STATE OF COLORADO

OFFICE OF THE STATE ARCHITECT

STATE BUILDINGS PROGRAM

APPENDIX A: EVALUATION OF QUALIFICATIONS FORM: INTEGRATED PROJECT DELIVERY

Name of Firm:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Name of Project: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator No:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Date:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

RFP REFERENCE MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS Y \_\_\_\_ N \_\_\_\_

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT AND ATTESTATION INCLUDED: Y \_\_\_\_ N \_\_\_\_

If the minimum requirements have not been met, specify the reason(s): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

INSTRUCTIONS:

1. Weights are to be assigned prior to evaluation and are to be consistent on all evaluation forms.
2. Use only whole numbers.
3. Rating: 0 = not provided, 1 = Unacceptable, 2 = Poor, 3 = Fair, 4 = Good, 5 = Excellent
4. Total score includes the sum total of all criteria.
5. A passing score (as a percentage of the total points available) is to be established by the state prior to evaluation.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| * + - 1. QUALIFICATIONS OF THE FIRM(S) | Weight | X | Rating | = | Score |
| * + Overall qualifications |  | x |  | = |  |
| * + Organizational structure/lines of authority |  | X |  | = |  |
| * + Subcontractor selection and management |  | X |  |  |  |
| * + Colorado workforce |  | X |  |  |  |
| * + Safety/employee support |  | X |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. QUALIFICATIONS OF MANAGEMENT TEAM MEMBERS | Weight | X | Rating | = | Score |
| * Qualifications and relevant experience of superintendent |  | X |  | = |  |
| * Qualifications and relevant experience of in-house staff |  | X |  |  |  |
| * Location/Access |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. PROJECT MANAGEMENT APPROACH | Weight | X | Rating | = | Score |
| * Approach to successful CM/GC Services |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cost Effectiveness |  | X |  | = |  |
| Schedule effectiveness |  | X |  |  |  |
| Quality effectiveness |  | X |  |  |  |
| * Competitively Bid/Self Performed Work |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. PRIOR PROJECT EXPERIENCE/SUCCESS | Weight | X | Rating | = | Score |
| * Project #1 |  | X |  | = |  |
| Timeliness  Disruption  Budget Considerations  Quality  Acceptability/Punchlist  Compliance |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Project #2 |  | X |  | = |  |
| Timeliness  Disruption  Budget Considerations  Quality  Acceptability/Punchlist  Compliance |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Project #3 |  | X |  | = |  |
| Timeliness  Disruption  Budget Considerations  Quality  Acceptability/Punchlist  Compliance |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. EQUITY, DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION | Weight | X | Rating | = | Score |
| * Hiring and Promotion Practices |  | X |  | = |  |
| * Subcontracting Practices |  | X |  | = |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. MISCELLANEOUS | Weight | X | Rating | = | Score |
| * Claims/litigation history |  | X |  | = |  |
| * Apprenticeship Training Program |  | X |  | = |  |
| * Other |  | X |  | = |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

STATE OF COLORADO

OFFICE OF THE STATE ARCHITECT

STATE BUILDINGS PROGRAM

APPENDIX A1: EVALUATION OF QUALIFICATIONS FORM: INTEGRATED PROJECT DELIVERY

Name of Firm:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Name of Project: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator No:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Date:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

INSTRUCTIONS:

1. Weights are to be assigned prior to evaluation and are to be consistent on all evaluation forms.
2. Use only whole numbers.
3. Rating: 0 = not provided, 1 = Unacceptable, 2 = Poor, 3 = Fair, 4 = Good, 5 = Excellent
4. Total score includes the sum total of all criteria.
5. A passing score (as a percentage of the total points available) is to be established by the state prior to evaluation.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| * + - 1. QUALIFICATIONS OF THE FIRM(S) | Weight |  | Rating |  | Score |
|  |  | x |  | = |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. QUALIFICATIONS OF MANAGEMENT TEAM MEMBERS |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | X |  | = |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. PROJECT MANAGEMENT APPROACH |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | X |  | = |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. PRIOR PROJECT EXPERIENCE/SUCCESS |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | X |  | = |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. EQUITY, DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | X |  | = |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. MISCELLANEOUS |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | X |  | = |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

STATE OF COLORADO

OFFICE OF THE STATE ARCHITECT

STATE BUILDINGS PROGRAM

APPENDIX A2: QUALIFICATIONS AND PROPOSAL RANKING MATRIX: INTEGRATED PROJECT DELIVERY

INSTRUCTIONS/EXAMPLE:

1. QUALIFICATIONS Example uses the 60% / Fee 40% split. Optional is to use a (30% / Fee 70% split)
2. Insert total score from each evaluator's SUBMITTAL review.
3. Add all evaluators’ total scores and divide by the number of evaluators to determine the average score for each firm’s qualifications.
4. The maximum score for qualifications on the evaluation form is equivalent to 40 points and is equivalent to the maximum points available for qualifications. Therefore, each firm’s score is determined as a percentage of the maximum points available. To score each average qualification score, use the example formula.
5. Assume the highest score is 600.

Scoring of Qualifications

Firm B: 600 x 40 points = 40 points

600

Firm C: 500 x 40 points = 33.33 points

600

Firm A: 400 x 40 points = 26.66 points

600

1. Determine score for each firm’s sealed proposal with the lowest fee being equivalent to a maximum score of 60 points. To score each proposal, use the example formula.
2. Assume the lowest Proposal was $100,000.

Scoring of Proposals

Firm A: $100,000 x 60 points = 60 points

$100,000

Firm B: $100,000 x 60 points = 48 points

$125,000

Firm C: $100,000 x 60 points = 39.99 points

$150,000

1. Add the average qualification score to the Proposal score to determine cumulative qualifications and fee score.
2. Numerically rank all firms with the highest scoring firm being the most qualified and advantageous to the state.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FIRM** | **QUALIFICATIONS** | | | | | | **AVE.**  **QUALS** | **QUALS SCORE** | **PROPOSAL**  **SCORE** | **QUALS**  **& PROPOSAL SCORE** | **RANK** |
|  | **EVAL #1** | **EVAL #2** | **EVAL #3** | **EVAL #4** | **EVAL #5** | **EVAL #6** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |