

**ADDENDUM NO. 2
TO THE
REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS**

for

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR ARCHITECTURAL/CIVIL DESIGN

PUBLIC WORKS OPERATIONS FACILITY

May 8, 2026

This addendum includes question/answers and clarifications submitted by vendors regarding requirements of the RFQ. Please see information below. This addendum is provided for the benefit of all prospective respondents.

Questions/Answers:

Under the “Summary of Qualifications, Experience, and Availability” section, Bullet #3, can you provide more clarity of what you are looking for under the term “percentage of work”?

The intent is to identify the approximate percentage of the overall project work anticipated to be performed or supported by each office location identified by the consultant team.

Under the “Summary of Qualifications, Experience, and Availability” section, Bullet #4, by “manpower” do you mean the number of employees at the office location that will be completing the work?

The intent is to identify the staffing resources available at the office location(s) proposed to support the project (e.g., number of employees, engineers, architects, planners, technical staff, or other relevant personnel resources).

Under “Experience with Similar Projects” section: Bullet #1, you ask for “scope and fee of consulting services provided.” Are you looking for the full design team total fee number plus a list of disciplines (i.e. architectural, structural, geotech, etc.) that were covered by that fee? Or something else?

The intent is to identify the consulting fee associated with the services provided and the scope of work performed by the consultant team. Respondents may describe the scope of services provided and/or identify the disciplines included within the consulting services (e.g., architectural, structural, geotechnical, civil, mechanical, electrical, etc.).

Under “Experience with Similar Projects” section: Bullet #3 asks for “specialty areas addressed and sub-consultant involvement.” Are we to provide a list of our current proposed project team consultants that *also* provided specialty services on one or more of our selected (5) projects? Or are “specialty areas” and “sub-consultant involvement” meant to be two different lists?

Bullet #3 is intended to identify any specialty technical services involved with the referenced project(s) (e.g., traffic, structural, sustainability, geotechnical, permitting, etc.), as well as any sub-consultants that participated and their respective role(s) on the project. This may be provided together as part of the project description and does not need to be separated into two independent lists.

Page 5 states 20 pages maximum then states 12 pages maximum later in the paragraph. Could you confirm the maximum page count?

This item was clarified and corrected in Addendum No. 1. The maximum page count for the Statement of Qualifications is 20 pages plus two 11x17 exhibits.

Page 6 Experience with Similar Projects section, 3rd bullet, asked for contact info for a knowledgeable owner representative. Then Page 7 asks for list of professional references. Is it acceptable if these contacts are exactly the same in both sections?

Yes. The same contacts may be used for both the knowledgeable owner representative and professional references sections, if applicable.

The newly acquired project property (14.4 acres) is not within the city limits. Will the property be annexed into the City as a part of this project? Or, will the City annex the property themselves?

The property has already been annexed into the City.

If annexed, will the City extend necessary public utilities to the project site? Will extension of these utilities be a part of this project?

The City currently has water infrastructure available within the NE 232nd Avenue corridor. Sewer service will require extension to the project site. Any utility improvements or extensions necessary to support the project are anticipated to be included as part of this project.

The answer to question #1 above effects the permitting approach. Are we permitting through the City or the County?

The project will be permitted through the City.

Is the Weakley Road relocation part of this scope or will that be done by others?

The potential relocation of Weakley Road is currently conceptual. If pursued, it is anticipated that the relocation would be included as part of this project scope.

The RFQ only lists a topographic survey requirement. Are Meets and Bounds, Legal Description, Right-of-Ways, easements, etc. also required as part of phase 1's initial conceptual design effort?

The RFQ specifically identifies topographic survey services as part of the initial conceptual design effort. Additional survey-related services may be discussed further during project scoping. The City is open to consultant recommendations regarding whether these services would be beneficial during Phase 1 or after a preferred alternative has been selected.

What are your expectations for Geotechnical Engineering during this initial phase (soil bearing capacities in the intended building pad locations, infiltration testing for stormwater, pavement assemblies (light and heavy), other)?

Geotechnical engineering needs during the initial phase may be discussed further during project scoping. The City is open to consultant recommendations regarding what level of geotechnical investigation is appropriate during Phase 1 versus after a preferred alternative has been selected.

How much outreach to the three residential neighbors from the A|E team is expected or will this be handled by you and your team?

The adjacent residents have already been contacted and are aware of the proposed project. The City anticipates that the consultant team may assist with providing technical information, exhibits, or other project-related materials to support public involvement efforts as needed. The City anticipates leading and handling the majority of the public involvement and outreach associated with the project.

Are resumes included in the 20 page count limit?

This item was clarified in Addendum No. 1. Resumes may be submitted separately and will not count toward the 20-page limit.

Our team was reviewing the SOQ and noticed that electric vehicle charging ports are not mentioned, is this something we should anticipate the city wanting also?

Yes. Per Washington State Building Code requirements, new buildings with associated parking areas are required to include electric vehicle charging infrastructure. The City is also interested in planning for future expansion as more vehicles and equipment transition toward electric technologies.

Additional Attachments:

- 1) Site Tour Sign-In Sheet – May 6, 2026

Site Tour Sign in Sheet
Project #WTR26005 – PSA for Architectural/Civil Design
Public Works Operations Facility
May 6, 2026 (10:30am)

	Name Printed	Company	Email
1	STEVE DACUS	INTERFACE ENGR	stevd@interfaceeng.com
2	ALAN ARMSTRONG	MWA ARCHITECTS	AARMSTRONG@MWAARCHITECTS.CO.M
3	GLEN PAK	GBD ARCHITECTS	glenp@gbdarchitects.com
4	JEREMY FICK	ROBERTSON FICK ENGR.	JEREMY@ROBERTSONFICK.COM
5	MARK AASLAND	PAGE ENGINEERS	MARKA@PAGEENGRS.COM
6	Jason Gillies	Cameron McCarthy Landscape Architects	jgillies@cameronmccartly.com
7	Neil Lee	LeeKA ARCHITECTURE	Succeed@LeeKAinc.com
8	EDMUND TAWIAH	Tee & ASSOCIATES	etawiah@TEEENGR.com
9	Mark Reuland	KPFF	mark.reuland@kpff.com
10	IAN GELBRICH	FFA ARCH. INTERIORS	IGELBRICH@FFADESIGN.COM
11	Amy Winterowd	JE Dunn Construction	amy.winterowd@jedunn.com
12	BRANDON DOLS	NBS)	BDOLS@NBS).UM
13	Charles Swift	X KCA	Charles.Swift@xkca.us
14	MICHAEL STUEVE	ANKROM MORAN	MICHAELS@ANKROMORAN.COM
15	Shellee McCullick	Cumming Group	shellee.mccullick@cumming.com
16	Gemma Egger	Cumming Group	seggere@cumming.com
17	Aidan Katz	Soderstrom Architects	aidank@sdra.com
18	Ryan Sexton	NIS	ryan.sexton@nis-consulting.com

Site Tour Sign in Sheet
Project #WTR26005 – PSA for Architectural/Civil Design
Public Works Operations Facility
May 6, 2026 (10:30am)

	Name Printed	Company	Email
1	Logan Ellingson	Windsor Engineers	lellingson@windsorengineers.com
2	Brandon Watt	Windsor Engineers	Bwatt@windsorengineers.com
3	STEVEN CLARK	INTEGRUS	sclark@integrusarch.com
4	MOLLY JACOBS	INTEGRUS	MJACOBS@INTEGRUSARCH.COM
5	KELLY BONVILLAIN	STANTEC	kalcb.bonvillain@stantec.com
6	SEAN FEENEY	STANTEC	sean.feeneys@stantec.com
7	Scott Emmens	DAVID EVANS & ASSOC., Inc.	jse@dea-inc.com sdh@dea-inc.com
8	KYLE WOMACK	HENNEBERY EPDY ARCHITECTS	kwomack@ henneberyeddy.com
9	Mark Hurley	TCF Architecture	mark@tcfarchitecture.com
10	COREEN VAN ALSDILL	TCF ARCHITECTURE	coreen@tcfarchitecture.com
11	JANNA STACEY	JACOBS	janna.stacey@jacobs.com
12	Alexi Meuwissen	Scott Edwards Arch.	ameuwissen@seallp.com
13	Jeff Dunn	Scott Edwards Arch.	jdunn@seallp.com
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			