REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
PROFESSIONAL CONSULTING SERVICES FOR

BEDWELL BAYFRONT PARK
MASTER PLAN PROJECT

ISSUED:
Monday, November 7, 2016

PROPOSALS DUE:
Monday, December 12, 2016, by 5:00 p.m.

CITY OF MENLO PARK
COMMUNITY SERVICES
701 LAUREL ST.
MENLO PARK, CA  94025
INVITATION TO SUBMIT PROPOSALS

The City of Menlo Park invites proposals for professional services from a design team with demonstrated experience, knowledge and expertise in urban planning and/or landscape architecture design with experience in performing park master plans for municipalities.

Proposals shall be submitted no later than Monday, December 12, 2016, by 5:00 p.m. to:

Derek Schweigart
Assistant Community Services Director
City of Menlo Park
701 Laurel St.
Menlo Park, CA  94025
650-330-2267
dsschweigart@menlopark.org
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CITY OF MENLO PARK
SCOP OF SERVICES FOR
BEDWELL BAYFRONT PARK MASTER PLAN

I. OVERVIEW

The City of Menlo Park (“City”) invites qualified urban planning and landscape architecture design professionals with experience working with public agencies to submit a proposal for the development of a Master Plan for Bedwell Bayfront Park (BBP). Construction of a public park on the site of the City’s sanitary landfill began in 1982 and was completed in 1995. Currently, the park is designed as a passive open space with minimal improvements, including bike/pedestrian trails and restrooms. In conjunction with the construction of the park, gas recovery and leachate control projects were also built to ensure that the closed landfill met all regulatory requirements.

BBP is the City’s largest park and the City’s only open space on the San Francisco Bay (Bay). The park’s 160 acres are surrounded on three sides by the Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge. Easily accessible, the park’s many trails and hills provide great views of the refuge and South Bay. People enjoy the park for various activities including hiking, running, bicycling, dog walking, bird watching, kite flying and photography. The park’s hilly terrain, specifically designed for passive recreation, now serves as a landmark high point along the edge of the Bay.

The proposed Master Plan shall provide a long-term vision and general development guide for the park and its facilities, including how to protect its resources, improve amenities to enhance the park user experience, manage visitor use, plan for future park development and develop financing plan to pay for maintenance and capital cost of the park. The Master Plan shall recommend improvements for the next 25 years.

Deadline for submitting proposals is 5:00 p.m., Monday, December 12, 2016. Any proposals received after this time will be returned unopened.

II. BACKGROUND

Park Facilities
BBP is located at the east end of the City on San Francisco Bay at Highway 101 and Marsh Road. The site’s 160 acres are surrounded on three sides by the Don Edwards San Francisco Bay...
National Wildlife Refuge. People of all ages enjoy the park for hiking, running, bicycling, dog walking, bird watching, kite flying, and photography. The park has an extensive trail system. Some of the interior trails are steep, crossing the park’s hills, and lead to several viewpoints. Some of the park’s trails are suitable for wheelchairs. The relatively flat 2.3-mile trail around the perimeter of the park is part of the San Francisco Bay Trail. Parking is available along the entrance road and in two paved lots near the back of the park. Restrooms are near the first large paved parking lot.

**Park Usage**
The park was designed and planned as a passive open space area with minimal improvements, including bike/pedestrian trails and restroom. Since the early construction in 1982 and its completion in 1995, only in 2004-2006 did the City explore changes to the park in terms of its uses. The term “passive-recreation” has also been questioned recently with the issue of drones and other unmanned aircraft systems (UAS) in the park. The park has seen a significant increase in usage over the years and the recreational interests and needs of users have changed. Through various public forums, the City has learned that there is a desire for docent-led educational programs and tours, as well as spaces where information and opportunity for education could be received in the park.

Current park usage guidelines include:
1. Preserve the natural amenities of the open space land;
2. Conserve soil, vegetation, water and wildlife;
3. Exclude intensive uses or uses that could degrade the site or adjacent sites;
4. Encourage the following:
   a. Viewing and interpretation of the natural environment;
   b. Passive recreation activities such as hiking, running, cycling, dog-walking, photography, bird watching and similar day recreation use; and
   c. Landscape or wildlife restoration and enhancement programs.

In addition, on August 23, 2016, the City Council approved an amendment to the Menlo Park Municipal Code Section 8.28.130 prohibiting the use of drones and other UAS in City parks.

**Landfill**
Originally a landfill, solid waste operations were first established at the site by San Mateo County in 1957. The County operated a solid waste incinerator there, but the operation was unsuccessful and the plant was removed. The South County Garbage and Refuse Disposal District (SCGRDD) took over the area and established a conventional sanitary landfill using the fill and cover method of refuse disposal. In 1968, the City took over the responsibility of the landfill, with operations handled by the South County Garbage Company. The City then began the development of a park to meet the needs of the residents. Construction of the park began in 1982 and the landfill was closed in 1984. A gas recovery system was installed later for the handling of the methane gas produced by the landfill. In 1991, a leachate extraction system was installed. Construction of the park was finally completed in 1995. Currently, the City manages the operation of the landfill’s gas collection and control and leachate systems in accordance with all regulatory requirements. The park is also home to the West Bay Sanitary District’s wastewater equalization basins.
Gas Collection and Control and Leachate Recovery Systems

To comply with Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) regulatory requirements and as part of the landfill closure plan, the City covered the refuse with clay. This clay cap provides a seal to prevent gas from leaking to the atmosphere and water from infiltrating the landfill. The gas wellfield was installed in two phases, with the first phase built in 1984 and the second phase in 1987. The wellfield consists of 72 gas extraction wells and a network of pipes embedded just beneath the surface of the landfill cap that collect the gas. Originally, the landfill gas was directed to a flare for combustion. In 1987, an on-site gas-burning power generation plant was built. This facility consisted of 4 internal combustion engines. The electricity generated was sold to Pacific Gas and Electric until 2013, when the power plant was decommissioned due to lower landfill gas production, the age of the equipment, and increasingly stringent air quality standards. A new flare was built in 2013 and the landfill gas is combusted in compliance with the BAAQMD permit. The gas system is currently operated by Fortistar, a contract operator.

Another waste product generated as the refuse in a landfill decomposes through biological, chemical and physical processes, is an acidic liquid called leachate. In 1986 and 1987, seven sumps were installed along the perimeter of the landfill for the extraction of leachate. In 1991, a larger monitoring and collection system was installed, consisting of nine wells and the seven existing extraction sumps. The leachate system does not encompass the complete perimeter of the park. The City has the responsibility to monitor, collect samples and dispose of the leachate generated from the landfill. Once the leachate is captured, it is discharged to the sanitary system for conveyance to the wastewater treatment plant for treatment and disposal. The leachate system is operated per the requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Currently, the operation and maintenance of the system is contracted to CB&I Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc. (CB&I).

An assessment of the gas collection system was completed by CB&I on August 2016. As part of the evaluation, the gas recovery wells were located and surveyed and the integrity of each well was assessed. The findings indicated that many of the wells and gas lines are severely watered in, which is affecting the ability of the system to recover the landfill gas. Based on the findings, the study recommended improvements to the gas recovery system and the installation of leachate pumps to mitigate the high water levels found in the wells. The recommended upgrade would improve the gas recovery operations and protect human health and the environment.

Funding Sustainability of the Park

Funding for the maintenance and operation of the Park consists of two sources. The BBP Landfill Fund is used for all regulatory compliance expenses related to the closed landfill. The BBP Landfill Fund receives revenue from the City’s solid waste fees. The BPP Landfill Fund currently has a balance of $4,600,000, with current annual expenses of $390,000. As these funds are collected through the solid waste fee program, their use is restricted to regulatory compliance of the landfill related expenses and cannot be used for park maintenance and operations.
The BBP Maintenance Fund is a sinking fund used for expenses related to the operations and maintenance of park facilities. The City imposed a tipping fee on each ton of waste disposed in the landfill until it was closed. Between 2004 and 2006 the City explored the possibility of active recreational uses at BBP which might generate income for maintenance. A ballot measure was placed before the voters, which was voted down in 2006 and any plans to develop the park for active recreational uses were abandoned. In 2011, because the BBP Maintenance Fund was being depleted and projected to run out of funds in the next 4-5 years, staff revised the scope of services provided at the park. Daily contracted Ranger services were eliminated and general cleaning of the restrooms and litter removal was retained. The largest portion of the annual park maintenance cost was providing ranger service at an estimated annual cost of over $130,000 in 2011. The City Council approved the revised services in September 2011, resulting in an annual savings of over $100,000. The BBP Maintenance Fund currently has a balance of $335,000, with current annual expenses of $110,000.

Initially, when the ranger service was eliminated, there were few complaints received from the public. However, over the past few years the Parks and Recreation Commission and staff have received a number of complaints from the Friends of Bedwell Bayfront Park and other park users relating to car traffic congestion on weekends, off-leash dogs, feral feline feeding, drones and other unmanned aircraft systems (UAS).

**Capital Improvement and Maintenance Projects**

Park Facility
The City is responsible for the supervision and enforcement of park rules and regulations, as well as for ensuring that the on-going maintenance needs are met. The park’s maintenance program includes the following:

1. Annual mowing of the Park;
2. Daily cleaning of the restrooms and general garbage pickup;
3. Facility maintenance of the restrooms;
4. Maintenance of the fences; and
5. Annual signing and striping of parking lots.

In addition to the routine tasks, the park is in need of increased maintenance. In particular, users have identified the following maintenance projects:

1. Increased and improved bilingual signage throughout the park especially near the entrance and parking lot;
2. Maintenance of the park’s Great Spirit Path art installation;
3. Repair and maintenance of curb cuts near restrooms and parking lot;
4. Maintenance and addition to the number of benches throughout the park;
5. Improved maintenance of park restroom;
6. Trail maintenance and preservation;
7. Improved accessibility for the park; and
8. Landscaping where appropriate for safety and accessibility.
While the park requires on-going maintenance, there is significant capital investment needed. The park was developed over a thirteen year period, with the last phase occurring in 1995. As far back as November 2005, staff began to identify a number of capital improvement projects at the park, the cost for which exceed the funds currently available in the park maintenance budget. For example, the pathways and perimeter road have a useful life of ten years and fifteen years, respectively, and are in need of replacement. The main entrance road has a twenty year life. Some of the projects identified by City staff in 2005 are noted below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Improvement Projects Identified (2005 costs)</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pathway Renovation (290,000 sq. ft. – bike/pedestrian)</td>
<td>$1,823,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perimeter Road Resurfacing (149,000 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>$464,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Road Resurfacing (691,000 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>$2,229,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Panel Upgrade</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to the limitations of the BBP Maintenance Fund, the City has not completed any of the projects listed above. Funding for these projects needs to be determined as well as for the ongoing maintenance and park supervision needs. It is important to note that some of the capital improvements may be funded through existing Development Agreements. However, per the terms of the various agreements, the capital improvements made with these funds shall be determined by the City Council through a City public outreach process.

**Landfill**

As discussed in the previous sections, an assessment of the gas collection system was completed by CB&I on August 2016. The findings indicate that the gas collection system is in need of a major upgrade. Improvements to the system involve the decommissioning or replacement of wells that are damaged and no longer recovering landfill gas, the installation of pump systems in the gas wells for the extraction of water and condensate, and the replacement of all wellheads and vaults with industry standard components. Staff plans to hire CB&I to work with the consultant to support the master plan.

### III. PROJECT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The primary goals and objectives of the Master Plan are as follows:

- Development of a visioning process that facilitates engagement from the community and stakeholders to define the long-term uses and needs of the park;
- Establishment of park design guidelines and criteria;
- Development of a maintenance and capital improvement program that recommends and outlines the infrastructure upkeep needs and improvements necessary for existing amenities and future park development;
- Development of a funding plan to maintain the long-term vision and general development guide for the park and its facilities, including how to protect park resources, provide quality visitor experiences, and manage visitor use; and
- Continued operation of the landfill facilities in a manner that ensures proper safety, meets industry standards and complies with regulatory requirements.
IV. SCOPE OF WORK

The scope of work presented below is the minimum necessary to meet the City’s goals and objectives. The Consultant is expected to propose additions and modifications to the scope of work as is deemed necessary or advisable and to incorporate their expertise into the proposal.

The scope of work for the Master Plan includes the following:

1. Develop an inventory and assessment of existing open space, trails, signage (way-finding, trail signage, interpretive), roads, traffic control and circulation, parking and other park amenities, and consider existing conditions, opportunities, constraints, and adequacy to meet current and future needs;
2. Develop a public outreach plan following the City’s Community Engagement Model, which requires that the communication strategy be in both English and Spanish, to seek and incorporate community and stakeholder input in the development of a long-term vision for the park;
3. Analyze Americans with Disabilities Act design compliance and the user’s comfort and convenience when accessing the park;
4. Consistent with the community’s and stakeholder’s long-term visions for the park, identify options for:
   - Improving the park experience for a diverse population of users;
   - Including components that promote and enhance educational opportunities;
   - Enhancing the park user experience through improved amenities, such as access, bicycle and walking trails, parking, and park information kiosks;
   - Locations for interpretive signage and content that focuses on nature / wildlife, history of the park and the South Bay Salt Ponds / Ravenswood Complex. Options for incorporating new technology (smart phone / social media) shall also be evaluated;
   - Locations for wildlife viewing areas throughout park;
   - Improving access, pedestrian and bicycle circulation and way-finding throughout the park that considers the sensitivity of wildlife habitats, of the methane gas and leachate collection systems operations, and the West Bay Sanitary District Facilities; and
   - Improved park safety and enforcement of park rules and regulations.
5. Assess the use of UAS in context with the use of the park and the City’s current ban;
6. Working with the City’s landfill Consultant, identify regulatory and industry standard practices for similar park operations in former landfills that includes, but is not limited to access to potable water, fire protection and the operation of gas and leachate systems;
7. Develop recommendations for park improvements based on the assessment of the existing conditions, opportunities for improving the park conditions to meet future needs and the goals and objectives of the study. The recommendations shall also include the following:
   a. Incorporation of the landfill’s findings and capital improvement recommendations based on input and review from the City’s landfill Consultant;
   b. Coordination with the South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project / Ravenswood Complex;
c. Project costs;
d. Phasing (based on 5, 15, and 25 year time frames) and prioritization of all park and landfill projects based on feasibility, needs, cost, and coordination with other agency projects;

8. Identify funding sources for the capital and maintenance needs of the Park;
9. Identify and outline California Environmental Quality Act process and requirements for the implementation of recommended park improvements;
10. Develop a park user map and information booklet that adheres to the City’s branding standards;
11. Develop design guidelines that include, but are not limited to materials, signage, informational documentation, and landscaping; and
12. Develop an operations and maintenance plan for the park.

An important aspect of the Master Plan process will involve public outreach to develop the long-term vision for the park. The consultant services shall follow the Community Engagement Model and Communications Strategy and include attendance at meetings, including public meetings, City Council and Parks and Recreation Commission meetings, as well as meetings with stakeholders, as required; the facilitation of any public/staff workshops or meetings, if needed; and providing agendas and minutes for all project meetings. Any strategy that is developed by the consultant should include communication in English and Spanish both for marketing collateral materials and interpretation services at meetings.

The final deliverables for the project shall include:

1. The Master Plan report for Council approval, including a new Master Plan map;
2. A financial analysis that includes options to pay for the ongoing maintenance and capital needs of the park;
3. Updated BBP Design and Graphics Guideline documents for Council approval; and
4. A new park user map/information booklet.
5. All documents must be consistent with the City’s branding standards.

Project Stakeholders: The following stakeholders should be considered in future Master Plan discussions at some point in the process:

- City of Menlo Park (MP) Community Services Department staff
- City of MP Public Works Department staff
- City of MP Community Development Department staff
- City of MP City Council
- City of MP Parks and Recreation Commission (PRC)
- Cargill, Inc.
- Friends of Bedwell Bayfront Park
- California State Coastal Conservancy (CSCC)
- California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
- South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project
• Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge
• Audubon Society of San Mateo County
• Audubon Society of Santa Clara County
• California Exploratorium
• Facebook, Inc.
• Bohannon Corporation
• West Bay Sanitary District staff and board
• Concerned Citizens to Complete the Refuge (CCCR)
• Committee for Green Foothills
• Academy of Model Aeronautics

Reference documents for the project:
• BBP Environmental Impact Report (1976)
• Management Recommendations (1982)
• Gas Collection and Control System Study (2016)

Delivery of Documents to the City
The Consultant will convert all documents (text, AutoCAD, spreadsheets, photos, etc.) into Adobe Acrobat Document Format (PDF) for submission to the City with hard copies. At the completion of the project, the Consultant will also submit to the City electronic copies of all project documents, including Microsoft Word files, Excel files, PowerPoint files, and AutoCAD files (if AutoCAD is used to develop plans, layouts, maps, or other diagrams).

The Consultant shall provide a total of at least six (6) hard copies of all deliverables, including drafts for City review at different phases of the project. The Consultant should plan on submitting draft Master Plan documents for City review, revising the draft Master Plan incorporating City comments, resubmitting the revised documents for another City review, and then making other minor revisions before producing the final draft Master Plan documents to be presented to the City’s PRC. After the PRC meeting, the Master Plan documents shall be revised again and final Master Plan documents and deliverables shall be submitted for final City review. The Consultant shall then make any revisions necessary and then the Master Plan documents shall be presented to the City Council and any changes to the plan shall be incorporated into the final Master Plan.

Although the City anticipates successful completion of all project tasks, it reserves the right to terminate the work at any time it deems necessary. In the event of such termination, the Consultant shall, at the option of the City, promptly deliver to the City all work products completed to date, including working papers, study notes, electronic files, and data previously collected.

Additional Services
The Consultant should clearly state what services are not in their basic proposal but could be provided as additional services. Additional services may be required or desired and will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis by the City. Additional services must be approved in writing by the City once an additional services proposal is reviewed and approved by the City. The Consultant’s additional services proposal should clearly outline the scope of additional services,
the cost of the additional work, and the schedule for completing the work. The Consultant shall be compensated for the actual hours worked using the hourly rates set forth in the fee schedule submitted.

V. SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS

Proposals will be accepted until 5:00 p.m., Monday, December 12, 2016, and should be addressed to:

Derek Schweigart  
Assistant Community Services Director  
City of Menlo Park  
701 Laurel Street  
Menlo Park, CA 94025  
650-330-2267  
dsschweigart@menlopark.org

Any proposals received after the deadline will be returned unopened. Proposals shall be submitted in sealed envelopes which shall be plainly marked: “CITY OF MENLO PARK BEDWELL BAYFRONT PARK MASTER PLAN PROJECT”. The envelope shall also bear the name and business address of the proposer.

The City of Menlo Park reserves the right to reject any or all proposals and to waive any and all irregularities to choose the firm that, in its opinion, best serves its interests. The City will not be liable for any costs incurred by the proposer’s incidental to the preparation and presentation of qualifications, either orally or in writing. Costs for preparation of proposals will be the sole responsibility of the Consultant and will not be paid for by the City.

All questions/inquiries must be made through Derek Schweigart, via e-mail to dsschweigart@menlopark.org no later than 5:00 p.m. on November 30, 2016. The City will provide a written response to all questions in the form of an addendum.

VI. PROPOSAL FORMAT

In response to this Request for Proposals (RFP), consultants must provide a well-developed list of major project tasks that address the project goals and specific scope of work descriptions for these project tasks; methods and/or analytical procedures to perform the tasks; deliverables associated with each task; costs for each task; and any proposed changes or additions to the scope. The proposal shall consist of two (2) parts submitted as one (1) package.

Part One—NARRATIVE shall describe the Consultant’s understanding of the project approach to accomplishing the project goals, relevant past experience, and any litigation brought against the firm. The Consultant shall provide a description of the different tasks or phases of work as part of this narrative.
Consultants shall submit five (5) hard copies and one (1) PDF file of their proposal of maximum length 10 to 15 pages (not sheets), excluding curriculum vitae, bios, and project schedule. All hard copy documents submitted must be printed double-sided.

**Part Two—FEE PROPOSAL** shall provide a budget or cost schedule to complete the scope of work, submitted separately from Part One. Two (2) hard copies of Part Two shall be submitted in a sealed envelope and a digital file in Microsoft Excel with subtotal and totals (Consultant calculation formulas/percentages are not required).

**Part One—NARRATIVE**
The proposal shall, at a minimum, cover the following items. Label the sections of your proposal to match the numbers below:

1. **Background and Proposed Study Design**

   Explain the general background, qualifications, and organizational structure of the firm and describe any special knowledge or capabilities material to the project that exist within the firm. Describe the proposed approach to the Scope of Services, including:
   - Organization and scheduling of tasks to be performed.
   - Proposed deliverables.
   - The team’s overall approach in fulfilling the stated objectives.
   - A brief summary of your team’s key strengths.
   - Approaches to working with City staff and policy-making agencies and stakeholders.
   - Other relevant factors pertaining to formulation and execution of a successful project.

2. **Experience**

   Describe your firm’s prior experience studying, developing, and managing the preparation of park Master Plan documents for public agencies, and other related experience that shows your ability to deliver the Scope of Services.

   Provide a list of recent projects for which the firm has provided services of a similar nature. Provide all pertinent information, including project description, contact person, phone number, e-mail address, location, duration, and current project status. Indicate which projects are your references.

3. **Team Qualifications**

   Identify the name and title of the lead contact person and principal staff who will be assigned to this project. Provide curriculum vitae for key Consultant team personnel and brief bios for all other team members. Provide a description of their responsibilities and the percentage of time expected to be spent on this project.
4. **Project Subcontractors**

Submit a list of sub consultants, if any, to be utilized on the project and describe how each sub consultant is qualified to perform the services and will be utilized. Provide a list of their similar past projects with all pertinent information, including project description, contact person, phone number, e-mail address, location, duration, and current project status. Identify principal staff assigned to this project from each sub consultant firm and their responsibilities on this project.

5. **Legal Information**

As applicable, submit a list of lawsuits filed within the past two (2) years against the firm or its principals alleging misconduct and/or negligence. Submit a list of claims within the past two (2) years against the firm’s Professional Liability insurance policy (errors and omissions), if any. Accompanying each (or either) list shall be a declaration by a principal of the firm indicating careful review of such lists and adding appropriate information concerning the current status or other disposition of the lawsuits or claims. This information may be submitted separately and confidentially, if so desired.

6. **Conflict of Interest Issues**

As applicable, submit a list of all projects (completed within the past three (3) years or currently under way) located within San Mateo County.

Accompanying such a list shall be a declaration by a principal of the firm indicating knowledge of and careful review of the subject matter and asserting freedom from conflicts of interest that might arise from relationships with parties that are involved in disputes with the City of Menlo Park.

Additionally, for firms that are currently working on projects within the City of Menlo Park for other private- or public-sector clients, submit a list of the project(s), including a broad description of the work being performed and the efforts that will be undertaken to separate this project from the other projects to avoid the potential for any conflict of interest.

7. **Project Schedule**

Submit a project schedule (subject to adjustment by mutual consent of Consultant and City).

8. **Insurance Requirements**

Submit evidence of the required insurance as set forth in the standard professional services agreement.
Part Two—FEE PROPOSAL

Provide a Fee Proposal for completing the project. This Fee Proposal shall provide a detailed budget/cost schedule for each program element described in the Scope of Services. For purposes of estimating, elements may be combined as appropriate, but both subtotals and totals must be shown. Work must be broken up into task categories with the associated costs provided. The City intends to award this contract to the firm that it considers will provide the best overall program services for the available budget. The City reserves the right to reject any proposals that are not responsive to this RFP.

The elements of the Fee Proposal shall include the following:

1. A schedule of hourly rates and itemized costs used to negotiate changes in the Scope of Services if necessary.

2. A detailed budget/cost schedule (showing section subtotals) for all items described in the Scope of Services, broken down into tasks.

The fee proposal may be used as one (1) selection criterion, but will not be used as the sole selection criterion. In negotiating a contract with the successful firm, refinements to fee, scope, and schedule will be jointly determined.

VII. CITY STANDARD PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT

The Consultant and any legal counsel, if necessary, shall review the City’s standard professional services agreement (Attachment) prior to submittal of the proposal. The City’s professional services agreement is our standard consultant contract and no amendments to such will be allowed. The submission of a proposal is an indication to the City that the Consultant is satisfied with the contents of the agreement.

VIII. SELECTION PROCESS AND CRITERIA

A selection committee will evaluate the proposals submitted and assign each a ranking. Following are the criteria for evaluation of the proposals, with the assumption that all minimum requirements have been met:

A. Effectiveness, clarity, and conciseness of the project approach.
B. Experience of the firm and project team in performing similar work for other public agencies.
C. Practical experience and technical qualifications of key staff and sub consultants.
D. Demonstrated success on previous projects, especially of similar scope, including quality of work, meeting project schedule, and budget.
E. Adherence to the requirements of this RFP.
F. Any litigation brought against the firm.
G. Total cost to the City.
H. Proposed timeline for completion of services.

**Oral Interview**
The City may evaluate proposals solely on the basis of each proposer’s written submittal, or it may invite those consulting firms it deems to have submitted the best proposals to an interview with the selection team. The Consultant’s key staff members should be in attendance.

**Selection Process**
Per City policy, the determination of the most qualified Consultant shall be on the basis of demonstrated competence and qualifications for the type of services required. The City will check the references of the top-ranked Consultants for such things as record in accomplishing work in a timely manner for similar projects within budget, quality of work completed for the City or other public agencies, ability to work with City staff and the public, and outstanding litigation.