



# Offer and Acceptance

State of Arizona  
State Procurement Office

100 N. 15<sup>th</sup> Ave. Suite 201  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

SOLICITATION NO.: ADSP016-00005912 Request  
for Qualifications: 2016 Annual Professional  
Services List

PAGE  
1

Offeror: **RHA, LLC**

OF  
1

## OFFER

### TO THE STATE OF ARIZONA:

The Undersigned hereby offers and agrees to furnish the material, service or construction in compliance with all terms, conditions, specifications and amendments in the Solicitation and any written exceptions in the offer. Signature also certifies Small Business status.

RHA, LLC

Company Name

6677 West Thunderbird Road, Suite K183

Address

Glendale

Arizona

85306

City

State

Zip

Patrice@TeamRHA.co,m

Contact Email Address

Patrice Miller

Signature of Person Authorized to Sign Offer

Patrice Miller

Printed Name

Managing Partner

Title

Phone: (602) 493-1947

Fax: (602) 275-2972

Digitally signed by Patrice Miller  
DN: cn=Patrice Miller, o=RHA, LLC, ou=Managing Partner, email=Patrice@TeamRHA.com, c=US  
Date: 2016.02.16 14:02:29 -0700

By signature in the Offer section above, the Offeror certifies:

1. The submission of the Offer did not involve collusion or other anticompetitive practices.
2. The Offeror shall not discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment in violation of Federal Executive Order 11246, State Executive Order 2009-9 or A.R.S. §§ 41-1461 through 1465.
3. The Offeror has not given, offered to give, nor intends to give at any time hereafter any economic opportunity, future employment, gift, loan, gratuity, special discount, trip, favor, or service to a public servant in connection with the submitted offer. Failure to provide a valid signature affirming the stipulations required by this clause shall result in rejection of the offer. Signing the offer with a false statement shall void the offer, any resulting contract and may be subject to legal remedies provided by law.
4. The Offeror certifies that the above referenced organization  IS/  IS NOT a small business with less than 100 employees or has gross revenues of \$4 million or less.

## ACCEPTANCE OF OFFER

The Offer is hereby accepted.

The Contractor is now bound to sell the materials or services listed by the attached contract and based upon the solicitation, including all terms, conditions, specifications, amendments, etc., and the Contractor's Offer as accepted by the State.

This Contract shall henceforth be referred to as Contract No. ADSP016-00005912

The effective date of the Contract is March 1, 2016

The Contractor is cautioned not to commence any billable work or to provide any material or service under this contract until Contractor receives purchase order, contract release document or written notice to proceed.

State of Arizona  
Awarded this 29 day of February 2016

Procurement Officer



ATTACHMENT I – General Qualifications

ANNUAL REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE NO:  
ADSP016-00005912

STATE PROCUREMENT OFFICE  
Department of Administration  
100 North 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 201  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

**DEFINITIONS**

**Architect Services, Engineer Services, Land Surveying Services, Assayer Services, Geologist Services and Landscape Architect Services:** Those professional services within the scope of the practice of those services as provided in ARS § 32-101.

**Branch Office:** A geographically distinct place of business or subsidiary office of a firm that has a key role on the team.

**Discipline:** Primary technical capabilities of key personnel, as evidenced by academic degree, professional registration, certification, and/or extensive experience.

**Firm:** Defined in ARS § 32-101(B.19.).

**Key Personnel:** Individuals who will have major contract responsibilities and/or provide unusual or unique expertise.

**SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS:**

1. Complete this form for each branch office seeking work under this RFQ.
  - a. – e. **Firm (or Branch Office) Name and Address.** Self-explanatory.
  - f. **Year Established.** Enter the year the firm (or branch office, if appropriate) was established under the current name.
  - g. **Ownership.**
    - (g1). *Type.* Enter the type of ownership or legal structure of the firm (sole proprietor, partnership, corporation, joint venture, etc.).
    - (g2). *Small Business Status.* A firm is a small business if the firm has less than 100 employees **or** has gross revenues of \$4 million or less.
  - h.-j. **Point of Contact.** Provide this information for a representative of the firm that the Customer can contact for additional information. The representative must be empowered to speak on contractual and policy matters.
  - k. **Name of Firm.** Enter the name of the firm.
2. **Employees by Discipline.**
  - a. Select disciplines from the List of Disciplines (Function Code) listed on Page 3 of 4 Instructions. For employees that do not qualify for any of the disciplines, select "Other". *Note: The intended searchable database indicated in the RFQ will be populated from the Qualifications Form I Excel attachment only.*
  - b. Each person can be counted only twice; once for his/her primary function and once for his/her secondary function. Primary and secondary functions should be indicated by including a "P" or an "S" in column b after the Description Title is given.
  - c-d. If the form is completed for a firm (including all branch offices), enter the number of employees by disciplines in column c. If the form is completed for a branch office, enter the number of employees by discipline in column d and for the firm in column c.
3. **Profile of Firm's Experience and Annual Average Revenue for Last Year.**
  - a. Enter the approximate number of projects the firm (or branch) has done attributable by Profile Code listed on Page 3 of 4 Instructions over the last year.



ATTACHMENT I – General Qualifications

ANNUAL REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE NO:  
ADSP016-00005912

STATE PROCUREMENT OFFICE  
Department of Administration  
100 North 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 201  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

- b. Enter the appropriate Profile Codes from Instructions Pages 3 of 4 that represent the type of work the firm (or branch) has done over the last year.
  - c. Using the Revenue Index Number on Page 3 of 6 Form, indicate the approximate revenue the firm has earned over the last year per Profile Code entered into the table.
4. **Resumes of Key Personnel Proposed for This Contract.** Complete this section for each key person who will participate in this contract.
  - a. Self-explanatory.
  - b. Self-explanatory
  - c. Total years of relevant experience (block c1), and years of relevant experience with current firm, but not necessarily the same branch/office (block c2).
  - d. Name, City and State of the firm where the person currently works, which must correspond with one of the firms (or branch office or a firm, if appropriate) listed in Section 1.
  - e. Provide information on the highest relevant academic degree(s) received. Indicate the area(s) of specialization for each degree.
  - f. Provide information on current relevant professional registration(s) and in which State(s) they are current.
  - g. Provide information on any other professional qualifications relating to this contract, such as education, professional registration, publications, organizational memberships, certifications, training, awards, and foreign language capabilities.
  - h. Provide information on no more than five (5) projects in the last year which the person had a significant role that demonstrates the person's capability relevant to her/his proposed role in this contract. These projects do not necessarily have to be any of the projects presented in Section 5 for the project team if the person was not involved in any of those projects or the person worked on other projects that were more relevant than the team projects in Section 5. Use the check box provided to indicate if the project was performed with any office of the current firm. If any of the professional services or construction projects are not complete, leave Year Completed blank and indicate the status in Brief Description and Specific Role.
5. **Example Projects Which Best Illustrate Firms Qualification for this contract.** Select project where multiple team members worked together, if possible, that demonstrate the team's capability to perform work similar to that required for this contract. Complete one Section 5 for each project. List no more than five (5) projects.
  - a. Title and Locations of project or contract. For an indefinite delivery contract, the location is the geographic scope of the contract.
  - b. Enter the year completed of the professional services (such as planning, engineering study, or design), and/or the year completed if construction. If any of the professional services or the construction projects are not complete, leave Year Completed blank and indicate the status in Brief Description of Project and Relevance to This Contract (block f).
  - c. Project Owner or user, such as a government agency or installation, an institution, a corporation or private individual.
  - d. Provide the original budget or not to exceed dollar amount for the project.
  - e. Provide the Total Cost of the Project. If any of the professional services or construction projects is not complete, indicate the percentage complete and whether this project will be on budget, over or under budget.
  - f. Brief Description: Indicate scope, size, and length of project, principle elements and special features of the project. Discuss the relevance of the example project to this contract.
6. **Additional Information.** Use this section to provide additional information you feel may be necessary to describe your firm's qualifications for this contract.
7. **Annual Average Professional Services Revenues of Firm for Last 3 Years.** Complete this block for the firm or branch office for which this form is completed. In column a, enter an approximate percentage of total work attributable to State, Federal or Municipal Work. In column b, enter an approximate percentage of total work attributable to Non-Government work. Percentages should take into consideration work completed over the last 3 years.



ATTACHMENT I – General Qualifications

ANNUAL REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE NO:  
ADSP016-00005912

STATE PROCUREMENT OFFICE  
Department of Administration  
100 North 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 201  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

8. **Authorized Representative.** An authorized representative of the firm or branch office must sign and date the completed form. Signing attests that the information provided is current and factual. Provide the name and title of the authorized representative who signed the form.

List of Disciplines (Function Codes) for Question 2

- |                           |  |                          |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| Aeronautical Engineer     | Environmental Engineer                   | Mining Engineer          |
| Agricultural Engineer     | Environmental Scientist                  | Nuclear Engineer         |
| Archeologist              | Fire Protection Engineer                 | Petroleum Engineer       |
| Architect                 | Geodetic Surveyor                        | Photogrammetrist         |
| Architectural Engineering | Geographic Information System Specialist | Project Manager          |
| Biologist                 | Geological Engineer                      | Sanitary Engineer        |
| CADD Technician           | Geologist                                | Soils Engineer           |
| Chemical Engineer         | Hydrographic Surveyor                    | Structural Engineer      |
| Civil Engineer            | Hydraulic Engineer                       | Technician/Analyst       |
| Construction Manager      | Hydrologist                              | Transportation Engineer  |
| Construction Inspector    | Industrial Engineer                      | Water Resources Engineer |
| Control Systems Engineer  | Landscape Architect                      |                          |
| Cost Engineer/Estimator   | Mechanical Engineer                      |                          |
| Ecologist                 | Metallurgical Engineer                   |                          |
| Electrical Engineer       |  |                          |

List of Experience Categories (Profile Codes for Question 3)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| Acoustics, Noise Abatement  | Dams ( <i>Concrete; Arch</i> )                                       |
| Aerial Photography; Airborne Data and Imagery Collection and Analysis           | Dams ( <i>Earth; Rock</i> ); Dikes; Levees                           |
| Activity Centers  | Desalinization ( <i>Process and Facilities</i> )                     |
| Air Pollution Control   | Design-Build - Preparation of Requests for Proposals                 |
| Airports; Navajds; Airport Lighting; Aircraft Fueling                           | Digital Elevation and Terrain Model Development                      |
| Airports; Terminals and Hangars; Freight Handling                               | Digital Orthophotography   |
| Agricultural Development; Grain Storage; Farm Mechanization                     | Dining Halls; Clubs; Restaurants                                     |
| Animal Facilities   | Dredging Studies and Design  |
| Anti-Terrorism/Force Protection   | Design & Planning Structured Parking Facilities                      |
| Area Master Planning  | Detention Security Systems   |
| Auditoriums and Theaters  | Disability / Special Needs   |
| Automation; Controls; Instrumentation   | Ecological and Archeological Investigations                          |
| Barracks; Dormitories   | Educational Facilities; Classrooms                                   |
| Bridge Design: Bridges  | Electrical Studies and Design  |
| Cartography   | Electronics  |
| Cemeteries ( <i>Planning and Relocation</i> )                                   | Elevators; Escalators; People-Movers                                 |
| Chemical Processing and Storage   | Energy / Water Auditing Savings                                      |
| Child Care/Development Facilities   | Energy Conservation; New Energy Sources                              |
| Codes; Standards; Ordinances  | Environmental Impact Studies, Assessments or Statements              |
| Cold Storage; Refrigeration and Fast Freeze                                     | Fallout Shelters; Blast-Resistant Design                             |
| Commercial Building ( <i>Low Rise</i> ); Shopping Centers                       | Fire Protection  |
| Community Facilities  | Fisheries; Fish Ladders  |
| Communications Systems; TV; Microwave   | Forensic Engineering   |
| Computer Facilities   | Garages; Vehicles Maintenance Facilities; Parking                    |
| Conservation and Resource Management  | Gas Systems ( <i>Propane; Natural, Etc.</i> )                        |
| Construction Management   | Geodetic Surveying: Ground and Airborne                              |
| Construction Surveying  | Heating; Ventilating; Air Conditioning                               |
| Corrosion Control; Cathodic Protection Electrolysis                             | Highways; Streets; Airfield Paving; Parking Lots                     |
| Cost Estimating; Cost Engineering and Analysis; Parametric Costing; Forecasting | Historical Preservation  |
| Cryogenic Facilities  | Hospital and Medical Facilities                                      |
| Construction Materials Testing  | Hotels; Motels   |
|   | <i>Housing (Residential, Multi-Family; Apartments; Condominiums)</i> |



ATTACHMENT I – General Qualifications

ANNUAL REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE NO:  
ADSP016-00005912

STATE PROCUREMENT OFFICE  
Department of Administration  
100 North 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 201  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Hotels; Motels  
Hydraulics and Pneumatics  
Hydrographic Surveying  
Industrial Buildings; Manufacturing Plants  
Industrial Processes; Quality Control  
Industrial Waste Treatment  
Intelligent Transportation Systems  
Infrastructure  
Irrigation; Drainage  
Judicial and Courtroom Facilities  
Laboratories; Medical Research Facilities  
Land Surveying  
Landscape Architecture  
Libraries; Museums; Galleries  
Lighting (*Interior; Display; Theater, Etc.*)  
Lighting (*Exteriors; Streets; Memorials; Athletic Fields, Etc.*)  
Labs - General  
Labs – Research – Dry  
Labs – Research – Wet  
LEED Accredited A/E  
LEED Independent 3<sup>rd</sup> Party Building Commissioning  
Mapping Location/Addressing Systems  
Materials Handling Systems; Conveyors; Sorters  
Metallurgy  
Materials Testing  
Measurement / Verification / Conservation Water Consumption Savings  
Mining and Mineralogy  
Medical Related  
Modular Systems Design; Fabricated Structures or Components  
Mold Investigation  
Museums  
Nuclear Facilities; Nuclear Shielding  
Office Buildings; Industrial Parks  
Outdoor Recreation  
Petroleum and Fuel (*Storage and Distribution*)  
Photogrammetry  
Pipelines (*Cross-Country - Liquid and Gas*)  
Phase I Environmental  
Prisons & Correctional Facilities  
Plumbing and Piping Design  
Prisons and Correctional Facilities  
Product, Machine Equipment Design Pneumatic Structures, Air-Support Buildings Power Generation, Transmission, Distribution Public Safety Facilities  
Radar; Sonar; Radio and Radar Telescopes  
Radio Frequency Systems and Shielding's  
Railroad; Rapid Transit  
Recreation Facilities (*Parks, Marinas, Etc.*)  
Refrigeration Plants/Systems  
Rehabilitation (*Buildings; Structures; Facilities*)  
Research Facilities  
Resources Recovery; Recycling  
Roof Infrared Imaging to Identify Water Leaks

Roofing  
Safety Engineering; Accident Studies; OSHA Studies  
Security Systems; Intruder and Smoke Detection  
Seismic Designs and Studies  
Sewage Collection, Treatment and Disposal  
Soils and Geologic Studies; Foundations  
Solar Energy Utilization  
Solid Wastes; Incineration; Landfill  
Special Environments; Clean Rooms, Etc.  
Structural Design; Special Structures  
Surveying; Platting; Mapping; Flood Plain Studies  
Sustainable Design  
Swimming Pools  
Storm Water Handling and Facilities  
Specifications Writing  
Toxicology  
Testing and Inspection Services  
Traffic and Transportation Engineering  
Topographic Surveying and Mapping  
Towers (*Self-Supporting and Guyed Systems*)  
Tunnels and Subways  
Traffic Studies  
Transportation  
Urban renewals; Community Development  
Utilities (*Gas and Steam*)  
Value Analysis; Life-Cycle Costing  
Warehouse and Depots  
Water Resources; Hydrology; Ground Water  
Water Supply; Treatment and Distribution  
Wind Tunnels; Research/Testing Facilities Design  
Waste Water Treatment Facility  
Water Well Rehabilitation; Water Well Work  
Zoning; Land Use Studies



**ATTACHMENT I – General Qualifications**  
**ANNUAL REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE NO:**  
**ADSP016-00005912**

**STATE PROCUREMENT OFFICE**  
**Department of Administration**  
**100 North 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 201**  
**Phoenix, Arizona 85007**

*(If a firm has branch offices, complete for each specific branch office seeking work.)*

**1. ANNUAL REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS**

a. FIRM (OR BRANCH OFFICE ) NAME:	RHA, LLC
b. FIRM (OR BRANCH OFFICE) STREET:	6677 WEST THUNDERBIRD ROAD, SUITE K183
c. FIRM (OR BRANCH OFFICE) CITY:	GLENDALE
d. FIRM (OR BRANCH OFFICE) STATE:	ARIZONA
e. FIRM (OR BRANCH OFFICE) ZIP CODE:	85306
f. YEAR ESTABLISHED:	2011-Current (RHA, LLC) 1992-2011 (RH & Associates, Inc.)
(g1). OWNERSHIP - TYPE:	LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY (LLC)
(g2). OWNERSHIP - SMALL BUSINESS STATUS:	SMALL BUSINESS
h. POINT OF CONTACT NAME AND TITLE:	PATRICE MILLER, MANAGING PARTNER
i. POINT OF CONTACT TELEPHONE NUMBER:	(602) 493-1947
j. POINT OF CONTACT E-MAIL ADDRESS:	PATRICE@TEAMRHA.COM
k. NAME OF FIRM (If block 1a is a branch office):	NOT APPLICABLE





**ATTACHMENT I – General Qualifications**  
**ANNUAL REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE NO:**  
**ADSP016-00005912**

STATE PROCUREMENT OFFICE  
 Department of Administration  
 100 North 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 201  
 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

**3. PROFILE OF FIRM'S EXPERIENCE AND ANNUAL AVERAGE REVENUE FOR LAST YEAR**

c. Approximate No. of Projects	b. Experience	c. Revenue Index Number (see below)
31	Value Analysis; Life-Cycle Costing	4
<b>NOTE:</b>	Many of the Value Analysis/Value Engineering studies performed by RHA, LLC included the following experience elements:	
	• Anti-Terrorism/Force Protection	
	• Barracks; Dormitories	
	• Bridge Design: Bridges	
	• Codes; Standards; Ordinances	
	• Cost Estimating; Cost Engineering and Analysis; Parametric Costing; Forecasting	
	• Dams	
	• Design-Build	
	• Dining Halls; Clubs; Restaurants	
	• Dredging Studies and Design	
	• Disability / Special Needs	
	• Educational Facilities	
	• Electrical Studies and Designs	
	• Elevators	
	• Fire Protection	
	• Fisheries; Fish ladders	
	• Garages; Vehicles Maintenance Facilities; Parking	
	• Gas Systems	
	• Heating; Ventilating; Air Conditioning	
	• Highways; Streets; Airfield Paving; Parking Lots	
	• Housing	
	• Hydraulics and Pneumatics	
	• Infrastructure	
	• Irrigation; Drainage	



**ATTACHMENT I – General Qualifications**  
**ANNUAL REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE NO:**  
**ADSP016-00005912**

**STATE PROCUREMENT OFFICE**  
**Department of Administration**  
**100 North 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 201**  
**Phoenix, Arizona 85007**

	• Judicial and Courtroom Facilities	
	• Landscape Architecture	
	• LEED Accredited A/E	
	• Lighting	
	• Pipelines	
	• Plumbing and Piping Design	
	• Railroad; Rapid Transit	
	• Rehabilitation	
	• Security Systems	
	• Solar Energy Utilization	
	• Structural Design; Special Structures	
	• Sustainable Design	
	• Storm Water Handling and Facilities	
	• Traffic and Transportation Engineering	
	• Tunnels and Subways	
	• Transportation	
	• Utilities	
	• Water Resources; Hydrology; Ground Water	
	• Water Supply; Treatment and Distribution	

**PROFESSIONAL SERVICES REVENUE INDEX NUMBER**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. Less than \$100,000                  | 6. \$2 million to less than \$5 million   |
| 2. \$100,000 to less than \$250,000     | 7. \$5 million to less than \$10 million  |
| 3. \$250,000 to less than \$500,000     | 8. \$10 million to less than \$25 million |
| 4. \$500,000 to less than \$1 million   | 9. \$25 million to less than \$50 million |
| 5. \$1 million to less than \$2 million | 10. \$50 million or greater               |



**ATTACHMENT I – General Qualifications**

**ANNUAL REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE NO:  
ADSP016-00005912**

**STATE PROCUREMENT OFFICE  
Department of Administration  
100 North 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 201  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007**

**4. Resumes of Key Personnel Proposed for this Contract** *(Complete one Section #4 for each key person.)*

a. NAME  <b>RENEE L. HOEKSTRA</b>	b. ROLE IN THIS CONTRACT  <b>FACILITATOR – TEAM LEADER – CERTIFIED VALUE SPECIALIST</b>	c. YEARS EXPERIENCE	
		1. TOTAL <b>35</b>	2. WITH CURRENT FIRM <b>23</b> <i>(RHA, LLC formerly RH &amp; Associates, Inc.)</i>
d. LOCATION <i>(City and State)</i> <b>GLENDALE, ARIZONA</b>			
e. EDUCATION <i>(DEGREE AND SPECIALIZATION)</i> Continuing Education – Team Development, Facilitation, Life Cycle Cost Analysis, Risk Assessment		f. PROFESSIONAL TRAINING - REGISTRATIONS SAVE International® Certified Value Specialist No. 20030602	
g. OTHER PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS <i>(Organizations, Awards, etc.)</i> Certified to teach the Module I and Module II VE Courses; NPHQ Gold Medal Award for Program Development & Training for the Utah Department of Transportation; SAVE International®, Membership Director; U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution, Roster Member; PMI Project Management Certification Course, Trainer; CCI Project Management Course, Trainer; APWA PM Certification Course, Trainer			

**H. RELEVANT PROJECTS**

1.	(1) TITLE AND LOCATION <i>(City and State)</i> <b>McMicken Dam Outlet Channel Project, Flood Control District of Maricopa County - Value Analysis Study (Phoenix, AZ)</b>	(2) YEAR COMPLETED	
		Professional Services <b>2014</b>	Construction (if applicable)
	(3) BRIEF DESCRIPTION <i>(Brief scope, size, cost, etc.)</i> AND SPECIFIC ROLE <b>Specific Role:</b> Certified Value Specialist Team Leader <b>Construction Amount:</b> \$16M A Value Analysis (VA) study was conducted for the Flood Control District of Maricopa County McMicken Dam Outlet Channel Project. The primary project goals as defined by the District are to prepare a design for the Outlet Channel that will mitigate current deficiencies, lower risk, and meet District requirements for flood protection, for the 100-year flood. A secondary project goal is to identify landscaping, aesthetics, and multi-use opportunities within the project area that are compatible with the safe and proper function, operation, and maintenance of the McMicken Dam Outlet Channel. The VA team brainstormed 58 ideas. Of those, 14 ideas were identified for further development into VA proposals, including cost impacts.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Check if project performed with current firm
2.	(1) TITLE AND LOCATION <i>(City and State)</i> <b>Ina Road Traffic Interchange CMAR, Arizona Department of Transportation – Risk and Value Analysis Study (Tucson, AZ)</b>	(2) YEAR COMPLETED	
		Professional Services <b>2014</b>	Construction (if applicable)
	(3) BRIEF DESCRIPTION <i>(Brief scope, size, cost, etc.)</i> AND SPECIFIC ROLE <b>Specific Role:</b> Certified Value Specialist Team Leader <b>Construction Amount:</b> \$85M A Risk and Value Analysis (VA) study was conducted for the Arizona Department of Transportation Ina Road Traffic Interchange Project. The decision makers identified the project purpose as removing the railroad conflicts and increasing capacity. The proposed work for this project is located in Pima County within the Town of Marana. The project begins north of Ina Road (EB Milepost 247.4) and extends south approximately 2.03 miles to just south of Ina Road (EB Milepost 249.51). The work consists of reconstruction of an urban divided freeway including: bridges over the Union Pacific Railroad and Camino de Oeste, box culverts, retaining and sound walls, grading, pavement, drainage facilities, channels, water and sewer relocations, relation of other utilities, traffic signals, signing, pavement markings, lighting and surveillance equipment, landscaping and irrigation. The VE team brainstormed 104 ideas. Of those, 14 ideas were identified for further development into VE proposals, including cost impacts.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Check if project performed with current firm
3.	(1) TITLE AND LOCATION <i>(City and State)</i> <b>US89 Landslide Repair CMAR Pre-Construction Services, Arizona Department of Transportation – Scoping/Partnering Workshop (Page, AZ)</b>	(2) YEAR COMPLETED	
		Professional Services <b>2014</b>	Construction (if applicable)
	(3) BRIEF DESCRIPTION <i>(Brief scope, size, cost, etc.)</i> AND SPECIFIC ROLE <b>Specific Role:</b> Certified Value Specialist Team Leader <b>Construction Amount:</b> \$25M The team completed a Risk Analysis in conjunction with the scoping workshop. The team first brainstormed any perceived risks and then evaluated those risks using a Risk Register. The Risk Register identifies the perceived risk, assigns who the risk impacts, and classifies the risk for probability and severity to establish an overall risk rating. The team then provided additional information identifying order of magnitude impacts to budget and schedule. Finally, the team identified the need to Avoid, Mitigate, Transfer or Eliminate the identified risk with comments supporting the decision.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Check if project performed with current firm
4.	(1) TITLE AND LOCATION <i>(City and State)</i> <b>Black Mountain Blvd, SR51/SR101L TI, Arizona Department of Transportation – Risk &amp; Value Engineering Study (Maricopa County, AZ)</b>	(2) YEAR COMPLETED	
		Professional Services <b>2014</b>	Construction (if applicable)



ATTACHMENT I – General Qualifications

ANNUAL REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE NO:  
ADSP016-00005912

STATE PROCUREMENT OFFICE  
Department of Administration  
100 North 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 201  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

	<p>(3) BRIEF DESCRIPTION (<i>Brief scope, size, cost, etc.</i>) AND SPECIFIC ROLE  <b>Specific Role:</b> Certified Value Specialist Team Leader  <b>Construction Amount:</b> \$24.9M</p> <p>Although the entire project includes two phases to the project, this Risk and VE workshop only addressed the ADOT Phase 2 portion. Phase 2/GMP 2 will begin on the south side of the constructed roundabout and include the ramps/roadway concrete paving, and structures connecting Black Mountain Boulevard (BMB) to SR 51. Black Mountain GMP 2 will also include the construction of the pedestrian overpass. The City will own, operate and maintain the pedestrian overpass. GMP 2 will require the standard/detailed ADOT technical reviews, given ADOT will own, operate and maintain connecting ramps, structures and concrete paving but not the pedestrian overpass. The BMB project will be constructed by ADOT, for the City of Phoenix under an Intergovernmental Agreement. The VE team brainstormed 53 ideas. Of those, 11 ideas were identified for further development into VE proposals, including cost impacts.</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="980 254 1036 296" style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="1036 254 1523 296">Check if project performed with current firm</td> </tr> </table>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Check if project performed with current firm		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Check if project performed with current firm					
	<p>(1) TITLE AND LOCATION (<i>City and State</i>)  <b>Cottonwood – Camp Verde – Mogollon Rim HWY, SR 260 - Thousand Trails to I-17, Arizona Department of Transportation – Scoping, Risk Assessment and Value Analysis Study (Yavapai County, AZ)</b></p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="980 506 1523 541">(2) YEAR COMPLETED</th> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="980 541 1284 659" style="text-align: center;">Professional Services  <b>2015</b></td> <td data-bbox="1284 541 1523 659" style="text-align: center;">Construction (if applicable)</td> </tr> </table>	(2) YEAR COMPLETED		Professional Services  <b>2015</b>	Construction (if applicable)
(2) YEAR COMPLETED						
Professional Services  <b>2015</b>	Construction (if applicable)					
5.	<p>(3) BRIEF DESCRIPTION (<i>Brief scope, size, cost, etc.</i>) AND SPECIFIC ROLE  <b>Specific Role:</b> Certified Value Specialist Team Leader  <b>Construction Amount:</b> \$62M</p> <p>The proposed CMAR project is located in Yavapai County on State Route 260, beginning at Ogden Ranch Road with milling and replacing asphaltic concrete on the eastbound travel lanes and shoulders. At Thousand Trails Road, the two-lane roadway is reconstructed to a four-lane divided highway extending east to the I-17 Interchange. The project will replace the existing Cherry Creek Bridge and build a new multi-modal pathway from Cherry Creek Road to I-17. The work included consists of constructing seven roundabouts, earthwork, aggregate base, asphaltic concrete pavement, bridge construction, drainage improvements, curb and gutter, sidewalk and other related work. The documents available for the Risk and VE team were missing a few key project documents, including the geotechnical report. Many of the possibilities and issues are related to dirt work and phasing of the work during construction. Most of the ideas were classified as Design Comments. The team did develop 4 ideas as full alternatives.</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="980 659 1036 701" style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="1036 659 1523 701">Check if project performed with current firm</td> </tr> </table>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Check if project performed with current firm		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Check if project performed with current firm					



**ATTACHMENT I – General Qualifications**

**ANNUAL REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE NO:  
ADSP016-00005912**

**STATE PROCUREMENT OFFICE  
Department of Administration  
100 North 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 201  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007**

**4. Resumes of Key Personnel Proposed for this Contract** *(Complete one Section #4 for each key person.)*

a. NAME <b>PATRICE M. MILLER</b>	b. ROLE IN THIS CONTRACT <b>FACILITATOR – TEAM LEADER – CERTIFIED VALUE SPECIALIST</b>	c. YEARS EXPERIENCE	
		1. TOTAL <b>25</b>	2. WITH CURRENT FIRM <b>5</b>
d. LOCATION <i>(City and State)</i> <b>GLENDALE, ARIZONA</b>			
e. EDUCATION <i>(DEGREE AND SPECIALIZATION)</i> MBA, Marketing & Finance BA, History		f. PROFESSIONAL TRAINING - REGISTRATIONS SAVE International® Certified Value Specialist No. 201410500	
g. OTHER PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS <i>(Organizations, Awards, etc.)</i> Value Engineering Modules 1 and 2, SAVE International® (Arizona Chapter) President, APWA (Arizona Chapter) Past President, Continuing Education – Risk Assessment, Life Cycle Cost Analysis, Practical Design, Lean/Six Sigma			

**H. RELEVANT PROJECTS**

1.	(1) TITLE AND LOCATION <i>(City and State)</i> <b>McMicken Dam, Flood Control District of Maricopa County – Value Engineering Study (Maricopa County, AZ)</b>	(2) YEAR COMPLETED	
		Professional Services <b>2015</b>	Construction (if applicable)
	(3) BRIEF DESCRIPTION <i>(Brief scope, size, cost, etc.)</i> AND SPECIFIC ROLE <b>Specific Role:</b> Certified Value Specialist Team Leader <b>Construction Amount:</b> \$13.4M A Value Engineering (VE) study was conducted for the Flood Control District of Maricopa County McMicken Dam Project. The VE workshop focused on Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the McMicken Dam, and the first mile of the outlet channel. This overall dam rehabilitation was identified in the Wittmann ADMP Update because of the existing principle outlet deterioration, adequacy of the emergency spillway, and the need to keep the spillway flows from potentially damaging the outlet channel. The structure relocations require that a new channel be constructed for the Picacho Wash inflows. Additionally, these relocations allow sale of excess land. The goal was to review the current plans and determine if alternative solutions would provide more value to the project. The VE team brainstormed 50 ideas. Of those, 22 ideas were identified for further development into VE proposals, including cost impacts. One (1) Design Suggestion, without any cost impact, was written and eight (8) Design Comments were identified, and not developed, to provide additional information for the District and the designers to consider.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Check if project performed with current firm
2.	(1) TITLE AND LOCATION <i>(City and State)</i> <b>Gilbert Road Extension Project, Valley Metro – Value Engineering Study (Mesa, AZ)</b>	(2) YEAR COMPLETED	
		Professional Services <b>2015</b>	Construction (if applicable)
	(3) BRIEF DESCRIPTION <i>(Brief scope, size, cost, etc.)</i> AND SPECIFIC ROLE <b>Specific Role:</b> Certified Value Specialist Team Leader <b>Construction Amount:</b> \$73.2M A Value Engineering (VE) study was conducted on the 30% design for the Gilbert Road Extension Project for Valley Metro. The Gilbert Road Light Rail Transit (LRT) Project consists of approximately 1.9 miles double track alignment extending from near Main Street and Hobson to an open end of line station on Main Street and Gilbert Road. The project will include two stations on Main Street including stations at Stapley Drive and Gilbert Road, and a Park and Ride (PNR) at Gilbert Road, embedded trackwork, two traction power substations, signals for crossovers and at gated intersections, communications, and ticket vending machines. The alignment is center-street running with the overhead contact system poles between the tracks. The system elements shall be consistent with other Valley Metro corridors. This project will include renovation and reconstruction of any infrastructure such as utilities, storm drains, and landscaping that are impacted because of this project. All disturbed areas shall be reconstructed to the most current standards. The VE team brainstormed 80 ideas. Of those, 24 ideas were identified for further development into VE proposals, including cost impacts and seven Design Suggestions (DS), developed without cost impacts. Twenty-four (24) Design Comments (DC) were identified and not developed further into workbooks.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Check if project performed with current firm
3.	(1) TITLE AND LOCATION <i>(City and State)</i> <b>Rawhide Wash Project, Flood Control District of Maricopa County – Peer Review/Value Engineering Study (Maricopa County, AZ)</b>	(2) YEAR COMPLETED	
		Professional Services <b>2015</b>	Construction (if applicable)
	(3) BRIEF DESCRIPTION <i>(Brief scope, size, cost, etc.)</i> AND SPECIFIC ROLE <b>Specific Role:</b> Certified Value Specialist Team Leader <b>Construction Amount:</b> Not applicable A Peer Review / Value Engineering (VE) study was conducted for the Flood Control District of Maricopa County Rawhide Wash Project. The Rawhide Wash floodplain is one of the largest in Maricopa County and covers more than 10 square miles from approximately Jomax and Pima roads to the southwest past Loop 101. Rawhide Wash was mapped a 100-year regulatory floodplain by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and designated as an active alluvial fan. During large storms, stormwater and sediment can travel at high speeds from nearby mountains and spread out into multiple, shallow stream and washes. These streams and washes can shift during storm events, which results in an unprecedented path of floodwater and a high risk of flooding. Due to the high flood risk to people and properties in the Rawhide Wash floodplain, this area is being considered for possible regional flood control measures to reduce the flooding risk. The District and its city partners considered three potential options for Rawhide Wash: No Action, No Build and Build. The Build	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Check if project performed with current firm



**ATTACHMENT I – General Qualifications**

**ANNUAL REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE NO:  
ADSP016-00005912**

**STATE PROCUREMENT OFFICE  
Department of Administration  
100 North 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 201  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007**

Option is the only option that would reduce the flood hazard and risk. The purpose of the Peer Review / VE Study was to evaluate the four Build Options presented in the Pinnacle Peak West ADMS, Rawhide Wash Alternatives report (JE Fuller / Hydrology & Geomorphology, Inc., May 2015) and present recommendations for the District and JE Fuller to consider for Build Option selection and advancement. The peer review / VE team brainstormed 22 ideas. Of those, several ideas were combined into proposed new Build Options for the District and design team to consider. In addition, the peer review / VE team identified “next steps” for advancing a Build Option as well as other considerations to address the workshop objectives.

	<p>(1) TITLE AND LOCATION (<i>City and State</i>) <b>Capital Security Enhancement, Ron De Lugo Federal Building and US Courthouse, General Services Administration – Design Development Value Engineering Study (Washington, DC)</b></p>	<p>(2) YEAR COMPLETED</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="982 443 1265 562">Professional Services <b>2015</b></td> <td data-bbox="1265 443 1523 562">Construction (if applicable)</td> </tr> </table>		Professional Services <b>2015</b>	Construction (if applicable)		
Professional Services <b>2015</b>	Construction (if applicable)						
4.	<p>(3) BRIEF DESCRIPTION (<i>Brief scope, size, cost, etc.</i>) AND SPECIFIC ROLE <b>Specific Role:</b> Certified Value Specialist Team Leader <b>Construction Amount:</b> \$14.5M</p> <p>A Value Engineering (VE) study was conducted on the Design Development (DD) documents for the Capital Security Enhancement at Ron De Lugo Federal Building and US Courthouse Project for the General Services Administration. The GSA intends to make alterations to the Ron De Lugo Federal Building and US Courthouse located at 5500 Veterans Drive Charlotte Amalie, St. Thomas, US Virgin Islands. The project delivery is the traditional Design-Bid-Build method. The Ron De Lugo Federal Building and US Courthouse is a three (3) story building constructed in 1977, is 92,996 gross square feet (61,005 usable square feet) and located on the waterfront in the central business district of Charlotte Amalie. The building is occupied by the US Virgin Islands District Courts (USDC), US Magistrate Courts, US Probation, US Attorney, US Marshals Service (USMS), Department of Homeland Security (DHS), USDA/APHIS, Internal Revenue Service (IRS), and other government agencies. The VE team brainstormed 82 ideas. Of those, 42 ideas received a score of “5” (Great Opportunity) or “4” (Good Opportunity) and were identified for further review of cost impacts to project.</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="982 569 1036 604" style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="1036 569 1523 604">Check if project performed with current firm</td> </tr> </table>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Check if project performed with current firm		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Check if project performed with current firm						
5.	<p>(1) TITLE AND LOCATION (<i>City and State</i>) <b>Greenacres Elementary School Project, Central Valley School District – Value Analysis Study (Spokane Valley, WA)</b></p> <p>(3) BRIEF DESCRIPTION (<i>Brief scope, size, cost, etc.</i>) AND SPECIFIC ROLE <b>Specific Role:</b> Certified Value Specialist Team Leader <b>Construction Amount:</b> \$17.1M</p> <p>A Value Analysis (VA) study was conducted on the schematic design (SD) documents for the Greenacres Elementary School Project for the Central Valley School District. The new Greenacres Elementary school will be a 70,000 square-foot facility located within Spokane County. The existing single-story historic portion of the school, which will remain, faces southwest, with the planned new addition being a rectangular one-story construction with a courtyard in the middle that sits on the east side of the building. It is located in an older neighborhood and some shading is provided to the facility due to the abundance of trees near the project site. The VA team brainstormed 80 ideas. Of those, 24 ideas were identified for further development into VA proposals, including cost impacts and seven Design Suggestions (DS), developed without cost impacts. Twenty-four (24) Design Comments (DC) were identified and not developed further into workbooks.</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="982 869 1265 968">Professional Services <b>2015</b></td> <td data-bbox="1265 869 1523 968">Construction (if applicable)</td> </tr> </table> <table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="982 974 1036 1010" style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="1036 974 1523 1010">Check if project performed with current firm</td> </tr> </table>		Professional Services <b>2015</b>	Construction (if applicable)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Check if project performed with current firm
Professional Services <b>2015</b>	Construction (if applicable)						
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Check if project performed with current firm						



**ATTACHMENT I – General Qualifications**

**ANNUAL REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE NO:  
ADSP016-00005912**

**STATE PROCUREMENT OFFICE  
Department of Administration  
100 North 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 201  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007**

**4. Resumes of Key Personnel Proposed for this Contract** *(Complete one Section #4 for each key person.)*

a. NAME  <b>LAUREL M. DENNIS</b>	b. ROLE IN THIS CONTRACT  <b>FACILITATOR – TEAM LEADER – CERTIFIED VALUE SPECIALIST</b>	c. YEARS EXPERIENCE	
		1. TOTAL <b>33</b>	2. WITH CURRENT FIRM <b>8</b> <i>(RHA, LLC formerly RH &amp; Associates, Inc.)</i>
d. LOCATION <i>(City and State)</i> <b>UNIVERSITY PLACE, WASHINGTON</b>			
e. EDUCATION <i>(DEGREE AND SPECIALIZATION)</i> BS, Civil Engineering BS, Construction		f. PROFESSIONAL TRAINING - REGISTRATIONS SAVE International® Certified Value Specialist No. 950510 Professional Engineer/Civil: Washington 1983, Arizona 1984	
g. OTHER PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS <i>(Organizations, Awards, etc.)</i> Certified Value Specialist (CVS-Life), Module I & Module II Certification, LEED Accredited, Project Management Institute (PMI) Member, SAVE International®, Certification Board Executive Director			

**H. RELEVANT PROJECTS**

1.	(1) TITLE AND LOCATION <i>(City and State)</i> <b>I-5 Marvin Road/SR 510 Interchange Project, Washington State Department of Transportation – Value Engineering Study (Lacey, WA)</b>	(2) YEAR COMPLETED	
		Professional Services <b>2015</b>	Construction (if applicable)
	(3) BRIEF DESCRIPTION <i>(Brief scope, size, cost, etc.)</i> AND SPECIFIC ROLE <b>Specific Role:</b> Certified Value Specialist Team Leader <b>Construction Amount:</b> \$75M A Value Engineering (VE) study was conducted on the design documents for the I-5 Marvin Road/SR 510 Interchange Project for WSDOT. The proposed improvement under the Interchange Justification Report (IJR) for the I-5/ Marvin Road/SR 510 Interchange Project is a single point urban interchange (SPUI) with a collector/distributor (C/D) Road. The VE team brainstormed the project under two approaches. First the VE team identified ideas meeting the project needs statement, bottoms-up approach. Using the bottoms-up approach, the VE team identified 29 ideas. Second the VE team identified ideas for potential changes to the IJR design. The VE team identified 12 ideas for the IJR. Reviewing both creative idea lists, the top feasible interchanges were identified along with the common elements for each scheme and identified three potential project schemes.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Check if project performed with current firm
2.	(1) TITLE AND LOCATION <i>(City and State)</i> <b>Puyallup and Sumner Stations Access Improvements Projects, Sound Transit – Value Engineering/Constructability Review (Seattle, WA)</b>	(2) YEAR COMPLETED	
		Professional Services <b>2015</b>	Construction (if applicable)
	(3) BRIEF DESCRIPTION <i>(Brief scope, size, cost, etc.)</i> AND SPECIFIC ROLE <b>Specific Role:</b> Certified Value Specialist Team Leader <b>Construction Amount:</b> \$34.2M A Value Engineering (VE) study was conducted for the conceptual design documents for the Puyallup and Sumner Stations Access Improvements Projects in Seattle, WA for Sound Transit. This project provides access improvement features at both the Puyallup and Sumner stations as part of the Sounder Train system. The improvements include both site parking and parking garages for both stations to accommodate system expansion. Sumner station adds approximately 530 spaces and Puyallup Station approximately 600 spaces. Both sites include pedestrian bridges to access the parking. The current design level for the project is Conceptual Design. The VE team brainstormed 65 ideas for the Puyallup Station Access Improvements Project. Of those, 20 ideas were identified for further development into VE proposals, including cost impacts and 10 Design Suggestions (DS) were developed. The VE team identified 6 Design Comments, without any further development. The VE team brainstormed 51 ideas for the Sumner Station Access Improvements Project. Of those, 14 ideas were identified for further development into VE proposals, including cost impacts and 12 Design Suggestions (DS) were developed. The VE team identified 9 Design Comments, without any further development.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Check if project performed with current firm
3.	(1) TITLE AND LOCATION <i>(City and State)</i> <b>S 224th Street Improvements Phase 1 and 2 Project, City of Kent – Value Engineering Study (Kent, WA)</b>	(2) YEAR COMPLETED	
		Professional Services <b>2015</b>	Construction (if applicable)
	(3) BRIEF DESCRIPTION <i>(Brief scope, size, cost, etc.)</i> AND SPECIFIC ROLE <b>Specific Role:</b> Certified Value Specialist Team Leader <b>Construction Amount:</b> \$9.2M A Value Engineering (VE) study was conducted on the 30% design documents for the S. 224th Street Improvements Phase 1 and 2 Project for the City of Kent. The S. 224th Street Improvements Phase 1 and 2 Project, South 224th Street Bridge over State Route (SR) 167 in Kent, Washington includes Phase 1 and 2. The project consists of a planned roadway extension of South 224th Street and a three-span bridge over SR 167 and Phase II continues the roadway to 94th Avenue. The project will also involve constructing earth approach embankments for South 224th Street by raising the grade up to about 20 feet to accommodate the pier-supported bridge abutments. The VE team brainstormed 56 ideas. Of those, 24 ideas were identified for further development into VE proposals, including cost impacts and two Design Suggestions (DS), developed without cost impacts. Fourteen (14) Design Comments (DC) were identified and not developed further into workbooks.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Check if project performed with current firm



**ATTACHMENT I – General Qualifications**

**ANNUAL REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE NO:  
ADSP016-00005912**

**STATE PROCUREMENT OFFICE  
Department of Administration  
100 North 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 201  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007**

4.	(1) TITLE AND LOCATION ( <i>City and State</i> ) <b>Peninsula College (PC) Allied Health Early Childhood Development – Phase 1, Washington DES – Constructability Review (Port Angeles, WA)</b>	(2) YEAR COMPLETED	
		Professional Services <b>2015</b>	Construction (if applicable)
	(3) BRIEF DESCRIPTION ( <i>Brief scope, size, cost, etc.</i> ) AND SPECIFIC ROLE <b>Specific Role:</b> Certified Value Specialist Team Leader <b>Construction Amount:</b> \$988K This Constructability Review (CR) was conducted as a workshop using an independent, multi-disciplinary team to review the drawings and specifications. Peninsula College is a critical component of life in the north Olympic Peninsula. As the only institution of higher education in the region, the community depends upon the College for education and workforce training. Correspondingly, Peninsula College's enrollment is growing. However, the age, size and condition of several campus facilities threaten the College's ability to serve its current and future constituency. The CR approach used a facilitated workshop to encourage independent analysis of the bid set of project documents. The CR team suggests final coordination efforts should focus on: (a) Review waterproofing and the building envelop details; (b) Clarify some of the drawing details; and (c) Review the project schedule with Peninsula College.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Check if project performed with current firm
5.	(1) TITLE AND LOCATION ( <i>City and State</i> ) <b>Lease Fit-Out Belo Horizonte, Brazil Project, US Department of State, Overseas Building Operations – Value Engineering Study (Washington, DC)</b>	(2) YEAR COMPLETED	
		Professional Services <b>2015</b>	Construction (if applicable)
	(3) BRIEF DESCRIPTION ( <i>Brief scope, size, cost, etc.</i> ) AND SPECIFIC ROLE <b>Specific Role:</b> Certified Value Specialist Team Leader <b>Construction Amount:</b> \$21M A Value Engineering (VE) study was conducted on the 50% Design Development documents for the Lease Fit-Out Belo Horizonte, Brazil Project for the US Department of State, Office of Overseas Buildings Operations. The Belo Horizonte site is located at a summit on the west side of Belo Horizonte Municipality, in Minas Gerais, Brazil. The site is defined by the lease line forming a quasi-triangular shape enclosing an area of approximately 3668 sq. meters (0.3668 Ha.). Wilson Roch Lima Street bounds the site to the northwest, a multi-story building identified "Horizonte Building" to the east, and an open space area identified as "Copasa Natural Reserve" to the south. The site is already developed and is currently occupied by the Panorama Building, a five-story building of approximately 1.550 square meters of surface area. The building is located on the east side of the site while the rest of the areas west are occupied by three parking lots covering approximately 761 sq. meters, landscaped areas and an accessible ramp. The accessible ramp extends along the south of the site connecting the building to the parking lots. The primary intent of the design is to provide a functional and aesthetically pleasing interior fit-out for a new leased Consulate facility within an existing renovated structure. Design and coordination of perimeter security measures, including the incorporation of vehicular and pedestrian controls, are a critical part of this project. The main design objective of the work is to provide an open, light-filled work environment. This is to be accomplished by incorporating extensive glass partitions, where possible, to maximize daylight penetration into the depth of the building space. Low partitions at grouped work station areas are also intended to help the space feel as open as possible. Private offices and their support spaces are to be generally grouped at the building perimeter to take advantage of the light and expansive hill top views. The VE team brainstormed 122 ideas. Of those, 47 ideas were identified for further development into VE proposals, including cost impacts and three Design Suggestions (DS), developed without cost impacts. Thirty-six (36) Design Comments (DC) were identified and not developed further into workbooks.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Check if project performed with current firm



**ATTACHMENT I – General Qualifications**

**ANNUAL REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE NO:  
ADSP016-00005912**

**STATE PROCUREMENT OFFICE  
Department of Administration  
100 North 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 201  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007**

**4. Resumes of Key Personnel Proposed for this Contract** *(Complete one Section #4 for each key person.)*

a. NAME  <b>BARBARA C. HUMMELL</b>	b. ROLE IN THIS CONTRACT  <b>FACILITATOR – ASSISTANT TEAM LEADER – ASSOCIATE VALUE SPECIALIST</b>	c. YEARS EXPERIENCE	
		1. TOTAL <b>24</b>	2. WITH CURRENT FIRM <b>&gt;1</b>
d. LOCATION <i>(City and State)</i> <b>GLENDALE, WASHINGTON</b>			
e. EDUCATION <i>(DEGREE AND SPECIALIZATION)</i> Master of Public Administration Bachelor of Public Administration		f. PROFESSIONAL TRAINING - REGISTRATIONS SAVE International® Associate Value Specialist No. 201402012 Certified Professional Public Officer Certified Public Manager Certified Federal Contracts Manager Certified Professional Public Buyer	
g. OTHER PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS <i>(Organizations, Awards, etc.)</i> SAVE International, American Public Works Association, National Contract Management Association, National Institute of Government Purchasing. Module			

**H. RELEVANT PROJECTS**

1.	(1) TITLE AND LOCATION <i>(City and State)</i> <b>Erbil, Iraq New Consulate Compound, US Department of State Overseas Building Operations – Value Engineering Study (Washington, DC)</b>	(2) YEAR COMPLETED
		Professional Services <b>2015</b>
	(3) BRIEF DESCRIPTION <i>(Brief scope, size, cost, etc.)</i> AND SPECIFIC ROLE <b>Specific Role:</b> Associate Value Specialist Assistant Team Leader <b>Construction Amount:</b> \$241M A Value Engineering (VE) study was conducted on the schematic design documents for the Erbil, Iraq New Consulate Compound (NCC) and Housing Project for the U.S. Department of State, Office of Overseas Buildings Operations (OBO). The New Consulate Compound (NCC) in Erbil, Iraq will provide the U.S. with a new consulate facility and resident housing. The NCC includes a comprehensive site layout of all buildings within the compound in an approach that embraces the State Department’s requirements for diplomacy, safety, security, community, and high performance. The NCC will allow for future expansion when needed. The VE team brainstormed 207 ideas. Of those, 38 ideas were identified for further development into VE proposals, including cost impacts and 13 Design Suggestions (DS) were developed, which did not include costs. The potential savings to the project is \$31.8M.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Check if project performed with current firm
2.	(1) TITLE AND LOCATION <i>(City and State)</i> <b>Los Angeles Department of Water and Power Lagoon Refurbishment, Metropolitan Water District – Constructability &amp; Value Engineering Study (Los Angeles, CA)</b>	(2) YEAR COMPLETED
		Professional Services <b>2014</b>
	(3) BRIEF DESCRIPTION <i>(Brief scope, size, cost, etc.)</i> AND SPECIFIC ROLE <b>Specific Role:</b> Associate Value Specialist Assistant Team Leader <b>Construction Amount:</b> \$5M A Constructability and Value Engineering (VE) review workshop was conducted for the Metropolitan Water District (MWD) of Southern California, Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) Project at the Jensen Water Treatment Plant and the MWD headquarters in Los Angeles, CA. In December 2012, Metropolitan’s Board authorized a 50-year agreement with LADWP that allows Metropolitan to utilize four lagoons on the grounds of LADWP’s Aqueduct Filtration Plant. LADWP is responsible for refurbishing the four existing lagoons (Lagoons 2, 3, 7, and 8) for Metropolitan’s initial use, but has asked Metropolitan to perform preliminary design, final design, and construction of the lagoon refurbishment via reimbursement agreements. LADWP will also design, construct, and operate groundwater management facilities so that high groundwater does not impact lagoon construction and operation. Constructability reviews are different than value engineering workshops in that many of the issues identified need to be integrated into the current plans and specifications to ensure a complete and easily biddable document. There was only one value engineering idea that was identified and the team agreed to implement the idea into the plans and specifications.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Check if project performed with current firm
3.	(1) TITLE AND LOCATION <i>(City and State)</i> <b>Downtown San Bernardino Passenger Rail Project, San Bernardino Associated Governments - Partnering Workshop (San Bernardino, CA)</b>	(2) YEAR COMPLETED
		Professional Services <b>2015</b>
	(3) BRIEF DESCRIPTION <i>(Brief scope, size, cost, etc.)</i> AND SPECIFIC ROLE <b>Specific Role:</b> Associate Value Specialist Assistant Team Leader <b>Construction Amount:</b> \$ As an initial workshop for the construction phase of the Downtown San Bernardino Passenger Rail Project, the focus was on the project at hand, including issues, goals, problem solving, and effective conflict management. A variety of participatory exercises were employed to ensure involvement and communication among the participants. In addition, participants enjoyed a high-energy experience that resulted in a strong “team” foundation and the tools to maintain the process throughout the project.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Check if project performed with current firm



ATTACHMENT I – General Qualifications

ANNUAL REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE NO:  
ADSP016-00005912

STATE PROCUREMENT OFFICE  
Department of Administration  
100 North 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 201  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

4.	(1) TITLE AND LOCATION ( <i>City and State</i> ) <b>MC85 &amp; Avondale Boulevard Intersection Project, Maricopa County Department of Transportation – Partnering Workshop (Maricopa County, AZ)</b>	(2) YEAR COMPLETED	
		Professional Services <b>2015</b>	Construction (if applicable)
	(3) BRIEF DESCRIPTION ( <i>Brief scope, size, cost, etc.</i> ) AND SPECIFIC ROLE <b>Specific Role:</b> Assistant Facilitator <b>Construction Amount:</b> Unknown As an initial workshop for the construction phase of the MC85 and Avondale Boulevard Intersection Project, the focus was on the project at hand, including issues, goals, problem solving, and effective conflict management. A variety of participatory exercises were employed to ensure involvement and communication among the participants. In addition, participants enjoyed a high-energy experience that resulted in a strong “team” foundation and the tools to maintain the process throughout the project.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Check if project performed with current firm
5.	(1) TITLE AND LOCATION ( <i>City and State</i> ) <b>Port of Long Beach, Deep Draft Navigation Study, USACE Los Angeles District, P2#403268 – Value Engineering Study (Los Angeles, CA)</b>	(2) YEAR COMPLETED	
		Professional Services <b>2015</b>	Construction (if applicable)
	(3) BRIEF DESCRIPTION ( <i>Brief scope, size, cost, etc.</i> ) AND SPECIFIC ROLE <b>Specific Role:</b> Associate Value Specialist Report Preparation <b>Construction Amount:</b> Unknown A Value Engineering (VE) study was conducted for the Port of Long Beach (POLB), Deep Draft Navigation Study, P2# 403268 for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). The study area includes the waters in the immediate vicinity (and shoreward) of the breakwaters through the entire Port of Long Beach and the downstream reaches of the Los Angeles River that have direct impact on the Bay. The Port of Long Beach has undergone significant expansion in the past century and has become a major transportation and trade center, providing the shipping terminals for nearly one-third of the waterborne trade moving through the West Coast. This substantial amount of throughput is impacted by transportation inefficiencies, which can occur during larger south swells (waves not generated by local winds) and inclement weather conditions. The dynamic/wave effect impacts transportation efficiency by causing delays or lightering to vessels transiting channels and drafting as little as 55 feet with lengths of 900 feet or greater. In addition, the maximum operating draft along the approach channel during calmer weather conditions is 65 feet due to safety concerns pending further study on pitch and roll. Today approximately 46% of liquid bulk vessel calls have maximum operating drafts of at least 55 feet and 26% have maximum drafts potentially exceeding 65 feet. Since about 1/3 of all crude oil or 9 million tons arrived in vessels drafting 55 feet or greater in 2011, the most recent year data is available, tankers carrying several billion dollars of crude oil shipments are potentially impacted annually. Thus a sizeable and growing share of crude oil is being transported on vessels that light load or offload prior to entering the port. The number of larger liquid bulk vessel calls has been growing and is expected to increase in the future. Light loading, delays, and rerouting crude oil shipments are expected to increase in the future if no federal action is taken. As a planning study, with very preliminary information, the VE team reviewed the identified documents and brainstormed 32 ideas. Of those, 15 ideas were identified for further discussion into VE suggestions, and 7 VE Comments, which were not discussed in further detail.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Check if project performed with current firm



**ATTACHMENT I – General Qualifications**

**ANNUAL REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE NO:  
ADSP016-00005912**

**STATE PROCUREMENT OFFICE  
Department of Administration  
100 North 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 201  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007**

**5. EXAMPLE PROJECTS WHICH BEST ILLUSTRATE PROPOSED TEAM'S QUALIFICATIONS FOR THIS CONTRACT**

*(Present no more than five (5) projects. Complete one Section 5 for each project.)*

<p>a. TITLE AND LOCATION <i>(City and State)</i> <b>Cottonwood – Camp Verde – Mogollon Rim HWY, SR 260 - Thousand Trails to I-17, Arizona Department of Transportation – Scoping, Risk Assessment and Value Analysis Study (Yavapai County, AZ)</b></p>	<p align="center">b. YEAR COMPLETED</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="987 411 1256 489">PROFESSIONAL SERVICES 2015</td> <td data-bbox="1256 411 1559 489">CONSTRUCTION <i>(If applicable)</i></td> </tr> </table>		PROFESSIONAL SERVICES 2015	CONSTRUCTION <i>(If applicable)</i>
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES 2015	CONSTRUCTION <i>(If applicable)</i>			

**23. PROJECT OWNER'S INFORMATION**

<p>c. PROJECT OWNER Arizona Department of Transportation John Dickson Project Manager Email: JDickson@azdot.gov Phone: 602-712-8683</p>	<p>d. ORIGINAL BUDGET/NTE AMOUNT OF PROJECT Contract Amount: \$69,308 (Professional Fees for Study)</p>	<p>e. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT \$69,308 Construction Value: \$62M</p>
---	---	--

f. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT AND RELEVANCE TO THIS CONTRACT (include scope, size, and length of project)

**Project Description**

The proposed CMAR project is located in Yavapai County on State Route 260, beginning at Ogden Ranch Road with milling and replacing asphaltic concrete on the eastbound travel lanes and shoulders. At Thousand Trails Road, the two-lane roadway is reconstructed to a four-lane divided highway extending east to the I-17 Interchange. The project will replace the existing Cherry Creek Bridge and build a new multi-modal pathway from Cherry Creek Road to I-17. The work included consists of constructing seven roundabouts, earthwork, aggregate base, asphaltic concrete pavement, bridge construction, drainage improvements, curb and gutter, sidewalk and other related work.

**Project Goals**

- 1) Schedule
  - Design complete November 2015
  - Initial GMP, the first week of December
  - Money must be obligated by the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter of 2016
- 2) Budget - \$62M total available which includes:
  - ICAP – 10.39% of the cost
  - CE Costs
  - Right of Way
  - Construction
- 3) Maintain Business Access
  - a. Be aware that the Sheriff's Department has a jury pool selection twice a month
- 4) Accommodate Travelers
  - a. Construction Speed (45 mph)
- 5) Execute the Right of Way process effectively and timely
- 6) Keep the public informed

**Study Background**

The team completed a Risk Analysis in conjunction with the Value Analysis workshop. The team first brainstormed any perceived risks and then evaluated those risks using the attached Risk Register. The Risk Register identifies the perceived risk, assigns who the risk impacts, and classifies the risk for probability and severity to establish an overall risk rating. The team then provided additional information identifying order of magnitude impacts to budget and schedule. Finally, the team identified the need to Avoid, Mitigate, Transfer or Eliminate the identified risk with comments supporting the decision.

**Study Goals**

- 1) Downstream Drainage during construction
- 2) Box culvert at Grief Hill
- 3) Phasing (earthwork, traffic control, roundabout construction, drainage)



ATTACHMENT I – General Qualifications

ANNUAL REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE NO:  
ADSP016-00005912

STATE PROCUREMENT OFFICE  
Department of Administration  
100 North 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 201  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

- 4) Cherry Creek bridge
- 5) Over excavation number is not included in the current design
- 6) Alignment of SR 260
- 7) How to maintain higher speeds during construction

**Study Results**

The documents available for the Risk and VE team were missing a few key project documents, including the geotechnical report. Many of the possibilities and issues are related to dirt work and phasing of the work during construction. Most of the ideas were classified as Design Comments. The team did develop 4 ideas as full alternatives. The ideas that were developed were completed with the entire team as a group effort. Decisions were made immediately, as possible, during the workshop. Some were identified as Accept, which is defined as an alternative that is recommended by the team for inclusion in the design; Conditionally Accept, which is defined as those alternatives that the team would like to recommend for inclusion in the design; however, they may require approval from the resource agencies or another ADOT group; the final category is Reject, which is defined as those alternatives, that after further consideration, were dropped. The alternatives were developed and include, as needed, the following information:

- Original Concept
- Alternative Concept
- Advantages and Disadvantages of the Proposed Alternative
- Discussion / Justification
- Implementation Considerations
- Performance Criteria
- Disposition



**ATTACHMENT I – General Qualifications**

**ANNUAL REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE NO:  
ADSP016-00005912**

**STATE PROCUREMENT OFFICE  
Department of Administration  
100 North 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 201  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007**

**5. EXAMPLE PROJECTS WHICH BEST ILLUSTRATE PROPOSED TEAM'S QUALIFICATIONS FOR THIS CONTRACT**

*(Present no more than five (5) projects. Complete one Section 5 for each project.)*

<p>a. TITLE AND LOCATION <i>(City and State)</i> <b>Ina Road Traffic Interchange CMAR, Arizona Department of Transportation – Scoping, Risk Assessment &amp; Value Analysis Study (Tucson, AZ)</b></p>	<p align="center">b. YEAR COMPLETED</p>	
	<p align="center">PROFESSIONAL SERVICES 2014</p>	<p align="center">CONSTRUCTION <i>(If applicable)</i></p>

**23. PROJECT OWNER'S INFORMATION**

<p>c. PROJECT OWNER Arizona Department of Transportation Rod Lane Tucson District Engineer Email: RLane@azdot.gov Phone: 520-388-4210</p>	<p>d. ORIGINAL BUDGET/NTE AMOUNT OF PROJECT Contract Amount: \$15,818 (Professional Fees for Study)</p>	<p>e. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT \$15,818 Construction Value: \$85M</p>
---	---	--

f. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT AND RELEVANCE TO THIS CONTRACT (include scope, size, and length of project)

**Project Description**

The proposed work for this project is located in Pima County within the Town of Marana. The project begins north of Ina Road (EB Milepost 247.4) and extends south approximately 2.03 miles to just south of Ina Road (EB Milepost 249.51). The work consists of reconstruction of an urban divided freeway including: bridges over the Union Pacific Railroad and Camino de Oeste, box culverts, retaining and sound walls, grading, pavement, drainage facilities, channels, water and sewer relocations, relation of other utilities, traffic signals, signing, pavement markings, lighting and surveillance equipment, landscaping and irrigation.

**Project Goals**

Overall project goals were discussed in order to educate the study team on the important elements within the project. They include the following:

- Accommodate businesses
- Limit impacts to traveling public
- Establish footprint for environmental
- Maintain major utilities in operations
- Minimize environmental impacts at the Santa Cruz River
- Increase capacity
- Meet or beat the construction budget = \$85,430,000

**Study Background**

A Risk and Value Analysis (VA) study was conducted for the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) Ina Road Traffic Interchange Project on September 24-26, 2014 at ADOT's Tucson District Office for the project described below. The decision makers identified the project purpose as removing the railroad conflicts and increasing capacity.

The Risk and VA workshops are different on CMAR projects as compared to a regular design VA workshop. The team collaborated to develop a risk register. Additionally, the team developed performance attributes that were used as a decision making tool during the workshop and the team should use these measures to aid in decision making throughout the project. The performance attributes included; schedule, mainline operations, local operations, hydrologic, and utilities. The team developed opportunities and then decisions were made on those alternatives that will be incorporated into the design.

It was understood that this project has several constraints related to environmental and commitments to the public which limited some of the opportunities for the team. However, workshop objectives were identified at the start of the workshop which included:

- Minimize traffic impacts
- Discuss construction phasing
- Reduce utility impacts
- Review structures



ATTACHMENT I – General Qualifications

ANNUAL REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE NO:  
ADSP016-00005912

STATE PROCUREMENT OFFICE  
Department of Administration  
100 North 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 201  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

- Minimize right-of-way takes
- Maintain existing storm drainage
- Identify paving opportunities on Ina Road new sections

**Study Results**

The VE team brainstormed 104 ideas. Of those, 14 ideas were identified for further development into VE proposals, including cost impacts. Upon review of the draft report and additional information regarding the proposed alternatives, a total of 8 were included for further evaluation by the project team.



ATTACHMENT I – General Qualifications

ANNUAL REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE NO:  
ADSP016-00005912

STATE PROCUREMENT OFFICE  
Department of Administration  
100 North 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 201  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

5. EXAMPLE PROJECTS WHICH BEST ILLUSTRATE PROPOSED TEAM'S QUALIFICATIONS FOR THIS CONTRACT

(Present no more than five (5) projects. Complete one Section 5 for each project.)

a. TITLE AND LOCATION (City and State) <b>Black Mountain Blvd, SR51/SR101L TI, Arizona Department of Transportation – Scoping, Risk Assessment &amp; Value Engineering Study (Maricopa County, AZ)</b>	b. YEAR COMPLETED	
	PROFESSIONAL SERVICES 2014	CONSTRUCTION (If applicable)

23. PROJECT OWNER'S INFORMATION

c. PROJECT OWNER Arizona Department of Transportation Ron McCally Project Manager Email: RMcCally@azdot.gov Phone: 602-712-7646	d. ORIGINAL BUDGET/NTE AMOUNT OF PROJECT Contract Amount: \$16,875 (Professional Fees for Study)	e. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT \$16,875 Construction Value: \$24.9M
--	---	---

f. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT AND RELEVANCE TO THIS CONTRACT (include scope, size, and length of project)

**Project Description**

Although the entire project includes two phases to the project, this Risk and VE workshop only addressed the ADOT Phase 2 portion. Phase 2/GMP 2 will begin on the south side of the constructed roundabout and include the ramps/roadway concrete paving, and structures connecting Black Mountain Boulevard (BMB) to SR 51. Black Mountain GMP 2 will also include the construction of the pedestrian over-pass. The City will own, operate and maintain the pedestrian overpass. GMP 2 will require the standard/detailed ADOT technical reviews, given ADOT will own, operate and maintain connecting ramps, structures and concrete paving but not the pedestrian overpass. The BMB project will be constructed by ADOT, for the City of Phoenix under an Intergovernmental Agreement.

**Project Goals**

Overall project goals were discussed in order to educate the study team on the important elements within the project. They include the following:

- Meet environmental requirements and commitments
- Maintain the flood pool balance
- Total project completion by winter 2015
- Maintain \$24.9M total project budget
- Minimize impacts to SR101
- Reduce maintenance

**Study Background**

A Risk and Value Engineering (VE) study was conducted for the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) Black Mountain Blvd, SR51/SR101L Traffic Interchange (Phase 2), Pinnacle Peak Road Project on February 18-19, 2014 at the Phoenix offices of Aztec Engineering. The decision makers identified the project purpose as moving traffic while improving operations within the corridor.

The Risk and VE workshops are different on CMAR projects as compared to a regular design VE workshop. The team collaborated to develop a risk register. This risk register should be used throughout the project, at each of the design deliverables, to help identify risks and then mitigation measures throughout the design process as well as retiring risks that have been mitigated in the design. Additionally, the team developed performance measures that were used as a decision making tool during the workshop and the team should use these measures to aid in decision making throughout the project. The team developed opportunities and then decisions were made on those alternatives that will be incorporated into the design.

It was understood that this project has several constraints related to environmental and commitments to the public which limited some of the opportunities for the team. However, workshop objectives were identified at the start of the workshop which included:

- Remove the pier from the SR101 median at Ramp S



ATTACHMENT I – General Qualifications

ANNUAL REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE NO:  
ADSP016-00005912

STATE PROCUREMENT OFFICE  
Department of Administration  
100 North 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 201  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

- Shorten the Ramp S bridge at the north end
- Phasing opportunities for building the end caps
- Discuss site distance issues on Ramps N and S
- Maintain ADOT maintenance access along south ramp
- Identify cost impacts
- Provide creativity and innovation in structure types

**Study Results**

The VE team brainstormed 53 ideas. Of those, 11 ideas were identified for further development into VE proposals, including cost impacts. During the development, two of the alternatives were rejected by the team for further consideration.



**ATTACHMENT I – General Qualifications**

**ANNUAL REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE NO:  
ADSP016-00005912**

**STATE PROCUREMENT OFFICE  
Department of Administration  
100 North 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 201  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007**

**5. EXAMPLE PROJECTS WHICH BEST ILLUSTRATE PROPOSED TEAM'S QUALIFICATIONS FOR THIS CONTRACT**

*(Present no more than five (5) projects. Complete one Section 5 for each project.)*

a. TITLE AND LOCATION <i>(City and State)</i> <b>McMicken Dam, Flood Control District of Maricopa County – Value Engineering Study (Maricopa County, AZ)</b>	b. YEAR COMPLETED	
	PROFESSIONAL SERVICES 2015	CONSTRUCTION <i>(If applicable)</i>

**23. PROJECT OWNER'S INFORMATION**

c. PROJECT OWNER Flood Control District of Maricopa County Bobbie Ohler Project Manager Email: bao@mail.maricopa.gov Phone: 602-506-2943	d. ORIGINAL BUDGET/NTE AMOUNT OF PROJECT Contract Amount: \$10,132 (Professional Fees for Study)	e. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT \$10,132 Construction Value: \$13.4M
---	---	---

f. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT AND RELEVANCE TO THIS CONTRACT (include scope, size, and length of project)

**Project Description**

The McMicken Dam Project was constructed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE) in 1954 and 1955 to protect Luke Air Force Base, Litchfield Park Naval Air Facility, and agricultural activities in the area from flooding. The McMicken Dam Project is now owned and maintained by the Flood Control District (District) and currently provides flood protection for significant portions of the cities of Surprise, El Mirage, Sun City Grand, and Litchfield Park, as well as unincorporated areas of Maricopa County. Critical public infrastructure such as hospitals, schools, police and fire stations, freeways and other public roadways, railroads and canals such as Beardsley Canal also benefit from the flood protection provided by the McMicken Dam Project. The ability of the McMicken Dam Project to maintain the current level of protection, in the long-term, for the benefit of the public in an increasingly urbanized environment, is in question due to significant concerns regarding aging infrastructure, land subsidence, earth fissuring, urbanization encroachment and current dam safety standards. These dam safety issues have lead the District to determine that an overall rehabilitation of the dam is required.

The McMicken Dam Project includes McMicken Dam itself (approximately 9.5 miles in length), the McMicken Dam Outlet Channel (approximately 6 miles in length) and the McMicken Dam Outlet Wash (approximately 4 miles in length) which discharges to the Agua Fria River. McMicken Dam has a maximum height of 34 feet and a storm water storage capacity of approximately 20,450 acre-feet from a 245-square mile drainage area.

The VE workshop will focus on Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the McMicken Dam, and the first mile of the outlet channel.

Phase 1 and Phase 2 are at the 30% design stage. This overall dam rehabilitation was identified in the Wittmann ADMP Update because of the existing principle outlet deterioration, adequacy of the emergency spillway, and the need to keep the spillway flows from potentially damaging the outlet channel. The structure relocations require that a new channel be constructed for the Picacho Wash inflows. Additionally, these relocations allow sale of excess land. The goal is to review the current plans and determine if alternative solutions would provide more value to the project.

The first mile of outlet channel appears to be mostly incised; however, the south bank is comprised of fill material from the channel excavation and is actually a wide (200-foot wide +/-) levee. The goal is to avoid a "FEMA levee" condition and ensure that the reconstructed channel will safely convey design flows.

**Project Goals**

Overall project goals were discussed in order to educate the VE study team on the important elements within the project. They include the following:

- Channel – design for 100-year flood (minimum); no less than 5,000 cfs principal outlet – convey maximum discharge (5,000 cfs)
- Build a dam that is safe and will last 100 years
- Emergency spillway must safely pass the Probable Maximum Flood (PMF)
- Protect property



ATTACHMENT I – General Qualifications

ANNUAL REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE NO:  
ADSP016-00005912

STATE PROCUREMENT OFFICE  
Department of Administration  
100 North 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 201  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

- Protect public
- Sustainable – earth fissures, land subsidence, sediment
- Provide access for maintenance
- Consider existing / future roadway crossings (out-of-scope)
- Utilities, O&M – Maricopa Water District (MWD) and Western Area Power Administration (WAPA)
- No adverse impact to contiguous property
- Provide multi-use opportunities
- Maintain aesthetics
- Evaluate marketability of land
- Minimize long-term O&M costs

### Study Background

A Value Engineering (VE) study was conducted for the Flood Control District of Maricopa County (District) McMicken Dam Project on June 15-17, 2015 at District offices.

### Study Objectives

Workshop objectives were identified at the start of the VE workshop which included:

- Evaluate five structures
  - Dam
  - Picacho Wash Diversion Channel
  - Emergency Spillway Channel
  - Principal Outlet
  - Outlet Channel
    - West of US60
    - East of US60
- Evaluate structure locations, dimensions, materials
- Review site access
- Cost considerations

### Study Results

The VE team brainstormed 50 ideas. Of those, 22 ideas were identified for further development into VE proposals, including cost impacts. One (1) Design Suggestion, without any cost impact, was written and eight (8) Design Comments were identified, and not developed, to provide additional information for the District and the designers to consider.

For alternatives development, the VE team broke into three groups as follows:

- **Outlet Channel East of US60** (Team 1)
- **Principal Outlet and Outlet Channel West of US60** (Team 2)
- **Dam, Picacho Wash Diversion Channel and Emergency Spillway** (Team 3)



**ATTACHMENT I – General Qualifications**

**ANNUAL REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE NO:  
ADSP016-00005912**

**STATE PROCUREMENT OFFICE  
Department of Administration  
100 North 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 201  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007**

**5. EXAMPLE PROJECTS WHICH BEST ILLUSTRATE PROPOSED TEAM'S QUALIFICATIONS FOR THIS CONTRACT**

*(Present no more than five (5) projects. Complete one Section 5 for each project.)*

a. TITLE AND LOCATION <i>(City and State)</i> <b>Gilbert Road Extension Project, Valley Metro – Value Engineering Study (Mesa, AZ)</b>	b. YEAR COMPLETED	
	PROFESSIONAL SERVICES 2015	CONSTRUCTION <i>(If applicable)</i>

**23. PROJECT OWNER'S INFORMATION**

c .PROJECT OWNER Valley Metro Patrick Fuller Project Manager pfuller@valleymetro.org Phone: 602-322-4487	d .ORIGINAL BUDGET/NTE AMOUNT OF PROJECT Contract Amount: \$10,760 (Professional Fees for Study)	e. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT \$10,760 Construction Value: \$73.2M
---	---	---

f. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT AND RELEVANCE TO THIS CONTRACT (include scope, size, and length of project)

**Project Description**

The Gilbert Road Light Rail Transit (LRT) Project consists of approximately 1.9 miles double track alignment extending from near Main Street and Hobson to an open end of line station on Main Street and Gilbert Road.

The project will include two stations on Main Street including stations at Stapley Drive and Gilbert Road, and a Park and Ride (PNR) at Gilbert Road, embedded trackwork, two traction power substations, signals for crossovers and at gated intersections, communications, and ticket vending machines. The alignment is center-street running with the overhead contact system poles between the tracks. The system elements shall be consistent with other Valley Metro corridors. This project will include renovation and reconstruction of any infrastructure such as utilities, storm drains, and landscaping that are impacted because of this project. All disturbed areas shall be reconstructed to the most current standards.

**Project Goals**

- Improve transit reliability and mobility of the residential, business, and visitor communities within the project corridor and region.
- Maximize efficiency and effectiveness of the transportation system and accommodate travel-demand growth.
- Achieve a transportation system consistent with local, state and federal initiatives by supporting local and regional land use and development goals and enhancing the use of transit-supported land use, planning and design strategies.
- Provide a public transportation project that is compatible with and enhances the local general plans.

**Study Background**

A Value Engineering (VE) study was conducted on the 30% design for the **Gilbert Road Extension Project** for Valley Metro on November 9-10, 2015.

**Study Objectives**

- Identify and evaluate opportunities to provide value (performance and cost) for the project
- Meet FTA requirements

**Study Results**

The VE team brainstormed 49 ideas. Of those, seven ideas were identified for further development into VE proposals, including cost impacts. Fourteen Design Comments (DC) were identified but not developed further into workbooks.



ATTACHMENT I – General Qualifications

ANNUAL REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE NO:  
ADSP016-00005912

STATE PROCUREMENT OFFICE  
Department of Administration  
100 North 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 201  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

6. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

a. PROVIDE ANY ADDITIONAL INFORMATION YOU FEEL MAY BE NECESSARY TO DESCRIBE YOUR FIRMS QUALIFICATIONS. (ATTACH ADDITIONAL SHEETS AS NEEDED.)

## About RHA, LLC

RHA, LLC, a unique consulting firm specializing in professional facilitation and training, has over 23 years of experience in Arizona providing scoping, risk assessment, life cycle costing, value engineering (project and process studies), training and partnering services for government agencies throughout Arizona, providing services for transportation, water/wastewater, transit, bridge, flood control, and educational facilities. RHA was organized in 1992 (as RH & Associates, Inc.) and is a WBE/DBE/SBE firm in Arizona. RHA has been providing quality services in the planning, design and construction arena with most of the experience working with public sector clients.

RHA is headquartered in Glendale, Arizona with a branch office located in University Place, Washington.

## Technical and Facilitation Capabilities

The firm’s key personnel have expertise in facilitating and training for public- and private-sector clients. RHA facilitators also have architecture / engineering / construction industry expertise in planning, design, and construction. RHA team members apply their career-long understanding of public clients to deliver professional facilitation and training with successful results.

RHA provides neutral, third-party facilitation services. Our non-biased workshop leaders have no vested interest in the outcome of the project or process under study. Their interest is in the positive effect of the process on the project and the team. Our third-party facilitation provides a structured, yet informal and “safe” environment in which all team members are encouraged to actively participate.

## Services

RHA provides all services needed to design, implement, and evaluate a comprehensive program from start-up to closeout. Our services include:

- Program Design and Evaluation
- Effective Team Procurement and Management
- Workshop Facilitation
- Comprehensive Workshop Reports
- Team Building
- Risk Analysis
- Life Cycle Cost Analysis
- Cost-Benefit Analysis
- Constructability Reviews
- Training
- Alternative Delivery
- Practical Design

## Representative Client List

RHA employs three professional and experienced Certified Value Specialists (CVS) and one Associate Value Specialist (AVS). These individuals have experience in value engineering /analysis as well as an extensive background in project scoping, partnering, risk analysis, life cycle costing, practical design and constructability reviews for almost every type of project for the following select public agencies and private sector organizations:

- Arizona Department of Transportation
- Arizona State University - Del Webb Alliance for Construction Excellence
- Bureau of Indian Affairs, AZ
- Bureau of Indian Education, AZ
- City of Avondale, AZ
- City of Glendale, AZ
- City of Lake Havasu, AZ
- City of Phoenix, AZ
- City of Surprise, AZ
- Flood Control District of Maricopa County, AZ
- Maricopa County Department of Transportation, AZ



ATTACHMENT I – General Qualifications

ANNUAL REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE NO:  
ADSP016-00005912

STATE PROCUREMENT OFFICE  
Department of Administration  
100 North 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 201  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

- Valley Metro, AZ
- Pinal County, AZ
- National Society for Professional Engineers, AZ
- City of Kent, WA
- City of Ukiah, CA
- City of Sacramento, CA
- City of Pendleton, OR
- City of New York, NY
- Metropolitan Transportation Authority, NY
- 3M Corporation, AZ
- City of Chula Vista, CA
- Bureau of Reclamation, CA
- Caltrans - statewide, CA
- Capital Area Transit, PA
- City and County of San Francisco, CA
- Kentucky Transportation Cabinet
- King County, WA
- Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority
- ProRail, Netherlands
- Town of Concrete, WA
- Triangle Transit Authority, NC
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers – worldwide
- U.S. Department of State, Washington DC
- United States Border Water Commission – nationwide
- University of Hawaii, LTAP
- Utah Department of Transportation
- Valley Transportation Authority, CA
- Washington Department of Transportation
- Yakima County, WA

## Value Engineering – Projects/Facilities

The RHA team has expertise in facilitating value engineering workshops for public and private sector clients including extensive experience with Arizona government agencies as well as other federal, state, and local government departments throughout the nation. Our ability to provide excellent services is based on these varied experiences in the public sector for engineering, architecture and construction. Participant evaluations of our workshops indicate that our knowledge of the industry brings credibility to the workshop and increases its success.

Additionally, we have gained extensive experience in Alternative Delivery Methods including Design/Build, Construction Manager at Risk and Job Order Contracting.

### Value Engineering (Projects/Facilities) Workshops

Our workshops are led by team leaders who are certified in the SAVE International® value methodology with extensive experience in the public works industry. This extensive experience brings credibility to our workshops and better overall workshop results. One other key factor in our philosophy as team leaders is for the people involved in the workshops to learn about the value methodology and to actually enjoy themselves during the workshops so that future workshops are something they want to participate in, not because they were told to attend.

Our CVS® team leaders are fully prepared to lead each effort including all of the details required to ensure that each workshop is well organized. We shall draw upon our strong organizational and communication skills to fully communicate the expectations of the workshop to the invited participants: this can include making all meeting arrangements, providing all materials, including pre-study materials, conducting the workshops and providing draft and final reports. RHA completes a Team Primer for every study to all participants which explains the project and the expectations of the subject matter experts and provides the details for the workshop.

Another important role for the CVS® team leaders is quality outcomes. The results of the studies will most likely influence the outcome of the project. In recognition of the importance and influence of the study outcomes, RHA has identified several principles to reduce sensitivity, while ensuring quality-based defensible recommendations. These principles include:

- In any evaluation, choices must be principally based on quantified criteria that are readily apparent to all.
- The team will at all times respect the project schedule and budget when recommending revisions that may influence the status of the project.
- Our internal QC process will ensure quality services and deliverables are consistently provided for the duration of the project.



## Value Engineering – Procedures/Operational Processes

Process studies require a dynamic and flexible approach. Although the value methodology is applied, the use of the various steps and the ability to change and flow with the needs of the study and the team is imperative for success. RHA and their team leaders have completed numerous studies for government agencies and we have continually shown that we are able to meet the needs of the process and the team, regardless of the structure that was developed at the beginning of the process study. The fluid nature of a process requires the same approach when studying and trying to improve or change a process. Process improvement studies can put a number of strains on the study team, we provide the ability for them to provide input, express their concerns and feel that they are truly a part of the process improvement team. Our team leaders pride themselves in their efforts to engage the study team members and get their “buy in” to moving forward.

### Value Engineering (Procedures/Operational Processes) Workshops

Each process study is undertaken using the SAVE International® value methodology and in accordance with those standards and procedures as identified by the owner. As an example, the team leader would meet with the owner to map their current process and variations to the typical process and the agency or division/department involved in each step. Along with the process, the timeline would be established for the current process. This also identifies who controls which items of the process. After the current process is defined, the group is facilitated to define the current process in terms of what must be accomplished, what is the function. In the workshop setting, using the value methodology, the group then brainstorms other ways to accomplish and/or improve the functions. The brainstormed list is combined and pared down to the best of the ideas and further developed to validate the merit of the concept. Each alternative is defined in terms of improvement of schedule and staff effort to implement. The results of the workshop are documented in a report similar to a project study report. Once the report has been reviewed a follow-up meeting is conducted to make decisions of which alternatives will be implemented or partially implemented to improve the process. RHA will then work with the process sponsor to identify the next “implementation” steps and how we can help to accomplish success.

## Risk Analysis

Risk analysis is a very important aspect to the success of an overall project development and delivery program. RHA began integrating risk into their value engineering workshops and discussions after being involved in construction over the past 23 years. We have continually had to deal with issues in construction with large impacts to cost and schedule that could have easily been mitigated or eliminated during the design process.

Risk management is an important and critical element to the project delivery cycle. Risk can usually be divided into the following three categories:

- Political –this can be defined as communities, permitting, board priorities, , tenants, approvals, media, internal project team issues (i.e. not knowing who is really in charge).
- Technical – this is the most common related to design and construction projects and can be represented by requirements, technology, data, design, construction, maintenance, operations and life cycle cost.
- Contractual – this is most commonly related to funding, negotiations, scope of work, qualification requirements, certification requirements, incentives, penalties and defaults.

RHA relates the risk management approach to risk assessment and risk mitigation. Risk assessment is a qualitative approach to identifying risk. This includes both the upside and the downside of risk, together with evaluating the likelihood and potential impact. Risk mitigation, the most critical step in the process, is a creative thought process to develop alternatives while capitalizing on the “opportunity” risks and minimizing the likelihood and potential impact of “threat” risks.

### Risk Analysis Workshops

RHA has been leading teams for all types of technical workshops including risk analysis, scoping, construction, design, planning and value engineering. Risk workshops will help to bring together the affected stakeholders to identify risks on a project. Specific types of Port projects might include; tenant impacts, environmental, ingress and egress, utilities, oil and fuel, rail, hazardous materials, labor/unions, mariners, etc. This, along with many of the traditional impacts that we often see in design and construction projects such as scope, schedule, budget, phasing, and constructability.



## ATTACHMENT I – General Qualifications

**ANNUAL REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE NO:  
ADSP016-00005912**

**STATE PROCUREMENT OFFICE  
Department of Administration  
100 North 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 201  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007**

Once the risks have been identified, we will work with the team to quantify the impacts of the risk. This includes Probability, Risk Occurrence or Severity, Cost and Schedule impacts. We will work with the Port to document this information in a Risk Matrix or Registry. This will allow the project manager to document the identified risks as well as future risks on the project. It will be important to work with the project manager to develop a management plan on how to manage the risk on the project. It will be our responsibility to work closely with the project manager to aid them in these elements.

## Life Cycle Cost Analysis

Life Cycle Cost Analysis (LCCA) is a critical element in the course of credibly evaluating alternatives to improve a design. Facility owners and operators are continually challenged to control and reduce operating costs, while designers frequently face capital cost and funding limitations. Consequently, when alternatives are considered, the total cost impact on the project must be weighed. Judging alternatives based solely on initial construction cost impacts overlooks potential high maintenance and operational costs, and frequently results in simple cost cutting as opposed to meaningful value improvement.

As alternative proposals are developed, all costs associated with the alternatives, including initial and life cycle costs, are documented. Life cycle costs include operations and maintenance (O&M), reinvestment cycles or required upgrades/updates) are calculated using the discount rate provided by the client and the life-cycle time horizon (or lifetime) specified by the client, or from a standard resource such as R.S. Means. The resulting present value cost permits comparisons among the proposals by removing the timing differences for the investments.

## Partnering

The litigious nature of the construction industry has created a need for a better way to do business. A means to “put the handshake back in construction.” The mission of RHA is to be a part of the solution. Through the Partnering process, exciting results and great successes are being achieved.

RHA has facilitated over 900 workshops throughout the nation. We provide all services needed to design, implement and evaluate a Partnering program. The firm can assist with a comprehensive program from start-up to closeout. Our services include:

- Program design and evaluation
- Facilitation of Partnering workshops
- Materials for Partnering programs
- Comprehensive workshop reports
- Turn-key meeting arrangements
- Follow-up meeting facilitation
- Team building

RHA provides neutral, third-party facilitation services for Partnering and Team Building workshops. This provides non-biased workshop leaders with no vested interest in the outcome of the project. Their interest is the positive affect of Partnering on the project.

Our third-party facilitation provides a structured, yet informal and “safe” environment in which all team members are encouraged to actively participate. It is natural and necessary for the “details” of the project to surface during the workshop. We use the project elements to help the teams focus on the effect of the Partnering process on the specific project at hand. The facilitator’s role is to ensure that the workshop stays on track, balancing the need for issue resolution and the development of a team approach.

RHA’s Partnering programs are tailored to each project. We try and avoid the traditional lecture format and provide a variety of participatory exercises to ensure involvement and communication among the participants. Our facilitators encourage a high-energy, enjoyable experience that results in a strong “team” foundation and the tools to maintain the process throughout the project.

## Partnering Workshops

- Initial Workshops – These focus on the project at hand, including issues, goals, problem solving, and effective conflict management.
- Turn-around Workshops – When project teams need to refocus their efforts on effective issue resolution, conflict management and improving communication.



## ATTACHMENT I – General Qualifications

**ANNUAL REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE NO:  
ADSP016-00005912**

**STATE PROCUREMENT OFFICE  
Department of Administration  
100 North 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 201  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007**

- Maintenance Workshops – These short workshops help to keep teams and projects on track by allowing teams to discuss both the positives and negative aspects of the project and focus on maintaining a strong team.
- Facilitated Issue Resolution – Very specific facilitated sessions focusing on project issues and coming to resolution.
- Close-out Workshops – Designed to help finalize the end of the project, discuss construction and design challenges and helps to focus on improving future projects.

## Training

---

RHA affords great flexibility in providing various types of training to support our clients. This includes trainers and subject matter experts and support for interview training, RFQ/RFP development, risk analysis, life cycle costing, manual development, value analysis, team development, communication, issue resolution, leadership, negotiation, facilitation, effective meetings and partnering.

The RHA approach is to provide training that ensures the participants are highly motivated and excited about the courses. We believe it is necessary to apply adult-learning techniques to that training to ensure involvement, excitement and ensure that the attendees truly embrace the course content. This is done through experienced and motivated trainers and trainers that bring a wealth of experience with numerous agencies throughout the nation. The trainers and subject matter experts that we employ have the required personality and skill set to provide effective training along with an enjoyable atmosphere. This helps attendees learn and more widely embrace using the skills developed. One of the very important elements in training is the issue of consistency in the training. We ensure that the programs delivered maintain the same consistency regardless of the trainer assigned.

RHA takes great pride in our continuing efforts to improve our program based on feedback from the workshop attendees and discussions with owners. We want to continue to provide the best possible services to our clients.

### Training Workshops

Specific approaches to training must address the changes that occur within the industry and for owners. RHA works closely with client/owner staff to stay abreast of the various changes and challenges. RHA's goal is to bring many different teams together through various training techniques including Affective, Cognitive and Psychomotor Learning Domains. The type of technique is dependent on the needs of the specific course and the individuals who will attend the training. Adult learning is very different and specific techniques are required to address the following:

- Help attendees relate the training to their immediate work and help them reach personal and professional goals.
- Provide opportunities to enjoy speaking to one another, not just listen to the sound of the instructor's voice.
- Understand that they have preferences and prejudices that may not be overcome in a one-shot training.
- Help them to participate and feel like an active part of the learning process.
- Respect them and their abilities during the learning process.
- Include active learning with small group exercises and movement around the room through varied training activities.
- Make information applicable. They will expect to be able to use what they learn immediately.
- Realize that the participants learn at different speeds and through different methods, so ensure that training is flexible.
- Provide them feedback and constructive criticism.
- Provide a strong emphasis on building the person up not tearing them down.
- Ensure that the experience is enjoyable.

As training experts, we know that our success in both the development and delivery of our programs come from implementing all of the above techniques. Our commitment to our clients is to ensure an enjoyable training experience which increases learning retention and enthusiasm in the topic.



ATTACHMENT I – General Qualifications

ANNUAL REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE NO:  
ADSP016-00005912

STATE PROCUREMENT OFFICE  
Department of Administration  
100 North 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 201  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

7. ANNUAL AVERAGE PROFESSIONAL SERVICES REVENUES OF FIRM FOR LAST 3 YEARS

a. Percentage of Total Work Attributable to State, Federal and Municipal Government Work:	100%
b. Percentage of Total Work Attributable to Non-Government Work:	0%

8. AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE. The foregoing is a statement of facts.

*Patrice Miller*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: December 16, 2015  
\_\_\_\_\_

Patrice Miller

Managing Partner

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_