







WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Bridge Design Office Staff Augmentation - Project Management Services // Packet B

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS

KPFF CONSULTING ENGINEERS // 08.07.2023



AUGUST 7, 2023

Dear Members of the Selection Committee,

WSDOT CSOSubmittals@wsdot.wa.gov

SUBJECT Bridge Design Office Staff Augmentation - Project Management Servies

> OUR ADDRESS 1601 Fifth Avenue Suite 1600 Seattle, WA 98101 206.622.5822 (p)

We are pleased to present KPFF Consulting Engineers' (KPFF) proposal for WSDOT Bridge Design Office Staff Augmentation- Project Management Services work. KPFF has partnered with WSP and DBE firm TranTech to provide seamless staff augmentation. KPFF and our partners bring a wealth of bridge design, project management, and on-call type staff augmentation experience. The project managers and structural engineers have over 100 years of combined experience managing, designing, strengthening, inspecting bridges in Washington state. Benefits this team of professionals bring to this project include:

- Depth and Breadth of WSDOT Design Experience: The KPFF/WSP/ TranTech team has supported WSDOT on a myriad of projects and has a track record of delivering complicated designs on-time and under budget. This substantial base of technical knowledge will be utilized during the reviews of Design Consultant deliverables to provide constructive comments that improve the PSE documents. Our knowledge of WSDOT specific policies and preferences will provide project management services as if the projects were managed by WSDOT internally.
- Proactive Project Management: Our project managers and structural engineers understand the positive impact an attentive and involved project manager can have on a project. They facilitate coordination between disciplines to ensure team members have the information they need to accomplish their tasks without delay. When design or construction issues arise, they initiate and guide discussions to identify and implement the best solution for the project. Finally, by diligently tracking project progress and expenditures, they can identify, communicate, and address impacts to the project schedule and cost in a timely manner.

Our team is committed to providing WSDOT with responsive and high-quality service throughout the life of this contract. The team understands the importance of WSDOT's goals for this contract: maintaining project schedules, ensuring funds are spent responsibly, and achieving high quality deliverables. Our team of professionals has the tools and experience to meet those goals.

Our project managers and structural engineers look forward to the opportunity to discuss this project in further detail. Please contact me directly at the phone number or email below if you have questions or need additional information. Thank you for the opportunity to submit our qualifications for this project.

Sincerely,

Rachel Liberty, PE, Se Project Manager D 206.926.0451

rachel.liberty@kpff.com

Greg Hess, PE, SE Principal-in-Charge D 206.926.0512

greg.hess@kpff.com

W. My Man.



Consultant Information/Contractor Certification

Prime and Sub-Consultants

Consultant Information Form

Firm Name:				F	YE Date:		Number of Employees:	
KPFF, Inc.				April 30th			442 (WA)	
Address:								
1601 Fifth Avenue	e, S	uite 1600						
City:	State:		Zip Code:			County		
Seattle	WA	1	98101			Kin	g	
Phone:		Fax:			npany Web Site:			
206.622.5822		N/A		W۷	vw.kpff.c	om		
Remit to Address:								
1601 Fifth Avenue	e, S	uite 1600						
City:	State:		Zip Code:			County		
Seattle	WA	\	98101			Kin	g	
Phone:			Fax:					
206.622.5822			N/A					
Statewide Vendor Number (SWV) for	Remit t	o Address:	Federal Tax I	D Nur	nber or Social Secu	rity Nun	nber:	
SWV0088974-00			91-075					
Unified Business Identifier Number (U	JBI):		Date Universa	al Nun	nbering System (DI	JNS) Nu	ımber:	
578-063-612			04277	729	9			
Year Firm Established:		UDBE/SBE/MSVWBE Certifi	cation Number	::	NAICS Code &			
1960		N/A			541330	Eng	g. Services	
Proposed Project Manager:			Email:					
Rachel Liberty, Pl	Ξ		rachel.liberty@kpff.com					
Financial Contact:			Email:	∃mail:				
Ron Raphael ro			ron.raphael@kpff.com					
Firm Type:								
☐ Sole Proprietor ☐ Partners	ship [■ C – Corp.	nership 🔲 Su	ıbchap	oter S Corp.	imited L	iability Company	
Annual Gross Receipt:								
☐ \$0 to \$1 Million ☐ \$1 Mil	lion to S	\$5 Million	10 Million] \$10 [Million to \$15 Mill	ion 🔳	Over \$15 Million	
Note:								
Firm Name: Please <u>do not</u> use: dba's		-						
formation of a legally registered new of	ompany	such as a joint venture; derivati	ves of your lega	al nam	e; acronyms; etc.	The firm	name shown must be your	

firm's legal name.

Federal Tax ID Number: Your Federal Tax ID number must be that number registered to your legal firm name. If you do not have a Federal Tax ID number, please use your social security number.

Unified Business Identifier (UBI) Number: Your firm will be REQUIRED to acquire a UBI Number prior to execution of an agreement and/or being approved as a Sub-consultant to an existing agreement. This is a Washington State Business license and can be acquired by contacting the Washington State Department of Revenue web site at www.dor.wa.gov.

Statewide Vendor (SWV) Number: The Statewide Vendor (SWV) Number is REQUIRED for vendors to receive payments. If your firm doesn't already have an SWV number, your firm will be required to acquire a SWV number prior to execution of an agreement. Please contact WSDOT TRAINS Help Desk at 360-705-7514 for assistance.

FYE Date: Your firm's fiscal year end date.

UDBE/SBE/MSVWBE Certification: If your firm is certified as a UDBE/SBE/MSVWBE enter your firm's certification number. Federal Certifications: Underutilized Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (UDBE), Small Business Enterprise (SBE). State Certifications: Minority, Small, Veteran, Women Business Enterprise. For additional information go to the Washington State Office of Minority & Women's Business Enterprises web site at www.omwbe.wa.gov.

It is critical that your firm name is your legal firm name and that it is the same name assigned to your Federal Tax ID number and is the same name utilized for your SWV number.

Consultant Information Form

WSP USA Inc.			FY	E Date:	Number of Employees: 66,200
33301 9th Ave S Suite 300					
Fedreal Way W	A	Zip Code: 9800			ing
Phone: 206-431-2300	N/A		1 ^	oany Web Site:	vsp.com/en-us/
PO Box 732476					
Dallas T	<	7537	3		allas
206-382-5200		N/A			
SWV0027322-0		Federal Tax I		ber or Social Security N 569	Number:
Unified Business Identifier Number (UBI): 600-275-529				pering System (DUNS) -8700	Number:
Year Firm Established: 1933	UDBE/SBE/MSVWBE Certif	ication Number	::	NAICS Code & Code 541330 (Genera	Name: al Engineering Services)
Proposed Project Manager: Greg Banks		greg.	ba	nks@w	sp.com
Financial Contact: Cheryl Mareno		chery	/l.r	nareno@	wsp.com
Firm Type: Sole Proprietor Partnership C - Corp. Limited Partnership Subchapter S Corp. Limited Liability Company Annual Gross Receipt: \$\int\\$0 to \$1 Million \$\int\\$1 Million to \$5 Million \$\int\\$5 Million \$\int\\$5 Million to \$10 Million \$\int\\$10 Million to \$15 Million					

Note:

Firm Name: Please <u>do not</u> use: dba's – doing business as; combination names when two firms are working together, unless the combination name is the formation of a legally registered new company such as a joint venture; derivatives of your legal name; acronyms; etc. The firm name shown must be your firm's legal name.

Federal Tax ID Number: Your Federal Tax ID number must be that number registered to your legal firm name. If you do not have a Federal Tax ID number, please use your social security number.

Unified Business Identifier (UBI) Number: Your firm will be REQUIRED to acquire a UBI Number prior to execution of an agreement and/or being approved as a Sub-consultant to an existing agreement. This is a Washington State Business license and can be acquired by contacting the Washington State Department of Revenue web site at www.dor.wa.gov.

Statewide Vendor (SWV) Number: The Statewide Vendor (SWV) Number is *REQUIRED* for vendors to receive payments. If your firm doesn't already have an SWV number, your firm will be required to acquire a SWV number prior to execution of an agreement. Please contact WSDOT TRAINS Help Desk at 360-705-7514 for assistance.

FYE Date: Your firm's fiscal year end date.

UDBE/SBE/MSVWBE Certification: If your firm is certified as a UDBE/SBE/MSVWBE enter your firm's certification number. Federal Certifications: Underutilized Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (UDBE), Small Business Enterprise (SBE). State Certifications: Minority, Small, Veteran, Women Business Enterprise. For additional information go to the Washington State Office of Minority & Women's Business Enterprises web site at www.omwbe.wa.gov.

It is critical that your firm name is your legal firm name and that it is the same name assigned to your Federal Tax ID number and is the same name utilized for your SWV number.

Consultant Information Form

rim Name:				F	FIE Date:		Number of Employees:
TranTech Engineering, LLC				12/31			65
Address:	,	Cuito 100					
365-118th Ave S		Suite 100	7. 0.1			<u> </u>	
City:	State:	\	Zip Code:			County	
Bellevue		98005		W 1 C'	Kin	9	
Phone: Fax: 425.453.5545 425.453.677		425.453.6779	9		pany Web Site:	ng.d	om
Remit to Address: 365-118th Ave SE, Suite 100							
City:	State:		Zip Code:			County	
Bellevue	WA	A	98005			Kin	g
Phone: 425.453.5545			Fax: 425.453.6779				
Statewide Vendor Number (SWV) for SWV015683400		o Address:	Federal Tax ID Number or Social Security Number: 68-0607809				
Unified Business Identifier Number (U					bering System (D	UNS) Nu	ımber:
602507862			07060	22	64		
Year Firm Established:		UDBE/SBE/MSVWBE Certifi			NAICS Code &		
2005		DBE: D2W0025137; SE	BE: S00002	5137	541330); 23	37310
Proposed Project Manager:	_		knikzad@trantecheng.com				
Kash Nikzad, Ph	ıD,	PE	knikza		ptrante@	cher	ng.com
Financial Contact:			Email:		<u> </u>		
Shadi Farbood			sfarbood@trantecheng.com				
Firm Type:							
☐ Sole Proprietor ☐ Partners	ship [☐ C – Corp. ☐ Limited Partn	nership 🔲 Su	ibchapt	er S Corp. 🔳 L	imited L	iability Company
Annual Gross Receipt:							
□ \$0 to \$1 Million □ \$1 Mil	llion to S	\$5 Million	10 Million] \$10 N	Million to \$15 Mill	ion 🗆	Over \$15 Million
Note:							
Firm Name: Please <u>do not</u> use: dba's – doing business as; combination names when two firms are working together, unless the combination name is the							

formation of a legally registered new company such as a joint venture; derivatives of your legal name; acronyms; etc. The firm name shown must be your firm's legal name.

Federal Tax ID Number: Your Federal Tax ID number must be that number registered to your legal firm name. If you do not have a Federal Tax ID number, please use your social security number.

Unified Business Identifier (UBI) Number: Your firm will be REQUIRED to acquire a UBI Number prior to execution of an agreement and/or being approved as a Sub-consultant to an existing agreement. This is a Washington State Business license and can be acquired by contacting the Washington State Department of Revenue web site at www.dor.wa.gov.

Statewide Vendor (SWV) Number: The Statewide Vendor (SWV) Number is REQUIRED for vendors to receive payments. If your firm doesn't already have an SWV number, your firm will be required to acquire a SWV number prior to execution of an agreement. Please contact WSDOT TRAINS Help Desk at 360-705-7514 for assistance.

FYE Date: Your firm's fiscal year end date.

UDBE/SBE/MSVWBE Certification: If your firm is certified as a UDBE/SBE/MSVWBE enter your firm's certification number. Federal Certifications: Underutilized Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (UDBE), Small Business Enterprise (SBE). State Certifications: Minority, Small, Veteran, Women Business Enterprise. For additional information go to the Washington State Office of Minority & Women's Business Enterprises web site at

It is critical that your firm name is your legal firm name and that it is the same name assigned to your Federal Tax ID number and is the same name utilized for your SWV number.

6. Consultant Information/Contractor Certification (cont.)

CONTRACTOR CERTIFICATION EXECUTIVE ORDER 18-03 – WORKERS' RIGHTS WASHINGTON STATE GOODS & SERVICES CONTRACTS

Pursuant to the Washington State Governor's Executive Order 18-03 (dated June 12, 2018), the Washington State Department of Transportaion is seeking to contract with qualified entities and business owners who certify that their employees are not, as a condition of employment, subject to mandatory individual arbitration clauses and class or collective action waivers.

> Solicitation Title: WSDOT Bridge Design Office Staff Augmentation - Project Management Services

I hereby certify, on behalf of the firm identified below, as follows (check one): ☑ No Mandatory Individual Arbitration Clauses and Class or Collective Action Waivers for **EMPLOYEES.** This firm does NOT require its employees, as a condition of employment, to sign or agree to mandatory individual arbitration clauses or class or collective action waivers. OR ☐ MANDATORY INDIVIDUAL ARBITRATION CLAUSES AND CLASS OR COLLECTIVE ACTION WAIVERS FOR EMPLOYEES. This firm requires its employees, as a condition of employment, to sign or agree to mandatory individual arbitration clauses or class or collective action waivers. I hereby certify, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington, that the certifications herein are true and correct and that I am authorized to make these certifications on behalf of the firm listed herein. FIRM NAME: KPFF, Inc. Name of Contractor/Bidder – Print full legal entity name of firm By: Rachel Liberty PE Print Name of person making certifications for firm Project Manager Place: Seattle, WA Title: Title of person signing certificate Print city and state where signed Date: 08-07-2023

CONTRACTOR CERTIFICATION EXECUTIVE ORDER 18-03 – WORKERS' RIGHTS WASHINGTON STATE GOODS & SERVICES CONTRACTS

Pursuant to the Washington State Governor's Executive Order 18-03 (dated June 12, 2018), the Washington State Department of Transportation is seeking to contract with qualified entities and business owners who certify that their employees are not, as a condition of employment, subject to mandatory individual arbitration clauses and class or collective action waivers.

Solicitation Title: Bridge Design Office Staff Augmentation -**Project Management Services** I hereby certify, on behalf of the firm identified below, as follows (check one): ☑ No Mandatory Individual Arbitration Clauses and Class or Collective Action Waivers for EMPLOYEES. This firm does NOT require its employees, as a condition of employment, to sign or agree to mandatory individual arbitration clauses or class or collective action waivers. OR ■ MANDATORY INDIVIDUAL ARBITRATION CLAUSES AND CLASS OR COLLECTIVE ACTION WAIVERS FOR EMPLOYEES. This firm requires its employees, as a condition of employment, to sign or agree to mandatory individual arbitration clauses or class or collective action waivers. I hereby certify, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington, that the certifications herein are true and correct and that I am authorized to make these certifications on behalf of the firm listed herein. FIRM NAME: _____WSP USA Inc.____ Name of Contractor/Bidder – Print full legal entity name of firm By: Baul Greg Banks Print Name of person making certifications for firm Title: _Managing Director, Structures______ Place: __Federal Way, WA___ Print city and state where signed Title of person signing certificate Date: _____August 7, 2023______

CONTRACTOR CERTIFICATION EXECUTIVE ORDER 18-03 – WORKERS' RIGHTS WASHINGTON STATE GOODS & SERVICES CONTRACTS

Pursuant to the Washington State Governor's Executive Order 18-03 (dated June 12, 2018), the Washington State Department of Transportaion is seeking to contract with qualified entities and business owners who certify that their employees are not, as a condition of employment, subject to mandatory individual arbitration clauses and class or collective action waivers.

Solicitation Title: Bridge Design Office Staff Augmentation – Project Management Services

I hereby certify, on behalf of the firm identified below, as follows (check one): NO MANDATORY INDIVIDUAL ARBITRATION CLAUSES AND CLASS OR COLLECTIVE ACTION WAIVERS FOR EMPLOYEES. This firm does NOT require its employees, as a condition of employment, to sign or agree to mandatory individual arbitration clauses or class or collective action waivers. OR ☐ MANDATORY INDIVIDUAL ARBITRATION CLAUSES AND CLASS OR COLLECTIVE ACTION WAIVERS FOR EMPLOYEES. This firm requires its employees, as a condition of employment, to sign or agree to mandatory individual arbitration clauses or class or collective action waivers. I hereby certify, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington, that the certifications herein are true and correct and that I am authorized to make these certifications on behalf of the firm listed herein. TranTech Engineering, LLC FIRM NAME: Name of Contractor/Bidder - Print full legal entity name of firm Kash Nikzad, PhD, PE By: Signature of authorized person Print Name of person making certifications for firm Place: **Bellevue, WA** Title: **Principal Owner** Print city and state where signed Title of person signing certificate

Date:

July 31, 2023

CONTRACTOR CERTIFICATION WAGE LAW COMPLIANCE — RESPONSIBILITY CRITERIA WASHINGTON STATE GOODS & SERVICES CONTRACTS

Prior to awarding a contract, agencies are required to determine that a bidder is a 'responsible bidder.' See RCW 39.26.160(2) & (4). Pursuant to legislative enactment in 2017, the responsible bidder criteria include a contractor certification that the contractor has not willfully violated Washington's wage laws. See Chap. 258, 2017 Laws (enacting SSB 5301).

WSDOT Bridge Design Office

Solicitation or Agreement Title: Staff Augmentation - Project

Management Services

Solicitation Posting Date or Agreement Start Date: <u>July 17, 2023</u>

I hereby certify, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington, that the below certification is true and correct and that I am authorized to make the following certification on behalf of the firm listed herein.

CERTIFICATION:

This firm has <u>NOT</u> been determined by a final and binding citation and notice of assessment issued by the Washington Department of Labor and Industries or through a civil judgment entered by a court of limited or general jurisdiction to have willfully violated, as defined in <u>RCW 49.48.082</u>, any provision of RCW chapters <u>49.46</u>, <u>49.48</u>, or <u>49.52</u> within three (3) years prior to the date of the above-stated date.

FIRM NAME: KPFF, Inc.

Name of Consultant/Contractor - Print full legal entity name of firm

By:

Signature of authorized person

Rachel Liberty, PE

Print Name of person making certifications for firm

Title: Project Manager

Title of person signing certificate

Place: Seattle, WA

Print city and state where signed

Date: 08-07-2023

Submittal Instructions:

- If submitting a proposal in response to a solicitation, a signed Certification Document for the Prime and all Subs must also be included in your proposal Packet B (see advertisement for additional requirements).
- If requesting to add a Sub to an existing agreement, submit the signed Certification Document to: ConsultantRates@wsdot.wa.gov.

CONTRACTOR CERTIFICATION - WAGE THEFT PREVENTION: PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACTS

CONTRACTOR CERTIFICATION WAGE LAW COMPLIANCE – RESPONSIBILITY CRITERIA WASHINGTON STATE GOODS & SERVICES CONTRACTS

Prior to awarding a contract, agencies are required to determine that a bidder is a 'responsible bidder.' See RCW 39.26.160(2) & (4). Pursuant to legislative enactment in 2017, the responsible bidder criteria include a contractor certification that the contractor has not willfully violated Washington's wage laws. See Chap. 258, 2017 Laws (enacting SSB 5301).

Solicitation or Agreement Title: Bridge Design Office Staff Augmentation - Project Management Services

Solicitation Posting Date or Agreement Start Date: July 17, 2023

I hereby certify, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington, that the below certification is true and correct and that I am authorized to make the following certification on behalf of the firm listed herein.

CERTIFICATION:

This firm has <u>NOT</u> been determined by a final and binding citation and notice of assessment issued by the Washington Department of Labor and Industries or through a civil judgment entered by a court of limited or general jurisdiction to have willfully violated, as defined in <u>RCW 49.48.082</u>, any provision of RCW chapters <u>49.46</u>, <u>49.48</u>, or <u>49.52</u> within three (3) years prior to the date of the above-stated date.

FIRM N	\ame:W	SP USA Inc		
	Nar	ne of Consultant/Contractor – P	rint full legal enti	ty name of firm
Ву:	Signature of a	uthorized person	Greg B Print Na	danks_ame of person making certifications for firm
Title:	Managing Title of perso	Director, Structures n signing certificate	Place: _	Federal Way, WA Print city and state where signed
Date:	August	7, 2023		

Submittal Instructions:

- If submitting a proposal in response to a solicitation, a signed Certification Document for the Prime and all Subs must also be included in your proposal Packet B (see advertisement for additional requirements).
- If requesting to add a Sub to an existing agreement, submit the signed Certification Document to: ConsultantRates@wsdot.wa.gov.

CONTRACTOR CERTIFICATION - WAGE THEFT PREVENTION: PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACTS

6. Consultant Information/Contractor Certification (cont.)

CONTRACTOR CERTIFICATION WAGE LAW COMPLIANCE — RESPONSIBILITY CRITERIA WASHINGTON STATE GOODS & SERVICES CONTRACTS

Prior to awarding a contract, agencies are required to determine that a bidder is a 'responsible bidder.' See RCW 39.26.160(2) & (4). Pursuant to legislative enactment in 2017, the responsible bidder criteria include a contractor certification that the contractor has not willfully violated Washington's wage laws. See Chap. 258, 2017 Laws (enacting SSB 5301).

WSDOT Bridge Design Office

Solicitation or Agreement Title: Staff Augmentation - Project

Management Services

Solicitation Posting Date or Agreement Start Date: <u>July 17, 2023</u>

I hereby certify, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington, that the below certification is true and correct and that I am authorized to make the following certification on behalf of the firm listed herein.

CERTIFICATION:

This firm has <u>NOT</u> been determined by a final and binding citation and notice of assessment issued by the Washington Department of Labor and Industries or through a civil judgment entered by a court of limited or general jurisdiction to have willfully violated, as defined in <u>RCW 49.48.082</u>, any provision of RCW chapters <u>49.46</u>, <u>49.48</u>, or <u>49.52</u> within three (3) years prior to the date of the above-stated date.

FIRM NAME:Iran Iech Engineering, LLC	
By: Signature of authorized person	 Print full legal entity name of firm Kash Nikzad, PE Print Name of person making certifications for firm
Title:	Place: Bellevue, WA
Title of person signing certificate	Print city and state where signed
Date:8/3/23	_
Submittal Instructions:	

CONTRACTOR CERTIFICATION – WAGE THEFT PREVENTION: PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACTS

References/Past Performances

Prime Consultant

7 2	Washington State
	Washington State Department of Transportation

Performance Evaluation Consultant Services

Consultant Name			ition Type erim X	Subconsulta	ant \square Fin	al	
Consultant Address 1601 Fifth Avenue, Suite 16		Projec	t Title	11 Padde e Projec		<u></u>	
Seattle, WA 98101				ment Num			
Type of Work	S&E X Other (Spec		Lui	of Agreemon mp Sum urly Rate	ent		
Complexity of Work X Difficult Routine	Date Agreement App	roved		st Plus Fi ner Desi	xed Fee ign-Build	d	
Amount of Original Agreement \$	Total Amount Mo \$	difications		Total Am \$	ount Agreen	nent	
Completion Date Including Extensions TBD (in construction as of 8/2022)	Actual Completio	n Date		Actual To	otal Paid		
Type and Extent of Subcontracting							
Prime engineering design as	subconsultant	to contracto:	r.				
Performance Rating Scale (From Average	e Score Below)						
S	AR	MR_	В			P	
S Superior A	AR	/leets Std.	Belov	v Std.		oor	Τ
S	AR	Comments (J	Belov ustify	v Std. Above	& Below I	Poor Ratings)	Rating
S Superior A	AR	/leets Std.	Below Ustify Creek pr nvolved r all negotia willing to for delive	Above oject we we negotiations ations, KPF negotiate. ering as a to	& Below I orked through s with KPFF a FF was cooper. They kept thop priority and	Ratings) n a couple of as the design rative and be project	Rating AR
Superior A Standard Criteria 1. Negotiations Cooperative and responsive Adhered to WSDOT guidelines on fee. Met negotiation schedule. Open and honest communications.	AR bove Std.	Comments (J On the I-5 / Padden change orders that in lead for the job. In a responsive, fair and goals and schedule	Below Ustify Creek pr nvolved r all negotia willing to for delive	Above oject we we negotiations ations, KPF negotiate. ering as a to	& Below I orked through s with KPFF a FF was cooper. They kept thop priority and	Ratings) n a couple of as the design rative and be project	
Superior A Standard Criteria 1. Negotiations Cooperative and responsive Adhered to WSDOT guidelines on fee. Met negotiation schedule. Open and honest communications. Willingness to negotiate in good faith 2. Cost / Budget Finished within agreed budget, including Appropriate level of effort (Cost commen	AR bove Std. All supplements surate with work) (Approx. xx% -yy%) cluding supplements. ments).	Comments (J On the I-5 / Padden change orders that in lead for the job. In a responsive, fair and goals and schedule	Belov Ustify Creek pr nvolved r all negotia willing to for delive ded in a til 75% comp eer of Rea on subm and, throu y known	Above oject we whegotiations, KPF negotiate. Fring as a tomely mano pliete and tomely mano other in the price of the price of the properties of the properti	& Below I orked through s with KPFF a F was cooper. They kept the priority and or.	Ratings) n a couple of as the design rative and the change of the change	AR

DOT Form 272-019

Distribution: Original: Consultant Revised 10/2020

Copies: Project Manager - Area Consultant Liaison - Consultant Services Office

7. References/Past Performances (cont.)

		<u> </u>	
5. Communications	KPFF's communication is clear and concise in all forma		
Clear and concise communication (Oral, written, drawings).	Written instruction does not come from WSDOT since	this is a	
Demonstrates an understanding of oral and written	Design-Build project.		MR
instructions			
Communicated at intervals appropriate for continual progres	SS		
6. Management			
Provided creative cost control measures			
Submitted appropriate, periodic, accurate progress reports			
Accurate and timely invoicing			
Conducted meetings efficiently			MR
Limited the number of consultant-initiated contract			
modifications / supplements			
Collaborated effectively with WSDOT			
Responsive			
Managed subconsultants effectively			
7. Other Criteria (As agreed)			
Overall Rating	KPFF has been good to work with. They are knowledgeable on WSDOT		
	and most policy and review of their design work has not resulted in significond comments or major issues that are not easily resolved. When issues have		
	their proposed solutions are backed with sound engineering judgment.		MR
	I have rated this a "Meets Requirements" simply because the project is n	not yet	
	complete, and there are tasks that KPFF still has to complete, however i		
	any concerns that there will be issues and if their past performance on the continues this rating would be "Above Standards"	nis project	
		<u> </u>	
Rated By (Project Manager Name and Title)	Project Manager Signature	Date	
Mikkel Lamay WSDOT Project Engineer	Milled In	8/11/2022	
Rated By (Area Consultant Liaison Name and Title)	Area Consultant Liaison Signature	Date	
NA	NA		
Executive Review (Name and Title)	Executive Signature	Date	
NA NA	NA		

KPFF's work has meet contract standards and WSDOT policies. Their responses to comments are thorough, timely and have gone through the appropriate level of QA/QC. During Procurement of this contract, KPFF and Granite developed an innovative concept for construction of the I-5 bridges which allowed them to complete that work with minimal impact to I-5 traffic. Minimizing Public Impacts was identified as a WSDOT project goal and this concept exceeded WSDOT expectations for minimization.

Distribution: Original: Consultant Copies: Project Manager - Area Consultant Liaison - Consultant Services Office



Performance Evaluation Consultant Services

Consultant Name	Evaluation Type				
KPFF, Inc.		☐ Interim ☐ Subconsultant ☐ Final			
Consultant Address		F	Project Title		
1601 - 5th Avenue, Suite 1600			I-90 / Mullan Rd Cro	ssing Deck Reha	bilitation
Seattle, WA 98101		1.6	Design		
71			Agreement Number		
		16	Y- 12471		
Type of Work		7	Type of Agreement		
Study Design R/W PS	&E Other (Specify	Below):	Lump Sum		
			Hourly Rate		
Complexity of Work	Date Agreement Approv		Cost Plus Fixed Fee		
☐ Difficult ☒ Routine	January 11, 2		Other		
Amount of Original Agreement	Total Amount Modif	***	Total Amount	Agreement	
\$ 39,051.00	\$	17,490.06	26	56,541.06	
Completion Date Including Extensions	Actual Completion I		Actual Total F		
August 31, 2021	Charles and the state of the st	t 31, 2021	\$	56,541.0	6
Type and Extent of Subcontracting	Augus	1,2021	, ,	30,341.0	U
Type and Extent of Subcontracting					
Performance Rating Scale (From Average	Score Below)				
10 9 8	7 6	5	4 3	2 1	
Superior Above R	eqmnts Meets	Reqmnts	Below Reqmnts	Poor	-3.5
Criteria		Comment			Score
Negotiations		See attached w	orksheet.		
Cooperative and responsive.					7
1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 -			and a commence	+	
2. Cost / Budget		See attached w	vorksheet.		6
Complete within agreement budget inc	luding supplements.				
3. Schedule		See attached w	8		
Complete within agreement schedule in	ncluding supplements.			0	
			-	(%)	
4. Technical Quality		See attached w		6	
Met Standards.					
5. Communications		See attached w	orksheet.		7
Clear, Concise Communication (Oral, v	vritten, drawings).				
6. Management		See attached w	oules hoot		7
Team player. Managed subs. Accurate	, timely invoices.	See attached w	orksneet.		
Appropriate, periodic, accurate progres					
Total Score					41
Average Score (Total Score / Number of	f criteria rated)				6.8
D. J. D. (D.) J. M	y betain		1625A7:	15.4	
Rated By (Project Manager Name and Titl	e) Project N	lanager Signati	ure	Date	
Craig Boone	2	R. B.	Digitally signed by Craig R. Boone Date: 2021.09.29 12:10:37 -07'00'		
WSDOT Bridge Project Manager	/	100 - 100 to 100 -		10000	
Rated By (Area Consultant Liaison Name	and Title) Area Cor	nsultant Liaison	Signature	Date	
Craig Boone	1.	R. Bo	Digitally signed by Craig R. Boone		
WSDOT Consultant Liaison		er divine	Date: 2021.09.29 12:11:01 -07'00'		
Executive Review (Name and Title)	Executive	e Signature		Date	
Mark Gaines	im	1114			
WSDOT Bridge & Structures Engine	of a Hoises 09/29/2021				

DOT Form 272-019 EF Revised 3/2002 Distribution: Original: Consultant

Copies: Project Manager - Area Consultant Liaison - Consultant Services Office

Consultant Performance Evaluation Worksheet

Agreement No.: Y-12471

Task No.:

Project Title: I-90 / Mullan Rd Crossing Deck Rehabilitation Design

Consultant: KPFF, Inc. Project Manager: Craig Boone

NEGOTIATIO	ONS	
Considerations	Score	Comments: Fee proposals were
Timely Proposal	6	submitted on time. The initial
Complete Proposal (Nothing Missing)	6	proposed fee was substantially higher
Timely Questions And Recommendations	8	than WSDOT's estimate. However,
Fee Negotiation	6	KPFF was willing to negotiate and came
		down to a reasonable fee. KPFF did a
		great job of asking questions to clarify
		the scope.
Overall Score	7	

COST / BUD	GET	
Considerations	Score	Comments: Initial fee = \$39,051 + Sup
Actual Cost Vs. Agreed Upon Cost	6	1 fee = \$17,514 = \$56,565. Amount spent = \$56,541.06.
Overall Score	6	

SCHEDUL	E.	
Considerations	Score	Comments: All submittals were
Met Agreed Upon Schedule	8	received on time. Project had an aggressive schedule which KPFF met.
Overall Score	8	-

TECHNICAL QU	JALITY	
Considerations	Score	Comments: Final product was good.
Deliverables Well Organized And Complete	6	100% and Proof Copy submittals had
Number Of Errors And/Or Omissions	5	more review comments than expected.
Number Of Review Comments	4	WSDOT had to provide more direction
Work Conforms With WSDOT Standards & Policies	6	than expected specifically the move
Design Will Minimizes Construction Costs	6	to scarification in strips. WSDOT may
Sound Engineering Judgment Used	6	be somewhat responsible for the
Completed In Accordance w/ Applicable Codes	6	transition to scarification in strips, as
Innovative Design When Appropriate	6	the examples WSDOT provided did not
		include an example of scarification in
		strips.
Overall Score	6	

Agreement No.: Y-12471

Task No.:

Project Title: I-90 / Mullan Rd Crossing Deck Rehabilitation Design

Consultant: KPFF, Inc. Project Manager: Craig Boone

COMMUNICAT	TIONS	
Considerations	Score	Comments: Communications were
Clear And Concise	7	good!
Professional	7	1
Uses Appropriate Lines Of Communication	7	1
Frequency And Duration Of Communications	7	1
Open And Honest	7	1
Listens And Understands WSDOT Needs	7	
	-	
Overall Score	7	7

MANAGEM	ENT	
Considerations	Score	Comments: KPFF was always available
Available And Responsive	8	and responsive. KPFF adjusted well
Submittals On Time	6	when WSDOT decided to eliminate the
Progress Reports Complete And Accurate	6	requirement for the work to be
Invoices Timely And Accurate	6	completed with a containment system,
Follows Directions Given By WSDOT	8	which resulted in changes to the plans
Notified WSDOT Early Regarding Task "ISSUES"	6	and the analysis. KPFF also adjusted
Adapts To Changes Made By WSDOT	8	well when WSDOT decided the deck
Number Of Consultant-Initiated Task Amendments	6	needed to be scarified in strips.
Subconsultant Management	N/A	
Address WSDOT Review Comments	6	
Overall Score	7	-

Washington State Department of Transportation

Performance Evaluation Completed by Reference

Consultant Name: KPFF Consulting Engineer	S			
Consultant's Project Manager: Aaron Olson & Rachel Liberty				
Project Name to be Evaluated on: (Work must have been con Richardson Creek Bridge #300	npleted within the last 3 years or is currently	y being performed.)		
Type of Work: Roadway Design Plans Specs & Estimat		Right-of-Way Other = Structural Engineeri		
Contract Information: (Work must have been completed with Start Date	in the last 3 years or is currently being performance End Date	ormed.) Dollar Amount of Services		
✔ Prime Sub 01/28/21	12/31/23	212,687.53		
F	Performance Evaluation			
Rating Criteria		Score		
Please rate each criteria on a scale of 1 to 10.	1 being low and 10 being high.	1 - Low to 10 - High		
1. Was the firm cooperative and responsive during any negotion budget related or work element related?	ations whether they were	9.00		
2. Did the firm complete the project within the total budgeted	amount?	10.00		
3. Did the firm complete the project within the contract sched	10.00			
4. Did the firm meet all of your technical standards and qualit	10.00			
5. Was the firm's communication, both oral and written, clear and concise?				
6. Was the firm's project management system effective?	10.00			
Total Score (Total the score by adding the scores for criterias 1 through 6.	58.00			
Average Score (Average the score by dividing the total score by the total number of criteria that was rated.)				
	Evaluator Information:			
Firm/Company Name: Snohomish County Publ				
Evaluator's Name: Nolan Anderson, PE	Evaluator's Title: Engineer III			
Firm/Company Address: 3000 Rockefeller Ave,	M/S 607, Everett, WA 982	01		
Phone: (425) 262-2643 Fax:	Date: 08,			
Distribution: Original: Return to Consultant being	evaluated; and	Rev. 2014		

SR 3/SR 104/SR 303/ST 307/SR 308 Kitsap County Remove Fish Barriers Project

1 2	QUALIFICATION FORM G –SUBMITTER REFERENCE FORM Submitters complete this section:
3	To Whom It May Concern:
4 5 6	The Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. Company ("Submitter") is currently responding to WSDOT's solicitation for the procurement of Progressive Design Build – SR 3/SR 104/SR 303/ST 307/SR 308 Kitsap County Remove Fish Barriers Project.
7 8 9 10 11 12	WSDOT is placing increased emphasis in its procurements on past performance as a source selection factor. WSDOT is requiring that clients of entities responding to their solicitations be identified and is requesting their participation in the evaluation process. Therefore, we are requesting that you provide the following information regarding our performance on the contract identified below. Please complete this form and return it to the email address specified below no later than March 9, 2023 at 5:00 PM Pacific Time.
14 15 16 17	Jenna Kemp WSDOT Contract Ad & Award office CAA@WSDOT.WA.GOV
18 19 20	By my signature below, I authorize you to provide the information below to WSDOT and to respond to any additional inquiries by WSDOT regarding our performance on the referenced contract.
21	1/31/2023

Submitters to complete information in this section:

Contract Identifying Information (contract number or name):				
Contract Identifying Information (Contract number of name).				
Owner Name: Washington State Department of Transportation				
Project Title: US 101/SR 109 Grays Harbor, Jefferson and Clallam Counties Remove Fish Barriers Phase 1				
Owner Contact: Kyler Kokenge or Ricky Bhalla		Owner Project Manager*: Kyler Kokenge		
Phone #: 360-489-5772 or 360-357-2615		Phone #: 360-489-5772		
Email Address: bhallar@wsdot.wa.gov		Email Address: bhallar@wsdot.wa.gov		
Work Performance Period: 03/2021	to Present	Project Value: \$ 30.1M		

Brief Summary of Statement of Work:

This progressive design-build project for WSDOT will replace 29 fish barriers along US101 and SR 109 in Washington's Clallam, Jefferson and Gray's Harbor counties. Kiewit will replace small culverts with large fish passages. The Kiewit/KPFF team is currently on track to complete Phase 1 services 8 months ahead of schedule. We have reached a lump sum agreement for Bundle 1 and are currently on schedule to start construction in the spring of 2023.

*If the individual is not currently employed by the owner, please indicate current organizational affiliation.

25 26

22

23 24 Signature

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS

Schedule B Qualification Forms Qualification Form G Page 1

Date

References complete the remaining sections:

1. How effective was the Submitter in achieving the objectives/goals of the project? 2. How well did the Submitter perform all contracted services within the budget? 3. How well did the Submitter submit complete and accurate financial reports and invoices? 4. Did a draft or final audit report disclose questioned or disallowed costs? 4. Did a draft or final audit report disclose questioned or disallowed costs? 4. Did a draft or final audit report disclose questioned or disallowed costs? 5. Did sallowed or recommended for disallowance? 6. Did the Submitter complete contract requirements according to specified time frames? 7. Did the Submitter respond to technical direction and requests in a timely manner? 8. Was the Submitter provide plans, specifications, and other contract deliverables that met or exceeded the project technical requirements? 8. Was the Submitter pro-active in providing information and submittals (including but not limited to cost, schedule, and scope information)? 9. Did the Submitter demonstrate a collaborative working relationship with the project team? 10. Did the Submitter provide appropriate transparency during open-book pricing negotiations and negotiate in good faith? 11. Did the Submitter provide technical expertise and resources to solve contract problems? Summary Adjectival Rating of Overall Submitter Performance: Comments (Please explain any ratings below Acceptable)	For the following questions, where applicable, check the adjectival rating which most closely represents your assessment of the Submitter's performance.		Outstanding	Good	Acceptable	Marginal	Unsatisfactory
3. How well did the Submitter submit complete and accurate financial reports and invoices? 4. Did a draft or final audit report disclose questioned or disallowed costs? If yes, please indicate: a) Disallowed or recommended for disallowance? b) Disallowed costs as a % of audited funds? c) Administrative finding? 5. Did the Submitter complete contract requirements according to specified time frames? 6. Did the Submitter respond to technical direction and requests in a timely manner? 7. Did the Submitter provide plans, specifications, and other contract deliverables that met or exceeded the project technical requirements? 8. Was the Submitter pro-active in providing information and submittals (including but not limited to cost, schedule, and scope information)? 9. Did the Submitter demonstrate a collaborative working relationship with the project team? 10. Did the Submitter provide appropriate transparency during open-book pricing negotiations and negotiate in good faith? 11. Did the Submitter provide technical expertise and resources to solve contract problems? x	project?			x			
invoices? 4. Did a draft or final audit report disclose questioned or disallowed costs? If yes, please indicate: a) Disallowed or recommended for disallowance? b) Disallowed costs as a % of audited funds? c) Administrative finding? 5. Did the Submitter complete contract requirements according to specified time frames? 6. Did the Submitter respond to technical direction and requests in a timely manner? 7. Did the Submitter provide plans, specifications, and other contract deliverables that met or exceeded the project technical requirements? 8. Was the Submitter pro-active in providing information and submittals (including but not limited to cost, schedule, and scope information)? 9. Did the Submitter demonstrate a collaborative working relationship with the project team? 10. Did the Submitter provide appropriate transparency during open-book pricing negotiations and negotiate in good faith? 11. Did the Submitter provide technical expertise and resources to solve contract problems? x Summary Adjectival Rating of Overall Submitter Performance:					х		
If yes, please indicate: a) Disallowed or recommended for disallowance? b) Disallowed costs as a % of audited funds? c) Administrative finding? 5. Did the Submitter complete contract requirements according to specified time frames? 6. Did the Submitter provide plans, specifications, and other contract deliverables that met or exceeded the project technical requirements? 8. Was the Submitter pro-active in providing information and submittals (including but not limited to cost, schedule, and scope information)? 9. Did the Submitter demonstrate a collaborative working relationship with the project team? 10. Did the Submitter provide appropriate transparency during open-book pricing negotiations and negotiate in good faith? 11. Did the Submitter provide technical expertise and resources to solve contract problems? x Summary Adjectival Rating of Overall Submitter Performance:	invoices?	d		x			
a) Disallowed or recommended for disallowance? b) Disallowed costs as a % of audited funds? c) Administrative finding? 5. Did the Submitter complete contract requirements according to specified time frames? 6. Did the Submitter respond to technical direction and requests in a timely manner? 7. Did the Submitter provide plans, specifications, and other contract deliverables that met or exceeded the project technical requirements? 8. Was the Submitter pro-active in providing information and submittals (including but not limited to cost, schedule, and scope information)? 9. Did the Submitter demonstrate a collaborative working relationship with the project team? 10. Did the Submitter provide appropriate transparency during open-book pricing negotiations and negotiate in good faith? 11. Did the Submitter provide technical expertise and resources to solve contract problems? x Summary Adjectival Rating of Overall Submitter Performance:	4. Did a draft or final audit report disclose questioned or disallowed costs?	Y	es	No			
b) Disallowed costs as a % of audited funds? c) Administrative finding? 5. Did the Submitter complete contract requirements according to specified time frames? 6. Did the Submitter respond to technical direction and requests in a timely manner? 7. Did the Submitter provide plans, specifications, and other contract deliverables that met or exceeded the project technical requirements? 8. Was the Submitter pro-active in providing information and submittals (including but not limited to cost, schedule, and scope information)? 9. Did the Submitter demonstrate a collaborative working relationship with the project team? 10. Did the Submitter provide appropriate transparency during open-book pricing negotiations and negotiate in good faith? 11. Did the Submitter promptly notify the owner of potential problems? 12. Did the Submitter provide technical expertise and resources to solve contract problems? 8. Summary Adjectival Rating of Overall Submitter Performance:	If yes, please indicate:			x			
c) Administrative finding? 5. Did the Submitter complete contract requirements according to specified time frames? 6. Did the Submitter respond to technical direction and requests in a timely manner? 7. Did the Submitter provide plans, specifications, and other contract deliverables that met or exceeded the project technical requirements? 8. Was the Submitter pro-active in providing information and submittals (including but not limited to cost, schedule, and scope information)? 9. Did the Submitter demonstrate a collaborative working relationship with the project team? 10. Did the Submitter provide appropriate transparency during open-book pricing negotiations and negotiate in good faith? 11. Did the Submitter provide technical expertise and resources to solve contract problems? x Summary Adjectival Rating of Overall Submitter Performance:	a) Disallowed or recommended for disallowance?						
5. Did the Submitter complete contract requirements according to specified time frames? 6. Did the Submitter respond to technical direction and requests in a timely manner? 7. Did the Submitter provide plans, specifications, and other contract deliverables that met or exceeded the project technical requirements? 8. Was the Submitter pro-active in providing information and submittals (including but not limited to cost, schedule, and scope information)? 9. Did the Submitter demonstrate a collaborative working relationship with the project team? 10. Did the Submitter provide appropriate transparency during open-book pricing negotiations and negotiate in good faith? 11. Did the Submitter provide technical expertise and resources to solve contract problems? x Summary Adjectival Rating of Overall Submitter Performance:	b) Disallowed costs as a % of audited funds?						
frames? 6. Did the Submitter respond to technical direction and requests in a timely manner? 7. Did the Submitter provide plans, specifications, and other contract deliverables that met or exceeded the project technical requirements? 8. Was the Submitter pro-active in providing information and submittals (including but not limited to cost, schedule, and scope information)? 9. Did the Submitter demonstrate a collaborative working relationship with the project team? 10. Did the Submitter provide appropriate transparency during open-book pricing negotiations and negotiate in good faith? 11. Did the Submitter promptly notify the owner of potential problems? 12. Did the Submitter provide technical expertise and resources to solve contract problems? Summary Adjectival Rating of Overall Submitter Performance:	c) Administrative finding?						
manner? 7. Did the Submitter provide plans, specifications, and other contract deliverables that met or exceeded the project technical requirements? 8. Was the Submitter pro-active in providing information and submittals (including but not limited to cost, schedule, and scope information)? 9. Did the Submitter demonstrate a collaborative working relationship with the project team? 10. Did the Submitter provide appropriate transparency during open-book pricing negotiations and negotiate in good faith? 11. Did the Submitter promptly notify the owner of potential problems? 12. Did the Submitter provide technical expertise and resources to solve contract problems? X Summary Adjectival Rating of Overall Submitter Performance:			·	x			
that met or exceeded the project technical requirements? 8. Was the Submitter pro-active in providing information and submittals (including but not limited to cost, schedule, and scope information)? 9. Did the Submitter demonstrate a collaborative working relationship with the project team? 10. Did the Submitter provide appropriate transparency during open-book pricing negotiations and negotiate in good faith? 11. Did the Submitter promptly notify the owner of potential problems? 12. Did the Submitter provide technical expertise and resources to solve contract problems? Summary Adjectival Rating of Overall Submitter Performance:		,	x				
(including but not limited to cost, schedule, and scope information)? 9. Did the Submitter demonstrate a collaborative working relationship with the project team? 10. Did the Submitter provide appropriate transparency during open-book pricing negotiations and negotiate in good faith? 11. Did the Submitter promptly notify the owner of potential problems? 12. Did the Submitter provide technical expertise and resources to solve contract problems? Summary Adjectival Rating of Overall Submitter Performance:		s		x			
project team? 10. Did the Submitter provide appropriate transparency during open-book pricing negotiations and negotiate in good faith? 11. Did the Submitter promptly notify the owner of potential problems? 12. Did the Submitter provide technical expertise and resources to solve contract problems? Summary Adjectival Rating of Overall Submitter Performance:					x		
negotiations and negotiate in good faith? 11. Did the Submitter promptly notify the owner of potential problems? 12. Did the Submitter provide technical expertise and resources to solve contract problems? Summary Adjectival Rating of Overall Submitter Performance:				x			
12. Did the Submitter provide technical expertise and resources to solve contract problems? Summary Adjectival Rating of Overall Submitter Performance:				x			
problems?	11. Did the Submitter promptly notify the owner of potential problems?	1	x				
Summary Adjectival Rating of Overall Submitter Performance:							
	1			+			
	• • •			x			$oxed{igsquare}$

In reference to #2, the project is trending significantly over budget; however, WSDOT's original budget underestimated the project cost and policy changes related to fish passage are also resulting in additional costs.

Digitally signed by Kyler Kokenge Date: 2023.03.03 15:14:38-08'00' Kh Khu

3/3/2023

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS

Schedule B **Qualification Forms** Qualification Form G

Page 2

Washington State Department of Transportation

Performance Evaluation Completed by Reference

Consultant Name: KPFF Consulting Engineers					
Consultant's Project Manager: Aaron Olson & Rachel Liberty					
Project Name to be Evaluated on: (Work must have been completed value Coal Creek Bridge No. 3035A Replacement	vithin the last 3 years or is currently	being performed.)			
Type of Work: Roadway Design Plans Specs & Estimates Transportation Study Right-of-Way Other					
Contract Information: (Work must have been completed within the la	st 3 years or is currently being perfo	rmed.) Dollar Amount of Services			
✔ Prime Sub 11/08/18	12/31/23	899,602.66			
Perfor	mance Evaluation				
Rating Criteria	Thanes Evaluation	Score			
Please rate each criteria on a scale of 1 to 10. 1 being	low and 10 being high.	1 - Low to 10 - High			
Was the firm cooperative and responsive during any negotiations we budget related or work element related?	hether they were	9.00			
2. Did the firm complete the project within the total budgeted amount? 9.0					
3. Did the firm complete the project within the contract schedule(s)? 9.00					
4. Did the firm meet all of your technical standards and quality expectations?					
5. Was the firm's communication, both oral and written, clear and concise? 8.					
6. Was the firm's project management system effective?					
Total Score (Total the score by adding the scores for criterias 1 through 6.)		49.00			
Average Score (Average the score by dividing the total score by the total number of criteria that was rated.)					
Evaluator Information:					
Firm/Company Name: King County Department of Local Services					
Evaluator's Name: TingTing Martin Evaluator's Title: Project Manager					
Firm/Company Address: 201 S Jackson Street, Seattle, WA 98104					
Phone: (206) 477-3562 Fax:	Date: 08/	03/23			
Distribution: Original: Return to Consultant being evalua Copy: Fax to WSDOT at 360-705-6838 or e	ted; and	Rev. 2014			

SEATTLE

TACOMA

ΙΔΟΕΥ

SPOKANE

PORTLAND

EUGENI

SACRAMENTO

SAN FRANCISCO

LOS ANGELES

LONG BEACH

ORANGE COUNTY

SAN DIEGO

BOISE

SALT LAKE CITY

DES MOINES

ST. LOUIS

CHICAGO

NASHVILLE

BIRMINGHAN

LOUISVILLE

CINCINNAT

WASHINGTON DO

NEW YORK



1601 Fifth Avenue Suite 1600 Seattle WA 98101

206.622.5822

www.kpff.com