



Columbia County Public Works

Request for Proposals:
S-C00055-00014942

*Engineering & Related Services for Bridge Installation Little Clatskanie
River Confluence (Apiary Road MP 8.4)*

**Project-Specific Proposal for Project Management, Preliminary Engineering,
Permitting, Right-of-Way Acquisition and Related Services**

**Issue Date: September 22, 2025
Closing Date & Time: October 14, 2025 by 4:00 P.M.**

**Place/Issuing Office:
Columbia County Public Works
1054 Oregon St
St. Helens, OR 97051**

Single Point of Contact (SPC):

Grant DeJongh
Columbia County Public Works
1054 Oregon Street
St. Helens, OR 97051
503-397-5090
publicworks@columbiacountyor.gov

Section 2.0 EVALUATION PROCESS & CONSULTANT SELECTION

2.1 EVALUATION PROCESS

The County will evaluate Proposals in accordance with the relevant evaluation procedures set forth in OAR 137-048-0220 and this RFP. The County will first review Proposals for conformance with the Pass/Fail and Required criteria identified above. Proposals meeting all Pass/Fail criteria (including submittal of all Required items in the time allowed) will be forwarded to an evaluation committee for the Qualifications Based Selection phase of the evaluation. At the end of that phase, Proposals will be ranked based on a QBS score and up to the three (3) top-ranked Proposals will proceed on to the Pricing Information phase of the evaluation. The Proposals reviewed in the Pricing Information phase will then be ranked based on the sum of the points awarded in both evaluation phases.

2.1.1 QUALIFICATIONS BASED SELECTION PHASE

The Qualifications Based Selection phase has two parts. First, members of an evaluation committee will independently score each Proposal. Following that, the County may, in its sole discretion, conduct an interview/follow-up question round of scoring.

(a) Evaluation Committee Round

The evaluation committee will score each Proposal using the Scoring Criteria set forth in Section 2.2, except for Scoring Criteria 2.2.6. The committee will be made up of five (5) members selected from the following: one Public Works Department employee, one County employee not from the Public Works Department, one person selected by the Board of County Commissioners, and two persons from different outside agencies.

Committee members will independently judge the merits of the Proposals by comparing the requirements and criteria stated in the RFP with the responsiveness and the relevance of experience/qualifications presented in the Proposal. The committee will not consider any proposed pricing for Services as part of the process, but it may consider price and cost data from previous projects.

A Proposal's final score from this round will be determined by adding together the individual committee member scores for that Proposal and dividing that number by the number of committee members. The Proposals will then be ranked by the resulting final score.

(b) Interviews/Follow-up Questions Round (Optional)

Upon completion of the initial independent evaluation of the Proposals, the evaluation committee, at its sole discretion, may determine that a round of interview/follow-up questions is to be conducted. If possible, at least the two (2) top-ranked Proposers from the Evaluation Committee Round shall be evaluated in this round. The committee for this round shall be the same as the previous round's evaluation committee, unless individual committee members are unavailable. In this case, the interview/follow-up question committee will be comprised of at least three (3) of the original evaluation committee members.

This round has a maximum score of 50 points with the committee members using the following criteria in scoring:

- Understanding of Requested Services
- Technical Approach
- Project Management/Cost Effectiveness
- Proposer's General Qualifications
- Proposer's Capabilities
- Proposer's Relevant Experience
- Project Team and Qualifications

The interviews/follow-up question round will be conducted as follows:

- Committee members will independently score each proposal.
- Follow-up questions will typically be sent via email to Proposer(s) as an alternative to face-to-face interviews. However, the County may conduct face-to-face interviews if determined necessary after conducting written follow-up questions.
- Interviews normally require physical attendance at County offices; however, the County may elect to conduct interviews via teleconference or video conference. Further details will be included with notification of time and date of interviews, if conducted. All determinations as to the format, timing, and location of interviews will be at the County's discretion.
- Interviews, if held, will typically be conducted about two (2) weeks after the evaluation ranking is announced; follow-up invitations will be sent with the rankings for interview time and date.
- A Proposal's final score from this round will be determined by adding together the individual committee member scores for that Proposal and dividing that by the number of members on the committee.

(c) QBS Score

If the County does not conduct the Interviews/Follow-up Question Round, a Proposal's QBS score will be the total of its Evaluation Committee Round final score plus 50 points, less any points deducted as part of the review of Required items.

If the County conducts the Interviews/Follow-up Question Round, Proposals not included in that round will no longer be considered. The QBS score for each of the remaining Proposals will be the total of their final scores from the Evaluation Committee Round and the final score from the Interviews/Follow-up Question Round, less any points deducted as part of the review of Required items.

(d) References

The County does not intend to score references, but may contact references to verify information provided in Proposals. Proposers must provide three (3) references using the form attached (Attachment B) for projects where the Proposer provided services relevant to the scope of services contemplated in this RFP. If the contact and alternate contact for a reference are both members of the evaluation committee for this RFP, the County will request a different project reference from the Proposer.

2.1.2 PRICING EVALUATION

Upon completion of the Qualifications Based Selection Phase, Proposals will be ranked based upon their QBS score. Price Proposals will be requested from up to the top three (3) Proposers. Price Proposals shall be based on the Scope of Work in this RFP and shall be submitted on Attachment C. Up to 23 points can be awarded under the Pricing Evaluation. The points awarded will be the sum of the following two calculations:

12* (lowest proposed price/proposed price)

11* (lowest proposed hours/proposed hours)

2.1.3 CLARIFICATIONS

The County may require any clarification it needs to understand the Proposer's Proposal. Any necessary clarifications or modifications that are in the best interest of the County may be made before the Proposer is awarded a Contract, and some or all of the clarifications or modifications may become part of the final Contract. Clarifications may not be used to rehabilitate a non-responsive Proposal.

2.1.4 CONSULTANT SELECTION

Proposer's QBS score and Pricing Evaluation score shall be added together for a final score. The Proposer with the highest final score will be selected to start negotiations as provided in Section 2.4.

2.1.5 COUNTY RIGHT TO CANCEL PROCUREMENT

The County may reject any or all Proposals and may cancel this RFP at any time prior to the signing of any resulting contract if doing either would be in the public interest as determined by the County. The County is not liable for any costs a Proposer incurs while preparing or presenting the Proposal or during further evaluation and negotiation stages. All Proposals will become part of the public file. The County will follow the requirements of OAR 137-048-0250 in the event of any cancelation.

2.2 SCORING CRITERIA

Scoring will be based on the categories described below. The Proposer must describe how the Proposer meets the requirements that are specified in this RFP, as related to the subsections below. Be clear and concise.

2.2.1 UNDERSTANDING OF REQUESTED SERVICES/PROJECT

20 Points

Demonstrate a clear and concise understanding of this type of project based on existing information. Address general description of the project purpose and key issues. Please explain any special expertise specific to bridge design and construction experience.

Proposed list of candidates for Board appointee to RFP selection committee

- Representative from County Counsel's office
- Department head
- Representative from TRAC or Traffic Safety Committee

Note: Any appointee would need to be verified at the time of the RFP closure as not possessing a conflict of interest with any of the proposing firms, their owners, their staff, or their proposed subconsultants.