

July 1, 2013

Mr. William E. Johnson III
Purchasing City Manager
City of Petersburg, VA
135 North Union Street
Petersburg, VA 23803

Attention: Tangela Innis, CPPB, MBA, VCO, VCA, Purchasing Agent

**Re: PPEA Proposal #13-0041– Rehabilitation of the Poor Creek Pump Station
Force Main**

Dear Mr. Johnson and members of the selection committee:

Versar, Inc. in association with Timmons Group is pleased to provide an update to our previously accepted unsolicited proposal submission, Rehabilitation of the Poor Creek Pump Station Force under PPEA.

We hereby acknowledge the formal Solicitation Requirements released with RECEIPT OF UNSOLICITED PPEA PROPOSAL AND SOLICITATION OF COMPETING PROPOSALS (13-0041) and Addendum #1 Questions and Answers, PPEA # 13-0041 (Addendum #1).

We respectfully request that Volume II of this proposal which contains the Corporate Financial Statements, be considered "Confidential Proprietary Information - Exempt from FOIA Release."

The following Evaluation Criteria for Evaluating Proposals is outlined in the City's Solicitation of Competing Proposals. Versar, Inc. would like to take this opportunity to assure those evaluating our proposal that all applicable Evaluation Criteria has been thoroughly addressed in the proposal. A notation of the applicable proposal section or appendix has been made next to each of the evaluation criteria.

a. Qualifications and Experience

1. Experience with similar projects;
2. Demonstration of ability to perform work;
3. Leadership structure;
4. Project Manager's Experience;
5. Management approach;
6. Financial condition; and
7. Project ownership;

Items 1 through 5: Volume I, Section 1 provides a detailed summary of these evaluation criteria.



VERSAR

6850 Versar Center
Springfield, VA 22151
703.750.3000
www.versar.com

Item 6: Volume II, Appendix D contains Versar's financial statement for period ending July, 1, 2011.

Item 7: Since the project will be owned entirely by the City, a detailed discussion regarding project ownership is not required and therefore has not been provided.

b. Project Characteristics

1. Project definition;
2. Proposed project schedule;
3. Operation of the project;
4. Technology; technical feasibility;
5. Conformity to laws, regulations, and standards;
6. Environmental impacts;
7. Condemnation impacts;
8. State and local permits;
9. Maintenance of the project.

Items 1 and 3 through 9: Volume I, Section 2 and Volume II, Section 2 provide a detailed summary of these evaluation criteria.

Item 2: Volume II Appendix C contains the project schedule. An update to this schedule taking a revised start date into consideration is attached to this letter. Volume II Appendix B contains Versar's detailed price proposal that further addresses Items 1 through 9.

c. Project Financing

1. Cost and cost benefits to the City;
2. Financing and the impact on the debt burden of the City or appropriating body;
3. Financial plan, including the degree to which the proposer has conducted due diligence investigation and analysis of the proposed financial plan and the results of any such inquiries or studies;
4. Opportunity cost assessment;
5. Estimated cost;
6. Life-cycle cost analysis;
7. The identity, credit history, past performance of any third party that will
8. Provide financing for the project the nature and timing of their commitment, as applicable and
9. Such other items as the City deems appropriate.

Items 1, 2 and 5: Volume II, Section 3 and Volume II, Appendix B provides a detailed summary of these evaluation criteria.

Items 3, 4 and 7: Since this project is to be owned and financed by the City in a similar manner to that of a typical utility Capital Improvement Project, a project financing and financial plans have not been prepared. The proposal does outline numerous pricing alternatives for the City to consider thus assuring financial flexibility in successfully implementing this project.

Item 6: Since this project is rehabilitation to an existing force main, significant deviations to the existing alignment were not considered. Additionally, due to the critical condition of the force main, a "do nothing" alternate is not acceptable.

With this in mind, a detailed life-cycle cost analysis has not been prepared. The design does incorporate installation methods that will provide the City with a low initial capital cost and materials that will assure longevity of the piping system that will avoid conditions that currently exist. These factors assure the most favorable operations and maintenance situation to the City and thus a low life-cycle cost.

d. Project Benefit and Compatibility

Factors to be considered in determining the proposed project's compatibility with the appropriate local or regional comprehensive or development plans include:

1. Community benefits;
2. Community support or opposition, or both;
3. Public involvement strategy;
4. Compatibility with existing and planned facilities; and
5. Compatibility with local, regional, and state economic development efforts.

Items 1 and 5: Volume I, Section 4 provides a detailed summary of these evaluation criteria.

e. Other Factors

1. The proposed cost of the qualifying project;
2. The general reputation, industry experience, and financial capacity of the private entity;
3. The proposed design of the qualifying project;
4. The eligibility of the project for accelerated documentation, review, and selection;
5. Local citizen and government comments;
6. Benefits to the public, including financial and nonfinancial;
7. The private entity's compliance with a minority business enterprise participation plan or good faith effort to comply with the goals of such plan;
8. The private entity's plans to employ local contractors and residents;
9. The recommendation of a committee of representatives of members of the City and the appropriating body which may be established to provide advisory oversight for the project; and
10. Other criteria that the City deems appropriate.

Item 1: Volume II, Appendix B contains the detailed price proposal that outlines all project costs and pricing alternatives. The proposal does outline numerous pricing alternatives for the City to consider thus assuring financial flexibility in successfully implementing this project.

Item 2: Volume I, Section 1 and Volume II, Appendix B outline the reputation, experience and financial capacity of the Versar team.

Item 3: Volume II, Section 2 and Volume II, Appendix A contain a Detailed Project Description and Project Design Drawings. The design has been prepared to assure best value to the City and in a manner that permits the project to be implemented without disruption of service.

Item 4: The proposed project schedule outlines steps to be taken to assure a timely implementation of the project.

Items 5 and 6: Volume I, Section 4 addresses these evaluation criteria.

Items 7 and 8: Our team is prepared to engage minority business enterprise subcontractors for various portions of the work which could include Clearing, Hauling or Erosion/Sediment Control. Additionally we will employ the use of local suppliers, subcontractors and residents in order to strengthen the local economy.

Versar, Inc. has enclosed the review fee in the amount of \$10,000, Ten Thousand Dollars.

Versar, Inc. included the \$5,000, Five Thousand Dollars for the submission fee with the original unsolicited proposal submission.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit our qualifications. If you should have any questions, or need any additional information, please do not hesitate to call me at 703.589.0477. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,



Anthony Campbell, PMP, LEED AP
Division Manager

Enclosures:

Revised Project Schedule
2 CDs of Volume I
2 CDs of Volume II – PROPRIETARY AND CONFIDENTIAL