ATTACHMENT 4

TO REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) FOR DESIGN BUILD ENTITY

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | PROPOSAL SCORING |
|  |  | New Fort Ord Courthouse  Superior Court of California,  County of Monterey |
|  |  |  |

**PROPOSAL SCORING**

**STEP 1: SCORING OF TECHNICAL PROPOSAL**

The Technical Proposal shall be scored first. The Technical Proposal shall be evaluated for the following factors with maximum scoring as set forth below.

### Preliminary Rendering

MAXIMUM AVAILABLE POINTS **10**

The conceptual rendering demonstrates the Design Build Entity’s understanding of the Project’s programming needs and articulates their vision of concepts and building materials as they relate to the Project’s Target GMP.

**Project Team Organization / Key Personnel**

MAXIMUM AVAILABLE POINTS **40**

Demonstrates experience of the Design Build Entity, and its members, in successful completion of similar size institutional design build projects, preferably working together as a design-build team. Demonstrates clear organization and management responsibility of the team during both Pre-GMP Phase Work and Post-GMP Phase Work. Demonstrates competent qualifications and experience of listed Subcontractors and major Design Consultants. Demonstrates experience and training of the principals and key personnel to be assigned to the Project; personnel experience on similar size institutional design build projects; continuity of Design Build Entity’s proposed staff from Pre-GMP Phase Work through the Completion of the Project. Organization chart for the Project sufficiently identifies roles and responsibilities for each position.

**Approach to the Project**

MAXIMUM AVAILABLE POINTS **35**

Design Build Entity’s proposed Project plan clearly explains the Design Build Entity’s approach to this Project and a clear understanding of the purpose, service, scope, and objectives of this RFP. Design Build Entity clearly conveys its approach in designing to the Target GMP while coordinating with the Court staff for functionality and maintaining consistency with the California Trial Court Facilities Standards. Design Build Entity clearly identifies any innovation techniques that will be incorporated into the Project and their benefit to the Judicial Council. Design Build Entity demonstrates its understanding of the Project risks and identify the team’s approach to proactively manage the design and construction process to mitigate those risks.

**Design & Construction Schedule**

MAXIMUM AVAILABLE POINTS **10**

Design Build Entity’s proposed Project schedule demonstrates the Design Build Entity’s understanding of the overall process and sequencing of activities for this Project. The proposed Contract Schedule identifies the process and anticipated durations for obtaining the required Project approvals. Design Build Entity demonstrates competent schedule management practices, an ability to mitigate delay, and to coordinate with regulatory agencies for approval.

**Target GMP Costs Analysis / Life Cycle Cost Analysis**

MAXIMUM AVAILABLE POINTS **60**

The analysis demonstrates how the Design Build Entity can manage the design and construction of the Project to achieve the overall Target GMP within the constraints of the Performance Criteria Documents. Design Build Entity sufficiently demonstrates how to integrate life cycle costs of products in the design of the Project and to design the Project in an energy efficient manner.

**MAXIMUM POINTS FOR SCORING OF TECHNICAL PROPOSAL: 155**

**STEP 2: SCORING OF PRICE PROPOSAL**

After scoring the Technical Proposal, the Price Proposal shall be evaluated and scored. The Fee Proposal Form and Professional Rate Sheet shall be scored separately as follows.

**Scoring of Fee Proposal Form**

MAXIMUM AVAILABLE POINTS **45**

The costs will be scored by applying a ratio that results in the Fee Proposal with the lowest Total Amount receiving the maximum number of points of **45 points**. The other Fee Proposals shall receive a progressively reduced amount of the maximum available points based on the ratio attributed to that Fee Proposal as set forth the “Example Fee Equation” below.

**EXAMPLE FEE EQUATION**

The worksheet below will be used to calculate the number of points to be assigned to each Fee Proposal. The number of Fee Proposal points to be assigned to a Design Build Entity’s Price Proposal is the number in line 6.

An example is provided for a project receiving two Fee Proposals where the aggregate costs in Fee Proposal A received 45 points and Fee Proposal B received 40 points:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **FEE POINT CALCULATOR** |  | **EXAMPLE FEE PROPOSAL A** | **EXAMPLE FEE PROPOSAL B** |
| Line 1 | Maximum number of cost points |  | 45 | 45 |
| Line 2 | Enter the dollar amount of the lowest Price Proposal |  | $ 2,000,000 | $ 2,000,000 |
| Line 3 | Enter the dollar amount of the Price Proposal you are evaluating |  | $2,000,000 | $ 2,250,000 |
| Line 4 | Divide the number in line 2 by the number in line 3 and enter the resulting number |  | 1.0 | .889 |
| Line 5 | Multiply the number in line 1 by the number in line 4, and enter the resulting number |  | 45 | 40.005 |
| Line 6 | Round the number in line 5 to the nearest whole number and enter that number |  | 45 | 40 |

**Scoring of Professional Billing Rate Sheet**

MAXIMUM AVAILABLE POINTS **5**

The rate sheet will be reviewed by Judicial Council and scoring will be applied as identified below:

Billing rate evaluation and scoring shall be performed on a composite hourly rate of the positions listed. The composite hourly rate will be determined by multiplying the proposed hourly rate for each position by the designated weight factor. The revised personnel rates will be tallied to identify an overall composite rate which will be scored. The lowest composite hourly rate submitted will receive the maximum points available. The points awarded for the remaining fee proposals will be calculated by identifying the ratio of the lowest composite rate proposal to the rate proposal being evaluated and multiplying that ratio by the maximum number of points available. (i.e. rate proposal points for Design Build Entity A = (lowest composite rate/Design Build Entity X composite rate)\*maximum points). Calculations are carried to two decimal points and then rounded to a whole number.

If Design Build Entity utilizes a different job title than listed in the rate sheet, include the rate for the closest-aligned job title. A rate must be provided for each consultant position listed or the Design Build Entity will be at risk of being considered nonresponsive.

*Example Calculation:*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Firm | Proposed Composite Rate | Calculation | Points Awarded |
| A | $185/hr | (185/185)\*(5) = 5 | 5 |
| B | $275/hr | (185/275)\*(5) = 3.36 | 3 |
| C | $198/hr | (185/198)\*(5) = 4.67 | 5 |

**MAXIMUM POINTS FOR SCORING OF PRICE PROPOSAL: 50**

**SCORING OF INTERVIEW**

The purpose of interviews is to evaluate the communication skills of the team and to consider information received during the interview process related to the evaluation criteria identified above. The members of the team shall explain their approach to working in a collaborative Design Build environment with subcontractors, local government, Court staff, Judicial Council staff, and demonstrate the communication skills between members of the Design Build Entity.

**MAXIMUM POINTS FOR SCORING OF INTERVIEW: 20**

**MAXIMUM TOTAL POINTS FOR PROPOSAL: 225**

The Judicial Council shall aggregate the scores for the Technical Proposal, Price Proposal, and interviews to determine the best value score for the Design Build Entity. In the event of a tie for first place in the total score, the Design Build Entity with the highest score in the “Scoring of Price Proposal” will be deemed the highest scoring Design Build Entity.

**SCORING OF DESIGN BUILD ENTITY**

1. **Score for Technical Proposal:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ / **155**

**(Total of (1) through (5) Below)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scoring Category | | Maximum Possible Points | Design Build Entity Points |
| 1. Preliminary Rendering | | **10** |  |
| 1. Project Team Organization / Key Personnel | | **40** |  |
| 1. Approach to the Project | | **35** |  |
| 1. Design & Construction Schedule | | **10** |  |
| 1. Target GMP Analysis | | **60** |  |
| **Total** | **155** |  | |

1. **Scoring of Price Proposal:**  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ / **50**

**(Total of (1) and (2))**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scoring Category | | Maximum Possible Points | Design Build Entity Points |
| 1. Fee Proposal Form | | **45** |  |
| 1. Professional Billing Rate Sheet | | **5** |  |
| **Total** | **50** |  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Maximum Possible Points | Design Build Entity Points |
| **20** |  |

1. **Scoring of Interview:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Maximum Possible Points | Design Build Entity Points |
| **225** |  |

**END OF ATTACHMENT**