



DATE: February 1, 2022
TO: Potential Proposers
FROM: Elena Kuhnhenh, Senior Fiscal Analyst
RE: E-TIP Request for Proposals No. 2022-0001

RFP ADDENDUM #1

This Addendum modifies the Request for Proposal (RFP) document(s) only to the extent indicated herein. Proposers must be responsive to any requirements of this Addendum as if the requirements were set forth in the originally issued RFP. Failure to do so may result in Proposal rejection.

The purpose of this Addendum is to:

Revise the attachment listed in section 3.2 of the RFP and add the referenced attachment to the original RFP packet of documents. The packet of documents is available at the following link:

<https://www.lcog.org/transportation/page/oregon-transportation-improvement-program-electronic-data-platform-e-tip>

This addendum details revisions to pre-existing language in the RFP either by ~~strike through~~ for deletions or underlining for insertions.

Revision 1 CHANGE

Section 3.2 TECHNICAL PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA and POINTS AVAILABLE
Amended to correct Attachment referenced in Evaluation Criteria #5 – Reference
Questionnaires

Proposer must complete sections A and B of a separate Reference Questionnaire form (~~RFP Attachment D~~ **Attachment F**) for each reference and send to the reference contact electronically (MS Word Format). ***Completed Reference Questionnaire forms must then be sent by the reference directly to SPC at the e-mail address on the form no later than the close date and time of this RFP.***

Revision 2 ADDITION
 Amended to include Attachment F

Attachment F
REFERENCE QUESTIONNAIRE FORM- page 1

(Note: Proposer completes sections A and B. Text boxes may be expanded, but the entire form must not exceed 2 pages.)

A. Consultant and Project Information		
Project Title:	Consultant Name:	
Location:		
Project Type:		
Brief Project Description and Proposing Firm's Role:		
Contract #:	Contract Start (Mo/Yr):	Contract Complete (Mo/Yr):
Client's Budget for the Project (if applicable):		
Consultant Services (including as amended):		
(check one)		
This is a: <input type="checkbox"/> primary reference; or <input type="checkbox"/> alternate reference		
B. Client Information		
Client Name:		
Client's PM:	Alt contact for client:	
Email:	Title:	
Ph #:	Email:	
	Ph #:	

C. Reference Responses

INSTRUCTIONS: This is a reference questionnaire for the above-named firm for consultant services provided on the above-named project. **Do not submit reference questionnaire forms used on prior solicitations, as they may include different questions and scoring.** Please complete section C of this form by providing ratings for the criteria below using the Ratings Guidelines. If any of the criteria are outside of your area, please obtain input from the appropriate individual who may have information. **Please email the completed Reference Form directly to the Lane Council of Governments no later than the date instructed by the consulting firm requesting this reference. Send to Elena Kuhnenn at the following email address: procurement@lcog.org Phone number for questions: 541-682-6295**

REFERENCE QUESTIONNAIRE FORM (page 2)

	<p>Ratings Guidelines:</p> <p>Exceptional 9-10 points: Exceeded expectations and well above average to work with. Very high user satisfaction.</p> <p>Very Good 7-8 points: Met all expectations and exceeded in some areas.</p> <p>Satisfactory 4-6 points: Met all contract requirements and/or professional expectations; may have had minor problems but implemented satisfactory corrective actions.</p> <p>Marginal 1-3 points: Some performance and/or professional expectations not met; ineffective corrective actions for some problems.</p> <p>Unsatisfactory 0 points: Technical, budget or schedule performance expectations not met. Low user satisfaction.</p> <p>Not Applicable (N/A): Enter NA if not applicable for the project.</p>	<p>Rating Scores ↓</p>
<p>For the firm, listed in Section A, please respond to the following:</p>		
1	Rate their efforts to collaboratively resolve negotiation issues in a timely manner.	
2	Rate their responsiveness to questions and efforts to collaboratively resolve issues throughout the contract term and the firm’s method of escalating unresolved issues.	
3	How well did they coordinate/communicate with its staff, subcontractors, client staff, and other stakeholders?	
4	How well did they manage the budget? Did they demonstrate efforts to control costs and conduct tasks, meetings, travel, etc. in an efficient manner? Were the consultant services completed within the original budget (for each phase, if phased)?	

5	How well did they perform on meeting schedule requirements? Were critical path items effectively managed and deliverable schedules met?	
6	How well did they come up with creative or innovative solutions when presented with issues/problems?	
7	How well did they appear to apply sufficient staff resources with the appropriate skills and expertise?	
8	Rate the quality of the firm's draft and/or final deliverables. (Was significant input by client or revision by firm required to meet contract requirements or applicable industry standards?)	
9	Rate how the firm demonstrated expertise in designing, coordinating and deploying an electronic Transportation Improvement Program, or other similar large scale electronic platform.	
10	How would you rate your overall experience with the firm?	

SCORE AVERAGE _____

Note: The score for this Reference Questionnaire will be the average of all rating scores provided by the client contact. If some of the criteria are not responded to or marked as "N/A", total the scores provided and divide by the number of criteria responded to.