (1) page long.

3. Executive Summary/Statement of Understanding

The proposer may use this section to introduce the proposal and include a detailed statement of understanding of the project. The executive summary should not be more than one (1) page long and can be combined with the transmittal if desired.

4. Consultant Team Qualifications & Experience

This is a relatively small project that could see proposals from a single firm with all or most team members employed by that firm or teams made up of individuals from several different firms, therefore the experience of the individual team members will be evaluated along with the team members' experience working together, not so much the primary firm having completed similar projects. Summarize the individual team members' qualifications and experience working on similar projects and also discuss what experiences the team members have working together. The qualification & experience summary should not be more than (3) pages. Individual resumes can be attached as reference documents, although brevity is encouraged for the proposal document as a whole.

5. Project Approach

Discuss the procedures you would use in investigating the issue(s) at hand and executing the project in a manner that will resolve those issues in the most economically sound manner. Are there any unique opportunities or alternatives not discussed in the RFP that should be considered or mentioned?

B. Additional Reference Documents & Information

Any other information the proposer feels is applicable to the evaluation of the proposal or of their qualification for accomplishing the work should be included in a section titled "Additional Information". Proposers may use this section to address those aspects of the firm or team that distinguish it from others. Additional information is not mandatory.

C. Fee Schedule

DO NOT INCLUDE INFORMATION ON HOURLY RATES, FEE SCHEDULES OR HOURS ANTICIPATED TO COMPLETE THE WORK.

D. References

References are not required with this proposal but may be submitted as additional information. The City reserves the right to request and check references at any time.

E. Certification Statements

All proposals must contain signed certification statements. See section XII of the RFP for the certification statements signature page.

VII. EVALUATION CRITERIA

Overall Impression of the Proposal – 10 points / 100

- Is the executive summary clear, concise and complete?
- Did the proposal follow the general format and instructions outlined in the RFP?
- Was the proposal easy to read and were there grammatical and spelling errors?

Project Team Qualifications & Experience – 30 points / 100

- The project team must be qualified to perform the duties specified in this RFP.
- What is the experience of the individual team members and are all they all qualified to work on the project?
- Does the team have experience working on projects together? Have they all worked together on projects before, and if so, which ones? Or have some of them worked together, but not all?
- Is it easy to figure out what experience the team members have and if the team or portions of the team have worked on projects together or is it still a bit unclear after reviewing the proposal?
- Do the team members have the required licenses and certifications to perform all of the work that may be required? Does the proposal discuss which aspects may require certain licenses and certifications and which aspects might not?

Project Understanding – 25 points / 100

- Is there a good understanding of the issues-at-hand?
- Does the proposal distinguish well between technical standards and local concerns of citizens and elected officials?
- Does it seem like the consultant has a good handle on the existing conditions?

Project Approach – 25 points / 100

- The firm and project team selected will approach this project in a way that satisfies both technical standards and the goals of the City Council/URA Board.
- Does it seem like the consultant's approach will be efficient yet still capable of producing more than one option that satisfies concerns and goals?
- Does the approach discuss any cost saving potential?
- Does the consultant's approach consider transparency in local government?

Unique Insight & Innovative Solutions – 10 points / 100

- Does the proposal contain any unique insight not specifically covered in the RFP or that is currently being overlooked?
- Are any innovative or unique approaches discussed, and if so, do they seem reasonable?

VIII. SUBMITTAL DATE & TIME

Three (3) bound copies and one .pdf file of your proposal must be submitted with the project name "DOWNTOWN INTERSECTION MONUMENT REMOVAL FEASIBILITY STUDY" prominently displayed on the cover.

Proposals must be received at the City of Sherwood City Hall by the 3:00PM (PST) deadline on November 20th, 2015. Faxed or emailed submittals will not be accepted. Mailed proposals must be received by the deadline.

Proposals shall be addressed to:

City of Sherwood
Engineering Department
Attn: Jason Waters
22560 SW Pine Street
Sherwood, OR 97140
(503) 925-2304

IX. EVALUATION AND AWARD PROCESS

Selection and Evaluation Process

A Selection Committee assembled by the City will review the proposals. Proposals will be evaluated by a 3-4 person committee to determine which one(s) best meet the needs of the City. Following the submittal deadline, proposals will be reviewed and evaluated in accordance with the aforementioned Evaluation Criteria.

Process

The Selection Committee will review, score and rank all of the proposals received based on the Evaluation Criteria. The committee may then elect to interview the highest ranked proposers or immediately negotiate a contract with the top ranked proposer. If the City elects to conduct interviews, 10 criteria points will be assigned to the interview process and will be added to the total score from the Evaluation Criteria. If interviewed, the questions will be the same for each proposer interviewed.

Once a selection is made, the City will post a Notice of Intent to award a contract on the RFP website and begin negotiations with the selected consultant. If these negotiations are unsuccessful the City will release the primary consultant and begin negotiations with the next highest ranked proposer or cancel the request altogether.

If negotiations are successful, the City Council (the City's contract review board) will approve the contract via resolution, the Notice of Award will be posted, and the contract executed by both parties, after which a kickoff meeting will be scheduled to commence the work.

Investigation of References

The City reserves the right to investigate references and the past performance of any proposer or team member at any time with respect to its successful performance of similar projects, compliance with specifications and contractual obligations, its completion or delivery of a project on schedule and its lawful payment of employees and workers.

X. CITY RESOURCES

City resources, for example anticipated staff time, equipment and materials will be coordinated with the selected consultant during negotiations when needs, roles and responsibilities are better known.

XI. SUPPLEMENTAL TERMS AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS

1. The City of Sherwood retains the right, in its sole discretion, to negotiate contract terms with qualified consultants and terminate negotiation of the professional services contract and commence negotiations with another qualified respondent to this RFP.
2. The City of Sherwood may cancel this procurement or reject any or all proposals in accordance with ORS 279B.100.
3. All proposals must state whether the bidder is a resident bidder or non-resident bidder as defined by ORS 279A.120. See Certification Statements page located in section XII of this RFP.
4. Proposals may be publically examined at Sherwood City Hall after, but not before, the Notice of Intent to award a contract has been posted on the RFP website.
5. All information submitted by proposers shall be public record and subject to disclosure pursuant to the Oregon Public Records Act (ORS 192.410 et seq.), except such portions of the proposal for which proposer requests exception from disclosure consistent with Oregon Law. Any portion of a proposal that the proposer claims constitutes a "trade secret" or is "confidential" must meet the requirements of ORS 192.501, ORS 192.502 and/or ORS 646.461 et seq. If the entire proposal is marked as a constituting a "trade secret" or being "confidential", at the City's sole discretion, such a proposal may be rejected as non-responsive.
6. A sample Professional Services Contract is attached for reference and review.
7. During negotiations Proposers may propose to the City Attorney contractual terms and conditions that relate to subject matter reasonably identified in the request for proposal.
8. The City reserves the right to reasonably request additional information or clarification of information provided in the responses without changing the terms of the RFP.

9. Proposers shall use recyclable products to the maximum extent economically feasible in the performance of the contract work set forth in this document.
10. Asbestos abatement is not required under this scope of work.
11. The City reserves the right to accept or reject Proposals based on minor technicalities, irregularities, or omissions in a Proposal.
12. Proposers respond to the RFP at their own expense.
13. Solicitation protests shall follow the procedures set forth in OAR 137-047-0730.
14. Contract award protests shall follow the procedures set forth in OAR 137-047-0740.

XII. CERTIFICATION STATEMENTS

Non-Discrimination Clause

The consultant agrees not to discriminate against any client, employee or application for employment or for services, because of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, handicap or age, in accordance with ORS 279A.110(4).

Officer's signature: _____

Type or print officer's name: _____

Type or print firm's name: _____

Resident Certificate

Please check one:

Resident Vendor. Consultant is a resident vendor as defined by ORS 279A.120(1)(b).

Or,

Non-Resident Vendor. Consultant is not-resident vendor and will follow the procedures set forth by ORS 279A.120(3).

Officer's signature: _____

Type or print officer's name: _____

Type or print firm's name: _____

Proposal Terms & Conditions

The consultant certifies that it has thoroughly examined this request for proposal, including all terms and conditions, and that the consultant's proposal to the best of their knowledge satisfies all terms and conditions listed in the RFP.

Officer's signature: _____

Type or print officer's name: _____

Type or print firm's name: _____

**This certification statement page must be signed and submitted with your proposal.*

XIII. BACKGROUND INFORMATION & REFERENCE MATERIALS

Please see the project RFP website for additional background information and exhibits related to the Old Town Monument Removal Feasibility Study

Information likely to be available to prospective proposers:

- Construction plans and details
- Construction RFIs and submittals
- Construction photos
- City fiber optic utility map

XIV. APPENDICES

- A. Sample Professional Services Contract for the City of Sherwood
- B. Monument Location Map (12 monuments w/ identification #1-12)