MISC. ORDER NO. 2023 – 32

## In the County Court of Craighead County, Arkansas

In the matter of evaluating and selecting the most qualified Architectural Firm with Engineering services to provide the best service for requested county project.

FILED

MAY 0 4 2023

#### <u>ORDER</u>

COUNTY & PROBATE COURT CLERK

Comes before the County Court of Craighead County, Arkansas, the matter of evaluating and awarding contracts to the best qualified Architectural Firms with engineering services to provide services to Craighead County. Current projects that are being reviewed are utilizing federal State and Local Fiscal Recovery Fund Grant funds to improve HVAC air quality in county facilities located in various areas of the county. Architectural and engineering professionals must be fully familiar with federal law and regulations relevant to projects and expenditures funded by the U.S. Department of Treasury State and Local Fiscal Recovery Fund Program (SLFRF). Other county projects may be forthcoming if funding becomes available. Selected firms shall be licensed to business within the State of Arkansas to provide design, construction observation, and ancillary services, as well as preparation of necessary documents for permitting, biding, review phases of construction, approval of pay schedule, and overall construction process in progress, pursuant to Arkansas Code Annotated 22-9-203 and 2 CFR & 200.321.

Requests for Qualifications for architectural firms with engineering services were advertised in the local newspaper and the County website for two consecutive weeks as required by law. Craighead County received RFQ proposals from architectural firms. A committee of three elected officials met to review RFQ's. The committee met on May 4, 2023, at 10:30 AM to review the RFQ packets received to select the best qualified firm, according to Arkansas codes 19-11-802; 19-11-803; and 19-11-804. After full in-depth discussion and evaluations were completed, the committee selected the best qualified architectural firm for the specified projects.

It is therefore, considered, ordered, and adjudged that the contract for the best qualified architectural firm with engineering services to design construction observation, and ancillary services, as well as preparation of necessary documents for permitting, biding, review phases of construction, approval of pay schedule, and overall construction process in progress and evaluate and design HVAC to improve air quality in various county facilities, and a contract for the best qualified architectural firm be awarded to Brackett Krennerich Architects, 100 E. Huntington Ave, Suite D, Jonesboro, AR 72401.

Dated this \_\_\_\_\_day of May 2023

Approved:

Marvin Day
Craighead County

Craighead County Judge

MBH

AFFP
REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS (RF

# RECEIVED APR 0 5 2023

FROM CRAIGHEAD COUNTY JUDGE'S OFFICE

## Affidavit of Publication

STATE OF AR }
COUNTY OF CRAIGHEAD }

Matthew Smith, being duly sworn, says:

That he is Classified Director of the Jonesboro Sun, a daily newspaper of general circulation, printed and published in Jonesboro, Craighead County, AR; that the publication, a copy of which is attached hereto, was published in the said newspaper on the following dates:

March 28, 2023 April 01, 2023

Publisher's Fee: / \$ 460.20

That said newspaper was regularly issued and circulated on those dates.
SIGNED:

Man Son

Subscribed to and sworn to me this 1st day of April 2023.

Janet Melton, Notary Public 9/6/2032

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS (RFQ)
PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES WITH ENGINEERING SERVICES
PROVIDED

The entire special control of the Season Enterteet to Address the Season Season Annual Annual Control of the Co

Craighead County is requesting Statements of Qualifications from interested and qualified professionals to provide Architectural services with Engineering services provided for various current and future county projects. Current projects that are being reviewed are utilizing U.S. Treasury Coronavirus Local Fiscal Recovery Fund grant to improve HVAC Air Quality in County facilities located in various areas of the county. Interested professionals should ask for the "REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS (RFQ) PACKAGE" and may submit RFQ's according to qualifications package. Architectural professionals must be fully familiar with the federal law and regulations relevant to projects and expenditures funded by the U.s. Department of Treasury Coronavirus Local Fiscal Recovery Fund Program. To be considered, RFQs must be received at the Office of the Craighead County Judge, 511 Union Street, Room 119, Jonesboro, AR 72401 before April 11, 2023, 2:00 p.m. local time. All questions regarding the qualification process should be directed to Al Haines at ahaines@craigheadcounty.org or by telephone at 870.933.4500. Submitting firms shall be licensed to do business within the State of Arkansas to provide design, construction observation, and ancillary services, as well as, preparation of necessary documents

for permitting, bidding, review phases of construction, approval of pay schedule, and overall construction process and progress. Pursuant to Arkansas Code Annotated 22-9-203 and 2 CFR § 200.321, Craighead County encourages all qualified small, minority and women owned business enterprises to bid on and receive contracts for goods, services, and construction. Also, the county encourages the primary firm to consult portions of their contract to qualified small, minority, and women owned business enterprises. Craighead County reserves the right to reject any or all RFQs and to waive irregularities therein, and all parties submitting shall agree that such rejection shall be without liability on the part of Craighead County for any damage or claim brought by any submitting party because of such rejections, nor shall the party submitting seek any recourse of any kind against Craighead County because of such rejections.

RFQ is available to view on the Craighead County website at www.craigheadcounty.org.
Al Haines
Purchasing Agent
Craighead County

00013656 70631562

JANET MELTON
NOTARY PUBLIC -STATE OF ARKANSAS
CRAIGHEAG COUNTY
My Commission Expires 09-06-2032
Commission No. 12389619

Guday Dry

# Form 13 RFQ Evaluation Package (Engineer/Architect) Criteria for Procurement

Α	Specialized Experience and Technical Competence	(40 Points Possible*)
1.	Experience with Project Planning and Start-Up Services	5 Points Maximum
2.	Project Design	5 Points Maximum
3.	Knowledge and Experience with State and Federal Requirements	5 Points Maximum
4.	Experience with Financial Management	5 Points Maximum
5.	Experience with Contract Management	5 Points Maximum
6.	Experience with Competitive Bidding Process	5 Points Maximum
7.	Experience with Construction Management and Observation	5 Points Maximum
8.	Experience with Project Closeout	5 Points Maximum
	TOTAL POINTS SCORED	40 TOTAL Points
Ŀ.	SECTION A	Maximum

<u>B.                                    </u>	Performance	(15 Points Possible*)
1.	Ability to Meet Schedules and Deadlines	5 Points Maximum
2.	Control of Costs	5 Points Maximum
3.	Quality of Work	5 Points Maximum
	TOTAL POINTS SCORED	15 TOTAL Points
	SECTION B	Maximum

<u>C.                                    </u>	Capacity and Capability of Firm to Perform Work	(15 Points Possible*)
1.	Staff to be Assigned	5 Points Maximum
2.	Staff Experience	5 Points Maximum
3.	Staff Time Available	5 Points Maximum
	TOTAL POINTS SCORED	15 TOTAL Points
	SECTION C	Maximum

<u>D.</u>	Proximity to and Familiarity with Project Area	oints Possible*)	
1.	Convenient proximity to project to facilitate sufficient contact.		5 Points
			Maximum
2.	Familiarity with confines of project area.		5 Points
ļ			Maximum
	TOTAL POINTS SCORED		10 TOTAL Points
	SECTION D		Maximum

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	*	
TOTAL POINTS	SECTIONS A THROUGH D	80 POINTS
SCORED	•	

<sup>\*</sup> Numeric amounts are suggested guidance.

#### RFQ Evaluation Package (Engineer/Architect) Rating Guidelines

For a Project Administrator, Architect, Engineer, Surveyor or Lawyer, the following RFQ Rating Guidelines are to be used in evaluating all RFQs received:

#### Score

- Documentation **clearly indicates** that the offeror possesses the knowledge and experience necessary to perform the job.
- Documentation clearly indicates that the offeror does possess the knowledge and experience necessary to perform the job, but there is also evidence of factors that limit the offeror.
- Documentation is **unclear**; it **neither does nor does not** indicate that the offeror has the knowledge and experience necessary to perform the job.
- 2 Documentation is **considerable** that the offeror **does not** possess the knowledge and skills necessary to perform the job.
- Documentation is **clear and convincing** that the offeror **does not** possess the necessary knowledge and experience to perform the job.

#### Specialized Experience and Technical Competence

- The selection committee must evaluate each offeror's response to each area of the criterion "specialized experience and technical competence."
- Next, the selection committee must rate each area of "specialized experience and technical competence" on a scale from 1 to 5 using the rating guideline scale above.
- The rating achieved for each area of "specialized experience and technical competence" must then be placed on each offeror's rating worksheet.
- The selection committee must now document on each scoring sheet why each particular score was given, i.e., explain why one offeror was judged to possess the knowledge and experience necessary to perform the job or explain what evidence exists to justify a judgment that there are factors limiting the offeror's ability to provide the services desired, etc.
- Lastly, the individual areas of "specialized experience and technical competence" must be summed to produce a subtotal.

#### Performance

- The three areas of "performance" will be evaluated in terms of the results of reference checks.
- The selection committee should contact references and check work experience claimed by each offeror in response to the "performance" criterion.
- Next, the selection committee must evaluate the results of these contacts and rate each offeror using the rating scale on the preceding page.
- The rating achieved for each area of "performance" must then be placed on the rating worksheet of each offeror.

- The selection committee must now document on each scoring sheet why each particular score was given, i.e., explain why one offeror was judged to possess the knowledge and experience necessary to perform the job or explain what evidence exists to justify a judgment that there are factors limiting the offeror's ability to provide the services desired, etc.
- Finally, the individual areas of "performance" scores must be summed to obtain the "performance" subtotal.

### Capacity and Capability of Firm to Perform Work

- The selection committee must evaluate each offeror's response to each area of the criterion "capacity and capability of firm to perform work."
- The selection committee must rate each area of "capacity and capability of firm to perform work" on a scale from 1 to 5 using the rating guidelines scale on the preceding page.
- Next, the rating achieved for each area of "capacity and capability of firm to perform work" must be placed on each offeror's rating worksheet.
- The selection committee must now document on each scoring sheet why each particular score was given, i.e., explain why one offeror was judged to possess the knowledge and experience necessary to perform the job or explain what evidence exists to justify a judgment that there are factors limiting the offeror's ability to provide the services desired, etc.
- Lastly, the individual areas of "capacity and capability of firm to perform work" must be summed to obtain the "capacity and capability to perform work" subtotal.

#### Proximity to and Familiarity with Project Area

- The selection committee must evaluate each offeror's response to each area of the criterion "proximity to and familiarity with the project area."
- The selection committee must rate each area of "proximity to and familiarity with the project area" on a scale from 1 to 5 using the rating guidelines scale on the preceding page.
- Next, the rating achieved for each area of "proximity to and familiarity with the project area" must be placed on each offeror's rating worksheet.
- The selection committee must now document on each scoring sheet why each particular score was given, i.e., explain why one offeror was judged to possess the knowledge and experience necessary to perform the job or explain what evidence exists to justify a judgment that there are factors that limit the offeror's ability to provide the services desired, etc.
- Lastly, the individual areas of "proximity to and familiarity with the project area" must be summed to obtain the "proximity to and familiarity with the project area" subtotal.

#### **Total Score**

Sum all category subtotal scores above.

# **RFQ Evaluation Package**

(Engineer/Architect)
Rating Sheet
Brackett-Kreunerich

Name of Offeror:		Bracke	utt- K	veureni	ch
Possible Points:	80	Points A	Awarded:		
A. Specialized Experien	nce and Techr	iical Comp	etence		(40 Points Possible
				Points Possible	Points
1. Experience with Project	_	art-Up Servic by the score give		5	_5
	Lo	rs of	Expe	vience	_
2. Project Design			·	5	A
2. Troject Besign	Justify	v the score giv	ven:		
· ·		•			
					en e
3. Knowledge and Experien	A Second of the Control of the Contr	d Federal Rec the score giv	_	S 5	
4. Experience with Financia	al Management			5	
The Deposition of Will I figures.	*****	the score giv	en:		
· .					
5. Experience with Contract	_	the score give	en:	5	_5

			Points Possible	Points Awarded	
6.	Experience with Competitive Bi	dding Process  Justify the score given:	5	_ 5_	
					The state of the latest and the late
7.	Experience with Construction M	anagement and Observation  Justify the score given:	5	_5	
	- <del></del>				
8	Experience with Project Closeou	t  Justify the score given:	5	<b></b>	
			-	•	
SP	ECIALIZED EXPERIENCE AN	D TECHNICAL COMPET	ENCE SUBTO	TAL <b>38</b>	
	ECIALIZED EXPERIENCE AN	D TECHNICAL COMPET			 e)
		D TECHNICAL COMPET		TAL <b>38</b> Points Possible Points Awarded	<b>e</b> )
В.			(15 Points	Points Possible	<b>e)</b>
В.	Performance	adlines	(15 Points	Points Possible Points Awarded	<b>e</b> )
	Performance  Ability to Meet Schedules and De	adlines	Points Possible 5	Points Possible Points Awarded	<b>e</b> )
В.	Performance  Ability to Meet Schedules and De	adlines	(15 Points	Points Possible Points Awarded	<b>e</b> )

3.	Quality of Work				5 <b>5</b>	
		Justify the score given:				
	PERFORMANCE SUBTOTAL					
J.	Capacity and Capability of	Firm to Perform Wo	ork	(15	Points Possil	ole)
A. J.	a Language (1990) a santa a la caractería de la caractería de la caractería de la caractería de la caractería d		一点 经工作 医多克氏性 化二基二甲磺胺	Points ossible	Points Awarded	
•	Staff to be Assigned	Justify the score given:		5	5_	
***	Cold for the second	-		-		
	Staff Experience	Justify the score given:		5		-
			. * <del>**</del>			
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
•	Staff Time Available	Justify the score given:		.5	4	
					The state of the	

D. Proximity to and Familiar	ity with Pro	ject Area		Points Possib	le)
A STATE OF THE STA			Points Possible	Points Awarded	
Convenient Proximity to Project		afficient Contact e score given:	5	_5	
•					
Familiarity with Confines of Proje		score given:	5		
	•				
ROXIMITY TO AND FAMILIARI	TY WITH PR	OJECT AREA S	UBTOTAL	10	
. 639-2011-2 June 1	ta 10 g um v				
				. •	
				•	
OTAL SCORE ints)			(80	maximum	
	D • 4	<b>D</b> • 4			
Criteria	Points Possible	Points Achieved			
Experience/Competence Subtotal	40	38			
Performance Subtotal	15				
Capacity/Capability Subtotal	15	14			
Proximity/Familiarity Subtotal	10	10			
				s the flavor of the first of the second of t	$\overline{a}$
TAL SCORE	80	75			
•			Ma	noi I	
			•		
I	Form 13 - Page 7 2018				

RFQ Evaluation Package (Engineer/Architect) Procurement Summary Sheet

Non-responsive bid					
Total score	75				
Area proximity and familiarity (5)	01	•			
Capacity and capability to perform (4)	11				
Performanc e	13				
Experience and competence (2)	38				
Offerors (1)	Brackett Krannerich				

Form 13 - Page 8 2018

# Form 13 - I RFQ Evaluation Package (Engineer/Architect) Instructions for Completing the Procurement Summary Sheet

The Grantee shall list each offeror submitting a response to the Grantee's Request for Qualifications (RFQ) in column 1. The offeror achieving the highest total score during the evaluation should be listed first, the second highest score should be listed second, and so on.

The Grantee should list the four (4) general evaluation category scores of specialized experience and technical competence; performance; capacity and capability of firm to perform work; and proximity to and familiarity with project area achieved by each offeror during the RFQ evaluation in columns 2, 3, 4 and 5 respectively. The total score for each offeror should be listed in column 6.

Column 7 is used to indicate incomplete offers and/or non-responsive submittals. If an offeror's response is judged non-responsive, a check should be placed in this column and columns 2 through 6 should be left blank.

Richard Roaps

# Form 13 RFQ Evaluation Package (Engineer/Architect) Criteria for Procurement

A.	Specialized Experience and Technical Competence (40	Points Possible*)
1.	Experience with Project Planning and Start-Up Services	5 Points Maximum
2.	Project Design	5 Points Maximum
3.	Knowledge and Experience with State and Federal Requirements	5 Points Maximum
4.	Experience with Financial Management	5 Points Maximum
5.	Experience with Contract Management	5 Points Maximum
6.	Experience with Competitive Bidding Process	5 Points Maximum
7.	Experience with Construction Management and Observation	5 Points Maximum
8.	Experience with Project Closeout	5 Points Maximum
	TOTAL POINTS SCORED	40 TOTAL Points
<u></u>	SECTION A	Maximum

В.	Performance —	(15 Points Possible*)
1.	Ability to Meet Schedules and Deadlines	5 Points Maximum
2.	Control of Costs	5 Points Maximum
3.	Quality of Work	5 Points Maximum
	TOTAL POINTS SCORED	15 TOTAL Points
	SECTION B	Maximum

<u>C.</u>	Capacity and Capability of Firm to Perform Work	(15 Points Possible*)
1.	Staff to be Assigned	5 Points Maximum
2.	Staff Experience	5 Points Maximum
3.	Staff Time Available	5 Points Maximum
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	TOTAL POINTS SCORED	15 TOTAL Points
	SECTION C	Maximum

<u>D.</u>	Proximity to and Familiarity with Project Area	(10 Points Possible*)
1.	Convenient proximity to project to facilitate sufficient contact.	5 Points
		Maximum
2.	Familiarity with confines of project area.	5 Points
		Maximum
	TOTAL POINTS SCORED	10 TOTAL Points
	SECTION D	Maximum

TOTAL POINTS	SECTIONS A THROUGH D	80 POINTS
SCORED		321115

<sup>\*</sup> Numeric amounts are suggested guidance.

#### RFQ Evaluation Package (Engineer/Architect) Rating Guidelines

For a Project Administrator, Architect, Engineer, Surveyor or Lawyer, the following RFQ Rating Guidelines are to be used in evaluating all RFQs received:

#### Score

- Documentation **clearly indicates** that the offeror possesses the knowledge and experience necessary to perform the job.
- Documentation clearly indicates that the offeror does possess the knowledge and experience necessary to perform the job, but there is also evidence of factors that limit the offeror.
- Documentation is unclear; it neither does not indicate that the offeror has the knowledge and experience necessary to perform the job.
- 2 Documentation is considerable that the offeror does not possess the knowledge and skills necessary to perform the job.
- Documentation is clear and convincing that the offeror does not possess the necessary knowledge and experience to perform the job.

### Specialized Experience and Technical Competence

- The selection committee must evaluate each offeror's response to each area of the criterion "specialized experience and technical competence."
  - Next, the selection committee must rate each area of "specialized experience and technical competence" on a scale from 1 to 5 using the rating guideline scale above.
- The rating achieved for each area of "specialized experience and technical competence" must then be placed on each offeror's rating worksheet.
  - The selection committee must now document on each scoring sheet why each particular score was given, i.e., explain why one offeror was judged to possess the knowledge and experience necessary to perform the job or explain what evidence exists to justify a judgment that there are factors limiting the offeror's ability to provide the services desired, etc.
  - Lastly, the individual areas of "specialized experience and technical competence" must be summed to produce a subtotal.

#### Performance

- The three areas of "performance" will be evaluated in terms of the results of reference checks.
- The selection committee should contact references and check work experience claimed by each offeror in response to the "performance" criterion.
- Next, the selection committee must evaluate the results of these contacts and rate each offeror using the rating scale on the preceding page.
- The rating achieved for each area of "performance" must then be placed on the rating worksheet of each offeror.

- The selection committee must now document on each scoring sheet why each particular score was given, i.e., explain why one offeror was judged to possess the knowledge and experience necessary to perform the job or explain what evidence exists to justify a judgment that there are factors limiting the offeror's ability to provide the services desired, etc.
- Finally, the individual areas of "performance" scores must be summed to obtain the "performance" subtotal.

### Capacity and Capability of Firm to Perform Work

- The selection committee must evaluate each offeror's response to each area of the criterion "capacity and capability of firm to perform work."
- The selection committee must rate each area of "capacity and capability of firm to perform work" on a scale from 1 to 5 using the rating guidelines scale on the preceding page.
- Next, the rating achieved for each area of "capacity and capability of firm to perform work" must be placed on each offeror's rating worksheet.
- The selection committee must now document on each scoring sheet why each particular score was given, i.e., explain why one offeror was judged to possess the knowledge and experience necessary to perform the job or explain what evidence exists to justify a judgment that there are factors limiting the offeror's ability to provide the services desired, etc.
- Lastly, the individual areas of "capacity and capability of firm to perform work" must be summed to obtain the "capacity and capability to perform work" subtotal.

### Proximity to and Familiarity with Project Area

- The selection committee must evaluate each offeror's response to each area of the criterion "proximity to and familiarity with the project area."
- The selection committee must rate each area of "proximity to and familiarity with the project area" on a scale from 1 to 5 using the rating guidelines scale on the preceding page.
  - Next, the rating achieved for each area of "proximity to and familiarity with the project area" must be placed on each offeror's rating worksheet.
- The selection committee must now document on each scoring sheet why each particular score was given, i.e., explain why one offeror was judged to possess the knowledge and experience necessary to perform the job or explain what evidence exists to justify a judgment that there are factors that limit the offeror's ability to provide the services desired, etc.
  - Lastly, the individual areas of "proximity to and familiarity with the project area" must be summed to obtain the "proximity to and familiarity with the project area" subtotal.

#### **Total Score**

• Sum all category subtotal scores above.

Ville linguage et a

# RFQ Evaluation Package (Engineer/Architect)

Name of Offeror: Brackett Krennerich

Possible Points: Points Awarded: A. Specialized Experience and Technical Competence (40 Points Possible) Points Points Possible Awarded Experience with Project Planning and Start-Up Services 5 Justify the score given: Project Design Justify the score given: Knowledge and Experience with State and Federal Requirements 5 Justify the score given: Experience with Financial Management 4. Justify the score given:

5. Experience with Contract Management

Justify the score given:

	Points Possible	Points Awarded
6. Experience with Competitive Bidding Process  Justify the score given:	5	5
7. Experience with Construction Management and Observation  Justify the score given:	5	
8 Experience with Project Closeout  Justify the score given:	5	<u> </u>
SPECIALIZED EXPERIENCE AND TECHNICAL COMPETER	NCE SUBTO	TAL <u>38</u>
B. Performance	(1	5 Points Possible)
	Points Possible	Points Awarded
1. Ability to Meet Schedules and Deadlines  Justify the score given:	5	4
2. Control of Costs	5	
Justify the score given:	3	_7_

Points Points Possible Awarded  I. Staff to be Assigned  Justify the score given:  Staff Experience  Justify the score given:  Staff Time Available  5  4  5  4  5  4  5  5  5  6  5  6  7  8  8  8  8  9  9  9  9  9  9  9  9  9	3. Quality of Work			5
C. Capacity and Capability of Firm to Perform Work  Points Possible Awarder  Staff to be Assigned  Staff Experience  Justify the score given:  Staff Time Available  5  Justify the score given:	. ——	Justify the score given:		
Staff to be Assigned  Staff to be Assigned  Justify the score given:  Staff Experience  Justify the score given:  Staff Time Available  5  4  5  4  5  4  5  5  5  6  5  7  5  6  5  7  7	PERFORMANCE SUBTOT	AL		_/3
Staff to be Assigned  Justify the score given:  Staff Experience  Justify the score given:  Staff Time Available  5  4  Staff Time Available  5  4  Staff Time Available  5  4  Staff Time Available	C. Capacity and Capability	of Firm to Perform Work	(1	5 Points Possible
Staff Time Available  Justify the score given:  5  Justify the score given:	an a colonia d'ilinais ration de l'arche de la			Points Awarded
Staff Time Available  Justify the score given:  5	Staff to be Assigned	Justify the score given:	5	4
Staff Time Available  Justify the score given:  5		7 - 17		
	Staff Experience	Justify the score given:	5	5
Justify the score given:	Staff Time Available	Justify the score given:	.5	_4

D. Proximity to and Familiar	ity with Pro	ject Area	(10 Points Possible)
		"我们的""我们的"的"我们,我们的"这个人"的"我们",我们就没有这个最后的"我们是最后	oints Points ssible Awarded
1 Convenient Proximity to Project		afficient Contact score given:	5 _5
2. Familiarity with Confines of Proj			5 5
	Justify the	score given:	
PROXIMITY TO AND FAMILIARI	TX/XX/TEXT DY	OTECE ADEL CITE	nom 4 x
TOTAL SCORE			(80 maximum
Criteria . Experience/Competence Subtotal	Points Possible 40	Points Achieved	
Performance Subtotal	15	13	
Capacity/Capability Subtotal	15	13	
Proximity/Familiarity Subtotal	10	10	
	10		

Form 13 - Page 7 2018

RFQ Evaluation Package
(Engineer/Architect)
Procurement Summary Sheet

		 7	********	<del></del>		7	 	 7			7			
									Brackett Krennenth		(1)	-		Ulterors
									38	}	(2)	<b>)</b>	competence	Experience
				to Pass And	namen da entren				8	(3)	3		(	Performanc
								2 2	13		(4)			Capacity
	eta disere								10		(5)		proximity and familiarity	Area
									HC		(6)			Total score
·							·				(7)	DIG	responsive	Non-

Form 13 - Page 8 2018

# Form 13 - I RFQ Evaluation Package (Engineer/Architect) Instructions for Completing the Procurement Summary Sheet

The Grantee shall list each offeror submitting a response to the Grantee's Request for Qualifications (RFQ) in column 1. The offeror achieving the highest total score during the evaluation should be listed first, the second highest score should be listed second, and so on.

The Grantee should list the four (4) general evaluation category scores of specialized experience and technical competence; performance; capacity and capability of firm to perform work; and proximity to and familiarity with project area achieved by each offeror during the RFQ evaluation in columns 2, 3, 4 and 5 respectively. The total score for each offeror should be listed in column 6.

Golumn 7 is used to indicate incomplete offers and/or non-responsive submittals. If an offeror's response is judged non-responsive, a check should be placed in this column and columns 2 through 6 should be left blank.

Sherils Borg

# Form 13 RFQ Evaluation Package (Engineer/Architect) Criteria for Procurement

<b>A.</b>	Specialized Experience and Technical Competence (40	Points Possible*)
1.	Experience with Project Planning and Start-Up Services	5 Points Maximum
2.	Project Design	5 Points Maximum
3.	Knowledge and Experience with State and Federal Requirements	5 Points Maximum
4.	Experience with Financial Management	5 Points Maximum
5.	Experience with Contract Management	5 Points Maximum
6.	Experience with Competitive Bidding Process	5 Points Maximum
7.	Experience with Construction Management and Observation	5 Points Maximum
8.	Experience with Project Closeout	5 Points Maximum
	TOTAL POINTS SCORED	40 TOTAL Points
	SECTION A	Maximum

В.		Performance	(15 Points Possible*)
L	1.	Ability to Meet Schedules and Deadlines	5 Points Maximum
	2.	Control of Costs	5 Points Maximum
	3.	Quality of Work	5 Points Maximum
-		TOTAL POINTS SCORED	15 TOTAL Points
L		SECTION B	Maximum

<u>C.                                    </u>	Capacity and Capability of Firm to Perform Work	(15 Points Possible*)
1.	Staff to be Assigned	5 Points Maximum
2.	Staff Experience	5 Points Maximum
3.	Staff Time Available	5 Points Maximum
	TOTAL POINTS SCORED	15 TOTAL Points
	SECTION C	Maximum

<b>D.</b> ]	Proximity to and Familiarity with Project Area	(10 1	Points Possible*)
1.	Convenient proximity to project to facilitate sufficient contact.		5 Points
			Maximum
2.	Familiarity with confines of project area.		5 Points
			Maximum
	TOTAL POINTS SCORED		10 TOTAL Points
<u>L</u>	SECTION D		Maximum

TOTAL POINTS	SECTIONS A THROUGH D	80 POINTS
SCORED		

<sup>\*</sup> Numeric amounts are suggested guidance.

#### RFQ Evaluation Package (Engineer/Architect) Rating Guidelines

For a Project Administrator, Architect, Engineer, Surveyor or Lawyer, the following RFQ Rating Guidelines are to be used in evaluating all RFQs received:

#### Score

- Documentation clearly indicates that the offeror possesses the knowledge and experience necessary to perform the job.
- Documentation clearly indicates that the offeror does possess the knowledge and experience necessary to perform the job, but there is also evidence of factors that limit the offeror.
- Documentation is unclear; it neither does not indicate that the offeror has the knowledge and experience necessary to perform the job.
- 2 Documentation is **considerable** that the offeror **does not** possess the knowledge and skills necessary to perform the job.
- 1 Documentation is clear and convincing that the offeror does not possess the necessary knowledge and experience to perform the job.

### Specialized Experience and Technical Competence

- The selection committee must evaluate each offeror's response to each area of the criterion "specialized experience and technical competence."
- Next, the selection committee must rate each area of "specialized experience and technical competence" on a scale from 1 to 5 using the rating guideline scale above.
- The rating achieved for each area of "specialized experience and technical competence" must then be placed on each offeror's rating worksheet.
  - The selection committee must now document on each scoring sheet why each particular score was given, i.e., explain why one offeror was judged to possess the knowledge and experience necessary to perform the job or explain what evidence exists to justify a judgment that there are factors limiting the offeror's ability to provide the services desired, etc.
  - Lastly, the individual areas of "specialized experience and technical competence" must be summed to produce a subtotal.

#### Performance

- The three areas of "performance" will be evaluated in terms of the results of reference checks.
- The selection committee should contact references and check work experience claimed by each offeror in response to the "performance" criterion.
- Next, the selection committee must evaluate the results of these contacts and rate each offeror using the rating scale on the preceding page.
- The rating achieved for each area of "performance" must then be placed on the rating worksheet of each offeror.

- The selection committee must now document on each scoring sheet why each particular score was given, i.e., explain why one offeror was judged to possess the knowledge and experience necessary to perform the job or explain what evidence exists to justify a judgment that there are factors limiting the offeror's ability to provide the services desired, etc.
- Finally, the individual areas of "performance" scores must be summed to obtain the "performance" subtotal.

## Capacity and Capability of Firm to Perform Work

- The selection committee must evaluate each offeror's response to each area of the criterion "capacity and capability of firm to perform work."
- The selection committee must rate each area of "capacity and capability of firm to perform work" on a scale from 1 to 5 using the rating guidelines scale on the preceding page.
- Next, the rating achieved for each area of "capacity and capability of firm to perform work" must be placed on each offeror's rating worksheet.
- The selection committee must now document on each scoring sheet why each particular score was given, i.e., explain why one offeror was judged to possess the knowledge and experience necessary to perform the job or explain what evidence exists to justify a judgment that there are factors limiting the offeror's ability to provide the services desired, etc.
- Lastly, the individual areas of "capacity and capability of firm to perform work" must be summed to obtain the "capacity and capability to perform work" subtotal.

## Proximity to and Familiarity with Project Area

- The selection committee must evaluate each offeror's response to each area of the criterion "proximity to and familiarity with the project area."
- The selection committee must rate each area of "proximity to and familiarity with the project area" on a scale from 1 to 5 using the rating guidelines scale on the preceding page.
  - Next, the rating achieved for each area of "proximity to and familiarity with the project area" must be placed on each offeror's rating worksheet.
  - The selection committee must now document on each scoring sheet why each particular score was given, i.e., explain why one offeror was judged to possess the knowledge and experience necessary to perform the job or explain what evidence exists to justify a judgment that there are factors that limit the offeror's ability to provide the services desired, etc.
  - Lastly, the individual areas of "proximity to and familiarity with the project area" must be summed to obtain the "proximity to and familiarity with the project area" subtotal.

#### **Total Score**

• Sum all category subtotal scores above.

## RFQ Evaluation Package (Engineer/Architect)

(Engineer/Architect)

Rating Sheet

Name of Offeror:		rennerich	4	
Possible Points:	80	Points Award	ed:	
A. Specialized Ex	xperience and Tech	nical Competence	e	(40 Points Possib)
			Points Possible	Points
1. Experience with	Project Planning and St Justif	tart-Up Services  Sy the score given:	5	4
2. Project Design			5	
A TRANSPORT	Justify	v the score given:		-4
3. Knowledge and I	Experience with State an	d Federal Requireme	ents 5	eL.
y West or		the score given:		
4. Experience with I	Financial Management  Justify	the score given:	5	_5_
5. Experience with C	ontract Management  Justify to	the score given:	5	5

			Points Possible	Points Awarded	: :
6.	Experience with Competitive	Bidding Process  Justify the score given:	5	_2	
				/	
7.	Experience with Construction	Management and Observation  Justify the score given:	5	4	
			in the second se		
					-
8	Experience with Project Close	out  Justify the score given:	5	+	:
بالمراجع المراجع					
SPI	ECIALIZED EXPERIENCE	AND TECHNICAL COMPET	ENCE SUBT	OTAL <u>3</u> 5	
в. І	Performance			15 Points Possible)	)
	de Ar established Anna established		Points Possible	Points Awarded	
1.	Ability to Meet Schedules and I	Deadlines Justify the score given:	5	4	-
	_			• · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
2. (	Control of Costs	Justify the score given:	<b>5</b> ,	4	
			,		

		Points	Points
3. Quality of Work		Possible	Awarded 5
	Tugtify the seems since		4
	Justify the score given:		
			•
PERFORMANCE SUBT	OTAL		12
			·
		ing the second second	
C. Capacity and Capabili	ity of Firm to Perform Wo	rk (: Points	15 Points Possible)  Points
		Possible	Awarded
1. Staff to be Assigned	Justify the score given:	5	4_
Don't have been seen as a second of the seco	sustify the score given.	n agaman dida na na min	en e
			f
2. Staff Experience	Justify the score given:	5	_4_
		- <del>-</del>	
G 2000 A 11.11			
3. Staff Time Available	Justify the score given:	<b>5</b>	4
		•	

CAPACITY AND CAPABILITY OF FIRM TO PERFORM WORK SUBTOTAL

12

D. Proximity to and ramiliar	(10	Points Possible)		
and the state of t			Points Possible	Points Awarded
1 Convenient Proximity to Project		fficient Contact score given:	5	
2. Familiarity with Confines of Proj	ect Area.		5	5
		score given:	-	
PROXIMITY TO AND FAMILIARI	TY WITH PR	OJECT AREA S	UBTOTAL	10
	330,7800 ju		301 - 101 -	
				•
TOTAL COORE				·
TOTAL SCORE points)	•		( 80 )	naximum
Criteria	Points	Points		
2 ± 10 ¼ 4 5 ± 1.	Possible	Achieved		
1. Experience/Competence Subtotal	40	35		
2. Performance Subtotal	15	12		
3. Capacity/Capability Subtotal	15	12		
l. Proximity/Familiarity Subtotal	10	10		
The state of the s				- Karana ana ana

Form 13 - Page 7 2018

RFQ Evaluation Package (Engineer/Architect) Procurement Summary Sheet

	<b>,</b>		<del></del>	<del></del>	 	 	_	 ,		 	ormania.	A	*****
	Non- responsive	(L)											
	Total score	9	69										
	Area proximity and familiarity	(2)	01										
	Capacity and capability		[2]										
	renormanc e	(3)	(2)									Registration .	7
Hyperience	and competence	(2)	35					· -					
Offerors		(1)	Bracket Krennepich										

Form 13 - Page 8 2018

# Form 13 - I RFQ Evaluation Package (Engineer/Architect) Instructions for Completing the Procurement Summary Sheet

The Grantee shall list each offeror submitting a response to the Grantee's Request for Qualifications (RFQ) in column 1. The offeror achieving the highest total score during the evaluation should be listed first, the second highest score should be listed second, and so on.

The Grantee should list the four (4) general evaluation category scores of specialized experience and technical competence; performance; capacity and capability of firm to perform work; and proximity to and familiarity with project area achieved by each offeror during the RFQ evaluation in columns 2, 3, 4 and 5 respectively. The total score for each offeror should be listed in column 6.

Column 7 is used to indicate incomplete offers and/or non-responsive submittals. If an offeror's response is judged non-responsive, a check should be placed in this column and columns 2 through 6 should be left blank.