



City of Santa Fe, New Mexico

Memorandum



DATE: July 10, 2024

TO: Governing Body

VIA: *Regina Wheeler*
Regina Wheeler (Jul 16, 2024 10:18 MDT)

FROM: Regina Wheeler, Public Works Department Director

FROM: Romella Glorioso-Moss, PhD, CPM, Complete Streets Capital Projects Manager *RGM*

ACTION:

Request for Approval of Professional Services Agreement with WSP USA, Inc. to Provide On-Call General Engineering Services in an Amount Not to Exceed \$5,409,375 including NMGRT for Four Years. (Romella Glorioso-Moss, Capital Projects Manager: rsglorioso-moss@santafenm.gov)

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

Pursuant to New Mexico Procurement Code Section 1.4.1.31, RFP 24001 was issued with the purpose of establishing multiple on call contracts for professional general engineering services to support infrastructure projects including roadway, trail, drainage, bridge, facility, parks, utility, transit and others. The RFP process determined that awarding an on-call contract to WSP USA, Inc. is in the best interest and is advantageous to the City of Santa Fe. A total of 7 contracts are recommended for award as a result of this RFP. Having multiple professional service firms under contract provides capacity and expertise to deploy the City's extensive state and federal infrastructure funding. Having multiple vendors under on-call contract also facilitates the solicitation of multiple quotations on any particular piece of work and selection of best value provider for a particular task.

The total amount payable to the Contractor under this Agreement, including gross receipts tax and expenses, shall not exceed \$5,409,375 over 4 years. Execution of this agreement does not constitute any promise to purchase any amount of work. Funds for these services will be identified and budgeted, as needed, for each individual capital improvement project.

PROCUREMENT METHOD:

The procurement method is via RFP 24001.

CONTRACT NUMBER:

The FY25 Munis contract number is 3250009.

FUNDING SOURCE:

Fund Name/Number: Various

Munis Org Name/Number: Various

Munis Object Name/Number: Various

Project ID / String: Various

ATTACHMENTS

Professional Services Agreement
Procurement Checklist
Summary of Contract
Business Registration
Coverage of Insurance

Halona Crowe

Reviewed by Halona Crowe

Item #: 24-0506
Munis Contract #: 3250009
RFP#: 24001

CITY OF SANTA FE
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACT

THIS CONTRACT is made and entered into by and between the City of Santa Fe, New Mexico, hereinafter referred to as the “City,” and **WSP USA Inc.**, hereinafter referred to as the “Contractor,” and is effective as of the date set forth below upon which it is executed by the Parties.

RECITALS

WHEREAS, the Chief Procurement Officer of the City has made the determination that this Agreement is in accordance with the provisions of the New Mexico Procurement Code (NMSA 1978, 13-1-28 et seq.) pursuant to NMSA 1978, section 13-1-111; and

WHEREAS, the Contractor is one of such requisite and qualifications and is willing to engage with the City for professional services, in accordance with the terms and conditions hereinafter set out, and the Contractor understanding and consenting to the foregoing is willing to render such professional services as outlined in the Agreement; and

The City and the Contractor hereby agree as follows:

1. Scope of Work

The Contractor shall provide the following services-for the City:

The Professional Engineer (PE) shall provide On-Call General Engineering Services and Construction Management Services for the design and construction of roadway, trail, drainage, facility, utility and traffic design. Once a need is identified, the City’s Director of Public Works will issue a written Task Order to the PE that will detail required services. Upon receiving the City's request for services, the PE shall provide the City with an estimate of staff hours required to do the work and each project will be negotiated on a project-by-project basis. The PE may also be required to do some of the work in phases. Where a project proceeds in phases based on the development model used by the City, the PE shall provide the work estimate for each phase. Contractor shall not commence work on a Task Order until a written Notice to Proceed is issued by the Director of Public Works.

Work estimates shall be based on producing the deliverables described in the development model below for the tasks or phase(s) in the Task Order.

1. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT PHASES

In the following, all NMDOT standards refer to the NMDOT “Tribal/Local Public Agency Handbook, 2019 or most current edition unless otherwise specified.

a. Phase 1 - Project Scoping

The PE will review available data, propose project scope, conduct scoping field review, and write scoping report in accordance with guidelines of the New Mexico Department of Transportation.

1. Phase 1 Activities:

- i. Understanding and documenting existing conditions, environmental, and right-of way needs
- ii. Identifying design parameters for the project
- iii. Documenting safety considerations
- iv. Describing proposed improvements
- v. Conducting a preliminary field review meeting
- vi. Developing a preliminary engineer's estimate

2. Phase 1 Deliverables

a. Scoping Report

The following defines the required contents of the Scoping Report. The PE should evaluate all items listed below but some elements may not apply based on the project type.

- i. Project Summary/General Description
 - a) Project data
 - Control number
 - Type of work
 - Project purpose and need
 - Location description
 - Posted route
 - Milepost (coordinates and/or intersections)
 - Project length
 - NMDOT district
 - County
 - Roadway functional classification
 - Terrain type
 - Fiscal year (study, design, construction) and project Termination Date
 - Program (funding category)
 - b) Site description (beginning of project to end of project)
 - c) Survey requirements (location and/or property survey)
 - d) Right-of-way requirements
 - e) Environmental Level of Effort (ELOE)
 - f) Estimated project development time (from scoping to letting) all within agreement contract time
 - g) Estimated project construction schedule and budget
- ii. Existing Conditions (where applicable)

- a) Typical road section
 - Driving lanes per direction
 - Auxiliary lanes (acceleration, deceleration, and turning lanes) and medians
 - Shoulders (including rumble strips/stripes) and/or curb and gutter
 - Surfacing tapers
 - Multi-modal facilities (including transit, pedestrian and bicycle facilities)
 - b) Roadside slopes
 - c) Geotechnical conditions
 - d) Surfacing type and condition
 - e) Horizontal alignment
 - f) Vertical alignment
 - g) Major and minor roadway intersections
 - h) Right-of-way width
 - i) Major structures (> 20-foot span)
 - j) Other structures (< 20-foot span, may include fencing, retaining walls, cattle guards, concrete box culverts, safety barriers, etc.)
 - k) Roadway lighting
 - l) Traffic control and management devices (traffic signals, intelligent transportation system (ITS) equipment, special traffic signs, etc.)
 - m) Utilities (inventory and owners)
 - n) Environmental factors
 - o) Posted speed limit and design speed
 - p) Driveway and entrances (inventory)
 - q) Level of service (traffic volume and fleet characteristics)
 - r) Facilities and compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)
 - s) Railroad facilities (identify, should include railroad right-of-way, crossings, etc.)
 - t) Erosion control and landscaping installations
 - u) School crossings
 - v) Safety considerations
- iii. Proposed Improvements
- a) Typical section (including surfacing type and thickness)
 - b) Major structures
 - c) Other structures
 - d) Horizontal alignment
 - e) Vertical alignment
 - f) Intersections
 - g) Turnouts
 - h) Safety
 - i) Drainage and erosion control
 - j) Design exceptions/ variances
 - k) Detours and traffic control
 - l) Warrants and signalization
 - m) Landscaping and irrigation
 - n) ADA/ pedestrian/ bicycle
 - o) Special issues or unique project elements

iv. Factors Affecting Project Development and Schedule

a) Survey requirements

b) Environmental requirements and certification

- Archaeological requirements
- Historic preservation requirements (include the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) or Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO))
- Hazardous materials investigations
- Right-of-way (ROW) considerations and certification
- Utility relocations and/or hookups and utility certification
- Outside agency involvement and coordination
- Railroad facilities and certification
- ITS facilities and certification

b. Conceptual Design

Contractor shall inquire with the Director of Public Works whether an Early Neighborhood Notification (“ENN”) Meeting will be held for the project. If an ENN is to be held, Contractor shall develop a conceptual design based on the Project Scoping Report, and may be directed to present the conceptual design to the Public via the Early Neighborhood Notification (ENN) Meeting described below. Conceptual design can be simply a series of sketches, ideas and explorations, or it can go to considerable depth, including design illustrations, indicative plans, sections and elevations and 3D models of a development approach.

c. Early Neighborhood Notification (ENN) Meeting

ENN is required for certain types of city capital improvement projects requiring review by the governing body as follows:

- i. Facility plans for municipal facilities or services, including wastewater, solid waste, potable water and airport facilities.
- ii. New projects or projects to expand or extend service to new service areas included in the capital improvement plan or general plan.
- iii. Any new road construction or reconstruction of an existing road that materially expands capacity.
- iv. Projects funded out of capital impact fee funds.
- v. Any new park or reconstruction or expansion of an existing park that exceeds one acre in size or one hundred and fifty thousand dollars (\$150,000) in cost.
- vi. Construction of a new building or structure at a park or placement of new lighting at a park that exceeds one hundred and fifty thousand dollars (\$150,000) in cost.

See APPENDIX A for the ENN Requirements.

b. Phase II – Preliminary Design (30% Design)

Preliminary design defines the general project location and design concepts. It includes, but is not limited to, preliminary engineering and other activities and analyses, such as environmental assessments, topographic surveys, metes and bounds surveys, geotechnical investigations,

hydrologic analysis, hydraulic analysis, utility engineering, traffic studies, financial plans, revenue estimates, hazardous materials assessments, general estimates of the types and quantities of materials, and other work needed to establish parameters for the final design. Preliminary design should focus on establishing the horizontal and vertical alignments, typical section, and drainage and structural needs to a level sufficient to establish the project footprint. Contractor shall develop a preliminary design to the standard of the NMDOT for a 30% level of completion.

1. Phase 2 Activities

The following activities should be initiated, if applicable, or required by the Scoping Report:

- i. Complete Drainage Report
- ii. Development of typical sections, grading plans, geometric alignments
- iii. Bridge type/size/location studies, temporary structure requirements, staged bridge construction requirements
- iv. Structural design, retaining wall design, noise wall design
- v. Guardrail length/layout
- vi. Existing property lines
- vii. Title and deed research
- viii. Soil borings
- ix. Cross sections with flow line elevations
- x. Ditch designs
- xi. Intersection design/configuration
- xii. Interchange design/configurations
- xiii. Pavement design
- xiv. Storm/sanitary sewer design
- xv. Culvert design, identification of removal items
- xvi. Quantity estimates
- xvii. Pavement details/elevation tables
- xviii. Preliminary traffic control plans to be maintained during construction
- xix. Coordinate railroad impacts
- xx. Coordinate ITS impacts and improvements
- xxi. Identify utility owners, records research, and begin utility coordination for Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE)
- xxii. Continue documentation for environmental, cultural resource, and hazardous materials investigations, and obtain approvals
- xxiii. Hold ENN meeting (APPENDIX A)

If additional right-of-way is needed, the following additional activities need to occur in order during Preliminary Design.

- i. Complete property survey
- ii. Based on the project footprint, cultural and biological resource impacts are identified and plans for avoidance or mitigation are prepared.
- iii. If there are right-of-way impacts, the PE will schedule a meeting with the NMDOT's Right of Way Bureau and the Tribal/Local Public Agency Coordinator of North Region Design.
- iv. Begin Title Search and Title Reports

2. Phase 2 Deliverables

Typically, preliminary design would require a final geotechnical report, a final drainage report, utility location and mapping, right-of-way design and legal descriptions, roadway plan and profiles, bridge and structure types and criteria, plan and profile sheets, a preliminary traffic control plan, a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), and an engineer's construction cost estimate.

The PE shall use the NMDOT format for plan sets with standard information to be completed to a level consistent with the design stage. For NMDOT series sheets standards please refer to "Tribal/Local Public Agency Handbook, 2019 or most current edition.

c. Phase III – Grade and Drain (60% Design)

The engineer shall address all comments on the 30% complete Preliminary Design by City Staff, including but not limited to Complete Streets, Parks and Open Spaces, Land Use, Public Utilities, and SFMPO, as well as comments by the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee and comments from the NMDOT review meeting. All of the components in the 30% Preliminary Design phase are further developed and designed to a greater level of detail.

1. Phase III Activities

- i. Design drainage improvements
- ii. Finalize project footprint
- iii. Complete quantity schedules (if not included in the preliminary plans) and ensure they reflect computed design quantities
- iv. Prepare and submit design variance and/or exceptions (if applicable)
- v. Continue with environmental approvals
- vi. Continue right-of-way process
- vii. Develop preliminary traffic control plans including a suggested sequence of construction.
- viii. Submit engineer's estimate
- ix. Prepare and submit draft contract book, including specifications, special provisions and Notice to Contractor (NTC)
- x. Incorporate ITS sheets, if necessary
- xi. Incorporate rail design or mitigation and coordinate rail agreements and special provisions, as required
- xii. Submit all Public Interest Findings (PIF) requests, if applicable
- xiii. Coordinate the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) sheets and Temporary Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (TESCP) sheets with the City's River and Watershed Manager (if the project's disturbed area is greater than one acre)
- xiv. Begin Utility Relocation documentation (if applicable) for utility certification

2. Phase III Deliverables

Submit to the City's Project Manager the 60% design plan set for review at least 2 weeks in advance of review meeting.

d. Phase IV - Plan-in-Hand (90% Design)

Comments from the 60% Design review meeting and Constructability Review, when applicable, are incorporated during the 90% Design phase. At 90% Design, the plans, quantities, and engineer's estimate should be nearly complete. Only minor design changes should be occurring at (or after) this design phase. During the 90% Design phase, construction phasing layouts and construction signing, and striping plans are finalized, and project certification requests are completed and requested from NMDOT's North Region Design Coordinator or T/LPA Coordinator.

1. Phase IV Activities

- i. Finalize plans
- ii. Finalize right-of-way coordination/certification
- iii. Finalize utilities coordination/certification
- iv. Finalize ITS coordination/certification
- v. Finalize railroad coordination/certification
- vi. Finalize environmental certification
- vii. Complete work zone checklist
- viii. Start plans, specifications, and estimates (PS&E) checklist
- ix. Finalize project cost estimate, including testing, construction management, and utility relocation when applicable
- x. Request Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Program (DBE) goal from the Region Coordinator, if applicable
- xi. Finalize project specifications and contract book, including all federal requirements
- xii. If project-specific special provisions are required, those must be submitted to the NMDOT's North Region Design Coordinator or T/LPA Coordinator for review and approval
- xiii. If project-specific Notice to Contractors (NTCs) are required, those must be submitted to the NMDOT's North Region Design Coordinator or T/LPA Coordinator for review and approval

2. Phase IV Deliverables

The 90% design plans shall include as appropriate: cover sheet, title sheet, typical roadway sections, quantity sheets, general notes, SWPPP Information sheet, TESCPC sheets, plan and profile sheets, roadway, trail, interchange and intersection plans, structure placement sheets, special details, bridge plans and foundation recommendations, traffic control and detour plans, permanent signing and striping, signalization, lighting plans, grading plans, earthwork computations, landscape details and/or plans, incorporation of standard plans and those prepared by others, final detail estimate and proposal, supplemental specifications, notice to contractors, and special provisions as required and all other plans/specifications as may be required.

The 90% design plan set shall further include five (5) required NMDOT certifications. Environmental, ROW, Utility, Railroad, and Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) certifications must be submitted to City's Project Administrator at least two (2) weeks prior the review meeting.

e. Phase V - Plans, Specifications, and Estimate (PS&E)

The PS&E phase incorporates the comments from the 90% Design review meeting and finalizes the plans, quantities, and engineer's estimate. The contract book and specifications are complete, and all certifications are obtained prior to holding the PS&E review.

1. PS&E Deliverables

- a. PS&E package (to be submitted to City Project Administrator at least one week before NMDOT's annual deadline of June 1st)
 - i. 100% construction plans
 - ii. Engineer's opinion of probable cost
 - iii. Contract book
 - iv. Environmental clearance and certification documentation
 - v. SHPO's concurrence
 - vi. Right-of-way certification documentation
 - vii. Utility certification documentation
 - viii. ITS certification documentation
 - ix. Railroad certification documentation
 - x. Work zone checklist
 - xi. All other applicable maintenance agreements
 - xii. PS&E checklist
 - xiii. Approved Public Interest Findings (PIFs) and/or variances if applicable

- b. Project Production Package (to be submitted to City Project Administrator at least one week before NMDOT's annual deadline of June 15th)
 - i. Stamped and sealed construction plans
 - ii. Engineer's opinion of probable cost (including Construction Management if using federal funding to cover these expenses and utility relocation when applicable)
 - iii. Contract book (may leave out wage decisions until ready to bid because they can change over time)
 - iv. Environmental clearance and certification documentation, including signed environmental commitments sheet in the construction plans
 - v. SHPO's or THPO's concurrence
 - vi. Right-of-way certification documentation
 - vii. Utility certification documentation
 - viii. ITS certification documentation
 - ix. Railroad certification documentation
 - x. Work zone checklist
 - xi. All other applicable maintenance agreements
 - xii. Signed PS&E checklist
 - xiii. Approved PIFs and/or variances if applicable

f. Phase VI - Construction Engineering and Management Services

Construction Engineering and Management Services begins when the City advertises, bids and awards the project.

Upon request, the PE shall review bids and/or offers and provide an opinion to the City's Central Purchasing Office as to whether the bids and/or offers fully address the Invitation to Bid and/or Request for Proposals, and shall recommend selection of a bidder or offeror with written justification for that recommendation.

When a contract is awarded by the City in relation to the project, the PE shall fully execute and participate in the following tasks to implement the construction of the Project in conformance with the plans and specifications:

1. Hold Transition Meeting with City Project Administrator and NMDOT/FHWA Staff to discuss the required project documentation, format for submittals, and procedures to be used to ensure adequate management of a federally-funded construction project.
2. Hold Preconstruction Conference.
3. Duties during construction:
 - i. Daily documentation and maintain a project management diary
 - ii. Verify all construction activities and documentation meet NMDOT and federal standards and policies
 - iii. Supervise activities for government and third-party inspectors and office personnel
 - iv. Administer change orders in compliance with the change order provisions stated in the Tribal/Local Public Agency Handbook (current edition).
 - v. Coordinate all project activities
 - vi. Maintain public relations
 - vii. Address all problems and/or concerns related to project designs and plans.
 - viii. Approve all project documentation and submittals (including source books, certificates of compliance, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), payrolls, subcontracts, traffic control diary, quality control plan, and testing reports).
 - ix. Enforce contractor's compliance with contract requirements (i.e., Buy America, Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE), EEO, traffic control/safety, etc.)
 - x. Administer monthly progress payments
 - xi. Reject defective and/or non-compliant material and workmanship, in accordance with the contract
 - xii. Interpret the plans and specifications
 - xiii. Verify construction activities meet contractor schedule
 - xiv. Designate a person familiar with Storm Water Pollution (SWPP) Plan Preparation and Maintenance to review the work of contractors and provide an opinion on compliance to the Public Works Director, when applicable. In order to be considered "familiar," that person would need to have attended the Associated Contractors of New Mexico (ACNM) class "Storm Water Qualified Person" or equivalent.
 - xv. Approve the contractor's Quality Control Plan per Section 902, Quality Control, of the NMDOT Standard Specifications at least two weeks prior to the start of any work being performed that requires QC testing for acceptance. Once the Quality Control Plan is approved, PE shall verify that it is on file.
 - xvi. Review and approve any proposed changes to the traffic control plan at least two weeks prior to implementation. Ensure the revisions have been designed in

accordance with 23 CFR § 630 Subpart J – Work Zone Safety and Mobility and 23 CFR § 630 Subpart K – Temporary Traffic Control Devices and are stamped by a current New Mexico Licensed Professional Engineer. If any part of the revised traffic control will be located on an NMDOT roadway, concurrence from the District Traffic Engineer is required prior to approval by the City project manager. Unapproved changes shall not be allowed in the field.

- xvii. Ensure proper B2Gnow and LCPtracker reporting.
- xviii. Review and approve progress payments.
- xix. Prepare for Project Closure and Final Inspection.

4. Duties after construction

Prepare and submit the Final Package to NMDOT.

In all cases where the PE is responsible for acceptance of a deliverable, payment of invoices remains subject to acceptance by city staff pursuant to Section 3(D) above.

2. Standard of Performance; Licenses

A. The Contractor does hereby accept its designation as a professional service, rendering services related to general engineering and construction management services for the City, as set forth in this Agreement. The Contractor represents that Contractor possesses the personnel, experience, and knowledge necessary to perform the services described under this Contract.

B. The Contractor agrees to obtain and maintain throughout the term of this Contract, all applicable professional and business licenses required by law, for itself, its employees, agents, representatives, and subcontractors.

3. Compensation

A. The City shall pay to the Contractor in full payment for services satisfactorily performed as per Task Order, such compensation not to exceed five million dollars (\$5,000,000), excluding gross receipts tax. The New Mexico gross receipts tax levied on the amounts payable under this Contract totaling four hundred nine thousand three hundred seventy-five dollars (\$409,375) shall be paid by the City to the Contractor. **The total amount payable to the Contractor under this Agreement, including gross receipts tax and expenses, shall not exceed five million four hundred nine thousand three hundred seventy-five dollars (5,409,375). This amount is a maximum and not a guarantee that the work assigned to be performed by Contractor under this Contract shall equal the amount stated herein. The parties do not intend for the Contractor to continue to provide services without compensation when the total compensation amount is reached. Contractor is responsible for notifying the City when the services provided under this Contract reach the total compensation amount. In no event will the Contractor be paid for services provided in excess of the total compensation amount without this Contract being amended in writing prior to those services in excess of the total compensation amount being provided.**

B. Payment is subject to availability of funds pursuant to the Appropriations Paragraph set forth below and to any negotiations between the parties from year to year pursuant to Paragraph 1, Scope of Work, and to approval by the City. All invoices MUST BE received by the City no later than thirty (30)

days after the termination of the Fiscal Year in which the services were delivered. Invoices received after such date WILL NOT BE PAID.

C. Payment in future fiscal years is subject to availability of funds pursuant to the Appropriations Paragraph set forth below and to any negotiations between the parties from year to year pursuant to Paragraph 1, Scope of Work, and to approval by the City. All invoices MUST BE received by the City no later than fifteen (15) days after the termination of the Fiscal Year in which the services were delivered. Invoices received after such date WILL NOT BE PAID.)

D. Contractor must submit a detailed statement accounting for all services performed and expenses incurred. If the City finds that the services are not acceptable, within thirty days after the date of receipt of written notice from the Contractor that payment is requested, it shall provide the Contractor a letter of exception explaining the defect or objection to the services, and outlining steps the Contractor may take to provide remedial action. Upon certification by the City that the services have been received and accepted, payment shall be tendered to the Contractor within thirty days after the date of acceptance. If payment is made by mail, the payment shall be deemed tendered on the date it is postmarked.

E. If the City fails to pay the contractor within twenty-one days after receipt of an undisputed request for payment, the City shall pay interest to the contractor beginning on the twenty-second day after payment was due, computed at one and one-half percent of the undisputed amount per month or fraction of a month until the payment is issued. If the City receives an improperly completed invoice, the City shall notify the sender of the invoice within seven days of receipt in what way the invoice is improperly completed, and the owner has no further duty to pay on the improperly completed invoice until it is resubmitted as complete.

F. **Notice of Extended Payment Provision For Grant Funded Contracts.** This contract allows the owner to make payment within 45 days after submission of an undisputed request for payment.

4. Term

THIS CONTRACT SHALL NOT BECOME EFFECTIVE UNTIL APPROVED BY THE CITY. This Contract shall terminate **four (4) years from date of final signature** unless terminated pursuant to paragraph 5 (Termination) and paragraph 6 (Appropriations). Four (4) years is the limit to the Term of this Contract in accordance with NMSA 1978, Sections 13-1-150 through 152.

5. Termination

A. Grounds. The City may terminate this Agreement for convenience or cause. For contracts within their authority, the City Manager or their designee is authorized to provide the notice of termination, otherwise such notice of termination shall be provided by the Mayor or their designee as authorized by the Governing Body. The Contractor may only terminate this Agreement based upon the City's uncured, material breach of this Agreement.

B. Notice; City Opportunity to Cure.

1) The City shall give Contractor written notice of termination at least thirty (30) days prior to the intended date of termination.

2) Contractor shall give City written notice of termination at least thirty (30) days prior to the intended date of termination, which notice shall (i) identify all the City's material breaches of this Agreement upon which the termination is based and (ii) state what the City must do to cure such material breaches. Contractor's notice of termination shall only be effective (i) if the City

does not cure all material breaches within the thirty (30) day notice period or (ii) in the case of material breaches that cannot be cured within thirty (30) days, the City does not, within the thirty (30) day notice period, notify the Contractor of its intent to cure and begin with due diligence to cure the material breach.

3) Notwithstanding the foregoing, this Agreement may be terminated immediately upon written notice to the Contractor (i) if the Contractor becomes unable to perform the services contracted for, as determined by the City; (ii) if, during the term of this Agreement, the Contractor is suspended or debarred by the City; or (iii) the Agreement is terminated pursuant to Paragraph 6, "Appropriations", of this Agreement.

C. Liability. Except as otherwise expressly allowed or provided under this Agreement, the City's sole liability upon termination shall be to pay for acceptable work performed prior to the Contractor's receipt or issuance of a notice of termination; provided, however, that a notice of termination shall not nullify or otherwise affect either party's liability for pre-termination defaults under or breaches of this Agreement. The Contractor shall submit an invoice for such work within thirty (30) days of receiving or sending the notice of termination. *THIS PROVISION IS NOT EXCLUSIVE AND DOES NOT WAIVE THE CITY'S OTHER LEGAL RIGHTS AND REMEDIES CAUSED BY THE CONTRACTOR'S DEFAULT/BREACH OF THIS AGREEMENT.*

6. Appropriations

The terms of this Contract are contingent upon sufficient appropriations and authorization being made by the Governing Body for the performance of this Contract. If sufficient appropriations and authorization are not made by the Governing Body, this Contract shall terminate immediately upon written notice being given by the City to the Contractor. The City's decision as to whether sufficient appropriations are available shall be accepted by the Contractor and shall be final. If the City proposes an amendment to the Contract to unilaterally reduce funding, the Contractor shall have the option to terminate the Contract or to agree to the reduced funding, within thirty (30) days of receipt of the proposed amendment.

7. Status of Contractor

The Contractor and its agents and employees are independent contractors performing professional services for the City and are not employees of the City. The Contractor and its agents and employees shall not accrue leave, retirement, insurance, bonding, use of City vehicles, or any other benefits afforded to employees of the City as a result of this Contract. The Contractor acknowledges that all sums received hereunder are reportable by the Contractor for tax purposes, including without limitation, self-employment and business income tax. The Contractor agrees not to purport to bind the City unless the Contractor has express written authority to do so, and then only within the strict limits of that authority.

8. Assignment

The Contractor shall not assign or transfer any interest in this Contract or assign any claims for money due or to become due under this Contract without the prior written approval of the City.

9. Subcontracting

The Contractor shall not subcontract any portion of the services to be performed under this Contract without the prior written approval of the City. No such subcontract shall relieve the primary Contractor from its obligations and liabilities under this Contract, nor shall any subcontract obligate direct payment from the City.

10. Release

Final payment of the amounts due under this Contract shall operate as a release of the City, its officers and employees from all liabilities, claims and obligations whatsoever arising from or under this Contract.

11. Confidentiality

Any confidential information provided to or developed by the Contractor in the performance of this Contract shall be kept confidential and shall not be made available to any individual or organization by the Contractor without the prior written approval of the City.

12. Product of Service -- Copyright

All materials developed or acquired by the Contractor under this Contract shall become the property of the City and shall be delivered to the City no later than the termination date of this Contract. Nothing developed or produced, in whole or in part, by the Contractor under this Contract shall be the subject of an application for copyright or other claim of ownership by or on behalf of the Contractor.

13. Conflict of Interest; Governmental Conduct Act

A. The Contractor represents and warrants that it presently has no interest and, during the term of this Contract, shall not acquire any interest, direct or indirect, which would conflict in any manner or degree with the performance or services required under the Contract.

B. The Contractor further represents and warrants that it has complied with, and, during the term of this Contract, will continue to comply with, and that this Contract complies with all applicable provisions of the Governmental Conduct Act, Chapter 10, Article 16 NMSA 1978.

C. Contractor's representations and warranties in Paragraphs A and B of this Article are material representations of fact upon which the City relied when this Contract was entered into by the parties. Contractor shall provide immediate written notice to the City if, at any time during the term of this Contract, Contractor learns that Contractor's representations and warranties in Paragraphs A and B of this Article were erroneous on the effective date of this Contract or have become erroneous by reason of new or changed circumstances. If it is later determined that Contractor's representations and warranties in Paragraphs A and B of this Article were erroneous on the effective date of this Contract or have become erroneous by reason of new or changed circumstances, in addition to other remedies available to the City and notwithstanding anything in the Contract to the contrary, the City may immediately terminate the Contract.

D. All terms defined in the Governmental Conduct Act have the same meaning in this section.

14. Amendment

A. This Agreement shall not be altered, changed, or amended except by instrument in writing executed by the parties hereto and all other required signatories.

B. If the City proposes an amendment to the Contract to unilaterally reduce funding due to budget or other considerations, the Contractor shall, within thirty (30) days of receipt of the proposed Amendment, have the option to terminate the Contract, pursuant to the termination provisions as set forth in Article 4 herein, or to agree to the reduced funding.

15. Entire Agreement.

This Agreement, together with any other documents incorporated herein by reference and all related Exhibits and Schedules constitutes the sole and entire agreement of the Parties with respect to the subject matter of this Agreement, and supersedes all prior and contemporaneous understandings, agreements, representations, and warranties, both written and oral, with respect to the subject matter. In the event of any inconsistency between the statements in the body of this Agreement, and the related Exhibits and Schedules, the statements in the body of this Agreement shall control.

16. Merger

This Contract incorporates all the Agreements, covenants and understandings between the parties hereto concerning the subject matter hereof, and all such covenants, agreements, and understandings have been merged into this written contract.

All terms and conditions of the RFP #24001 On-Call General Engineering Services for Roadway, Trail, Bridge, Drainage, Facility, Utility and Traffic Design and the Contractor's response to such document(s) are incorporated herein by reference and is included in the order of precedence.

No prior Agreement or understanding, oral or otherwise, of the parties or their agents shall be valid or enforceable unless embodied in this Contract.

17. Penalties for violation of law

NMSA 1978, sections 13-1-28 through 13-1-199, imposes civil and criminal penalties for its violation. In addition, the New Mexico criminal statutes impose felony penalties for illegal bribes, gratuities, and kickbacks.

18. Equal Opportunity Compliance

The Contractor agrees to abide by all federal and state laws and rules and regulations, and Santa Fe City Code, pertaining to equal employment opportunity. In accordance with all such laws of the State of New Mexico, the Contractor assures that no person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, religion, color, national origin, ancestry, sex, age, physical or mental handicap, or serious medical condition, spousal affiliation, sexual orientation or gender identity or immigration status except as necessary to comply with employment law, be excluded from employment with or participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity performed under this Contract. If Contractor is found not to be in compliance with these requirements during the life of this Contract, Contractor agrees to take appropriate steps to correct these deficiencies.

19. Applicable Law

The laws of the State of New Mexico shall govern this Contract, without giving effect to its choice of law provisions. Venue shall be proper only in a New Mexico court of competent jurisdiction in accordance with NMSA 1978, section 38-3-2. By execution of this Contract, Contractor acknowledges and agrees to the jurisdiction of the courts of the State of New Mexico over any and all lawsuits arising under or out of any term of this Contract.

20. Workers Compensation

The Contractor agrees to comply with state laws and rules applicable to workers compensation benefits for its employees. If the Contractor fails to comply with the Workers Compensation Act and applicable rules when required to do so, this Contract may be terminated by the City.

21. Professional Liability Insurance

Contractor shall maintain professional liability insurance throughout the term of this Contract providing a minimum coverage in the amount required under the New Mexico Tort Claims Act. The Contractor shall furnish the City with proof of insurance of Contractor's compliance with the provisions of this section as a condition prior to performing services under this Contract.

22. Other Insurance

If the services contemplated under this Contract will be performed on or in City facilities or property, Contractor shall maintain in force during the entire term of this Contract, the following insurance coverage(s), naming the City as additional insured.

A. **Commercial General Liability** insurance shall be written on an occurrence basis and be as broad as ISO Form CG 00 01 with limits not less than \$2,000,000 per occurrence and \$2,000,000 in the aggregate for claims against bodily injury, personal and advertising injury, and property damage. Said policy shall include broad form Contractual Liability coverage and be endorsed to name the City of Santa Fe their officials, officers, employees, and agents as additional insureds.

B. **Business Automobile Liability** insurance for all owned, non-owned automobiles, with a combined single limit not less than \$1,000,000 per accident.

C. **Broader Coverage and Limits.** The insurance requirements under this Contract shall be the greater of (1) the minimum coverage and limits specified in this Contract, or (2) the broader coverage and maximum limits of coverage of any insurance policy or proceeds available to the Named Insured. It is agreed that these insurance requirements shall not in any way act to reduce coverage that is broader or that includes higher limits than the minimums required herein. No representation is made that the minimum insurance requirements of this Contract are sufficient to cover the obligations of Contractor hereunder.

D. Contractor shall maintain the above insurance for the term of this Contract and name the City as an additional insured and provide for 30 days cancellation notice on any Certificate of Insurance form furnished by Contractor. Such certificate shall also specifically state the coverage provided under the policy is primary over any other valid and collectible insurance and provide a waiver of subrogation.

23. Records and Financial Audit

The Contractor shall maintain detailed time and expenditure records that indicate the date; time, nature and cost of services rendered during the Contract's term and effect and retain them for a period of three (3) years from the date of final payment under this Contract. The records shall be subject to inspection by the City. The City shall have the right to audit billings both before and after payment. Payment under this Contract shall not foreclose the right of the City to recover excessive or illegal payments.

24. Indemnification

The Contractor shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless the City from all actions, proceeding, claims, demands, costs, damages, attorneys' fees and all other liabilities and expenses of any kind from any source which may arise out of the performance of this Contract, caused by the negligent act or failure to act of the Contractor, its officers, employees, servants, subcontractors or agents, or if caused by the actions of any client of the Contractor resulting in injury or damage to persons or property during the time when the Contractor or any officer, agent, employee, servant or subcontractor thereof has or is performing services pursuant to this Contract. If any

action, suit or proceeding related to the services performed by the Contractor or any officer, agent, employee, servant or subcontractor under this Contract is brought against the Contractor, the Contractor shall, as soon as practicable but no later than two (2) days after it receives notice thereof, notify the legal counsel of the City.

25. New Mexico Tort Claims Act

Any liability incurred by the City of Santa Fe in connection with this Contract is subject to the immunities and limitations of the New Mexico Tort Claims Act, Section 41-4-1, et. seq. NMSA 1978, as amended. The City and its “public employees” as defined in the New Mexico Tort Claims Act, do not waive sovereign immunity, do not waive any defense and do not waive any limitation of liability pursuant to law. No provision in this Contract modifies or waives any provision of the New Mexico Tort Claims Act.

26. Invalid Term or Condition

If any term or condition of this Contract shall be held invalid or unenforceable, the remainder of this Contract shall not be affected and shall be valid and enforceable.

27. Enforcement of Contract

A party's failure to require strict performance of any provision of this Contract shall not waive or diminish that party's right thereafter to demand strict compliance with that or any other provision. No waiver by a party of any of its rights under this Contract shall be effective unless express and in writing, and no effective waiver by a party of any of its rights shall be effective to waive any other rights.

28. Notices

Any notice required to be given to either party by this Contract shall be in writing and shall be delivered in person, by courier service or by U.S. mail, either first class or certified, return receipt requested, postage prepaid, as follows:

To the City: Regina Wheeler, Public Works Department Director, City of Santa Fe, P.O. Box 909 Santa Fe, NM 87504-0909, rawheeler@santafenm.gov.

To the Contractor: Dan Sims, Principal-in-Charge and Senior Vice President, 2440 Louisiana Blvd., Suite 400, Albuquerque, NM 87110, Dan.Sims@wsp.com.

29. Authority

If Contractor is other than a natural person, the individual(s) signing this Contract on behalf of Contractor represents and warrants that he or she has the power and authority to bind Contractor, and that no further action, resolution, or approval from Contractor is necessary to enter a binding contract.

30. Non-Collusion

In signing this Agreement, the Contractor certifies the Contractor has not, either directly or indirectly, entered into action in restraint of free competitive bidding in connection with this offer submitted to the City's Chief Procurement Officer.

31. Default/Breach

In case of Default and/or Breach by the Contractor, for any reason whatsoever, the City may procure the goods or services from another source and hold the Contractor responsible for any resulting excess costs and/or damages, including but not limited to, direct damages, indirect damages, consequential damages, special damages, and the City may also seek all other remedies under the terms of this Agreement and under law or equity.

32. Equitable Remedies

The Contractor acknowledges that its failure to comply with any provision of this Agreement will cause the City irrevocable harm and that a remedy at law for such a failure would be an inadequate remedy for the City, and the Contractor consents to the City 's obtaining from a court of competent jurisdiction, specific performance, or injunction, or any other equitable relief in order to enforce such compliance. The City's rights to obtain equitable relief pursuant to this Agreement shall be in addition to, and not in lieu of, any other remedy that the City may have under applicable law, including, but not limited to, monetary damages.

33. Default and Force Majeure

The City reserves the right to cancel all, or any part of any orders placed under this Agreement without cost to the City, if the Contractor fails to meet the provisions of this Agreement and, except as otherwise provided herein, to hold the Contractor liable for any excess cost occasioned by the City due to the Contractor's default. The Contractor shall not be liable for any excess costs if failure to perform the order arises out of causes beyond the control and without the fault or negligence of the Contractor; such causes include, but are not restricted to, acts of God or the public enemy, acts of the State or Federal Government, fires, floods, epidemics, quarantine restrictions, strikes, freight embargoes, unusually severe weather and defaults of subcontractors due to any of the above, unless the City shall determine that the supplies or services to be furnished by the subcontractor were obtainable from other sources in sufficient time to permit the Contractor to meet the required delivery scheduled. The rights and remedies of the City provided in this Clause shall not be exclusive and are in addition to any other rights now being provided by law or under this Agreement.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties have executed this Contract as of the date of the signature by the required approval authorities below.

CITY OF SANTA FE:


Alan Webber (Aug 19, 2024 17:04 MDT)
ALAN WEBBER, CITY MAYOR

DATE: Aug 19, 2024

CONTRACTOR:

WSP, USA Inc

Daniel Sims (Jul 3, 2024 11:31 MDT)
DAN SIMS
PRINCIPAL-IN-CHARGE &
SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT

DATE: Jul 3, 2024

CRS#: 01-195458-002

Registration #: _____

ATTEST:


GERALYN CARDENAS
INTERIM CITY CLERK xiv
GB MTG 08/14/2024

CITY ATTORNEY’S OFFICE:


Marcos Martinez (Jul 3, 2024 11:34 MDT)
MARCOS MARTINEZ
SENIOR ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY

APPROVED FOR FINANCES:


EMILY OSTER, FINANCE DIRECTOR

APPENDIX A

EARLY NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATION

Early Neighborhood Notification (ENN) Applicability to City Capital Improvement Projects

ENN is required for certain types of *city capital improvement* projects requiring review by the *governing body* as follows:

- (i) facility plans for municipal facilities or services, including wastewater, solid waste, potable water and airport facilities;
- (ii) new projects or projects to expand or extend service to new service areas included in the *capital improvement plan* or *general plan*;
- (iii) any new road construction or reconstruction of an existing road that materially expands capacity; and
- (iv) projects funded out of capital impact fee funds.
- (v) any new park or reconstruction or expansion of an existing park that exceeds one acre in size or one hundred and fifty thousand dollars (\$150,000) in cost; construction of a new building or structure at a park or placement of new lighting at a park that exceeds one hundred and fifty thousand dollars (\$150,000) in cost.

The following types of *capital improvement* projects do not require ENN:

- (i) *replacement*, repair or maintenance of underground facilities where such activity does not represent a material expansion of existing facilities;
- (ii) road maintenance, repair, surfacing or resurfacing, striping, curb and gutter or sidewalk repair or maintenance, *sign* maintenance, signal repair, shoulder work, bridge or culvert maintenance work; and
- (iii) special assessment districts covered by *state law* or *city* ordinance.

Summary Notices to Meet ENN Guidelines (not all of the agencies may be needed for every project):

20 days in advance:

Project Consultants submit to City Project Administrator Meeting Notice Letter for review and Approval.

15 days in advance:

City Project Administrator

Email: to Santa Fe City Council members and the mayor, Santa Fe MPO staff, City of Santa Fe Parks and Recreation Department, BPAC members, City of Santa Fe Land Use Department, interested individuals, neighboring condominium / apartment associations and neighborhood associations

City PrimeGov: Post notice of ENN meeting on PrimeGov

Social Media: City's Facebook – Coordinate with Community Engagement Department's Communications Manager (505) 469-0946

Project Consultants

Mail: Meeting notice (first class mail) to property owners and physical addresses within 300' of project boundary and neighborhood associations within 300' of project boundary

Posters: At least (1) (preferably 2, but subject to availability) 4'x5' City of Santa Fe Notification Board

Newspaper: Display advertisement in a local daily newspaper of general circulation stating the date, time and place of the public hearing

City Project Administrator

Contacts:

OPTIONAL: One week in advance:

Email: to Santa Fe City Council members and mayor, Santa Fe MPO staff, City of Santa Fe Parks and Recreation Department, BTAC members, City of Santa Fe Land Use Department, interested individuals, neighboring condominium or apartment associations and neighborhood associations

OPTIONAL: One day in advance:

Email: to Santa Fe City Council members and mayor, Santa Fe MPO staff, City of Santa Fe Parks and Recreation Department, BTAC members, City of Santa Fe land Use Department, interested individuals, neighboring condominium or apartment associations and neighborhood associations

Additional References

Section 14-3.1(F) of the Santa Fe City Code for a complete representation of all regulations pertaining to Early Neighborhood Notification



City of Santa Fe, New Mexico

Memorandum



DATE: April 24, 2024

TO: Travis Dutton-Leyda, CPO 

VIA: JoAnn Lovato-Montano

FROM: Romella Glorioso-Moss, PhD, CPM *RGM*
Procurement Manager

RE: RFP#24001 Evaluation Committee Report

In accordance with the Request for Proposals for On-Call General Engineering Services for Roadway, Trail, Bridge, Drainage, Facility, Utility and Traffic Design (RFP# 24001) issued on February 8, 2024, the City received eleven (11) proposals from the following Offerors:

1. AECOM Technical Services, Inc. (AECOM)
2. Bohannon-Huston, Inc. (BHI)
3. Earth and Steel Design, LLC. (Earth & Steel)
4. Huitt-Zollars, Inc. (Huitt-Zollars)
5. Lee Engineering, LLC. (Lee Eng.)
6. Miller Engineers, Inc., d/b/a/ Souder, Miller & Associates (ME/SMA)
7. Molzen Corbin
8. Santa Fe Engineering Consultants, LLC. (SFEC)
9. WHPacific, an NV5 Company (WHPacific)
10. Wilson & Company, Inc. (Wilson)
11. WSP USA, Inc. (WSP)

The Evaluation Committee members are as follows:

- Dalmolin, Mike PE, Traffic Operations Engineer, Public Works – Complete Streets
- Isaacson, Zoë, River and Watershed Manager, Public Works – Parks and Open Space
- Jurgens, Taylor PE, Engineer, Public Utilities – Water
- Wolfenbarger, Jeanne PE, Traffic Engineer, Public Works – Complete Streets.

This Evaluation Committee Report summarizes all criteria used in scoring the response.

- March 11, 2024: Evaluation Committee met to review the Evaluation Committee duties and RFP process, and to receive the Offerors technical proposals.
- March 11-17, 2024: Each committee member reviewed and scored all the proposals individually.
- March 18, 2024: Procurement Manager and committee members held an in-person meeting to review and discuss individual score sheets and came to a consensus.

- April 4, 2024: Procurement Manager emailed SFEC for clarification on Appendix F and it was determined that Appendix F was not included in their proposals as required by the RFP.
- April 12, 2024: Evaluation committee report submitted to Central Purchasing for review.

SUMMARY:

Although Section IV.C. Business Specifications appeared before Section IV.B Technical Specification in RFP#24001, the Committee reviewed Offerors’ compliance to Section IV.C. Business Specifications first to identify proposals who are disqualified and should not move forward for further evaluation.

Section IV. C. Business Specifications

C.1 Letter of Transmittal Form

Specifications:

The Offeror’s proposal **must** be accompanied by the Letter of Transmittal Form located in APPENDIX A. The form should be completed and must be signed by the person authorized to obligate the company.

Evaluation Factor:

Pass/Fail only. No points assigned.

Scores:

| AECOM | BHI | Earth & Steel | Huitt-Zollars | Lee Eng’g. | ME/SMA | Molzen-Corbin | SFEC | WH Pacific | Wilson | WSP |
|-------|------|---------------|---------------|------------|--------|---------------|------|------------|--------|------|
| Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass |

Comments:

All Offerors submitted a Letter of Transmittal with their proposals. All Offerors passed this specification.

C.2 Campaign Contribution Disclosure Form

Specifications:

The Offeror must complete an unaltered Campaign Contribution Disclosure Form and submit a signed copy with the Offeror’s proposal. This must be accomplished whether or not an applicable contribution has been made (APPENDIX B). **Failure to complete and return the signed, unaltered form will result in Offeror’s disqualification.**

Evaluation Factor:

Pass/Fail only. No points assigned.

Scores:

| AECOM | BHI | Earth & Steel | Huitt-Zollars | Lee Eng'g. | ME/SMA | Molzen-Corbin | SFEC | WH Pacific | Wilson | WSP |
|-------|------|---------------|---------------|------------|--------|---------------|------|------------|--------|------|
| Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass |

Comments:

All Offerors submitted a signed Campaign Contribution Disclosure Form with their proposals. All Offerors passed this specification.

C.3 Non-Collusion Affidavit Form

Specifications:

The Offeror **must** complete an unaltered Non-Collusion Affidavit Form and submit a signed copy with the Offeror’s proposal (APPENDIX C). **Failure to complete and return the signed, unaltered form will result in Offeror’s disqualification.**

Evaluation Factor:

Pass/Fail only. No points assigned.

Scores:

| AECOM | BHI | Earth & Steel | Huitt-Zollars | Lee Eng'g. | ME/SMA | Molzen-Corbin | SFEC | WH Pacific | Wilson | WSP |
|-------|------|---------------|---------------|------------|--------|---------------|------|------------|--------|------|
| Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass |

Comments:

All Offerors submitted a signed Non-Collusion Affidavit Form with their proposals. All Offerors passed this specification.

C.4 Conflict of Interest Statement for Consulting Firms

Specifications:

The Offeror **must** complete an unaltered Conflict of Interest Statement for Consulting Firms and submit a signed copy with the Offeror’s proposal (APPENDIX D). **Failure to complete and return the signed, unaltered form will result in Offeror’s disqualification.**

Evaluation Factor:

Pass/Fail only. No points assigned.

Scores:

| AECOM | BHI | Earth & Steel | Huitt-Zollars | Lee Eng'g. | ME/SMA | Molzen-Corbin | SFEC | WH Pacific | Wilson | WSP |
|-------|------|---------------|---------------|------------|--------|---------------|------|------------|--------|------|
| Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass |

Comments:

All Offerors submitted a signed Conflict of Interest Statement with their proposals. All Offerors passed this specification.

C.5 Confidentiality and Non-Disclosure Agreement

Specifications:

The Offeror **must** complete an unaltered Confidentiality and Non-Disclosure Agreement and submit a signed copy with the Offeror’s proposal (APPENDIX E). **Failure to complete and return the signed, unaltered form will result in Offeror’s disqualification.**

Evaluation Factor:

Pass/Fail only. No points assigned.

Scores:

| AECOM | BHI | Earth & Steel | Huitt-Zollars | Lee Eng’g. | ME/ SMA | Molzen-Corbin | SFEC | WH Pacific | Wilson | WSP |
|-------|------|---------------|---------------|------------|---------|---------------|------|------------|--------|------|
| Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass |

Comments:

All Offerors submitted a signed Confidentiality and Non-Disclosure Agreement with their proposals. All Offerors passed this specification.

C.6 Sub-Consultants Offerors List

Specifications:

The Offeror **must** complete an unaltered Sub-Consultants Offerors List and submit a signed copy with the Offeror’s proposal (APPENDIX F). **Failure to complete and return the signed, unaltered form will result in Offeror’s disqualification.**

Evaluation Factor:

Pass/Fail only. No points assigned.

Scores:

| AECOM | BHI | Earth & Steel | Huitt-Zollars | Lee Eng’g. | ME/ SMA | Molzen-Corbin | SFEC | WH Pacific | Wilson | WSP |
|-------|------|---------------|---------------|------------|---------|---------------|------|------------|--------|------|
| Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Fail | Pass | Pass | Pass |

Comments:

All Offerors except the SFEC (Santa Fe Engineering Consultants, LLC) submitted a signed Sub-Consultants Offerors List with their proposals. SFEC was disqualified due to this fact.

Section IV.B Technical Specifications

Section IV.B.1 General Information (maximum 5 points)

Specifications:

Offeror **must** identify its principal member(s) or officer(s) who will be responsible for the administration of the contract; provide the name(s) and registration number(s) of the New Mexico Registered Professional Engineer who will be directly responsible and in charge of the work; and identify the name, address, and phone number of the office(s) where the work will be performed for the prime Offeror and all sub-consultants.

Evaluation Factor:

Points will be awarded based on the completeness of the Offeror’s responses.

Scores:

| AECOM | BHI | Earth & Steel | Huitt-Zollars | Lee Eng’g. | ME/SMA | Molzen-Corbin | SFEC | WH Pacific | Wilson | WSP |
|-------|-----|---------------|---------------|------------|--------|---------------|--------------|------------|--------|-----|
| 5 | 4.8 | 4.3 | 5 | 5 | 4.8 | 4.8 | Disqualified | 4.8 | 3.8 | 5 |

Comments:

- 1) **AECOM** (5 points) provided in detail, their principal officers and other engineers on staff to help complete a range of engineering tasks identified in the Scope of Work (SOW). AECOM’s office locations and its subconsultants were also provided. The proposal is particularly strong listing the experience of principal officers with previous work with the City.
- 2) **BHI** (4.8 points) provided requested information about principal officers and work locations. However, it was weak in reference to the consideration of subconsultants that may be required to supplement in-house staff.
- 3) **Earth and Steel** (4.3 points) missed a couple of specifications resulting to a 0.5 point deduction. The proposal identified the principal officer but not the requested details, such as the location where the work will be performed or information on the subconsultants.
- 4) **Huitt-Zollars** (5 points) provided full details on principals who will be responsible for the administration of the contract. The Offeror provided the names and registration numbers of the New Mexico Registered Professional Engineer who will be directly responsible and in charge of the work. The Offeror also identified the names, addresses, and phone numbers of the sub-consultants.
- 5) **Lee Eng’g.** (5 points) provided all the information requested such names and registration numbers of the principal officers; name, address, and phone number of the principal office including all sub-consultants. Their response was complete and identified all required information in this specification.
- 6) **ME/SMA** (4.8 points) provided general information on the principal officers but not on subconsultants.

- 7) **Molzen-Corbin** (4.8 points) provided sufficient information but lacked detail.
- 8) **WHPacific** (4.8 points) provided information on its principals and subcontractors but not much detail was included.
- 9) **Wilson** (3.8 points) provided the requested information on its principal officers but not the requested details, such as the location where the work will occur or requested information on the subconsultants. The Offeror did not also provide details (name, address and telephone number) of offices where the work will be performed.
- 10) **WSP** (5 points) proposal provided all the details of general information requested for principal officers and their subconsultants.

Section IV.B.2 Organizational References (maximum 15 points)

Specifications:

Offeror **must** provide a list of three (3) references from similar projects for city, state or federal government clients within the last four (4) years (2020-2023).

Offeror shall include the following Business Reference information as part of its proposals:

- a) Client name;
- b) Project description;
- c) Project dates (starting and ending);
- d) Technical environment (i.e. Professional design or construction management services for roadways, trails, bridges, drainage, facility, utility, traffic, underpasses/overpasses, etc.)
- e) Staff assigned to reference engagement that will be designated for work per this RFP; and
- f) Client project manager name, telephone number, fax number and email address.

Offeror is required to submit APPENDIX H, Organizational Reference Questionnaire (“Questionnaire”), to the business references it lists. **The business references must submit the Questionnaire directly to the designee identified in APPENDIX H. The business references must not return the completed Questionnaire to the Offeror.** It is the Offeror’s responsibility to ensure the completed forms are submitted on or before the date indicated in Section II. A, Sequence of Events, for inclusion in the evaluation process.

Organizational References that are not received or are not complete, may adversely affect the Offeror’s score in the evaluation process. Offerors are encouraged to specifically request that their Organizational References provide detailed comments.

Evaluation Factor:

Points will be awarded based upon an evaluation of the responses to a series of questions on the Organizational Reference Questionnaire (APPENDIX H). Offeror will be evaluated on references that show positive service history, successful execution of services and evidence of satisfaction by each reference. References indicating significantly similar services/scopes of work and comments provided by a submitted reference will add weight and value to a recommendation during the evaluation process.

Points will be awarded for each individual response up to 1/3 of the total points for this category. Lack of a response will receive zero (0) points.

The Evaluation Committee may contact any or all business references for validation of information submitted. If this step is taken, the Procurement Manager and the Evaluation Committee must all be together on a conference call with the submitted reference so that the Procurement Manager and all members of the Evaluation Committee receive the same information. Additionally, the City reserves the right to consider any and all information available to it (outside of the Organizational Reference information required herein), in its evaluation of Offeror responsibility per Section II.C.18.

Scores:

| AECOM | BHI | Earth & Steel | Huitt-Zollars | Lee Eng'g. | ME/SMA | Molzen-Corbin | SFEC | WH Pacific | Wilson | WSP |
|-------|------|---------------|---------------|------------|--------|---------------|--------------|------------|--------|------|
| 13.6 | 13.6 | 0 | 9 | 9.8 | 13.5 | 14.5 | Disqualified | 14.5 | 14 | 13.8 |

Comments:

- 1) **AECOM** (13.6 points) received three references. The reference for the NM 456 emergency bridge project is exemplary. The NMDOT had a pre-manufactured bridge, and this Offeror was able to retrofit these existing bridge components to fit the project’s specifications within 6 months. Such an approach saved a substantial amount of money and showed their adaptability. The other two references show the depth of this Offeror, from roadway improvements on NM 68 to inspection of bridge elements. The proposal outlined how this Offeror assumed control of the NM 68 project to correct deficiencies and shows their technical proficiency. However, the reference mentioned a few components were missed on the plan set. Both references did not provide rich detail to assess the firm’s performance.
- 2) **BHI** (13.6 points) received three references. All of them indicated high satisfaction with this Offeror and several mentioned having an extensive service history with them. The range of technical expertise displayed by these three projects referenced are quite varied and include drainage, roadway, and bridge. In particular, the Sunport Boulevard Extension project really showed the Offeror’s technical proficiency in all of the services requested. Scores were reduced due to the references providing very little detail and, in some cases, did not even provide any comment to justify the score provided. RFP requested firms encourage their references to provide detailed comments and thus points were reduced.
- 3) **Earth & Steel** (0 points) identified three references in their proposal (pp. 11-13). However, none of these references submitted the reference questionnaire to the Purchasing Division or to the Procurement Manager. Zero points were awarded as a result.
- 4) **Huitt-Zollars** (9 points) - The two references received for this Offeror provided almost no comment to justify high scores. The proposal lists a range of professional services, but the references do not provide any detail to demonstrate technical proficiency.

- 5) **Lee Eng'g.** (9.8 points) – Although three references were received for this Offeror, one did not respond to any of the questions at all. However, the two other references provided details to demonstrate their technical expertise in a range of roadway and traffic engineering services. Both references highly acclaim their services and rank them as the preferred on-call contract for traffic engineering services for the NMDOT and the City of Rio Rancho. Although this Offeror does not offer the full range of services identified in the SOW, such as bridges and drainage design services, this firm is ranked highly for meeting very specific and technical design services within traffic.
- 6) **ME/SMA** (13.5 points) - The three references for this Offeror were very complimentary and some continue to employ them on other projects. However, the language in two of the references were nearly word for word the same with some minor changes. For example, on Question 9 about which services were you least satisfied, the language is the exact same about project schedule.
- 7) **Molzen-Corbin** (14.5 points) - Two of the three references from the NMDOT and City of Albuquerque were effusive with praise and documented the long-standing relationship with this firm on multiple projects. The range of engineering services are also excellent, ranging from airport design, bridges, drainage, utility, etc. In particular that was impressive was the design details highlighting thoughtful design, including gravity flow when possible on the Santa Fe County project and sustainability rating on the I-25 interchange.
- 8) **WHPacific** (14.5 points) - Two of the three reference letters provided detailed comments and gave concrete examples of what separated this firm, such as the lack of change orders during construction owing to their “knowledge and expertise” during the design process. The other reference highlighted their knowledge of relevant manuals.
- 9) **Wilson** (14 points) - All the references highlighted how this Offeror has extensive histories and completed a lot of projects for several of them, including Los Alamos County, AMAFCA, and Rio Rancho. Other positives cited included how Wilson is able to complete a lot of the services in-house. However, the references also highlighted some weaknesses in technical writing and QA/QC processes.
- 10) **WSP** (13.8 points) received three references. Their references noted that their agency has worked with this Offeror on several projects and highlighted how they are one of the most accommodating firms and can handle large projects. The reference from the City of Albuquerque particularly how well executed the firm does with their complete street maintenance program, citing their ability to thoroughly research each corridor.

The Evaluation Committee did not contact any of the business references to validate any information submitted.

Section IV.B.3. Mandatory Specifications

IV.B.3.a. Specialized Design and Technical Competence (maximum 25 points)

Specifications:

Offeror **must** describe two (2) engineering design projects that highlight their specialized problem-solving techniques or approaches, innovative practices/ideas, and advantages its team brings or offers to the City.

Evaluation Factor:

Points will be awarded based on Offeror’s innovativeness, creativity, and effectiveness in designing past projects.

Scores:

| AECOM | BHI | Earth & Steel | Huitt-Zollars | Lee Eng’g. | ME/SMA | Molzen-Corbin | SFEC | WH Pacific | Wilson | WSP |
|-------|-----|---------------|---------------|------------|--------|---------------|--------------|------------|--------|------|
| 24.4 | 22 | 20 | 18.3 | 21.3 | 20.3 | 24 | Disqualified | 21.5 | 23.3 | 22.5 |

Comments:

- 1) **AECOM** (24.4 points) showcased two projects showed very clearly the attention to detail and the innovative practices they can bring to solve problems. One highlight is the unique approach to lighting the underpass, using a combination of design alternations to bring as much natural light as possible while using light shield sculptures to integrate art while reducing vandalism. The integration of art into design can really help a project succeed within the City. The ability to mobilize such an eclectic staff to address a broad array brings a lot of value to the City.
- 2) **BHI** (22 points) demonstrated their ability to factor in their clients’ input in decision-making. However, project examples given were simple and did not show their ability to be innovative, and creative.
- 3) **Earth and Steel** (20 points) described two engineering projects from work the principal members did as part of another firm. Therefore, it was unclear where division of responsibilities lies. Nevertheless, their project description highlights how both of the principal members contributed specialized problem-solving techniques.
- 4) **Huitt-Zollars** (18.3 points) described innovative practices and ideas, but they were not connected to the two projects highlighted.
- 5) **Lee Engineering** (21.3 points) listed two projects and had a supplemental section spotlighting unique and creative approaches to traffic engineering. Some of these unique and creative approaches include alternative intersection design, employment of big data to yield more nuanced understanding of traffic along I-40, and employment of “rest-in-red” signal operations. These innovative solutions were not linked to the two projects described in the proposal. These creative approaches offer potential benefits to the City but the firm will be limited to specific engineering services, such as traffic and roadway.
- 6) **ME/SMA** (20.3 points) in highlighting two projects showed some effective problem-solving, including receiving approval on meeting ADA requirements to the maximum extent feasible and

providing a graphic simulation of roadway design. However, they are quite simple, so it did not show creativity and innovativeness that RFP requires.

- 7) **Molzen-Corbin** (24 points) received the highest score for this question. The two project examples given were discussed succinctly and highlighted their innovativeness, creativity and advantages their team brings or offers to the City.
- 8) **WH Pacific** (21.5 points) described the two project examples given very well but no discussion on innovativeness and creativity. Project examples demonstrated the Offerors' ability to coordinate with multiple entities/stakeholders and involved complex project phasing and sequencing.
- 9) **Wilson** (23.3 points) demonstrated well their ability to take on very complex projects and see them through construction. Descriptions of the two project examples given were innovative and cutting edge. However, a few points were deducted because there was no discussion on hardships or difficulties encountered and how they were resolved.
- 10) **WSP** (22.5 points) described two projects but they lack specificity which makes it difficult to assess the firm's innovativeness or creativity and hence the advantages their team brings or offers to the City.

IV.B.3.b. Capacity and Capability of the Offeror to Perform the Scope of Work (maximum 25 points)

Specifications:

Offeror **must**:

- i. provide information about the business that demonstrates the ability to provide sufficient professional competence, meet time schedules, accommodate cost considerations, and project administration requirements, including information that demonstrates the Offeror's ability to perform the services required for this project;
- ii. include an organizational chart indicating key project team members, including any sub-consultants, and their specific roles on the project and/or area(s) of expertise, and clearly identifying the lead engineer who will be directly responsible for the project. The percentage of time each team member will spend or commit to providing services toward the project must be included in the organizational chart; and
- iii. provide brief resumes for the lead engineer and key project team members, describing why each team member was selected for this proposal, highlighting relevant project experience and knowledge of City/NMDOT/FHWA procedures. If a subcontractor is affiliated with the prime contractor as an affiliated company, firm, or business, the proposal must indicate this. The proposal must also identify the Offeror's team's list of current projects with the City.

Evaluation Factor:

Points will be awarded based on the team members' relevance and extent of their experience, expertise and knowledge in engineering design of a roadway, trail, bridge, drainage, facility, utility and traffic;

and of their formal education, certifications and licenses. In addition, points will also be based on the amount of care and attention given to assembling the team members based on their specialized professional competence and Scope of Work.

Scores:

| AECOM | BHI | Earth & Steel | Huitt-Zollars | Lee Eng'g. | ME/SMA | Molzen-Corbin | SFEC | WH Pacific | Wilson | WSP |
|-------|-----|---------------|---------------|------------|--------|---------------|--------------|------------|--------|------|
| 24.8 | 23 | 18.5 | 22 | 21.8 | 20.3 | 23 | Disqualified | 21.5 | 23.3 | 22.5 |

Comments:

- 1) **AECOM** (24.8 points) outlined an extensive approach to demonstrate their ability to meet project schedules and accommodate cost considerations through an extensive list of tools to monitor the schedule and tasks as well as a deep well of project cost data from other projects.

The Offeror gave an immense accounting of their technical expertise in all of the engineering services and how that would be tailored to meet the City’s standards through different planning documents. In terms of the engineers leading the project, almost all had decades of experience.

The proposal discussed in detail their cost control/estimating procedures, their Quality Management Plan/System to control QA/QC practices.

Resumes showed their team is well-qualified.

A small weakness is this section could have been written in a more concise way.

- 2) **BHI** (23 points) has extensive on-call experience. They have a long list of contracts with work relevant to RFP’s SOW. They also provide specialty engineering services such as community development, planning and GIS which are important components to public engagement/participation. However, the Offeror’s organizational chart did not have the percentages each member would be assigned to certain tasks and did not include the depth of the firm. Although the firm has extensive capacity in the range of engineering services, any subconsultant should have been listed even if it is not anticipated to be needed.
- 3) **Earth and Steel** (18.5 points) demonstrated a high-level of understanding of a project life-cycle but lacked specificity and details on how these projects are implemented. Principal members have a lot of experience in and around Santa Fe and with NMDOT. Staff resumes and organizational chart don’t indicate very much depth of key project staff.
- 4) **Huitt-Zollars** (22 points) demonstrated strong multi-disciplinary experience with a large design staff. Graphics on schedule and cost control were helpful and reflect strong schedule and cost control measures. Both the organizational chart and resumes showed a lot of experienced staff. One weakness identified is since the firm does not have any projects with the City, they may not be familiar with City codes and other regulations and procedures.

- 5) **Lee Engineering** (21.8 points) showed in their organizational chart and resume sections that they have a capacity to handle most engineering services listed in the SOW. However, the organizational chart lists many engineering services with one capable staff. Some questions thus remain as to the depth of the firm to handle large projects. But this firm seems to have a strong capability in roadway design and traffic engineering services based on what was provided. The firm also has had several projects, and currently has several projects, with the City, showing their experience of City procedures. However, the proposal did not address the requested information on the firm's ability to accommodate cost considerations and keep project schedules.
- 6) **ME/SMA** (20.3 points) demonstrated in their organizational chart and resumes that they have the capacity to handle most engineering services listed in the SOW but the organization chart lists many engineering services with one capable staff. This leads to a question as to the capacity of the firm to handle large projects and multiple projects.

Another weakness in the section was the parts dedicated to demonstrating the Offeror's ability to meet time schedules, accommodate cost schedules, etc. The response is too general and not enough concrete details were provided.

- 7) **Molzen-Corbin** (23 points) showed a lot of past experience with on-call contracts in New Mexico. It also showed multi-disciplinary experience in-house, including all areas of the SOW. The resumes show good experience in each discipline. One weakness identified was that the firm currently does not have any projects with the City and may not have extensive knowledge of City procedures due to this fact.
- 8) **WH Pacific** (21.5 points) demonstrated broad experience in several of the disciplines listed in the SOW. This firm has lots of experience with on-call contracts. The proposal provided concrete examples of their ability to meet cost and schedule components by providing tables of recent projects the firm has completed. The proposal detailed the range of professional competence, from traffic engineering, roadway design, to drainage. However, the same level of detail was not provided for some of the services in the RFP, such as bridges and facilities but the proposal listed resumes of some of the staff equipped to handle those kinds of tasks.
- 9) **Wilson** (23.3 points) stands out for its extensive knowledge of the City to the extent a special Microsoft Project file was jointly developed to track project schedules. That extensive City knowledge coupled with a broad range of engineers capable of all the engineering tasks support the firm's capabilities to the City. However, the proposal was weak in detailing and providing concrete examples to reduce construction cost and keep schedules.
- 10) **WSP** (22.5 points) showed the team's ability to support the City with local talent while also being able to lean on national expertise is an added benefit. The proposal's narrative also showed the Offeror has experience in several disciplines identified in SOW. The resumes reflect a team that is well-qualified and experienced in working with the City and NMDOT. A weakness in the section was the parts dedicated to demonstrating the firm's ability to meet time schedules, accommodate cost schedules, etc. The response is too general and not enough concrete details were provided.

IV.B.3.c Past Record of Performance (maximum 20 points)

Specifications:

Offeror **must** demonstrate through historical documentation that the Offeror has the ability to meet schedules and budgets, as well as user program goals, and final construction project costs. Project schedules should provide information about the progress of work as related to owner schedules and goals as well as the overall success of projects and client satisfaction. The proposal must describe two (2) past projects, specifying relevance to the current scope of work and include client references (names, addresses, email address and telephone numbers) for each project. Also, please submit APPENDIX G “Project/Contract Listing Form”.

Evaluation Factor:

Points will be awarded based upon an evaluation of the documented organizational experience, knowledge and resources that may be employed for the project. Points will also be awarded based on Contractor’s meeting project schedule agreed upon at the award of the contract. Considerations will be given if the project delay was caused by the City or NMDOT (APPENDIX G). Further, points will be awarded based on Offeror’s candid and well-thought-out response to successes and failures, as well as the ability of the Offeror to learn from its failures and grow from its successes.

Scores:

| AECOM | BHI | Earth & Steel | Huitt-Zollars | Lee Eng’g. | ME/SMA | Molzen-Corbin | SFEC | WH Pacific | Wilson | WSP |
|-------|------|---------------|---------------|------------|--------|---------------|--------------|------------|--------|------|
| 19 | 16.8 | 10.8 | 16.8 | 18 | 13.8 | 17.5 | Disqualified | 17.8 | 16.8 | 17.5 |

Comments:

- 1) **AECOM** (19 points) provided two projects which highlighted the firm’s capacity to act under duress and deliver projects by the required deadlines. The range of services provided further illustrates the capacity of the firm to act and deliver any type of engineering services listed in the SOW. However, the response, although quite detailed, did not provide enough discussion on cost and budget and lessons learned from successes and failures and how that will help the firm grow.
- 2) **BHI** (16.8 points) demonstrated the ability to meet the City’s design deadlines, however no documentation was provided on project schedules, budgets, and no discussions on lessons learned from project successes and failures.
- 3) **Earth and Steel** (10.8 points) No historical documentation was provided to justify the Offeror’s ability to meet schedules and budgets. Although the Offeror did not provide two projects the proposal did highlight the Offeror’s approach to keeping a project schedule and containing costs, but some documentation was required.
- 4) **Huitt-Zollars** (16.8 points) highlighted two projects that were delayed and elaborated on the role additional scope can have on wrecking on a client’s project timeline. In fact, the delay was over two years in both projects. The Offeror did not identify any lessons learned, if there were any, from these delays and how the firm will grow as a result.

The Offeror also failed to discuss whether project costs were attempted to be contained. Both projects were delayed for months while “securing funding” from the City. That raises the questions of whether the projects were funded in the first place or additional funding was required due to scope changes.

The lack of information made it hard for the Committee to assess Offeror’s response to this question other than the Offeror has some experience and resources to deliver the roadway and trail projects described.

- 5) **Lee Engineering** (18 points) highlighted two traffic engineering projects, both of which undertook unique and creative approaches. For the Airport Road signal timing optimization project, the firm impressively adopted the scope/fee proposal to adjust to budget cuts, optimizing the level of documentation accordingly. With this project being in the middle of the pandemic, the firm had to adjust the project and adapt their approach to lower volumes. In terms of engineering approaches, the “rest-in-red” concept is unique and really meets the project goals in unique ways. These two projects are focused only on traffic engineering services in the SOW and some approaches from other types of engineering services would have further bolstered their score.
- 6) **ME/SMA** (13.8 points) provided little-to-no discussion on actual vs. projected scheduled completion and actual vs. final project costs. One of the project examples showed experience in coordinating with multiple City departments and the public. The proposal did not also detail any lessons learned from successes or failures and how it will help the firm grow.
- 7) **Molzen-Corbin** (17.5 points) not only highlighted two projects but provided their systematic approach to meeting budgets and schedules. A cost and schedule performance table were provided, providing data to support their ability to meet client goals. Some of these projects cost a bit more than the estimate but the projects were always completed on time. The two projects showcase the range of services in the firm, from a large roadway to lift station. One mechanism in the lift station the firm employed to control costs to meet the budget was bid additives to provide flexibility in awarding the project. However, there was no discussion of discrepancies between bid estimates and actual bid amounts. Also not discussed were their project successes and failures and how that will help the firm grow.
- 8) **WH Pacific** (17.5 points) demonstrated broad experience in several of the disciplines listed in the SOW. They have a lot of experience with on-call contracts. The 2 projects described laid out the capability of this Offeror to handle an array of projects with a variety of stakeholders. One highlight was the complexity NM 566 bridge replacement over BNSF railroad and adjacent to the Navajo Nation. The Lovington road diet project highlighted an award for innovative design but did not detail in which ways the design was innovative to garner that award. The proposal further did not detail any lessons learned from successes or failures and how it will help the firm grow.
- 9) **Wilson** (16.8 points) demonstrated their ability to work in a tight window. Their ability to anticipate the critical path and potential long lead items as well as find solutions to prevent causing a delay in the project was key to their project success. Discussions on how project schedule and costs were controlled as well as any lessons learned were missing. Highlighting different projects than what were previously described could have been an opportunity.

10) WSP (17 points) featured two projects that are located within the City and displayed the Offeror’s capabilities to deliver a range of projects. The culvert replacement project particularly highlighted the firm’s capacity to deliver an expedited design to meet the city’s needs after the collapse of the previous culvert, thus shutting down a roadway for months. The design team also showed some capacity to change after staking the proposed structure in the field.

However, the Offeror did not take time to elaborate on the project schedule established and how their team met that schedule. Further, on the Guadalupe St. Bridge Preservation, a project cost is detailed but no information is provided as to whether this met the project’s budget, thus the Committee was unable to fully judge the Offeror’s ability to meet budgets.

IV.B.3.d Proximity to or Familiarity with the City of Santa Fe (maximum 5 points)

Specifications:

Offeror **must** identify its familiarity with the City of Santa Fe and its understanding of the scope of work. Offerors must demonstrate through narrative, graphics or maps the firm’s ability to respond quickly to on- and off-site requirements for engineering and construction management services and administration of a City project which will be awarded via this RFP. The Offeror must also indicate previous knowledge or experience regarding the City, and any current work or associated consultants who could enhance the firm’s ability to provide timely responses or special expertise to a City project needs.

Evaluation Factor:

Points will be awarded based on the Offeror’s familiarity with the City’s procedural, procurement and regulatory design requirements; thorough understanding of the Scope of Work; and how quickly they can respond to City request/need.

Scores:

| AECOM | BHI | Earth & Steel | Huitt-Zollars | Lee Eng’g. | ME/SMA | Molzen-Corbin | SFEC | WH Pacific | Wilson | WSP |
|-------|-----|---------------|---------------|------------|--------|---------------|--------------|------------|--------|-----|
| 4.8 | 4.8 | 4.5 | 4 | 4.5 | 4.8 | 4.5 | Disqualified | 4.8 | 4.8 | 5 |

Comments:

- 1) **AECOM** (4.8 points) has a staff office in Santa Fe for quick response times. They also have several years of past experience working with the City of Santa Fe, thus have excellent knowledge of procedural, procurement, and regulatory design requirements.
- 2) **BHI** (4.8 points) demonstrated knowledge and work throughout Santa Fe. No staff located directly in Santa Fe but still within an hour in Albuquerque.
- 3) **Earth and Steel** (4.5 points) is located within Santa Fe, leading to good response time. Narrative is limited to familiarity with City regulations, procedures, and processes.

- 4) **Huitt-Zollars** (4 points) has prior experience with the City and demonstrated clear understanding of the SOW. However, the office is located 1 hour from Santa Fe.
- 5) **Lee Engineering** (4.5 points) currently has several projects with the City and is located within an hour of Santa Fe.
- 6) **ME/SMA** (4.8 points) has a satellite office in Santa Fe that provides close proximity. Acknowledgment of historical and cultural significance which requires unique solutions is a particular strength of the proposal.
- 7) **Molzen-Corbin** (4.5 points) demonstrated a lot of previous experience with multiple departments in City but they do not have an office in Santa Fe. Their office is in Albuquerque.
- 8) **WH Pacific** (4.8 points) demonstrated a good understanding of the SOW and highlighted several projects with City of Santa Fe. Their staff is based mainly in Albuquerque.
- 9) **Wilson** (4.8 points) has an extensive project history in City and knows the City's procedural, procurement, and regularly design requirements.
- 10) **WSP** (5 points) has several staff within the State, including an office in Santa Fe. They also showed they have several years of project experience with City of Santa Fe.

IV.B.3.e New Mexico Produced Work (maximum 5 points)

Specifications:

Offeror **must** indicate the volume of work to be produced in New Mexico by a New Mexico firm or firms. The Offeror must identify any out-of-state consultant(s) or business relationships that will be involved on any City project that will be awarded via this RFP, and the extent of services to be provided by that firm or firms.

Evaluation Factor:

Points will be awarded based on the percentage of work produced in New Mexico using the following formula:

- 0% - 20% - 1 point
- 21% - 40% - 2 points
- 41% - 60% - 3 points
- 61% - 80% - 4 points
- 81% - 100% - 5 points

Scores:

| AECOM | BHI | Earth & Steel | Huitt-Zollars | Lee Eng'g. | ME/SMA | Molzen-Corbin | SFEC | WH Pacific | Wilson | WSP |
|-------|-----|---------------|---------------|------------|--------|---------------|--------------|------------|--------|-----|
| 5 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 5 | Disqualified | 5 | 5 | 5 |

Comments:

- 1) **AECOM** (5 points) – 90% of work will be produced in New Mexico.
- 2) **BHI** (0 point) – Evaluation Committee did not award any points because the Offerors’ response is not direct and subject to interpretation. The Offeror tried to answer this question indirectly by stating their firm is a NM-owned and –based so they anticipate completing all the work in NM.
- 3) **Earth and Steel** (5 points) – 100% of work will be produced in New Mexico.
- 4) **Huitt-Zollars** (5 points) – 100% of work will be produced in New Mexico.
- 5) **Lee Engineering** (5 points) – 100% of work will be produced in New Mexico.
- 6) **ME/SMA** (0 point) – The Evaluation Committee did not award any points because the Offeror ’s response is quite vague; stating a “substantial” portion of the work will be completed in NM.
- 7) **Molzen-Corbin** – 100% of work will be produced in New Mexico.
- 8) **WHPacific** – 100% of work will be produced in New Mexico.
- 9) **Wilson** – 100% of work will be produced in New Mexico.
- 10) **WSP** – 100% of work will be produced in New Mexico.

IV.B.3.f Volume of Work Currently Being Performed (0 to 5 point deduction). For Munis scores, see change in the scoring method below.**

Specifications:

Offeror **must** provide information on the status of any project that has been awarded by the City in the past four (4) years and is, on the date of the submittal, less than 75% complete by completing the “Contract/Project Listing Form” (APPENDIX G). The reason for any project delays must be identified.

Evaluation Factor:

Points shall be deducted for projects awarded that are less than 75% complete on the date the proposals are due. The following formula on fees shall be utilized in assessing scores:

| Contract Balance Amount* Per Project | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|
| \$ Less than - \$500,000 | minus 0 point |
| \$500,001 - \$750,000 | minus 1 point |
| \$750,001 - \$1,000,000 | minus 2 points |
| \$1,000,001- over | minus 3 points |

*Contract Balance Amount is defined as:

- i. Single Phase Contracts: Amount of contract including supplemental agreements that have been negotiated and that are covered under a signed contract, minus all paid invoices, if any (per project).
- ii. Multi-Phase Contracts: Amount of contract including all subsequent phases and supplemental agreements that have been negotiated and that are covered under a signed contract, minus all paid invoices, if any (per project).

The maximum total point deduction for this section (sum of all ongoing contracts) will be 5 points. Deduction points will be calculated on the date the proposals are due. The Offeror must invoice against ongoing contracts not less than five (5) business days prior to proposal due date to allow sufficient time for posting to Deduction Point listing. No points will be deducted if the delay was caused by either the City or NMDOT. For example, if work has to stop due to delay in amending the term of the funding agreement.

**** When recording scores in Munis, it was determined that Munis won't accept a negative score, therefore the scoring methodology was adjusted to positive scores in Munis as follows:**

Maximum score is 5 points.

Contract Balance Amount per Project

| | <u>RFP Scoring</u> | <u>Munis Scoring</u> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| \$ Less than - \$500,000 | minus 0 point | add 5 points |
| \$500,001 - \$750,000 | minus 1 point | add 4 points |
| \$750,001 - \$1,000,000 | minus 2 points | add 3 points |
| \$1,000,001- over | minus 3 points | add 2 points |

Using the above methodology, Offeror's scores are:

Scores:

| | AECOM | BHI | Earth & Steel | Huitt-Zollars | Lee Eng'g. | ME/SMA | Molzen-Corbin | SFEC | WH Pacific | Wilson | WSP |
|---------------|-------|-----|---------------|---------------|------------|--------|---------------|--------------|------------|--------|-----|
| RFP Scoring | -4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Disqualified | 0 | -2 | 0 |
| Munis Scoring | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | Disqualified | 5 | 3 | 5 |

Comments:

- 1) **AECOM** (-4) is working on 2 projects with the City with a remaining balance in the range of \$750,001 - \$1,000,000. Using the scoring method in the RFP, AECOM has a deduction of -4. In Munis, the score is 1 (maximum score of 5 minus 4).

- 2) **BHI** (0 point) currently has no project with the City with a remaining balance of over \$500,000. Hence, no points were deducted.
- 3) **Earth & Steel** (0 point) is not working on any project with the City. Hence, no points were deducted.
- 4) **Huitt-Zollars** (0 point) does not have any projects with the City at the time of proposal submittal. Hence, no points were deducted.
- 5) **Lee Eng'g.** (0 point) does not have any projects with the City with a remaining balance of over \$500,000. Hence, no points were deducted.
- 6) **ME/SMA** (0 point) does not have any projects with the City with a remaining balance of over \$500,000. Hence, no points were deducted.
- 7) **Molzen Corbin** (0 point) does not have any projects with the City with a remaining balance of over \$500,000. Hence, no points were deducted.
- 8) **WHPacific** (0 point) does not have any projects with the City with a remaining balance of over \$500,000. Hence, no points were deducted.
- 9) **Wilson** (-2 points) has one project with the City with a remaining balance in the range of \$750,001 - \$1,000,000. Using the RFP scoring method, they had a 2-point deduction. In Munis, the final score is 3 (maximum score of 5 minus 2).
- 10) **WSP** (0 point) does not have any project with the City with a remaining balance of over \$500,000. Hence, no points were deducted.

On-Call General Engineering Services for Roadway, Trail, Bridge, Drainage, Facility, Utility and Traffic Design

RFP# 24001 Evaluation Summary

Table 1. Evaluation Summary for AECOM, BHI, Earth & Steel, Huitt-Zollars and Lee Eng'g.

| RFP Section IV | Evaluation Factors | Maximum Points Available | AECOM | BHI | Earth & Steel | Huitt-Zollars | Lee Eng'g. |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------|------|---------------|---------------|------------|
| B. | Technical Specifications | | | | | | |
| B.1. | General Information | 5 | 5 | 4.8 | 4.3 | 5 | 5 |
| B.2. | Organizational References | 15 | 13.6 | 13.6 | 0 | 9.0 | 9.8 |
| B.3. | Mandatory Specifications | | | | | | |
| B.3.a. | Specialized Design and Technical Competence | 25 | 24.4 | 22 | 20 | 18.3 | 21.3 |
| B.3.b. | Capacity and Capability of the Offeror to Perform the Scope of Work | 25 | 24.8 | 23 | 18.5 | 22 | 21.8 |
| B.3.c. | Past Record of Performance | 20 | 19 | 16.8 | 10.8 | 16.8 | 18 |
| B.3.d. | Proximity to or Familiarity with the City of Santa Fe | 5 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 4.5 | 4 | 4.5 |
| B.3.e. | New Mexico Produced Work | 5 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| B.3.f. | Volume of Work Currently Being Performed | 0-5 Point Deduction | -4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| C. | Business Specifications | | | | | | |
| C.1. | Letter of Transmittal | Pass/Fail | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass |
| C.2. | Campaign Contribution Disclosure Form | Pass/Fail | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass |
| C.3. | Non-Collusion Affidavit Form | Pass/Fail | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass |
| C.4. | Conflict of Interest | Pass/Fail | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass |

| RFP Section IV | Evaluation Factors | Maximum Points Available | AECOM | BHI | Earth & Steel | Huitt-Zollars | Lee Eng'g. |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------|-----------|---------------|---------------|------------|
| | Statement for Consulting Firms | | | | | | |
| C.5. | Confidentiality and Non-Disclosure Agreement Form | Pass/Fail | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass |
| C.6. | Sub-Consultants Offeror's List | Pass/Fail | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass |
| | TOTAL POINTS | 100 maximum points | 92 | 85 | 63 | 80 | 85 |

Table 2. Evaluation Summary for ME/SMA, Molzen Corbin, SFEC, WHPacific, Wilson and WSP

| RFP Section IV | Evaluation Factors | Maximum Points Available | ME/SMA | Molzen Corbin | SFEC | WHPacific | Wilson | WSP |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------|---------------|------|-----------|--------|------|
| B. | Technical Specifications | | | | | | | |
| B.1. | General Information | 5 | 4.8 | 4.8 | NA | 4.8 | 3.8 | 5 |
| B.2. | Organizational References | 15 | 13.5 | 14.5 | NA | 14.5 | 14 | 13.8 |
| B.3. | Mandatory Specifications | | | | | | | |
| B.3.a. | Specialized Design and Technical Competence | 25 | 20.3 | 24 | NA | 22.3 | 23.3 | 21 |
| B.3.b. | Capacity and Capability of the Offeror to Perform the Scope of Work | 25 | 20.3 | 23 | NA | 21.5 | 23.3 | 22.5 |
| B.3.c. | Past Record of Performance | 20 | 13.8 | 17.5 | NA | 17.8 | 16.8 | 17.5 |
| B.3.d. | Proximity to or Familiarity with the City of Santa Fe | 5 | 4.8 | 4.5 | NA | 4.8 | 4.8 | 5 |
| B.3.e. | New Mexico Produced Work | 5 | 0 | 5 | NA | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| B.3.f. | Volume of | 0-5 Point | 0 | 0 | NA | 0 | -2 | 0 |

| RFP Section IV | Evaluation Factors | Maximum Points Available | ME/SMA | Molzen Corbin | SFEC | WHPacific | Wilson | WSP |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|----------------------|-------------|------------------|---------------|------------|
| | Work Currently Being Performed | Deduction | | | | | | |
| C. | Business Specifications | | | | | | | |
| C.1. | Letter of Transmittal | Pass/Fail | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass |
| C.2. | Campaign Contribution Disclosure Form | Pass/Fail | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass |
| C.3. | Non-Collusion Affidavit Form | Pass/Fail | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass |
| C.4. | Conflict of Interest Statement for Consulting Firms | Pass/Fail | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass |
| C.5. | Confidentiality and Non-Disclosure Agreement Form | Pass/Fail | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass |
| C.6. | Sub-Consultants Offeror's List | Pass/Fail | Pass | Pass | Fail | Pass | Pass | Pass |
| | TOTAL POINTS | 100 maximum points | 77 | 93 | NA | 91 | 89 | 90 |

Based on the Evaluation of the proposals submitted, as detailed above, the Evaluation Committee respectfully recommends awarding all Offerors that received a total score of 85 points and above, an on-call contract. The Offerors are: Molzen-Corbin (93), AECOM (92), WH Pacific (91), WSP (90), Wilson (89), BHI (85), and Lee Engineering (85). Awarding on-call contracts to the recommended Offerors are in the best interest and is most advantageous to the City of Santa Fe.

Evaluation Committee Members:

Michael Dalmolin

Dalmolin, Mike PE, Traffic Operations Engineer
Public Works – Complete Streets

05/23/2024

Date

Zoe Isaacson

Isaacson, Zoë River and Watershed Manager
Public Works – Parks and Open Space

05/23/2024

Date

Taylor Jurgens

Jurgens, Taylor PE, Engineer
Public Utilities – Water

5/24/2024

Date

Jeanne Wolfenbarger

Wolfenbarger, Jeanne PE, Traffic Engineer
Public Works – Complete Streets

05/28/2024

Date

Procurement Manager

Romella Glorioso-Moss

Glorioso-Moss, Romella PhD, CPM
Complete Streets Capital Projects Manager
Public Works – Complete Streets

05/31/2024

Date



CITY OF SANTA FE PROCUREMENT CHECKLIST

Contractor Name: WSP USA, Inc.

Procurement Title: Professional Services Agreement

Procurement Method: State Price Agreement Cooperative Sole Source Other

Exempt Request For Proposal (RFP) Invitation To Bid (ITB) Contract under 60K Contract over 60K

Department Requesting Public Works Staff Name Romella Glorioso-Moss

Procurement Requirements:

A procurement file shall be maintained for all contracts, regardless of the method of procurement. The procurement file shall contain the basis on which the award is made, all submitted bids, all evaluation materials, score sheets, quotations and all other documentation related to or prepared in conjunction with evaluation, negotiation, and the award process. The procurement shall contain a written determination from the Requesting Department, signed by the purchasing officer, setting forth the reasoning for the contract award decision before submitting to the Committees.

REQUIRED DOCUMENTS FOR APPROVAL BY PURCHASING*

YES N/A

- Approved Procurement Checklist (by Purchasing)
- Memo addressed to City Manager (under 60K) Committees/City Council (over 60K)
- State Price Agreement
- RFP
- Evaluation Committee Report
- ITB
- Bib Tab
- Quotes (3 valid current quotes)
- Cooperative Agreement
- Sole Source Request and Determination Form
- Contractors Exempt Letter
- Purchasing Officers approval for exempt procurement
- BAR
- FIR
- Executed Contract, Agreement or Amendment
- Current Business Registration and CRS numbers on contract or agreement
- Summary of Contracts and Agreements form
- Certificate of Insurance
- All documentation presented to Committees
- Other:

Romella Glorioso-Moss Capital Projects Manager 07/10/2024

Department Rep Printed Name (attesting that all information included) Title Date

JoAnn D Lovato Montano Procurement Manager Jul 25, 2024

Purchasing Officer (attesting that all information is reviewed) Title Date

Include all other substantive documents and records of communication that pertain to the procurement and contract.



City of Santa Fe

Summary of Contract, Agreement, Amendment & Lease

All applicable fields to be completed by department (complete 1.b only if you are processing an amendment):

1.a Munis Contract: 3250009 Procurement # (RFP/ITB# If any): 24001

Contractor: WSP USA, Inc

Procurement Method: Small Purchase RFP ITB Sole Source GSA Cooperative Exempt

Description/Title: PSA for On-Call General Engineering Services & Construction Management Services in the Total amount of \$5,409,375 (inclusive of NMGRT)

Contract: Agreement: Lease/Rent: Amendment:

Term Start Date: TBD Term End Date: 4 Years Total Contract Amount: \$5,409,375

Approved by Council (If over the City Manager's approval threshold, you must go through GB) TBD

Contract / Lease:

1.b Amendment #: _____ to the Original Contract/Lease # _____

Increase/(Decrease) Amount \$: _____

Extend Expiration Date to: _____

Approved by Council (If the original went through GB, all amendments must go through GB regardless of the amendment reason) Date: _____

Amendment is for: _____

2. HISTORY of Contract, Amendments & Lease / Rent - Please Elaborate (option: attach spreadsheet if multiple amendments)

3. Procurement History: RFP

JoAnn D Lovato Montano

JoAnn D Lovato Montano (Jul 25, 2024 15:13 MDT)

Purchasing Officer Review:

Jul 25, 2024

Date:

Comment & Exceptions: RFP# 24001

4. Funding Source: Various

Andy Hopkins

Budget Officer Approval:

Org / Object: Various

Jul 24, 2024

Date:

Comment & Exceptions: _____

5. Grant History (if applicable): Various

Grants Administrator Approval: _____ Date _____

Staff Contact who Completed This Form: Amanda Archuleta Phone #: 505-955-6631

To be recorded by City Clerk:

Clerk # _____ Email: ajarchuleta@santafenm.gov

Date of Execution: _____

ITT Representative (attesting that all information is reviewed)

Title

Date



CERTIFICATE OF LIABILITY INSURANCE

DATE (MM/DD/YYYY)

7/10/2024

THIS CERTIFICATE IS ISSUED AS A MATTER OF INFORMATION ONLY AND CONFERS NO RIGHTS UPON THE CERTIFICATE HOLDER. THIS CERTIFICATE DOES NOT AFFIRMATIVELY OR NEGATIVELY AMEND, EXTEND OR ALTER THE COVERAGE AFFORDED BY THE POLICIES BELOW. THIS CERTIFICATE OF INSURANCE DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A CONTRACT BETWEEN THE ISSUING INSURER(S), AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE OR PRODUCER, AND THE CERTIFICATE HOLDER.

IMPORTANT: If the certificate holder is an **ADDITIONAL INSURED**, the policy(ies) must have **ADDITIONAL INSURED** provisions or be endorsed. If **SUBROGATION IS WAIVED**, subject to the terms and conditions of the policy, certain policies may require an endorsement. A statement on this certificate does not confer rights to the certificate holder in lieu of such endorsement(s).

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| PRODUCER Arthur J. Gallagher Risk Management Services, LLC 300 Madison Avenue, 28th Floor New York NY 10017 | CONTACT NAME: AJG Sevice Team PHONE (A/C No. Ext): 212-994-7020 E-MAIL ADDRESS: GGB.WSPUS.CertRequest@ajg.com | | FAX (A/C, No): 212-994-7074 |
| | INSURER(S) AFFORDING COVERAGE | | |
| INSURED WSP USA Inc. One Penn Plaza New York, NY 10119 | INSURER A : QBE Specialty Insurance Company | | NAIC # 11515 |
| | INSURER B : | | |
| | INSURER C : | | |
| | INSURER D : | | |
| | INSURER E : | | |
| | INSURER F : | | |

COVERAGES **CERTIFICATE NUMBER:** 1160851828 **REVISION NUMBER:**

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT THE POLICIES OF INSURANCE LISTED BELOW HAVE BEEN ISSUED TO THE INSURED NAMED ABOVE FOR THE POLICY PERIOD INDICATED. NOTWITHSTANDING ANY REQUIREMENT, TERM OR CONDITION OF ANY CONTRACT OR OTHER DOCUMENT WITH RESPECT TO WHICH THIS CERTIFICATE MAY BE ISSUED OR MAY PERTAIN, THE INSURANCE AFFORDED BY THE POLICIES DESCRIBED HEREIN IS SUBJECT TO ALL THE TERMS, EXCLUSIONS AND CONDITIONS OF SUCH POLICIES. LIMITS SHOWN MAY HAVE BEEN REDUCED BY PAID CLAIMS.

| INSR LTR | TYPE OF INSURANCE | ADDL INSD | SUBR WVD | POLICY NUMBER | POLICY EFF (MM/DD/YYYY) | POLICY EXP (MM/DD/YYYY) | LIMITS |
|----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------|---------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | COMMERCIAL GENERAL LIABILITY <input type="checkbox"/> CLAIMS-MADE <input type="checkbox"/> OCCUR GEN'L AGGREGATE LIMIT APPLIES PER: <input type="checkbox"/> POLICY <input type="checkbox"/> PRO-JECT <input type="checkbox"/> LOC OTHER: | | | | | | EACH OCCURRENCE \$ DAMAGE TO RENTED PREMISES (Ea occurrence) \$ MED EXP (Any one person) \$ PERSONAL & ADV INJURY \$ GENERAL AGGREGATE \$ PRODUCTS - COMP/OP AGG \$ \$ |
| | AUTOMOBILE LIABILITY <input type="checkbox"/> ANY AUTO <input type="checkbox"/> OWNED AUTOS ONLY <input type="checkbox"/> SCHEDULED AUTOS <input type="checkbox"/> HIRED AUTOS ONLY <input type="checkbox"/> NON-OWNED AUTOS ONLY | | | | | | COMBINED SINGLE LIMIT (Ea accident) \$ BODILY INJURY (Per person) \$ BODILY INJURY (Per accident) \$ PROPERTY DAMAGE (Per accident) \$ \$ |
| | UMBRELLA LIAB <input type="checkbox"/> OCCUR EXCESS LIAB <input type="checkbox"/> CLAIMS-MADE DED RETENTION \$ | | | | | | EACH OCCURRENCE \$ AGGREGATE \$ \$ |
| | WORKERS COMPENSATION AND EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY ANY PROPRIETOR/PARTNER/EXECUTIVE OFFICER/MEMBER EXCLUDED? <input type="checkbox"/> Y / N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N / A (Mandatory in NH) If yes, describe under DESCRIPTION OF OPERATIONS below | | | | | | PER STATUTE OTH-ER E.L. EACH ACCIDENT \$ E.L. DISEASE - EA EMPLOYEE \$ E.L. DISEASE - POLICY LIMIT \$ |
| A | Professional Liability CLAIMS-MADE | | | QPL0022630 | 11/1/2023 | 10/31/2024 | Per Claim Aggregate \$2,000,000 \$2,000,000 |

DESCRIPTION OF OPERATIONS / LOCATIONS / VEHICLES (ACORD 101, Additional Remarks Schedule, may be attached if more space is required)
 THIRTY (30) DAYS NOTICE OF CANCELLATION
 RFP 24001 On-Call General Engineering Services: Roadway, Trail, Bridge, Drainage, Facility, Utility, and Traffic Design

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| CERTIFICATE HOLDER The City of Santa Fe; Public Works Department, Santa Fe County PO. Box 909 Santa Fe NM 87504-0909 | CANCELLATION SHOULD ANY OF THE ABOVE DESCRIBED POLICIES BE CANCELLED BEFORE THE EXPIRATION DATE THEREOF, NOTICE WILL BE DELIVERED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE POLICY PROVISIONS. AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE  |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

© 1988-2015 ACORD CORPORATION. All rights reserved.



City of Santa Fe
Treasury Department
200 Lincoln Ave.
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504-0909
505-955-6551

BUSINESS REGISTRATION

Business Name: WSP USA INC.
DBA: WSP USA INC.

Business Location: 150 WASHINGTON AVE
SANTA FE, NM 87501

Owner: WSP USA INC

License Number: 230545

Issued Date: August 03, 2023

Expiration Date: August 03, 2024

CRS Number: 01195458002

License Type: Business License - Renewable

Classification: Business Registration - Standard

Fees Paid: \$35.00

WSP USA INC.
2019 W GALISTEO ST UNIT M-1
SANTA FE, NM 87505

THIS IS NOT A CONSTRUCTION PERMIT OR SIGN PERMIT.
APPROPRIATE PERMITS MUST BE OBTAINED FROM THE CITY
OF SANTA FE BUILDING PERMIT DIVISION PRIOR TO
COMMENCEMENT OF ANY CONSTRUCTION OR THE
INSTALLATION OF ANY EXTERIOR SIGN.

THIS REGISTRATION/LICENSE IS NOT TRANSFERRABLE TO
OTHER BUSINESSES OR PREMISES.

TO BE POSTED IN A CONSPICUOUS PLACE

Signature: 
XAVIER VIGIL (Aug 19, 2024 16:50 MDT)

Email: xivigil@santafenm.gov

24-0506 WSP USA, Inc.

Final Audit Report

2024-08-20

| | |
|-----------------|----------------------------------------------|
| Created: | 2024-08-19 |
| By: | XAVIER VIGIL (xivigil@santafenm.gov) |
| Status: | Signed |
| Transaction ID: | CBJCHBCAABAAXcAcwJ6YfThh6W3pJVko6YHF4oukHiFS |

"24-0506 WSP USA, Inc." History

-  Document created by XAVIER VIGIL (xivigil@santafenm.gov)
2024-08-19 - 10:47:15 PM GMT- IP address: 63.232.20.2
-  Document e-signed by XAVIER VIGIL (xivigil@santafenm.gov)
Signature Date: 2024-08-19 - 10:50:56 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 63.232.20.2
-  Document emailed to Alan Webber (amwebber@santafenm.gov) for signature
2024-08-19 - 10:51:02 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Alan Webber (amwebber@santafenm.gov)
2024-08-19 - 11:00:42 PM GMT- IP address: 104.28.85.160
-  Document e-signed by Alan Webber (amwebber@santafenm.gov)
Signature Date: 2024-08-19 - 11:04:10 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 63.232.20.2
-  Document emailed to GERALYN CARDENAS (gfcardenas@santafenm.gov) for signature
2024-08-19 - 11:04:17 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by GERALYN CARDENAS (gfcardenas@santafenm.gov)
2024-08-20 - 3:07:11 PM GMT- IP address: 104.47.64.254
-  Document e-signed by GERALYN CARDENAS (gfcardenas@santafenm.gov)
Signature Date: 2024-08-20 - 3:07:23 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 63.232.20.2
-  Agreement completed.
2024-08-20 - 3:07:23 PM GMT