<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request for Proposal (RFP) Number</th>
<th>2023-04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RFP Title</td>
<td>High-Capacity Transit Planning and Environmental Linkages Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline for Submittal</td>
<td>August 7, 2023 5:00 PM MDT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send Submittals to</td>
<td>Meg Larsen, Director of Operations COMPASS 208.475.2228 <a href="mailto:mlarsen@compassidaho.org">mlarsen@compassidaho.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Inquires to COMPASS Project Manager</td>
<td>Lila Klopfenstein, Associate Planner COMPASS 208.475.2230 <a href="mailto:lklopfenstein@compassidaho.org">lklopfenstein@compassidaho.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format of Submittals</td>
<td>1. Total page limit is <strong>20 pages</strong>. The introductory letter, project organizational chart, and resumes are not included in the page count.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Front and back cover pages are acceptable and are not included in the page count. Cover pages shall only identify the consultant, sub-consultant(s), and project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Include “High-Capacity Transit Planning and Environmental Linkages Study Submittal” in the subject line of the electronic submittal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Submittal must be consolidated into one PDF file of 15MB or less. Zipped files are not recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Respondents are responsible for verifying receipt by COMPASS of the submittals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions and Revisions</td>
<td>1. Submit questions no later than the date specified in the calendar below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Questions must be sent via email to Lila Klopfenstein at <a href="mailto:lklopfenstein@compassidaho.org">lklopfenstein@compassidaho.org</a> <strong>No phone calls or verbal questions will be accepted.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Responses will be posted within three full business days of receipt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. In the event that it is necessary to provide additional clarification or revisions to this RFP, COMPASS will post addenda to COMPASS’ Jobs and Contracts web page (<a href="https://compassidaho.org/jobs-and-contracts/">https://compassidaho.org/jobs-and-contracts/</a>). It is the proposer’s responsibility to regularly monitor the website for such postings. COMPASS encourages potential respondents to register by providing their firm name, point of contact, and contact information via email to Meg Larsen, <a href="mailto:mlarsen@compassidaho.org">mlarsen@compassidaho.org</a> to help insure they are notified of any updates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Clarification of Submittals**

During the evaluation of submittals, COMPASS reserves the right to:

- contact any or all proposers for additional information for clarification purposes,
- discard submittals that contain errors, and/or
- waive disqualifying errors or gain clarification of errors or information, at COMPASS’ sole discretion.

**RFP Calendar**

Dates below are for planning purposes and represent COMPASS’ desired timeline for this project. Any revision to the “Deadline for Submittals” will be made by addendum. All other dates may be adjusted without notice as needs or circumstances dictate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 28, 2023</td>
<td>RFP released</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| July 24, 2023 5:00 PM MDT     | Written questions due  
No questions will be accepted after this date  
Responses posted within three full business days |
| August 7, 2023 5:00 PM MDT    | **DEADLINE FOR SUBMITTALS**                                             |
| August 7 – August 25, 2023    | Review and scoring                                                      |
| August 28 – September 1, 2023 | Two highest scoring proposers notified                                  |
| September 5 – September 8, 2023 | Interviews conducted (two highest scoring proposals only)             |
| Mid-September, 2023          | Selected consultant(s) notified                                         |
| Early-October, 2023          | Anticipated contract approved; notice to proceed                        |
| September 30, 2025           | Final report and all deliverables completed and submitted to COMPASS (24 months from the contract execution date/notice to proceed). |
Project Description

The Community Planning Association of Southwest Idaho (COMPASS) is seeking proposals from firms to conduct a Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL) study to evaluate high-capacity transit service options in the Treasure Valley region of southwest Idaho.

Study Area

COMPASS is the metropolitan planning organization for Ada and Canyon Counties, Idaho. COMPASS’ planning area is also commonly referred to as the “Treasure Valley” (Figure 1).

Figure 1: COMPASS Planning Area (“Treasure Valley”)

Primary transportation corridors in the Treasure Valley are oriented in the east-west direction serving the predominant travel pattern. Interstate-84 (I-84) is the primary east-west route, with Interstate-184 (I-184) serving downtown Boise. Continued population
growth\(^1\), increasing travel demand along east-west corridors, and deteriorating performance in the I-84/I-184 corridor have prompted COMPASS and its member agencies to study high-capacity transit options that connect major activity centers in the Cities of Caldwell, Nampa, Meridian, and Boise, as illustrated in the *Communities in Motion 2050 Vision* (Figure 2) – the regional growth scenario used in the long-range transportation plan (*Communities in Motion 2050*). The study area shall be refined based on the purpose and need statement.

---

**Background**

In June 2022, the COMPASS Board of Directors directed COMPASS to conduct a high-capacity transit PEL study. A PEL study engages stakeholder agencies to conduct planning within the framework of an environmental review process and can be used to narrow the number of alternatives for a future full environmental review. For this study, alternatives refer to a high-capacity transit mode along an alignment.

COMPASS and its member agencies desire to complete the PEL study to define the purpose and need for high capacity transit, identify alternatives that support those needs, identify next steps for feasible alternatives to move into an environmental review process, and use the results to support a future environmental process.

\(^1\) According to the decennial Census, the total population in the Treasure Valley grew by about 25\% from 2010-2020 and has since continued to grow.
This high-capacity transit PEL study shall be informed by nearly two decades of planning work, including: Rail Corridor Evaluation Study Volume 1 Study Report (April 2003)i, the Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study Priority Corridor Phase 1 Alternatives Analysis (October 2009)ii, and the Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study Update (September 2020)iii. These previous studies had suggested removal of three of the original eight alignments. However, a PEL study framework requires that all alternatives that meet project purpose and need and do not have fatal flaws are evaluated in, at least, an initial screening. Please note that a PEL study is not required to screen alternatives down to a single recommendation. Most PEL studies conclude with several recommended alternativesiv.

The PEL study is intended to be used in a future environmental process. However, to begin a full National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review process, the region must demonstrate that it can fund the operations of a high-capacity transit service. Currently, there is no dedicated funding source that could be used to operate this service.

Proposals

The final report and all deliverables must be completed and submitted to COMPASS within 24 months from the contract execution date/notice to proceed. COMPASS reserves the right to work with the selected team and adjust the schedule if necessary. Proposals will be evaluated based on their ability to meet the qualifications and selection criteria. The budget for the high-capacity transit PEL study is $1,000,000.

Proposals must be prepared and submitted in accordance with the guidelines and requirements outlined in this RFP. Interested firms must demonstrate knowledge and experience in the PEL study process and transit network modeling; especially analyzing a public transportation alternative that does not currently exist in the region.
General Scope of Services

This study will be conducted in four phases.

**Phase 1 – Project Development.** Gather stakeholders, analyze current and future corridor information, identify existing and forecasted no-build operational and capacity levels of service, develop a public involvement plan, and update the purpose and need statement.

**Phase 2 – Initial Screening Analyses.** Conduct tier 1 and tier 2 analyses to identify and screen alternatives. Tier 2 screening shall include more detailed conceptual plans and more detailed environmental analyses than tier 1.

**Phase 3 – Tier 3 Screening Analysis.** Screen remaining alternatives using a comprehensive system performance assessment and qualitative and quantitative analyses.

**Phase 4 – Recommendations and Next Steps.** Develop a set of recommendations and strategies for the remaining alternatives to move into a future environmental review. Prepare final documents for review and approval.

**Phase 1 – Project Development**

**A. Develop Project Schedule/Coordinate Stakeholders**

Develop a detailed schedule for the project. Create a stakeholder registry including the study sponsor, lead agency, cooperating agencies; participating agencies; interested tribes, and the public. Create a schedule showing when technical working group/stakeholder meetings and/or workshops with technical staff from relevant city and county agencies and departments would occur. Use the PEL questionnaire provided by the Federal Highway Administration to track deliverables and summarize/document planning throughout the course of the study. As part of the initial stakeholder outreach, hold a training session for key stakeholders and local agency staff describing the PEL process and expected outcomes of the study (a “visioning workshop”). Ensure that visioning workshop materials are available online for stakeholders to reference throughout the study.

**Deliverables:**

1. Project schedule
2. Calendar of project schedule/progress updates
3. PEL questionnaire
4. Stakeholder registry*
5. Responsibility matrix
6. Visioning workshop

*Note: Deliverables with * require federal agency concurrence.

---

2 Cooperating agencies have jurisdiction or special expertise over the environmental impacts of a project [40 CFR 1508.5].
3 Participating agencies include entities with an interest in the project [23 U.S.C. 139(d)(2)].
B. Develop Public Involvement Plan

*Develop a social and political risk assessment using media analysis, census data, and participating agency interviews, and use mitigation strategies from the risk assessment to develop a public involvement plan and communication materials. The public involvement plan should describe how and when public outreach will be conducted for community working groups, technical working groups, the COMPASS Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC), the COMPASS Board of Directors, and the public throughout the study. The plan must be developed in alignment with the COMPASS Participation Plan and NEPA Guidance. The plan should also build upon past public involvement efforts and community preferences, especially from Communities in Motion 2050. Clearly state on the COMPASS website and all study documents that this study may be used in a future environmental review.*

**Deliverables:**

1) Social and political risk assessment
2) Public involvement plan*
3) Public notice on the COMPASS website and all study documents stating intent to use planning products in a future environmental review

*Note: Deliverables with * require federal agency concurrence.*

C. Update Purpose and Need Statements

*Update purpose and need statements and goals and objectives from previous studies; all must receive concurrence from federal agencies and be recommended by RTAC and approved by the COMPASS Board of Directors. Identify all relevant plans in the study area to ensure the study considers existing planning efforts. Engage stakeholders and the public in the process to update the project purpose, need, goals, and objectives, and document this involvement. Document how decisions were made and agency concurrence on deliverables.*

**Deliverables:**

1) Updated project need statement*
2) Updated project purpose statement*
3) Updated goals and objectives*
4) Summary of all local plans and planning efforts relevant to the project
5) Public outreach on the updated project purpose, need, goals, and objectives
6) Description of stakeholder/public involvement and agency concurrence on project purpose, need, goals, and objectives

*Note: Deliverables with * require federal agency concurrence.*

D. Describe Existing/Future Corridor Conditions

*Analyze existing corridor conditions using data such as existing traffic information and historic growth patterns. Use the Communities in Motion 2050 population and job forecasts, 4 Reference purpose and need statements from the 2009 and 2020 Treasure Valley High-Capacity Transit Study.*
forecasted travel conditions, major markets to be served, and unmet transportation needs in the study corridor to analyze future travel conditions. These analyses will be used to describe the “problem” (need) that the project will address (purpose). Deliverable 2.c refers to the travel time analysis under a “no build” scenario. Task J includes an analysis for travel time analyses for tier 3 alternatives.

Deliverables:

1) Existing corridor conditions
   a) Existing traffic information and historic growth patterns
   b) Safety issues
   c) Social, economic, and environmental justice issues
   d) Travel time analysis
2) Future corridor conditions
   a) Population and jobs forecasts
   b) Major markets to be served
   c) Travel time analysis

Note: Deliverables with * require federal agency concurrence.

Phase 2 – Initial Screening Analyses

E. Determine Screening Criteria
Using the project purpose, need, goals, and objectives, determine the screening criteria and develop the process to eliminate alternatives from further analysis. Federal agency concurrence is required on the methodology to eliminate alternatives. Clearly document the screening criteria, methodology for eliminating alternatives, and feedback from participating agencies.

Deliverables:

1) List of screening criteria based on study goals and objectives*
2) Methodology to eliminate alternatives*
3) Technical document describing the screening criteria, methodology to eliminate alternatives, and feedback received from participating agencies

Note: Deliverables with * require federal agency concurrence.

F. Identify Alignment and Mode Options for Initial Screening
Identify alternatives, including a no-build alternative, that meet the purpose and need and do not have fatal flaws. Consider recommendations from previous studies to alter or conduct additional analysis on several alternatives\(^5\). Any changes to the previously studied alternatives must be consistent with the purpose and need.

Deliverables:

---

\(^5\) Previous studies state that more study should be conducted on conceptual exclusive guideway connections from the Boise Cutoff and Franklin Road to downtown Boise, conceptual exclusive guideway connections to the Boise Airport, and Bus on Shoulder System (BOSS) for the I-84 BRT-Mixed alternative.
1) List of alternatives that meet the purpose and need and do not have fatal flaws*
2) No-build alternative
3) Technical document describing alternatives, alternative identification process, fatal flaws, and feedback from participating agencies

Note: Deliverables with * require federal agency concurrence.

G. Conduct Tier 1 Screening
Conduct the initial (tier 1) feasibility screening on the list of alternatives. The tier 1 screening is the least detailed screening and consists of a yes/no scan based on screening criteria. Alternatives that do not meet the purpose and need will be removed from further analysis. Clearly document alternatives that have been removed and the reasoning behind removal.

Deliverables:
1) Tier 1 screening results, based on screening criteria
2) List of alternatives to be removed from further analysis, including justification for removal*

Note: Deliverables with * require federal agency concurrence.

H. Conduct Tier 2 Screening
Conduct the tier 2 screening analysis. The tier 2 screening analysis requires development of stop locations, travel time analyses, right-of-way needs, and an environmental scan. Use readily available data to conduct the scan. To the extent possible, consider impacts to infrastructure such as canals, railroads, airports, and utilities. Both tier 2 and 3 screenings must be accompanied by public outreach events. Alternatives that do not meet the purpose and need or have fatal flaws will be removed from further analysis.

Deliverables:
1) Tier 2 screening results, based on screening criteria
2) List of alternatives to be removed from further analysis, including justification for removal*
3) List of all resources protected by state or federal laws in the study area including historic places, parks and recreation lands, and other natural resources included in 36 C.F.R. Part 800
4) Environmental scan including potential environmental impacts, barriers, and feasible solutions to eliminate or mitigate impacts
5) Preliminary land survey to evaluate existing environmental conditions (e.g., records search of historical uses)
6) Technical document describing the screening results; the process of identifying resources, potential impacts, key environmental barriers, and mitigation strategies; and the feedback received from participating agencies
7) Assessment of right-of-way needs for each alignment

Note: Deliverables with * require federal agency concurrence.
Phase 3 – Tier 3 Screening Analysis

I. Conduct a Comprehensive System Performance Assessment

Conduct a performance evaluation of each remaining alternative using the Communities in Motion 2050 funded Public Transportation System. Include an analysis of household and job access to transit stops, using the Communities in Motion 2050 Vision. Task I will be used in the tier 3 screening (task k). Alternatives found to not meet the purpose and need will be removed from further analysis. Reasons for removal must be documented in the appropriate technical memoranda.

Deliverables:

1) Methodology and completion of a comprehensive system analysis, including:
   a) Impact to the 2050 funded public transportation system
   b) Ridership demand forecast (system and route-level)
   c) Household and job access to transit stops
   d) Preliminary intersection and/or at-grade crossing analysis
   e) System performance, for example travel time
2) Technical document describing the methodology for comprehensive system analysis, results of the analyses, the impact of alternative(s) on the future public transportation system, and feedback from participating agencies

Note: Deliverables with * require federal agency concurrence.

J. Benefits Assessment

Provide a qualitative and quantitative assessment of the benefits of the remaining high-capacity transit service alternative(s) and the “no-build” alternative. The assessment will include potential impacts to underserved populations, using COMPASS’ Regional Equity Index. Task J will be used in the tier 3 screening (task k). Alternatives found to not meet the purpose and need will be removed from further analysis. Reasons for removal must be documented in the appropriate technical memoranda.

Deliverables:

1) Methodology to assess benefits
2) Cost estimates for remaining alternative(s)
3) Qualitative and quantitative benefits and costs for each alternative; analysis must include impact to underserved populations
4) Potential transit-oriented development opportunities adjacent to potential station locations
5) Description of how each alternative achieves the desired benefits of future transportation investments (quantitative and qualitative), based on the project purpose and need, public input, and the technical feasibility of proposed investments.
6) Technical document describing the methodology and results as well as agency feedback

Note: Deliverables with * require federal agency concurrence.

---

6 Ensure that the model used is consistent with requirements for Federal Transit Administration’s Capital Investment Grants Program
**K. Conduct Tier 3 Screening**

The remaining alternatives will enter a tier 3 screening analysis which requires development of more detailed conceptual plans for alternatives, including operational features, maintenance and storage facilities, potential for phased implementation, cost estimates, ridership estimates, and qualitative benefits. A more detailed environmental scan shall be conducted on tier 3 alternatives, as determined necessary by the study team. The tier 3 screening must also include a comprehensive system performance analysis (task J) and benefits assessment (task K). Conduct public outreach on tier 3 alternatives. Alternatives that do not meet the purpose and need will be removed from further analysis. Required documentation is described in task deliverables.

**Deliverables:**

1) Tier 3 screening results including recommended NEPA Class of Action  
2) List of alternatives to be removed from further analysis, including justification for removal*  
3) Technical document describing (for the remaining alternatives):
   a) High-level technical and operational specifications for design, construction, and operation for each alignment and mode  
   b) Cost estimates  
   c) Description of potential for phased implementation  
   d) Key physical constraints, operational issues, and other pertinent challenges related to alignments and implementing any of the modes  
   e) Feedback from participating agencies  
   f) Feedback from the public  
   g) A description of how feedback was used in decision making

*Note: Deliverables with * require federal agency concurrence.*
Phase 4 – Recommendations and Next Steps

L. Recommendations/Strategies

Develop recommendations for alternative(s) to advance into a future NEPA environmental review and identify the conditions that are required to enter a NEPA process (e.g., dedicated funding). Include recommendations for local land use plans and decisions in the study corridor to support feasible alternative(s).

Deliverables:

1) Recommendations for alternatives that should advance into a future environmental review
2) Potential funding mechanism(s) for alternative(s)
3) Next steps for alternative(s) to move into a NEPA analysis*
4) A set of thresholds/triggers (travel times, congestion levels, etc.) that would allow the region to begin to proactively address transit needs in the corridor
5) Technical document detailing reasoning and recommendations as well as agency feedback*

Note: Deliverables with * require federal agency concurrence.

M. Prepare Final Documents

Review study findings and develop final documents. Confirm that all decision points and rationale are clearly documented using analyses developed from the technical memoranda. All final documents require a recommendation from RTAC and adoption by the COMPASS Board of Directors.

Deliverables:

1) Executive summary
2) Final technical memoranda*
3) PEL study document*
4) Completed PEL Questionnairexii

Note: Deliverables with * require federal agency concurrence.
Submittal Requirements

Total page limit is 20 pages; cover letter, organizational chart, and resumes are not included in the page count. Front and back cover pages are acceptable and are also not included in the page count. Cover pages shall only identify the consultant, sub-consultant(s), and project. See page one for additional submittal instructions and instructions on how to ask questions on this RFP.

The submittal for the high-capacity transit PEL study shall include the following:

A. Cover letter describing:
   a) Proposer’s understanding of the project
   b) Project manager and contact information (physical address, telephone number, and email)
   c) Brief description of the key personnel the proposer will commit to the project, their areas of expertise, and their role on the project team

B. Statement that the sample Professional Services Agreement has been read, that the proposer will meet the prerequisite insurance requirements, and the proposer, if selected, agrees to the terms and conditions of the agreement. This can be included as an affirmative acknowledgement in the cover letter. If proposers have questions about the terms and conditions of the agreement, they should submit them in writing by July 24, 2023, at 5:00 pm MDT.

C. Consultant qualifications and relevant experience including:
   a) Relevant qualifications and experience of the project manager and key staff who will be directly involved in this project
      i. briefly describe the role of individuals in any referenced projects
   b) The qualifications, experience and history of the project team:
      i. Demonstrate experience analyzing a public transportation alternative that does not currently exist in the region and experience with PEL studies
   c) The role, relevant qualifications, and experience of sub-consultant(s) who will be directly involved in this project
      i. if sub-consultants are not included, do not list
   d) Organizational chart of all members of the proposed project team, including sub-consultants, if applicable
   e) Description of the proposer’s project management systems including reporting, billing, and quality control processes
   f) References for three applicable projects with current contact information

D. Proposed work plan including:
   a) Description of project approach
b) Work plan and proposed schedule of the project addressing deliverables and scope of services provided in General Scope of Services section of this RFP. Include the anticipated team member responsible for tasks and deliverables

c) Project budget.
   i. Include task-level cost estimates with line-item estimates for major sub-tasks

E. Statement that all firms included on the team are not barred from federal contracts.
   a) Can be included as an affirmative acknowledgement in the cover letter

F. Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) status (including subcontractors), including name of certifying agency and contact person
   a) Respondents are encouraged to include DBE firms on their teams. The Idaho Transportation Department maintains a list of firms at https://itd.dbesystem.com/?TN=itd.
**Evaluation and Selection Process**

A selection committee comprised of member agency staff from key participating agencies and COMPASS will use the criteria below to score all proposals. Project teams with the two highest scoring proposals must attend an **in-person** interview with the selection committee in the COMPASS Offices (700 NE 2nd St, Meridian, ID 83642). No virtual interview options are available.

**Proposal Evaluation**

Submittals to this RFP will be evaluated on the following criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Maximum Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Proposed Work Plan</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Technical Expertise</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Public Outreach Expertise</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Project Team</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Project Management</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Quality of Proposal</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Project Cost</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Points Possible</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. **Proposed Work Plan: 25 points**
   a. Addresses full scope of services in the proposed workplan and schedule.
   b. Demonstrates thoughtful consideration of project aims within COMPASS’s regional context.
   c. Demonstrates the ability to address potential key challenges with the project approach and work plan and includes ideas for approach, deliverables, etc.

B. **Technical Expertise: 20 points**
   a. Demonstrates experience with and understanding of the PEL process; the relationship between PEL and the NEPA environmental review process; transit network modeling, especially experience analyzing a public transportation alternative that does not currently exist in the region; technical and operational specifications for design, construction, and operation of various transit modes.

C. **Public Outreach Expertise: 20 points**
   a. Demonstrates a record of achievement coordinating multiple stakeholders.
   b. Demonstrates experience with conducting large-scale public outreach processes and the ability to analyze, summarize, and communicate results effectively.
   c. Identifies innovative and/or locally appropriate methods to conduct public outreach.
   d. Demonstrates a strong understanding of public outreach within the PEL framework.
D. **Project Team:** 15 points  
   a. Demonstrates expertise and record of achievement on similar projects.  
   b. Shows qualifications and experience of key supervisory personnel and their commitment to the project.  
   c. Ensures staff availability to take on work tasks to meet the project completion date.

E. **Project Management:** 10 points  
   a. Demonstrates ability to manage the project and successfully complete it on time based on proposed schedule, organizational structure of the project team, and availability and location of consultant team. Past projects and references should be used to demonstrate appropriate stakeholder involvement and internal controls.  
   b. Shows staff commitment to the project, capacity of project team to take on work to meet project completion date, and previous successful collaboration among consultant team and firms, as appropriate.

F. **Quality of Proposal:** 5 points  
   a. Addresses project objectives contained in this RFP with quality and thoroughness.  
   b. Schedule, tasks, and deliverables are clearly laid out.

G. **Project Cost:** 5 points  
   a. The budget includes cost per task.

**Interview**

Project teams with the two highest scoring proposals must attend an in-person interview with the selection committee in the COMPASS Offices (700 NE 2nd St, Meridian, ID 83642). Teams unable to participate in-person are disqualified from consideration. No virtual interview options are available. If a project team cannot interview in-person, COMPASS will ask the next highest scoring proposal team to interview. Interviews are worth 30 points and will be used to select the consultant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Maximum Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Stakeholder Coordination</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. PEL Process Expertise</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Public Outreach Expertise</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Consideration of Regional Context</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Ability to address Key Project Challenges</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Transit Planning Expertise</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Points Possible**  
30
Appendix


