APPENDIX A
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO BOULDER
PRELIMINARY SELECTION/EVALUATION FORM
INTEGRATED PROJECT DELIVERY METHOD UTILIZING
DESIGN / BUILD SERVICES
Name of Firm: 
Name of Project: Baker Residence Hall Renovation – PR006697
Evaluator No: __________________________ Date: __________________________

RFP REFERENCE
MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS Y ____ N ____
If the minimum requirements (including letter from surety) have not been met, specify the reason(s):
Licensed GC? Y / N
Two Design/Build Projects in price range? Y / N
Design and Construction Experience? Y / N
Bond Letter? Y / N
LEED Experience? Y / N

Acknowledgement and Attestation included: Y _____ N _____

SCORE (FIRM’S QUALIFICATIONS):

Weight¹ x Rating² = Score

1. RESOURCES OF FIRM
   - Organizational Structure 
     - Line of Authority 
     - Staffing Assignments & Current Workload (assigned)
     - Location, Staff & their expertise 
     - Subcontracted services

2. PROJECT MANAGEMENT APPROACH OF FIRM
   - Integrated Design approach 
   - Approach to successful D/B Services
   - Schedule effectiveness
   - Quality effectiveness
   - Cost effectiveness
   - Self-Performed Work
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3. PRIOR EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE/REFERENCES OF FIRM

- Related experience/references: ___5____ x ________ = ________
  a. Relevant experience project list
  b. Project’s major members of team worked together
  c. References

4. PROJECT BACKGROUND/SUCCESS OF TEAM MEMBERS

- Project #1: ____2___ x ________ = ________
  a. Timeliness
  b. Budget Considerations
  c. Quality
  d. Disruption
  e. Sustainability
  f. Project context
  g. Claims
  h. Acceptability

- Project #2: ____2___ x ________ = ________
  a. Timeliness
  b. Budget Considerations
  c. Quality
  d. Disruption
  e. Sustainability
  f. Project context
  g. Claims
  h. Acceptability

- Project #3: ____2___ x ________ = ________
  a. Timeliness
  b. Budget Considerations
  c. Quality
  d. Disruption
  e. Sustainability
  f. Project context
  g. Claims
  h. Acceptability

5. MISCELLANEOUS

- Claims/litigation history: ____1___ x ________ = ________
- Apprenticeship Training Program:
  (Optional for Step I Prequalification): ____1___ x ________ = ________
- Current Workload: ____1___ x ________ = ________
- Other (Optional): ____2___ x ________ = ________

TOTAL SCORE: 30 x 5 = 150 Max^3

NOTES: 1. Weights are to be assigned prior to evaluation and are to be consistent on all evaluation forms.
2. Rating: 0.0-1.0 = unacceptable 1.1-2.0 = poor 2.1-3.0 = fair 3.1-4.0 = good 4.1-5.0 = excellent
3. TOTAL SCORE INCLUDES THE SUM TOTAL OF ALL CRITERIA.
APPENDIX A1

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO BOULDER
ORAL INTERVIEW EVALUATION FORM
INTEGRATED PROJECT DELIVERY METHOD UTILIZING
DESIGN / BUILD SERVICES

Name of Firm: ____________________________________________________________
Name of Project: Baker Residence Hall Renovation – PR006697
Evaluator No: ____________________________ Date: ____________________

SCORE (PROJECT TEAM QUALIFICATIONS) ¹:

1. PROJECT TEAM ORGANIZATION

   Team Structure
   ____4____ x ________ = ________
   Job Descriptions/Responsibilities/Locations
   Staffing Schedule/Current Work Loads
   Roles/Responsibilities of D-B team as project evolves
   Landscape/Site design integration

2. D/B PHILOSOPHY AND APPROACH OF TEAM

   Approach to successful D/B Services
   ____5____ x ________ = ________
   a. Schedule effectiveness
   b. Sustainability/LEED
   c. Cost and Quality effectiveness
   d. Integrated Project Delivery methods
   Self-Performed Work
   Competitively Bid/Subcontracted work
   Method of procuring subcontractors
   ‘Best Value’ and Quality Assurance Programs

3. PRIOR EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE/REFERENCES OF TEAM

   University and Student Housing experience
   ____5____ x ________ = ________
   LEED/sustainable design experience
   ____5____ x ________ = ________
   Proposed team experience
   ____3____ x ________ = ________
   General experience/references
   ____2____ x ________ = ________

4. HISTORIC STRUCTURES RENOVATIONS AND RE-USE

   Sensitivity to historic buildings
   ____4____ x ________ = ________
   Understanding of building systems
   Adaptive re-use strategies
   Application of sustainability measures to old buildings

5. PROBLEM SOLVING AND TEAM DYNAMICS

   Clarity of Presentation/Communication
   ____6____ x ________ = ________
   Response to Owner Comments/Clarifications
   Risk identifications and assessment
   Roles/Responsibilities of D-B team as project evolves
6. MISCELLANEOUS

- Craft Labor Capabilities
- Apprenticeship Training Program (Mandatory for Step II Interview)
- Current Workload
- Other

\[ \text{TOTAL SCORE: } 40 \times 5 = 200 \text{ Max}\]

6. COST PROPOSAL (score based on example below)

\[ = 150 \text{ Max}\]

7. Preliminary Qualifications (score from Appendix A)

\[ = 150 \text{ Max}\]

\[ \text{TOTAL SCORE: } 500 \text{ Max}\]

NOTES:
1. Agencies are encouraged to include additional criteria that reflect the unique characteristics of the project under each category to help determine the submitter's overall qualifications.
2. Weights are to be assigned prior to evaluation and are to be consistent on all evaluation forms.
3. Rating: 0.0-1.0 = Unacceptable, 1.1-2.0 = Poor, 2.1-3.0 = Fair, 3.1-4.0 = Good, 4.1-5.0 = Excellent
4. Total score includes the sum total of all criteria. Note: A passing score (as a percentage of the total points available) is to be established prior to evaluation.

EXAMPLE

1. Insert total score from each evaluator's GENERAL QUALIFICATIONS (SUBMITTAL) FORM (A) and INTERVIEW SELECTION/EVALUATION FORM (A1) only. Note: The maximum score for qualifications is 150 points and 200 points is the maximum points available for interviews. Therefore, each firm's score is determined as a percentage of the maximum points available.
2. Add all evaluators' total scores and divide by the number of evaluators to determine the average score for each firm's qualifications.
3. The maximum score for cost proposal is 150 points. Determine score for each firm’s cost proposal with the lowest cost being equivalent to a maximum score of 300 points. To score each cost proposal, use the example formula.

Assume the lowest cost proposal was $100,000.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Firm A:} & \quad \frac{100,000 \times 150}{100,000} = \text{points} \\
\text{Firm B:} & \quad \frac{100,000 \times 150}{125,000} = \text{points} \\
\text{Firm C:} & \quad \frac{100,000 \times 150}{150,000} = \text{points}
\end{align*}
\]

4. Add the average Qualifications score to the Technical (Design) / Cost proposal score to determine the cumulative score.
5. Numerically rank all firms with the highest scoring firm being the most qualified.
APPENDIX B

PROJECT SITE

A map of the area of Baker Hall can be viewed at:

HTTP://WWW.COLORADO.EDU/CAMPUSMAP/MAP.HTML?BLDG=BKER

It is the responsibility of the submitting firm to review the information referenced above and posted on the above web sites. Report any difficulties in accessing the referenced document to

margaret.chiu@colorado.edu
APPENDIX C

PROGRAM PLANS

The Baker Residence Hall Renovation Program Plan can be viewed at:
http://www.colorado.edu/facilitiesmanagement/pdc/construction/documents/CUBakerProgramPlanFinal.pdf

It is the responsibility of the submitting firm to review the information referenced above and posted on the above web sites. Report any difficulties in accessing the referenced document to

margaret.chiu@colorado.edu

APPENDIX D

LOCATION OF MANDATORY PRE-SUBMITTAL MEETING

A map of the area around the Baker Hall can be viewed at:
HTTP://WWW.COLORADO.EDU/CAMPUSMAP/MAP.HTML?BLDG=BKER

Meter parking is indicated in pink.

It is the responsibility of the submitting firm to review the information referenced above and posted on the above web sites. Report any difficulties in accessing the referenced document to

margaret.chiu@colorado.edu