



DRAFT AGENDA

Bi-State Bridge Replacement Working Group
Regular Meeting
April 11, 2022 / 1:00-3:00p (2 hours)
1000 E. Port Marina Dr., Hood River, Ore.

Members: Chair, Mike Fox (Commissioner), Port of Hood River; Vice Chair, Jake Anderson (Commissioner), Klickitat County; Catherine Kiewit (Mayor), City of Bingen; Marla Keethler (Mayor), City of White Salmon; Kate McBride (Mayor), City of Hood River; Bob Benton (Commissioner), Hood River County

Alternates: Kristi Chapman (Commissioner), Port of Hood River; Arthur Babitz (Commissioner), Hood River County; Joe Sullivan, City of Bingen; Jason Hartmann (Councilor), City of White Salmon; David Sauter (Commissioner), Klickitat County; Jessica Metta (Councilor), City of Hood River.

Staff/Consultants: Kevin Greenwood (Project Director), Port of Hood River; Michael McElwee (Executive Director), Port of Hood River; Steve Siegel, Siegel Consulting.

- | | | |
|----|---|------|
| 1. | Welcome | 2:00 |
| 2. | March 14 Regular Meeting Minutes | 2:01 |
| 3. | Bridge Authority Governance Update | 2:03 |
| 4. | Tolling Policy Discussion | 2:18 |
| 5. | Project Updates/Other Items | 2:30 |
| 6. | Next Meeting, May 16, 2022 | 2:40 |
| 7. | Replacement Bridge Management Contract Update | 2:41 |
| | A. Selection Process | |
| | B. Tour Marina 1 building | |
| | C. Adjourn for Tour | 3:00 |

-###-

Contact Kevin Greenwood, (541) 961-9517 or kgreenwood@portofhoodriver.com,
for Zoom credentials



BRIDGE REPLACEMENT PROJECT

Bi-State Working Group Meeting Summary

Monday, March 14, 2022 | 2pm – 4pm
Port of Hood River – via Zoom
1000 E Port Marina Drive, Hood River OR 97031

In Attendance:

Members: Chair, Mike Fox (Commissioner), Port of Hood River; Vice Chair, Jake Anderson (Commissioner), Klickitat County; Marla Keethler (Mayor), City of White Salmon; Catherine Kiewit (Mayor), City of Bingen; Kate McBride (Mayor), City of Hood River; Bob Benton (Commissioner), Hood River County.

Alternates: Kristi Chapman (Commissioner), Port of Hood River; Arthur Babitz (Commissioner), Hood River County.

Staff/Consultants: Kevin Greenwood (Project Director), Port of Hood River; Michael McElwee (Executive Director), Port of Hood River; Steve Siegel, Siegel Consulting; Brad Boswell and Jessica Hostetler, Boswell Consulting; Sam Hunaidi and Rob Wattman, ODOT; Michael Williams, WSDOT; Gordie Kelsey, Klickitat County.

Guests: Sen. Curtis King; Erick Haynie, Reg. 1 ACT; Jon Davies, Reg. 1 ACT; Jess Groves, Reg. 1 ACT; Megan Ramey, Reg. 1 ACT; Chuck Green and Scott Nettleton, Otak; Catherine Hovell, Michael Shannon, and Phoebe Hyun, HNTB; Ian Cannon, Exeltech; Matt Ransom, SWRTC.

Welcome

The Bi-State Working Group (BSWG) Chairman, Mike Fox, opened the meeting and welcomed attendees. Commissioner Fox turned to Sen. King for a brief update. Sen. King noted that the bi-state bridge authority bill is on the governor's desk awaiting signatures. All indications are that it will be signed. Sen. King commended Oregon legislature and the governor for passing bridge authority legislation and signing it immediately and added that this was another step to get the bridge built. A transportation package was put together and \$75 million went towards the Hood River-White Salmon bridge. Sen. King asked when some or all the funds would be needed so that they can assign a time frame for when those funds should be available. Commissioner Fox provided a timeline with a bridge completion date of October 2030. Sen. King strongly encouraged them to shorten that time frame and look at the schedule to see where things can be moved up. Sen. King noted that costs are going to keep rising so the sooner it can be built the lower the cost for all citizens in both states. Kevin Greenwood inquired about the \$1.5 million additional funds to WSDOT for traffic and revenue studies. Sen. King replied that Rep. Fey requested to have a study of toll revenues on the bridge to know what the revenues are going to be.

February 14 Regular Meeting Minutes

The minutes from February 14 regular meeting were approved by consensus.

Legislative Update

Greenwood reported that on the Oregon side the current federal administration has appropriated approximately \$800 million to ODOT through the IIJA program. The local bridge program was bumped up from \$35 million to \$100 million. The Oregon Transportation Committee (OTC) will finalize the new program at the end of March. Greenwood noted that the BSWG will soon start the development of the Commission Formation Agreements. In Oregon its anticipated that it will be a long session in 2023. Thorn Run Partners is planning a more aggressive ask for the bridge contribution during long session.

Replacement Bridge Management Contract (RBMC) RFP

Greenwood reported that they received comments from ODOT on the RBMC RFP document. Greenwood attended a meeting with Commissioner Fox and Sam Hunaidi from ODOT. There were no significant changes to the document, and it will be presented to the Port Commission on March 15 for their approval. The document should be live by March 16. Kate McBride noted her concern that the document did not specify working within a national scenic area. The document also does not note that by the end of the first year the RBMC would be looking at P3 as an option. Commissioner Fox explained the evaluation process and added that there is a monthly workplan that lists out all the major tasks that the BSWG needs them to do. This workplan can still be adjusted in the next few weeks, before it is presented to the contractor in the final negotiations. There was consensus to proceed with the RFP as written and present it to the Port Commissioner for approval. Greenwood noted that once the document goes live any inquires related to the procurement must be directed to him.

Greenwood noted that the Pre-Proposal Meeting is scheduled for March 31. The meeting will be held via Zoom. Commissioner Fox presented a draft agenda and discussed everyone's role in the meeting. There was consensus to move forward with the proposed agenda. Greenwood will develop a PowerPoint that will include everyone's speaking parts.

Commission Formation Agreement Process – S. Siegel

Greenwood turned to Steve Siegel for a brief summarization of the Commission Formation Agreements. Siegel referenced the memo that was provided to the BSWG and noted that its purpose was to provide a comprehensive broad explanation of what needs to be done over the next several years. Siegel noted that although there is a lot of work, it can be implemented in phases if necessary. The Commission formation schedule targets a Commission effective date of July 1, 2023. It will take a couple of years for the Commission to be fully operational. Commissioner Fox expressed his concern over they large amount of work and decisions this will require. Commissioner Fox asked the BSWG if anyone was interested or willing to work closely with Steve Siegel and Kevin Greenwood to bring forward decisions that need to be made to the BSWG. Bob Benton offered to help until his term ends at the end of the year. Group consensus was to have Bob Benton be the liaison between the BSWG and the Commission formation process.

Adjourn

Next meeting is scheduled for April 11.

-###-

**COMMISSION FORMATION AGREEMENT ISSUE 1:
COMPOSITION AND APPOINTMENT OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

I. BACKGROUND

- The Commission Formation Agreement (“CFA”) forming the bi-state bridge authority (“BSBA”) must address the composition and appointment process for the Board of Directors.
- The membership of the Board of Directors will be a key factor used by lenders and credit-rating agencies in assessing the creditworthiness of the BSBA.

II. INITIAL DISCUSSION PROPOSAL

- **GENERAL:** The Board will consist of ten members, half from each state. There will be six local government-appointed members, all of whom will be voting members. In addition, four state officials are proposed to be on the Board, all of whom will be non-voting members.
- **LOCAL GOVERNMENT-APPOINTED MEMBERS:**
 - The Klickitat County Commission and the Hood River County Commission will each appoint three Board members. The initial terms will be staggered, after the initial term each term will be four years. All six of these Board members will be voting members of the Board.
 - In WA, the Cities of White Salmon and Bingen will provide nominations; the appointment of a Board member will be in the discretion of Klickitat County. In OR, the City of Hood River and Port of Hood River will provide nominations; the appointment of a Board member will be in the discretion of Hood River County.
 - Once appointed, Board members are independent of the governing bodies that appointed or nominated them. They do not represent or serve as an agent for any local government.
 - The CFA will establish the following criteria for prospective Board members:
 - There will be no requirement that a Board member must live or work within the appointing County
 - In nominating and appointing Board members, the local governing bodies will prioritize persons with experience pertinent to the role and functions of the BSBA such as in financing, construction, lending, law, business management, or project management and development.
 - **DISCUSSION ITEM:** BSWG should discuss what, if any, provisions should be included in the CFA regarding the appointment of sitting local elected officials to the Board? There appears to be four basic options, although others may be identified:
 - Sitting elected officials are not allowed to be on the Board.
 - No restrictions, requirements, or criteria related to sitting elected officials
 - Require that at least one Board member from each state must be a sitting elected official

- Allow sitting elected officials to be on Board so long as he/she has experience pertinent to the BSBA such as in financing, construction, lending, law, business management, or project management and development.

- **STATE-APPOINTED MEMBERS**

- The ODOT Director and WSDOT Secretary will each appoint one DOT staff member to be a non-voting Board member. The appointed person must be senior level DOT staff with experience pertinent to the BSBA such as the DOT CFO, Chief Bridge Engineer, Toll Division Director, or Major Projects Director.
- The Oregon Treasurer and Washington Treasurer will each appoint one Treasury staff member to be a non-voting board member. The appointed person must be senior-level Treasury staff with experience pertinent to the BSBA such as the Debt Manager/Deputy, or Legal Compliance Officer.
- While these state-appointed Board members are non-voting, it is intended that they be fully-participating Board members that bring their special capabilities to Board deliberations.
- **NEXT STEPS:** If BSWG decides to seek state participation on the Board, BSWG should recommend that staff and consulting team begin discussions with state officials to determine their interest.

BSWG Memo



Prepared by: Kevin Greenwood
Date: April 11, 2022
Re: Port's 10-Year Model 2022

The Port's 10-Year Model is a Planning Tool for seeing the effect of different assumptions over a ten-year period. It's intended to change based upon updated information and approaches based upon Port financial policies. Attached is a summary roll-up of the Port's financial model that shows reserve accumulation for bridge repairs in the next several years.

The Port is planning safety repairs later this year of \$500k to repair the approach ramps and next year a significant \$1.5M repair will be needed to replace a wire rope on the lift. Additional repairs are possible to restore the 80,000 lb. weight limit in addition to bridge painting and other necessary projects to keep the current bridge safe and operable.

There was, however, discussion about increasing the toll in early 2023 and every two years until 2030 to fund a new reserve fund focused on bridge replacement needs.

As part of that discussion, there were a number of policy items discussed and deduced:

1. Identify total Port expenses related to the bridge replacement effort
2. Identify total Port revenue being use for the bridge replacement effort
3. Create a new Bridge Replacement Reserve Fund (separate from the Bridge Repair and Replacement Fund)
 - a. Implement a new toll increase of 25-cents for a cash toll and half that for Breeze By
 - b. Tolls would increase every two years so that current toll is doubled by time of new bridge opening.
4. Uses of the BRRF could potentially be used for:
 - a. Reserves for future bridge authority to develop creditworthiness
 - b. Reserves for operations in advance of first new bridge toll collections
 - c. Reserves for matching federal grant/appropriations
 - d. Paying for government affairs consultants
 - e. Paying for project portion of office/shop relocation
 - f. Paying for indirect or partial costs for other port staff and operations
5. Create an alternative 10-Year Model to prepare for bridge replacement along with a parallel Model that prepares for significant capital repairs with tolls to pay for those repair loans.

None of these policies have been adopted but the Port would appreciate feedback from the BSWG on these policy ideas. Ultimately as it will be important for the BSWG and the Port to work together on moving those policy considerations forward.

-###-

**Port of Hood River
Long Range Financial Model
Updated: March 17, 2022**

Agency-Wide Statistic	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
Total Operating Revenues	\$9,027,435	\$9,769,341	\$11,491,572	\$11,747,852	\$12,513,173	\$13,020,748	\$13,358,090	\$13,708,057	\$13,955,139	\$14,195,132
Total Direct Operating Expenses	\$4,199,754	\$4,566,479	\$4,624,828	\$4,406,304	\$4,582,556	\$4,742,946	\$4,908,949	\$5,080,762	\$5,258,589	\$5,442,639
Total Allocated Personnel	\$2,741,271	\$3,013,933	\$3,111,037	\$3,048,223	\$3,128,010	\$3,206,704	\$3,287,382	\$3,370,095	\$3,454,894	\$3,541,833
Net Operating Income before Debt Service and Capital Outlay	\$2,086,409	\$2,188,929	\$3,755,708	\$4,293,326	\$4,802,606	\$5,071,098	\$5,161,759	\$5,257,200	\$5,241,656	\$5,210,660
Cash on Cash Return before Debt Service and Capital Outlay	3.0%	3.0%	4.9%	4.7%	4.8%	4.7%	4.7%	4.6%	4.2%	4.0%
Net Operating Income after Debt Service and Net Capital Outlays (Excl. Grant Funded)	\$1,425,460	-\$192,648	-\$1,109,151	\$1,779,872	\$2,525,024	\$3,719,990	\$18,519,488	-\$7,004,426	-\$4,038,482	\$269,139
Cash on Cash Return after Debt Service and Capital Outlays (Excl. Grant Funded)	2.1%	-0.3%	-1.4%	1.9%	2.5%	3.4%	17.0%	-6.2%	-3.3%	0.2%
No. FTE in Port Buildings	336	332	332	332	332	332	342	342	342	342
Wages of Jobs in Port Buildings	\$15,964,681	\$16,671,103	\$17,721,383	\$18,430,238	\$18,983,145	\$19,457,724	\$19,944,167	\$20,442,771	\$20,953,840	\$21,578,993
End of Year Reserves	\$13,844,995	\$13,665,576	\$12,641,556	\$14,573,772	\$17,301,322	\$21,300,195	\$40,376,527	\$34,079,553	\$30,620,669	\$31,429,012
Reserves from Sale of Assets	\$ 3,106,074	\$ 3,106,074	\$ 3,106,074	\$ 3,840,492	\$ 4,175,904	\$ 4,672,488	\$ 5,289,294	\$ 5,289,294	\$ 5,289,294	\$ 5,289,294
Reserves Unassigned	\$ 10,738,921	\$ 10,559,503	\$ 9,535,482	\$ 10,733,280	\$ 13,125,418	\$ 16,627,707	\$ 35,087,233	\$ 28,790,259	\$ 25,331,375	\$ 26,139,719
10% on Net Depreciable Assets	\$ 6,203,938	\$ 6,465,947	\$ 7,925,056	\$ 8,929,592	\$ 9,695,752	\$ 9,826,384	\$ 10,311,272	\$ 11,284,382	\$ 12,028,773	\$ 12,189,940
Excess (Under) 10% Depreciable Assets	\$ 4,534,983	\$ 4,093,555	\$ 1,610,426	\$ 1,803,688	\$ 3,429,666	\$ 6,801,323	\$ 24,775,961	\$ 17,505,878	\$ 13,302,603	\$ 13,949,778
Total Capital Assets - Revenue	\$ 44,624,159	\$ 47,581,559	\$ 57,154,559	\$ 60,499,559	\$ 64,476,781	\$ 65,421,781	\$ 69,943,281	\$ 80,076,781	\$ 87,298,781	\$ 88,680,781
Total Capital Assets - Govt	\$ 16,227,913	\$ 17,077,913	\$ 22,096,002	\$ 28,061,945	\$ 32,145,327	\$ 32,345,476	\$ 32,552,631	\$ 32,767,036	\$ 32,988,945	\$ 33,218,622
Less: Land Sales	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 734,418	\$ 335,412	\$ 496,584	\$ 616,806	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Add: Capital Improvements	\$ 1,187,312									
	\$ 62,039,384	\$ 64,659,472	\$ 79,250,561	\$ 89,295,922	\$ 96,957,520	\$ 98,263,841	\$ 103,112,718	\$ 112,843,817	\$ 120,287,727	\$ 121,899,403
10%	\$ 6,203,938	\$ 6,465,947	\$ 7,925,056	\$ 8,929,592	\$ 9,695,752	\$ 9,826,384	\$ 10,311,272	\$ 11,284,382	\$ 12,028,773	\$ 12,189,940

**HOOD RIVER-WHITE SALMON BRIDGE REPLACEMENT PROJECT
REPLACEMENT BRIDGE MANAGEMENT CONTRACT PROCUREMENT SCHEDULE**

DRAFT: March 30, 2022

date included in RFP

public meetings

TASKS / SUB-TASKS	START	END	DAYS
RFP/RFQ RELEASED	3/11/22	4/22/22	42
Issue Date of RFQ/RFP	3/10/22	3/16/22	6
Pre-proposal meeting	3/16/22	3/31/22	15
Close question period (1 wk before due date)	3/31/22	4/15/22	15
Submittals due	4/15/22	4/22/22	7
SUBMITTAL EVALUATIONS	4/21/22	5/24/22	33
Pre-Evaluation Meeting (Training)	4/21/22	4/21/22	0
Bids Distributed	4/22/22	4/25/22	3
Proposal Evaluation Period	4/25/22	4/28/22	3
Selection Meeting	4/28/22	4/29/22	1
Interviews: Day 1	5/9/22	5/9/22	0
Interviews: Day 2	5/10/22	5/10/22	0
Evaluation Comm. completes assessment/not-selected notices	5/10/22	5/11/22	1
Port Comm. authorizes negotiations (NOI)	5/11/22	5/17/22	6
Selection protest period	5/17/22	5/24/22	7
RBM CONTRACT COMPLETION	5/24/22	7/19/22	56
Contract negotiations	5/17/22	6/2/22	16
FHWA/ODOT Review of contract	6/2/22	7/1/22	29
Finalize contract docs	7/1/22	7/6/22	5
BSWG Reviews RBMC Contract	7/6/22	7/12/22	6
Contract execution/NTP	7/12/22	7/19/22	7



EVALUATION COMMITTEE INSTRUCTIONS

Please read these instructions before the Pre-Evaluation Meeting on Thursday, April 21, 9:00-10:00am. It outlines processes and procedures required by statute, rule and policy. If you have any questions or difficulties contact the assigned procurement specialist listed below.

Thank you for your willingness to serve on the above referenced evaluation committee for this Request for Proposals (RFP) regarding the Replacement Bridge Management Contract (RBMC) for the Port of Hood River. These instructions outline the role of the Evaluation Committee and standards by which the Evaluation Committee will score the Statement of Proposal (SOPs) received for Request for Proposals #POHR 2022-01.

The assigned procurement specialist for this RFP is Kevin Greenwood, Port of Hood River Procurement Specialist, and can be reached at kgreenwood@portofhoodriver.com or (541) 961-9517.

OVERALL EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS

Statute, rule and policy* all combine to require an evaluation process that affords fair and equitable treatment of all Proposers. The following bullets outline the process used to assure the integrity of the evaluation process:

- Evaluators are selected on the basis of their ability to provide an objective, impartial evaluation of the proposals;
- Proposals are evaluated by an evaluation committee consistent with the process described in the RFP;
- Members of the Evaluation Committee with actual or potential conflicts of interest are required to declare this in writing and may be excluded from participating in the evaluation if a potential conflict exists, and will be excluded if an actual conflict exists; and
- Each member of the Evaluation Committee member shall independently read and score all proposals (that were received on time and that met pass/fail requirements) according to the evaluation criteria set forth in the RFP before attending the evaluation committee meeting.
- Evaluation Committee members shall complete an evaluation scoring sheet for each proposal prior to attending the evaluation committee selection meeting.

*Reference including, but not limited to: ORSs 244, 279B.060, 279C.110, OARs 125-247-0630, 137-047-0261, 137-048-0220, 137-048-0240.

RESPONSIBILITIES**

Accountability

As an Evaluation Committee member you are accountable for everything you say, write and do regarding the RFP, each proposal and the evaluation process. Proposal evaluations are part of the RFP and contract files and as such, are public records, including the names of the evaluators. Proposers and any member of the public may review evaluations of all proposals and proposers may use the information to determine

whether they submit a protest. Any written comments must be disclosed to any requesting party as part of the public record.

Proposers are entitled to ask for a debriefing and you can be required to attend and defend your position.

To preserve the integrity of the public contracting process, deviation from the Evaluation Committee instructions may result in consequences ranging from excluding an Evaluation Committee member's scores from the selection process to canceling the RFP and starting over. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the instructions, please contact the assigned procurement specialist identified above.

Public Record

A Public record includes any writing that contains information relating to the conduct of the public's business.

As such, evaluation and scoring sheets and comments are subject to Oregon's public records laws after the selection phase is concluded. Please note, however; confidentiality must be maintained at least until the issuance of the Notice of Intent to Award letters and sometimes until the execution of the Contract. This protects the integrity of the process and helps ensure fairness. It also limits the number of phone calls from lobbying Proposers.

Conflict of Interest

The Evaluation Scoring Sheets prepared for RFP evaluation contain a conflict of interest certification at the top of the first page. If you have, or think you have, a conflict of interest, including any circumstances that could be perceived by others as a conflict of interest, please contact the assigned procurement specialist immediately by phone or email to declare the conflict and its nature. The assigned procurement specialist and management shall review the circumstances of the conflict and determine whether or not it is necessary to exclude you from participating in the evaluation process. This will permit us the opportunity to seek a substitute evaluator. **If you have any questions about what constitutes a conflict of interest, or apparent conflict of interest, contact the assigned procurement specialist immediately.**

Proposing firms should not contact you about this RFP during any part of the evaluation and selection process. If a proposer contacts you about the RFP, contact the assigned procurement specialist immediately.

Incidental or business contact with proposers to this RFP regarding other contracts and projects is allowed provided there is no discussion regarding this RFP.

Contact with Others

Evaluation Committee members shall not independently:

- Discuss any aspect or opinion of Proposers, proposals or proposal ranking, or share information from proposals outside any evaluation committee meeting.
- Discuss the project in any way with Proposers or accept anything from Proposers. This includes gifts and meals. These actions may constitute grounds for rejection of the respective proposal and disqualification of the Proposer.
- Evaluate proposals based on criteria other than those contained in the RFP, or on the basis of information not included in the proposals.

- Complete independent research (like internet research), including hyperlinks in the proposal, as part of the evaluation of the proposals, unless required by the RFP and provided in the proposal.
- **Contact and discussion of this evaluation with any of the proposers, other evaluators, other Agency staff and Managers, or other persons including, but not limited to, stakeholders and the media is not permitted during this phase of the selection process.** Discussing proposals compromises the integrity of the solicitation process.
- **Use personal knowledge about a proposer.**

**Reference including, but not limited to, ORS 192.410 through 192.505, ORS 279B.060, ORS 279C.107, OAR 125-247-0630, 137-047-0261, and “Contact with Others”, below.

EVALUATION PROCESS FOR THIS PROJECT

Evaluation Summary

The assigned procurement specialist will act as a facilitator and consultant on contractual and procedural matters and will perform the initial review of the proposals to ensure all administrative and submission requirements are met. The assigned procurement specialist will not perform a technical evaluation of the proposals; that is the responsibility of the Evaluation Committee.

We will meet for a Pre-Evaluation Meeting on Thursday, April 21 at 9:00am via Zoom.

We will meet for the Selection Meeting on Friday, April 29 at 8:00am via Zoom.

If a member of the Evaluation Committee is not able to attend the pre-evaluation meeting or Selection Meeting, immediately notify the assigned procurement specialist to reschedule or obtain an alternate.

After completing pass/fail evaluations, the assigned procurement specialist will provide the evaluation committee with the names of the Proposers.

Evaluation and Scoring

The Evaluation Committee shall receive proposals, evaluation scoring sheets, and any other relevant materials based on the RFP by Monday, April 25. The Port will distribute proposals to Committee members in person over the weekend. Please communicate to Procurement Specialist directions for delivery.

Each proposal must be evaluated and scored based on the proposer’s response to the scoring criteria identified in the RFP.

Evaluation Committee members bring various resources, skills, and areas of expertise to the evaluation process. After all committee members have completed their scoring sheets, the Evaluation Committee will meet to jointly discuss the merits of each proposal, make any appropriate changes, document any changes and individually assign Total Scores for each proposal.

Evaluation Committee members shall **independently** review and assign points to each proposal based on the evaluation criteria and scoring methodology established in the RFP. Assign integers for “Points Awarded” only prior to the evaluation committee meeting. **No fractions and decimals. Please try to**

avoid tie scores unless truly appropriate. If there are sub-criteria without specific weights assigned, then each sub-criterion must be considered to have equal weight.

If there is a firm that you want to have contacted to request clarification on an issue, send the question and name of the firm to the assigned procurement specialist. DO NOT CONTACT THE PROPOSER YOURSELF.

Contact the assigned procurement specialist if you need additional information from other staff or if you need clarification from a Proposer about information in their proposal. The assigned procurement specialist will follow-up and provide information to the Evaluation Committee.

Evaluation Committee Members shall:

- Read the RFP and all addenda.
- Read each proposal prior to assigning points.
- Complete an independent Evaluation of each proposal
- Evaluate proposals based **only** on the criteria contained in the RFP
- Complete the Evaluation and Scoring Sheets provided
 - **Each score must include written justification or reason** for the score in the comment field for each category.
 - If the proposer receives a high score on an item, the comment must reflect why.
 - Conversely, if a low score is assigned, the comment must provide the rationale for that as well.
 - It is helpful to document the page or pages you found the information or content for your score.
 - If a scoring criterion includes sub-criteria, each individual sub-criterion must receive a score. If sub-criteria do not have specific weights assigned, then each sub-criterion must be considered to have equal weight.
 - Comments must be objective and based only on the information available in the Proposal.
 - Be thorough and objective. Scores should reflect your evaluation of the information presented in the Proposal.

The evaluation process must comply with applicable federal laws, state statutes, rules and Agency policies. Therefore, Evaluation Committee members shall:

- Document and refer all inquiries and contacts regarding the RFP from outside of the Evaluation Committee to the assigned procurement specialist.
- Refer all proposal clarification requests to the assigned procurement specialist.
- Put all notes and comments on the scoring sheets. **Use non-black ink pen** (not pencil) when scoring or making comments/notes on the scoring sheets. Do not erase anything (e.g. scoring, comments, etc). If you make an error in scoring use a single line to line-out the score to be deleted and enter your new score. Likewise with any comments you wish to delete or change, must be dated and initialed. You should then explain the reason for your deletion or change. This leaves a documented trail for persons that may later review these materials that will explain what you have done.
- While reviewing the proposals, if you make notes or other marks on them, please make sure to transfer relevant information to the evaluation scoring sheet. Your comments must support the points given for each evaluation criteria, and must be sufficient to support a challenge/protest.
- The Evaluation Committee is charged with fair and impartial evaluation of the proposals per the RFP requirements and must defend their scores and ranking. Be thorough and objective.

Document the basis of points awarded to each evaluation criterion in each proposal on the evaluation scoring sheet in the “Comments” spaces provided.

Pre-Evaluation Meeting

The purpose of Pre-Evaluation Meeting is meeting with the Selection Team. The assigned procurement specialist will provide an overview of the:

- RFP and any Addenda
- Evaluation process
- Evaluation guidelines identified in this Memorandum
- Timeline requirements for the RFP
- Evaluation and selection process
- Conflict of Interest and will collect the COI Certification Forms

The Project Manager will provide an overview of the Project.

Please review this Memorandum and the RFP and Addenda prior to the meeting. Proposals and evaluation scoring sheets will be distributed at the Pre-Evaluation Meeting.

Selection Meeting

Committee members should feel comfortable with the justification and defense of their respective evaluation and scoring of each proposal. It is not necessary that members concur on any given point. However, this meeting is an opportunity for members to discuss and compare their scores. Reviewing proposals is a laborious task, and members sometimes miss the discussion of a particular criterion, or confuse one proposal with another. Discussion of apparent discrepant scores during the evaluation meeting is an excellent way to identify information that was missed or misunderstood. To repeat, though, it is not necessary that members concur on any given point.

Please sign and date each Evaluation and Scoring Sheet prior to the Selection Meeting. Send the completed Evaluation and Scoring Sheets, as a PDF document, to the assigned procurement specialist not later than Thursday, April 28, 2022.

Bring all completed Evaluation and Scoring Sheets to the Selection Meeting.

The assigned procurement specialist will prepare a scoring matrix showing Evaluation Committee member’s scores.

The Evaluation Committee will discuss the scores at the Selection Meeting. Scores cannot be changed unless an Evaluation Committee member failed to consider critical information in a Proposal. All score changes must be clearly documented on the relevant Evaluation Committee member’s Evaluation and Scoring Sheet along with the justification for the change, initialed and dated by the Evaluation Committee member.

Once the Evaluation Committee has discussed the strengths and weaknesses of each Proposal, the assigned procurement specialist shall ask the Evaluation Committee to make a recommendation for intent to award and negotiations the highest ranked firm(s), recommendation to conduct references or for firms to be contacted for interviews, or recommendation to go to the next phase as defined in the RFP.

The assigned procurement specialist shall:

- Prepare a revised scoring matrix to accurately capture scores of each evaluator for each proposal;
- Determine the highest-ranking responsive, responsible Proposal and send the result to the Evaluation Committee for concurrence and written recommendation for Notice of Intent to Award;
- **If Applicable:**
 - Conduct reference checks,
 - Notify firms of invitation to interview
- Prepare and issue notice of intent to award a contract, and provide not-selected notices to Proposers not awarded a contract;
- Respond to any protests received.

Thank you for your commitment to serve on this Evaluation Committee. Please contact me if you have any questions or concerns at any time during the evaluation process.

Respectfully,

Kevin Greenwood, Project Director/Procurement Specialist
Port of Hood River
1000 E. Port Marina Dr.
Hood River, OR 97031
(541) 961-9517
kgreenwood@portofhoodriver.com