STATE OF COLORADO

OFFICE OF THE STATE ARCHITECT

STATE BUILDINGS PROGRAM

APPENDIX A1: PREQUALIFICATION SUBMITTAL EVALUATION FORM

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

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

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

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

RFQ REFERENCE MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS Y \_\_\_\_ N \_\_\_\_

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

Acknowledgment and Attestation included: Y \_\_\_\_ N \_\_\_\_

INSTRUCTIONS:

1. Criteria: Agencies/Institutions are encouraged to include additional criteria that reflect unique characteristics of the project under each category to help determine the submitter’s overall qualifications.
2. Weights: Agency/Institutions to assign weights, using whole numbers, to all criteria on evaluation forms for inclusion into RFQ document and prior to evaluations.
3. Ratings: Evaluator to assess the strength of each firms qualifications and assign a numerical rating of 1 to 5 using whole numbers
4. Rating: 0 = Not provided, 1 = Unacceptable, 2 = Poor, 3 = Fair, 4 = Good, 5 = Excellent
5. Total Score: Includes the sum of all criteria.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| * + - 1. PROJECT TEAM | Weight | | X | | Rating | = | | Score | |
| * + Qualifications and Relevant individual experience |  | | x | |  | = | |  | |
| * + Unique knowledge of key team members |  | | X | |  | = | |  | |
| * + Experience on projects as a team |  | | X | |  | = | |  | |
| * + Key staff involvement in project management and on-site presence |  | | X | |  | = | |  | |
| * + Time commitment of key staff |  | | X | |  | = | |  | |
| * + Qualifications and relevant subconsultant experience |  | | X | |  | = | |  | |
| 1. FIRM/TEAM CAPABILITIES | Weight | | X | | Rating | = | | Score | |
| * Are the lines of authority and coordination clearly defined? |  | | X | |  | = | |  | |
| * Are essential management functions identified? |  | | X | |  | = | |  | |
| * Are the functions effectively integrated? (e.g., subconsultants’ role delineated)? |  | | X | |  | = | |  | |
| * Current and projected work load. |  | | X | |  | = | |  | |
| 1. PRIOR EXPERIENCE | Weight | | X | | Rating | = | | Score | |
| * Experience of key staff and firm with projects of similar scope and complexity | |  | | X |  | | = | |  |
| * Demonstrated success on past projects of similar scope and complexity | |  | | X |  | | = | |  |
| * References | |  | | X |  | | = | |  |
| 1. PROJECT APPROACH | Weight | | X | | Rating | = | | Score | |
| * Budget Methodology / Cost Control |  | | X | |  | = | |  | |
| * Quality Control Methodology |  | | X | |  | = | |  | |
| * Schedule |  | | X | |  | = | |  | |
| 1. EQUITY, DIVERSIY AND INCLUSION | Weight | | X | | Rating | = | | Score | |
| * Incentives and promotion of diverse individuals |  | | X | |  | = | |  | |
| * Partnering with SDVOSB or other disadvantaged businesses |  | | X | |  | = | |  | |
| 1. WORK LOCATION | Weight | | X | | Rating | = | | Score | |
| * Location of prime and subconsultants |  | | X | |  | = | |  | |
| * Familiarity with project area |  | | X | |  | = | |  | |
| * Knowledge of local labor and material markets |  | | X | |  | = | |  | |

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

STATE OF COLORADO

OFFICE OF THE STATE ARCHITECT

STATE BUILDINGS PROGRAM

APPENDIX A2: ORAL INTERVIEW EVALUATION FORM

INSTRUCTIONS/EXAMPLE:

1. Criteria: Agencies/Institutions are encouraged to include additional criteria that reflect unique characteristics of the project under each category to help determine the submitter’s overall qualifications.
2. Weights: Agency/Institutions to assign weights, using whole numbers, to all criteria on evaluation forms for inclusion into RFQ document and prior to evaluations.
3. Ratings: Evaluator to assess the strength of each firms qualifications and assign a numerical rating of 0 to 5 with 5 being the highest rating. (Use whole numbers), 0 is missing information.
4. Total Score: Includes the sum of all criteria. Note: a passing score (as a percentage of the total points available) is optional and should be assigned by the agency/institution prior to evaluation.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CRITERIA | Weight | X | Rating | = | Score |
| * 1. PROJECT TEAM |  | x |  | = |  |
| * 1. TEAM CAPABILITIES |  |  |  |  |  |
| * 1. PRIOR EXPERIENCE |  |  |  |  |  |
| * 1. PROJECT APPROACH |  |  |  |  |  |
| * 1. WORK LOCATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL SCORE |  |  |  |  |  |

APPENDIX A3: PREQUALIFICATION AND ORAL INTERVIEW RANKING MATRIX

QUALIFICATION BASED SELECTION

(Use this form to rank and determine the most qualified architectural/engineering/consulting services firm for both the preliminary and interview evaluations.)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FIRM NAME** | **QUALIFICATIONS** | | | | | | **QUALS SCORE** | | **RANK** | | |
|  | **EVAL #1** | **EVAL #2** | **EVAL #3** | **EVAL #4** | **EVAL #5** | **EVAL #6** | |  | |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  | |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  | |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  | |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  | |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  | |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  | |  |