

ATTACHMENT 4
TO RFP FOR DESIGN BUILD ENTITY FIRM

PROPOSAL SCORING

Courts of Appeal, New Sixth Appellate District
Courthouse



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.

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 Design Work and Construction Work. Demonstrates competent qualifications and experience of listed Subcontractors and major Design Consultants. Demonstrates experience and training of the key personnel to be assigned to the Project; personnel experience on similar size institutional design build projects, including experience with the Office of the State Fire Marshal; continuity of Design Build Entity's proposed staff from Design 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 40

Design Build Entity's proposed Project plan clearly explains the Design Build Entity's approach to design and construct of this Project consistent with the Judicial Council's vision and objectives, including Critical Success Factors and the Court's desired aesthetic, and provides a clear understanding of the purpose, service, and scope of this RFP. Design Build Entity clearly conveys its approach in communicating and coordinating with the Judicial Council and Court staff for functionality and maintaining consistency with the Performance Criteria. 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 20

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

Stipulated Sum / Life Cycle Cost Analysis

MAXIMUM AVAILABLE POINTS 15

The analysis demonstrates how the Design Build Entity can manage the design and construction of the Project to maximize the Stipulated Sum 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 an energy efficient Project.

Enhancements

MAXIMUM AVAILABLE POINTS 85

The Performance Criteria identified in the Request for Proposal documents are derived from minimum functional and operational requirements. To obtain the **best value** for the Project, the Proposers are encouraged to include enhancements,

as described in the Request for Proposal, in their Proposals and within the Stipulated Sum. Judicial Council has identified 13 enhancements to the base project scope in this section and has ranked them to identify stakeholder priorities. The Judicial Council also encourages Proposers to develop their own enhancement suggestions for consideration as Design Build Entity Enhancements. All enhancements shall be of high quality, sustainable, durable and of low or no maintenance.

MAXIMUM POINTS FOR SCORING OF TECHNICAL PROPOSAL: 200

STEP 2: SCORING OF PRICE PROPOSAL

After scoring the Technical Proposal, the Price Proposal shall be evaluated and scored. The Proposer Information Form shall be scored on a pass/fail basis. The Addenda Acknowledgement Form shall be scored on a pass/fail basis, subject to Paragraph 2 of the Addenda Acknowledgement Form. The Declaration shall be scored on a pass/fail basis. The Fee Proposal Form and Professional Rate Sheet shall be scored separately as follows.

Scoring of Fee Proposal Form

MAXIMUM AVAILABLE POINTS 15

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 **15 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 15 points and Fee Proposal B received 13 points:

FEE POINT CALCULATOR			EXAMPLE FEE PROPOSAL A	EXAMPLE FEE PROPOSAL B
Line 1	Maximum number of cost points		15	15
Line 2	Enter the “Total Fees” dollar amount of the lowest Fee Proposal		\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000
Line 3	Enter the “Total Fees” dollar amount of the Fee 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		15	13.335
Line 6	Round the number in line 5 to the nearest whole number and enter that number		15	13

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: 20

SCORING OF INTERVIEW

The purpose of interviews is to evaluate the communication skills of the team and for the Proposer to present and confirm information provided in the Proposal related to the evaluation criteria identified above. This may also be an opportunity for the Interview Panel to request clarifications to the Proposer's submitted Proposal. The members of the team shall explain their approach to working in a collaborative Design Build environment amongst the Design Build Entity team and with local government, Court staff, and Judicial Council staff. Refer additionally to the DBE Selection Interview Outline included in the following pages for mandatory presentation topics.

MAXIMUM POINTS FOR SCORING OF INTERVIEW: 20

MAXIMUM TOTAL POINTS FOR PROPOSAL: 240

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

A. Score for Technical Proposal: _____ / 200
 (Total of (1) through (5) Below)

Scoring Category	Maximum Possible Points	Design Build Entity Points
1. Project Team Organization / Key Personnel	40	
2. Approach to the Project	40	
3. Design & Construction Schedule	20	
4. Stipulated Sum/Life Cycle Analysis	15	
5. Enhancements	85	
Total	200	

B. Scoring of Price Proposal: _____ / 50
 (Total of (1) and (2))

Scoring Category	Maximum Possible Points	Design Build Entity Points
1. Fee Proposal Form	15	
2. Professional Billing Rate Sheet	5	
Total	20	

C. Scoring of Interview: _____ / 20

Maximum Possible Points	Design Build Entity Points
20	

D. Total Score: _____ / 240

Maximum Possible Points	Design Build Entity Points
240	

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL EVALUATION SCORESHEET

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL EVALUATION SCORESHEET

Design-Build

New Sixth Appellate District Courthouse

Technical Reviewer: _____ Proposer Name: _____

RFP Attachment 4 - Proposal Scoring

A. Project Team Organization/Key Personnel - 40 Points Maximum

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 Design Phase Work and Construction Phase Work. Demonstrates competent qualifications and experience of listed Subcontractors and major Design Consultants. Demonstrates experience and training of the key personnel to be assigned to the Project; personnel experience on similar size institutional design build projects, including experience with the Office of the State Fire Marshal; continuity of Design Build Entity's proposed staff from Design Phase Work through the Completion of the Project. Organization chart for the Project sufficiently identifies roles and responsibilities for each position.		Max Pts/ Item	Proposer's Score
1	Appropriate staff proposed during each phase of the project. Identify whether positions will be for the duration or phase of the project. Continuity between phases.	5	0
2	Identify key positions within the organization and the role and responsibilities / Org. Chart.	3	0
3	Qualifications of Key Personnel.	5	0
4	Experience of Key Personnel working together on previous projects	2	0
5	Individual experience on institutional projects of similar size, scope, complexity and budget, including experience with the Office of the State Fire Marshal.	5	0
6	Individual experience with design build delivery method.	5	0
7	Identification of how staff will function during each phase of the project.	6	0
8	Qualifications of Subcontractors and Consultants.	5	0
9	Past experience on similar size Design Build projects for the DBE.	4	0
10	Deduction for change in Key Personnel from those specified in SOQ (Not to exceed 8 points)		
Subtotal Points for Project Team Organization and Personnel		40	0

B. Approach to the Project - 40 Points Maximum

Design Build Entity's proposed Project plan clearly explains the Design Build Entity's approach to design and construction of this Project consistent with the Judicial Council's vision and objectives, including Critical Success Factors and the Court's desired aesthetic, and provides a clear understanding of the purpose, service, and scope of this RFP. Design Build Entity clearly conveys its approach in communicating and coordinating with the Judicial Council and Court staff for functionality and maintaining consistency with the Performance Criteria. 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.		Max Pts/ Item	Proposer's Score
1	DBE participation in design, constructability, value engineering, estimating, recommendation of alternative materials and methods, and construction methods to maximize use of the Stipulated Sum.	5	0
2	DBE demonstrated ability to achieve the Judicial Council's vision and desired Court aesthetic through further development of the design of the Project.	10	0
3	Quality control plan / Personnel that will review submittals /Personnel tasked with assuring work complies with submittals / Use of mock-ups / Process to link VE & cost control from preconstruction to construction.	5	0
4	Process for communicating and presenting design schemes, floor plans, exterior, systems and materials to the Court and Judicial Council for approval, including building consensus and documenting decisions.	5	0
5	Specific Innovation techniques to be incorporated into the project to streamline processes to improve the overall project results and maximize the Stipulated Sum and meet the schedule.	10	0
6	Use of a centralized office during design.	2	0
7	Detailed explanation of potential project risks and the process for risk mitigation and keeping project on	2	0

C. Design & Construction Schedule - 20 Points Maximum

Design Build Entity's proposed CPM schedule demonstrates the Design Build Entity's understanding of the overall process and sequencing of activities for this Project. The proposed schedule identifies the process and anticipated durations of the phases of Work and obtaining the required Project approvals. Design Build Entity demonstrates competent schedule management practices, an ability to mitigate delay, and to coordinate with AHJs and regulatory agencies for approval.		Max Pts/ Item	Proposer's Score
1	A CPM schedule that integrates all critical proposed design & construction activities.	6	0
2	Illustrate an understanding of the project scope and Judicial Council processes, required Project approvals, and durations (especially State Fire Marshal review and approval). Coordination of the project phases with critical approval, review and activity links.	8	0
3	Administration of schedule to assure trade contractor compliance. Coordination of trade contractors, schedule and problem resolution.	4	0
4	Current and projected workload of DBE are consistent with and do not conflict with the performance of the Work on the Project.	12	0
Subtotal Points for Schedule Management		20	0

D. Stipulated Sum Cost Analysis / Life Cycle Cost Analysis - 15 Points Maximum

The analysis demonstrates how the Design Build Entity can manage the design and construction of the Project to maximize the Stipulated Sum 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 an energy efficient Project.		Max Pts/ Item	Proposer's Score
1	How will the DBE utilize value engineering proposals and alternate construction methods during the design process to increase quality and maximize the Stipulated Sum? When will they be proposed?	5	0
2	Design Builder's approach to the life cycle of the building and Life Cycle Cost Analysis	10	0
Subtotal Points for Cost Analysis		15	0

E. Enhancements / 85 points Maximum

The Performance Criteria identified in the Request For Proposal documents are derived from minimum functional and operational requirements. To obtain the best value for the Project, the Proposers are encouraged to include enhancements to the Request For Proposal within the Stipulated Sum. Judicial Council has identified 13 enhancements to the base project scope in this section and has ranked them to identify stakeholder priorities. The Judicial Council also encourages Proposers to develop their own enhancement suggestions for consideration as Design Build Entity Enhancements. All enhancements shall be of high quality, sustainable, durable and of low or no maintenance.		Max Pts/ Item	Proposer's Score
1	Sub-Total: Proposer's incorporation of Judicial Council suggested enhancements. (Judicial Council Priority)	60	0
	EH-1; Upgrade Exterior Window Grouping Articulation (1)	9	0
	EH-2; Enhanced Building Exterior Aesthetics and/or Materials (1)	9	0
	EH-3; Upgraded Colonnade and Entablature Materiality (1)	5	0
	EH-4; Upgrade Entrance Sign and Surround Consistent with Colonnade and Entablature (1)	5	0
	EH-5; Additional Security Cameras at 2 nd Floor Private Corridors (2)	4	0
	EH-6; Upgrade Lobby Feature Wall (1)	9	0
	EH-7; Upgrade Service Area Fencing to match adjacent Secure Parking enclosure wall (1)	6	0
	EH-8; Complete the Project earlier than the "Contract Time" (2)	3	0
	EH-9; Provide Basement Secure Parking in lieu of Surface Secure Parking Area (3)	2	0
	EH-10; Upgrade DG pathways at Plaza to an alternative upgraded permeable surface (3)	4	0
	EH-11; Increase LEED certification level from Silver to Gold (3)	1	0
	EH-12; Increase improvement to better than Title 24 energy standards by 20% minimum (3)	1	0
	EH-13; Furnish Extended Warranties and Guarantees for Major Equipment (3)	1	0
2	Proposer's innovative enhancements that benefit the project. [Max. 5 Enhancements]	15	0
3	Life Cycle Cost Analysis for Enhancements	10	0
Subtotal Points for Enhancements		85	0

F. Proposer Interview / 20 points Maximum

The purpose of the Proposer Interview is to evaluate the communication skills of the team and for the Proposer to present and confirm information provided in the Proposal related to the other evaluation criteria. This may also be an opportunity for the Interview Panel to request clarifications to the Proposer's submitted Proposal. The members of the team shall explain their approach to working in a collaborative Design Build environment amongst the Design Build Entity team and with local government, Court staff.

		Max Pts/ Item	Proposer's Score
1	Proposer's approach and unique strategies the team brings to the design and construction to achieve project success.	5	0
2	Proposer's methodology and included enhancements in the Stipulated Sum that contribute to meeting the CSF.	5	0
3	Proposer's schedule approach to complete the project within the "Contract Time."	5	0
4	Presentation approach and team member communication and factors that differentiate this Proposer and staff.	5	0

Subtotal Points for Proposer Interview		20	0
---	--	-----------	----------

Total Technical Proposal & Interview Points / 220 points Maximum

Max Pts	Proposer's Total Score
---------	---------------------------

Total Technical Proposal Points		220	0
--	--	------------	----------

When used as a final scoring summary form:
The undersigned states that this is a true summary of the average technical proposal score based on all scorers worksheets for this proposer.

Signature:

DBE SELECTION INTERVIEW OUTLINE FOR THE NEW SIXTH APPELLATE DISTRICT COURTHOUSE

Notes will be taken during the interview documenting any commitments or clarifications to the proposal. The Design Build Entity will be provided a copy of these interview notes after the interview to confirm accuracy. The interview notes for the selected Design Build Entity will become an Exhibit to the Agreement.

INTRODUCTIONS (5 MINUTES)

DBE EXERCISE (10 MINUTES)

PRESENTATION (40 MINUTES)

Preferred Topics and Order of Presentation

1. Introduction of the proposed staffing for the Project, and qualities that each proposed staff member brings to the team that will lend to the success of this Project.
2. Descriptions by Proposer's staff of their previous successes and difficulties with integration into, and communications with, previous project teams. Willingness to work collaboratively with Judicial Council.
3. Describe the Proposer's general approach to the design and construction. Place special emphasis on the Critical Success Factors (CSF) and the unique design and construction strategies or ideas your team will bring to ensure a successful delivery of the Project.
4. Describe the Proposer's general approach to the design and construction of this Project:
 - Describe the Proposer's approach to designing the facility consistent with the Court and Judicial Council's vision and objectives. Include information that demonstrates the Proposer's relevant design experience, understanding of the project scope, and ability to be responsive to achieving the Court's desired design and aesthetic (Refer to RFP, Attachment 9 Performance Criteria Documents, Chapter 3, Section 3.0 and Chapter 7, Sections 7.1.3 and 7.1.4).
 - Overview of schedule and opinion to complete within the "Contract Time."
5. The factors that differentiate this Proposer from others, i.e. unique qualifications to make the project a success.
6. Overview of the methodology and enhancements included in the Stipulated Sum.

Q&A PERIOD (35 MINUTES)

The Q&A period will be an interactive gathering of information. The DBE should be prepared to clarify information provided in their qualifications/proposal/interview and/or provide additional information regarding items not previously addressed.

END OF ATTACHMENT