

**WAC 468-600-330 Proposal evaluation factors and criteria.** For solicited proposals, the evaluation panel shall assess the certified proposals based on the unique project-specific evaluation criteria identified in the solicitation documents, including any written amendments or clarifications thereto, and upon any other factors the panel believes is necessary to ensure a successful project that benefits the public interest.

For unsolicited and competing proposals, the evaluation panel must consider the following factors:

(1) **Qualifications and experience.** Has the proposer created a team that is qualified, managed, and structured in a manner that will enable the team to complete the proposed project and perform the proposed scope of work?

(a) **Experience with similar infrastructure projects.** Have members of this team previously worked together or in a substantially similar consortium or partnership arrangement constructing, improving, operating, maintaining or managing transportation infrastructure? Has the lead firm managed, or any of the member firms worked on, a similar public-private partnership project?

(b) **Demonstration of ability to perform work.** Does the team possess the necessary financial, staffing, equipment, and technical resources to successfully complete the project and perform the proposed scope of work? Do the team and/or member firms have competing financial or workforce commitments that may inhibit success and follow-through on this project?

(c) **Leadership structure.** Is one firm designated as lead on the project? Does the organization of the team indicate a well thought out approach to managing the project? Is there an agreement/document in place between members?

(d) **Project manager's experience.** Is a project manager identified, and does this person work for the principal firm? If not, is there a clear definition of the role and responsibility of the project manager relative to the member firms? Does the project manager have experience leading this type and magnitude of project?

(e) **Management approach.** Have the primary functions and responsibilities of the management team been identified? Have the members of the team developed an approach to facilitate communication among the project participants? Has the firm adequately described its approach to communicating with and meeting the expectations of the state?

(f) **Financial condition.** Is the financial information submitted on the forms sufficient to determine the firms' capability to fulfill its obligations described in the project proposal, and is that capability demonstrated by the submitted information?

(g) **Project ownership.** Does the proposal identify the proposed ownership arrangements for each phase of the project and clearly state assumptions on legal liabilities and responsibilities during each phase of the project?

(h) **Competitive subcontracting.** To what extent have adequate procurement policies been adopted by the proposer to ensure opportunities for competitive procurement of work, services, materials and supplies that the proposer will subcontract?

(2) **Project characteristics.** Is the proposed project technically feasible?

(a) **Project definition.** Is the project described in sufficient detail to determine the type and size of the project, the location, all proposed interconnections with other transportation facilities,

the communities that may be affected, and alternatives (e.g., alignments) that may need to be evaluated?

(b) **Proposed project schedule.** Is the time frame for project completion clearly outlined? Is the proposed schedule reasonable given the scope and complexity of the project?

(c) **Quality management.** Does the proposer present a quality management plan, including quality control and quality assurance processes, that are good industry practice and are likely to result in delivery of a project and services that meet the department's standards and comply with contract requirements?

(d) **Operation.** Does the proposer present a reasonable statement setting forth plans for operation of the project or facilities that are included in the project?

(e) **Technology.** Is the proposal based on proven technology? What is the degree of technical innovation associated with the proposal? Will the knowledge or technology gained from the project benefit other areas of the state or nation? Does the technology proposed maximize interoperability with relevant local and statewide transportation technology? Can the proposed project upgrade relevant local technology?

(f) **Conforms to laws, regulations, and standards.** Is the proposed project consistent with applicable state and federal statutes and regulations, or reasonably anticipated modifications of state or federal statutes, regulations or standards? Does the proposed design meet applicable state and federal standards?

(g) **Federal permits.** Is the project outside the purview of federal oversight, or will it require some level of federal involvement due to its location on the National Highway System or Federal Interstate System or because federal permits are required? Does the proposal identify the primary federal permits and agencies that will be involved in review and oversight of the project?

(h) **Meets/exceeds environmental standards.** Is the proposed project consistent with applicable state and federal environmental statutes and regulations? Does the proposed design meet applicable state environmental standards? Does the proposal adequately address air quality issues?

(i) **State and local permits.** Does the proposal list the required permits and provide a schedule for obtaining them? Are there known or foreseeable negative impacts arising from the project? If so, does the proposal outline a plan to address those negative impacts? Are alternatives to standards or regulations needed to avoid those impacts that cannot be addressed?

(j) **Right of way.** Does the proposal set forth a method or plan to secure all property interests required for the transportation project?

(k) **Maintenance.** Does the proposer have a plan to maintain any facilities that are part of the proposed transportation project in conformance with department standards? Does the proposal clearly define assumptions or responsibilities during the operational phase including law enforcement, toll collection and maintenance? Under the proposal, will maintenance and operation of any new facilities be consistent with standards applied throughout the highway system and use the same work forces and methods?

(3) **Project financing.** Has the proposer provided a financial plan that allows access to the necessary capital to make a substantial contribution of nonstate, private sector, or other innovative financing resources to the financing of the facility or project?

(a) **Financing.** Did the proposer demonstrate evidence of its experience, ability and commitment to provide a sufficient private-sector contribution or other innovative financing contribution of funds or resources to the project as well as the ability to obtain the other necessary financing?

(b) **Conformance with RCW 47.29.060.** Does the proposed financing plan conform to any requirements of state-issued debt under RCW 47.29.060? If the proposed financing plan is not in conformance, has the proposer committed to seeking any necessary legislative or other state approvals in order to proceed with the financing plan as proposed?

(c) **Financial plan.** Does the financial plan demonstrate a reasonable basis for funding project development and operations? Are the assumptions on which the plan is based well defined and reasonable in nature? Are the plan's risk factors identified and dealt with sufficiently? Are the planned sources of funding and financing realistic? Is the proposer willing to place private capital at risk in order to successfully deliver the project? Does the proposer adequately identify sources of nonstate funding that it anticipates including in the project financing, and does the proposer provide adequate assurance of the availability of those funds and the reliability of the funding sources?

(d) **Estimated cost.** Is the estimated cost of the project reasonable in relation to the cost of similar projects?

(e) **Life-cycle cost analysis.** Does the proposal include an appropriately conducted life-cycle cost estimate of the proposed project and/or facility? How does the life-cycle cost impact the projected rate of return?

(f) **Financial model.** If the procurement is for a concession agreement, does the proposal present a sound base case financial model? Are the assumptions in the financial model reasonable and realistic?

(g) **Business objective.** Does the proposer clearly articulate its reasons for pursuing this project? Do its assumptions appear reasonable?

(4) **Public support.** Has the proposer demonstrated sufficient public support for the proposed project or proposed a reasonable plan for garnering that support?

(a) **Community benefits.** Will this project bring a significant transportation and economic benefit to the community, the region, and/or the state? Are there ancillary benefits to the communities because of the project?

(b) **Community support.** What is the extent of known support or opposition for the project? Does the project proposal demonstrate an understanding of the national and regional transportation issues and needs, as well as the impacts this project may have on those needs? Is there a demonstrated ability to work with the community? Have affected local jurisdictions expressed support for the project?

(c) **Public involvement strategy.** What strategies are proposed to involve local and state elected officials in developing this project? What level of community involvement is contemplated for the project? Has the proposer articulated a clear strategy for informing and educating the public and for obtaining community input throughout the development and life of the project?

(5) **Project compatibility.** Is the proposed project compatible with, or can it be made compatible with state and local comprehensive transportation plans?

(a) **Compatibility with the existing transportation system.** Does this project propose improvements that are compatible with, or that can be made compatible with, the present and planned transportation system? Does the project provide continuity with existing and planned state and local facilities?

(b) **Fulfills policies and goals.** Does the proposed project help achieve performance, safety, mobility or transportation demand management goals? Does the project improve connections among the transportation modes?

(c) **Conformity with local, regional and state transportation plans.** Does the project conform with, or can it achieve conformity with, city and county comprehensive plans and regional transportation plans? Does the project conform with, or can it achieve conformity with, plans developed by the commission and any applicable regional transportation plans or local transportation programs? If not, are the steps proposed in the proposal to achieve conformity with such plans adequate and appropriate to provide a high likelihood that the project and the applicable plans can be brought into conformity?

(d) **Economic development.** Will the proposed project enhance the state's economic development efforts? Is the project critical to attracting or maintaining competitive industries and businesses to the region, consistent with stated objectives?

[Statutory Authority: RCW 47.29.030. WSR 07-04-095, § 468-600-330, filed 2/6/07, effective 3/9/07.]