



OFFICE OF THE STATE ARCHITECT
STATE BUILDINGS PROGRAM
POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

BEST PRACTICES: DESIGN PROFESSIONALS AND CONSTRUCTION SOLICITATIONS

- This policy is intended to instruct all state agency/institution personnel in the process of selecting professional design and construction services for construction projects in order to conduct fair, open and consistent selection processes throughout the state. Agencies/institutions are encouraged to consult with OSA before solicitation.
 - The Office of the State Architect has participated in a task force with representatives from the design and construction community whose goal was to review the state's construction procurement process and make industry best practice procedural recommendations. Those recommendations have been accepted and incorporated into this policy. It is intended that the task force will meet from time to time to review the process.
-

**REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES
(D/B/B & CM/GC Agreements)**

1. Develop Project Specific Selection Criteria

Standard RFQ prequalification (Step I) and oral interview (Step II) evaluation forms (Appendix A and A1) contain the following general categories:

- 1). PROJECT TEAM
- 2). TEAM CAPABILITIES
- 3). PRIOR EXPERIENCE
- 4). PROJECT APPROACH
- 5). WORK LOCATION

Each category is required and the general selection criteria for qualifications within each category are typically applicable to most projects. However, some projects have unique characteristics for services and expertise and justify modifying the criteria accordingly and agency/institutions are encouraged to do so. A few examples justifying specialized selection criteria might include: unique building types and construction methodologies, advanced technological requirements, complex phasing and scheduling, energy conservation and environmental constraints and historic restoration. (Consult with OSA before solicitation).

NOTE: STANDARD OSA PREQUALIFICATION AND ORAL INTERVIEW FORMS (Appendix A and A1) MUST BE USED FOR ALL EVALUATIONS. The weights need to be provided prior to advertising the solicitation.

2. Selection Criteria Weighting for Qualifications

Selection committees for prequalification (Step I) and oral interviews (Step II) should include a balance of skills and expertise related specifically to the project. Each committee should include and be chaired by the Office of the State Architect/State Buildings Delegate or their designee, technical state personnel experienced in design and construction, program end users and possibly representation from experienced individuals from outside the state system. Committee size should typically be between three to seven individuals with the majority being experienced in design and construction. (Some projects may require greater numbers of individuals depending on the number of programs impacted). All committee member names should remain confidential and an identification number should be assigned to use on all prequalification and oral interview evaluation forms.

3. Selection Committee Expertise and Representation

Selection committees should include a balance of skills and expertise related specifically to the project. Each

committee should include and be chaired by the Office of the State Architect/State Buildings Delegate, technical state personnel experienced in design and construction, program end users and possibly representation from experienced individuals from outside the state system. Committee size should typically be between three to seven individuals with the majority being experienced in design and construction. (Some projects may require greater numbers of individuals depending on the number of programs impacted).

4. Determine Competitive Range for Oral Interview

The agency/institution may determine prior to and include in the RFQ solicitation the competitive range (shortlist) of firms to be invited to the oral interview (Step II) typically 3 to 5. Methodology to determine the number may be based on an established passing score or determined from the spread of overall scores, however, what is published in the RFQ document must be followed. Pass/fail scoring or ranking by total score of prequalification's (Step I) must be determined only by using published criteria and weights as per the RFP document.

5. Selection Committee Evaluations

Committee members are to evaluate and score the strength of each firm's prequalification submittal (Step I) and qualifications during the oral interview (Step II) separately and assign by criteria a numerical rating of 1 to 5 with 5 being the highest rating using whole numbers. Committee members' scores should be consistent whether or not they score high or low across all firms.

6. Conduct Roundtable Discussion after the Oral Interview for Clarifications and Consensus

After the prequalification scoring (Step I) and the last oral interview scoring of qualifications (Step II) the agency/institution should conduct a roundtable discussion with all selection committee members to compare rankings in each selection criteria and adjusted if appropriate. The total scores from each committee member will then be divided by the number of committee members to determine the average score and ranking per step for each firm's qualifications. Do not combine firm's scores from each step.

9. Provide Transparent Feedback

After award of the project, any firm having submitted prequalification's (Step I) or submitted prequalification's and was invited to the oral interviews (Step II), upon request, shall be provided a debriefing meeting by the agency/institution with access to all submittals, scoring and ranking documentation used in the determination of the award.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR INTEGRATED PROJECT DELIVERY (CM/GC, D/B/LS & D/B/GMP Agreements)

1. Develop Project Specific Selection Criteria

Standard RFP prequalification (Step I) and oral interview (Step II) evaluation forms (Appendix A and A1) contain the following general categories:

- 1). QUALIFICATIONS OF THE FIRM
- 2). QUALIFICATIONS OF THE MANAGEMENT TEAM MEMBERS
- 3). PROJECT MANAGEMENT APPROACH
- 4). PRIOR PROJECT EXPERIENCE/SUCCESS
- 5). MISCELLANEOUS

Each category is required and the general selection criteria for qualifications within each category are typically applicable to most projects. However, some projects have unique characteristics for services and expertise and justify modifying the criteria accordingly and agency/institutions are encouraged to do so. A few examples justifying specialized selection criteria might include: unique building types and construction methodologies, advanced technological requirements, complex phasing and scheduling, energy conservation and environmental constraints and historic restoration. **(Prequalification of construction services for Design/Bid/Build project delivery shall follow the same evaluation process as applicable to (Step I) of the RFP process above).**

NOTE: STANDARD OSA PREQUALIFICATION AND ORAL INTERVIEW FORMS (Appendix A and A1) MUST BE USED FOR ALL EVALUATIONS. The weights need to be provided prior to advertising the solicitation.

2. Selection Criteria Weighting for Qualifications and Cost

The RFP's have been modified to use a standard 70-30 numerical split between qualifications and cost for oral interview evaluations (Step II). (Refer to #4 for prequalification (Step I) evaluation). The highest score for oral interview qualifications on the evaluation form is to receive 70 points and the other team scores are to be determined as a percentage of the 70 points. Agency/institutions should carefully assign weights using whole numbers to all criteria on prequalification and oral interview evaluation forms for inclusion into the RFP solicitation and prior to evaluations. It is beneficial to the process if competing firms know the importance of each selection criteria by numerical weight prior to preparing prequalification submittals and for oral interviews. (An 80-20 split between oral interview qualifications and cost could be considered for highly complex or unique projects. (Consult with OSA before solicitation).

3. Selection Committee Expertise and Representation

Selection committees for prequalification (Step I) and oral interviews (Step II) should include a balance of skills and expertise related specifically to the project. Each committee should include and be chaired by the Office of the State Architect/State Buildings Delegate or their designee, technical state personnel experienced in design and construction, program end users and possibly representation from experienced individuals from outside the state system. Committee size should typically be between three to seven individuals with the majority being experienced in design and construction. (Some projects may require greater numbers of individuals depending on the number of programs impacted). All committee member names should remain confidential and an identification number should be assigned to use on all prequalification and oral interview evaluation forms. **(Prequalification of construction services for Design/Bid/Build project delivery shall follow the same evaluation process as applicable to (Step I) of the RFP process above).**

4. Determine Competitive Range for Oral Interview

a). The agency/institution may determine prior to and include in the RFP solicitation the competitive range (shortlist) of firms to be invited to the oral interview (Step II) typically 3 to 5. Methodology to determine the number may be based on an established passing score or determined from the spread of overall scores, however, what is published in the RFP document must be followed. Pass/fail scoring or ranking by total score of prequalification's (Step I) must be determined only by using published criteria and weights as per the RFP document. **(Prequalification of construction services for Design/Bid/Build project delivery shall follow the same evaluation process as applicable (Step I) of the RFP process above).**

b). If oral interview is included for prequalification final evaluations in addition to scoring prequalification submittals (Step I), the agency/institution must also employ the standard prequalification evaluation form with weights and include in the RFP document. Pass/Fail determinations without scoring are no longer acceptable. **(Prequalification of construction services for Design/Bid/Build project delivery shall follow the same evaluation process as applicable to (Step I) of the RFP process above).**

5. Selection Committee Evaluations

Committee members are to evaluate and score the strength of each firm's prequalification submittal (Step I) and qualifications during the oral interview (Step II) separately and assign by criteria a numerical rating of 1 to 5 with 5 being the highest rating using whole numbers. Committee members' scores should be consistent whether or not they score high or low across all firms. **(Prequalification of construction services for Design/Bid/Build project delivery shall follow the same evaluation process as applicable to (Step I) of the RFP process above).**

6. Conduct Roundtable for Clarifications and Consensus

After the prequalification scoring (Step I) and the last oral interview scoring of qualifications (Step II) the agency/institution should conduct a roundtable discussion with all selection committee members to compare rankings in each selection criteria and adjusted if appropriate. The total scores from each committee member will

then be divided by the number of committee members to determine the average score and ranking per step for each firm's qualifications. Do not combine firm's scores from each step. **(Prequalification of construction services for Design/Bid/Build project delivery shall follow the same evaluation process as applicable to (Step I) of the RFP process above).**

7. Keep Cost Proposals Confidential until the Oral Interview Scoring is Complete

The "Cost Proposals" are to be submitted at the oral interview and shall not be opened until all scoring for all oral interviews have been completed. The oral interview total score or average score for each firm should not be changed after the Cost Proposals are opened. The average score is to be combined with each firm's cost proposal to determine the highest scoring firm being ranked the most qualified.

8. Analyze all Cost Proposal Numbers

a). The agency/institution should analyze the cost proposals and note if there are wide variations and or if one firm is significantly lower than the rest. A significantly lower cost proposal could mean the firm will be providing significantly fewer hours to design and manage the project. (This assumes equally qualified firms have somewhat the same personnel cost structure and "like" firms are competing for the same talent in the market place). Consider requesting quantifiable backup such as man hours and hourly rates to understand what is driving significant differences. **(Also applicable to the Design/Bid/Build selection process).**

b). The agency/institution should verify that all firms used the advertised construction schedule for the pricing of the "Cost Proposal." Be aware of the consequences associated with changing the advertised assumptions. Allowing respondents to use a shorter schedule may be unrealistic, since the design, building systems, bid package requirements, phasing, and other project unique factors have not been finalized for the project. A firm's use of an accelerated short schedule could negatively affect the architect/engineer and their services. Agency/institutions may consider firms that alter the construction schedule Non-responsive. **(Also applicable to the Design/Bid/Build selection process).**

c). For Design/Build Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) Services proposals the Design/Build Entity's Architect/Engineers' Fee should include all Architect/Engineers' design services and fees for all Design Service Phases, Construction Administration Phase, Post Construction Phase (if applicable) and the Not- To- Exceed reimbursable expenses of the Architect/ Engineers. None of these Architect/Engineer Fees nor any portion of these fees are to be included in the Cost of Construction Work. This would provide compliance with State Contract form SC-9.0 and assure the proposals are evaluated (apples to apples) and scored correctly. The Exhibit A - Designated Services and Method of Payment should indicate all design services to be included in the Architect/ Engineer Basic Services Fee rather than in the cost of construction work.

d). If after reviewing all requested information the agency/institution determines that a prospective firm has not demonstrated the ability to meet the Standards of Responsibility (Procurement Code R-24-103-401-02) necessary to indicate the capability to meet all contractual requirements, the contract shall not be awarded and a written determination of Non-responsibility shall be issued. (Consult with OSA before issuing determination). **(Also applicable to the Design/Bid/Build selection process).**

9. Provide Transparent Feedback

After award of the project any firm having submitted prequalification's (Step I) or submitted prequalification's and was invited to the oral interviews and submitted a sealed cost proposal (Step II), upon request, shall be provided a debriefing meeting by the agency/institution with access to all submittals, scoring and ranking documentation used in the determination of the award.