

APPENDIX A

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO BOULDER
PRELIMINARY SELECTION/EVALUATION FORM
DESIGN / BUILD CONTRACTOR

Name of Firm: _____
Name of Project: Kittredge West and Kittredge Central Residence Halls – PR005711/PR006383
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 ___ 1 ___ x _____ = _____
- Line of Authority ___ 2 ___ x _____ = _____
- Staffing Assignments & Current Workload (assigned) ___ 1 ___ x _____ = _____
- Location, Staff & their expertise ___ 2 ___ x _____ = _____
- Subcontracted services ___ 1 ___ x _____ = _____

2. PROJECT MANAGEMENT APPROACH OF FIRM

- Approach to successful D/B Services ___ 2 ___ x _____ = _____
- Integrated Design approach ___ 3 ___ x _____ = _____
- Schedule effectiveness ___ 3 ___ x _____ = _____
- Quality effectiveness ___ 3 ___ x _____ = _____
- Cost effectiveness ___ 3 ___ x _____ = _____
- Self Performed Work ___ 1 ___ x _____ = _____

3. PRIOR EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE/REFERENCES OF FIRM

- Related experience/references ___ 4 ___ 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. Claims
 - g. Acceptability

- Project #2 ___ 2 ___ x ___ = ___
 - a. Timeliness
 - b. Budget Considerations
 - c. Quality
 - d. Disruption
 - e. Sustainability
 - f. Claims
 - g. Acceptability

- Project #3 ___ 2 ___ x ___ = ___
 - a. Timeliness
 - b. Budget Considerations
 - c. Quality
 - d. Disruption
 - e. Sustainability
 - f. Claims
 - g. Acceptability

5. MISCELLANEOUS

- Claims/litigation history ___ 1 ___ x ___ = ___
- Apprenticeship Training Program ___ 1 ___ x ___ = ___
(Optional for Step I Prequalification)
- Current Workload ___ 1 ___ x ___ = ___
- Other (Optional) ___ 2 ___ x ___ = ___

TOTAL SCORE: 36 x 5 = 180 Max₃

- 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
DESIGN / BUILD CONTRACTING SERVICES

Name of Firm:
Name of Project: Kittredge West and Kittredge Central Residence Halls - PR005711/PR006383
Evaluator No: Date:

SCORE (PROJECT TEAM QUALIFICATIONS) 1:

Weight2 x Rating3 = Score

1. PROJECT TEAM ORGANIZATION

- Team Structure (Weight 3)
Job Descriptions/Responsibilities/Locations (Weight 2)
Staffing Schedule/Current Work Loads (Weight 2)
Roles/Responsibilities of D-B team as project evolves (Weight 2)
Landscape/Site design integration (Weight 3)

2. D/B PHILISOPHY AND APPROACH OF TEAM

- Approach to successful D/B Services (Weight 5)
a. Schedule effectiveness
b. Sustainability/LEED
c. Cost and Quality effectiveness
d. Integrated Project Delivery methods
Self Performed Work (Weight 1)
Competitively Bid/Subcontracted work (Weight 2)
Method of procuring subcontractors (Weight 2)
'Best Value' and Quality Assurance Programs (Weight 2)

3. PRIOR EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE/REFERENCES OF TEAM

- University and Student Housing experience (Weight 4)
LEED experience (Weight 4)
Proposed team experience (Weight 3)
General experience/references (Weight 2)

5. MISCELLANEOUS

- Craft Labor Capabilities (Weight 1)
Apprenticeship Training Program (Mandatory for Step II Interview) (Weight 1)
Current Workload (Weight 2)
Other (Weight 3)

TOTAL SCORE: 44 x 5 = 220 Max 3

- 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.

APPENDIX A1

(This page is intentionally blank)

APPENDIX A2

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO BOULDER
TECHNICAL (DESIGN) / COST SELECTION/EVALUATION FORM
DESIGN / BUILD CONTRACTING SERVICES

Name of Firm: _____
Name of Project: Kittredge West and Kittredge Central Residence Halls – PR005711/PR006383
Evaluator No: _____ Date: _____

SCORE (TECHNICAL (CONCEPTUAL DESIGN) QUALIFICATIONS)¹:

Weight² x Rating³ = Score

1. PROJECT TEAM ORGANIZATION

10 x _____ = _____

- Team Structure
- Clarity of Presentation/Communication
- Response to Owner Comments/Clarifications
- Roles/Responsibilities of D-B team as project evolves

1. PROJECT APPROACH

8 x _____ = _____

- Schedule
 - a. Design Schedule
 - b. Construction Start / phasing / completion date
 - c. Staging / access / parking
- Work plan (equipment, noise, safety)

3. DESIGN PROPOSAL

- Compliance with Program Plan and Technical Criteria
 - a. Room count and unit mix
 - b. Compliance with space requirements
 - c. Completeness and detail
 - d. Compliance with building standards

9 x _____ = _____

- Building Design
 - a. Quality of spaces
 - b. Circulation and design efficiencies
 - c. Organization and security for residents
 - d. Building image and massing
 - d. MEP systems

10 x _____ = _____

- Site Design
 - a. Quality of spaces
 - b. Circulation and design efficiencies
 - c. Organization and security for residents
 - d. Site access
 - e. Parking impacts
 - f. Site utilities

10 x _____ = _____

3. DESIGN ENHANCEMENTS

8 x _____ = _____

- Core program enhancements
- Interior design and finishes
- Exterior finishes
- Site amenities
- General design enhancements
- Schedule enhancements

5. MISCELLANEOUS

5 x _____ = _____

SUB-TOTAL SCORE: 60 x 5 = 300 Max 3

6. COST PROPOSAL (score based on example below)

= 300 Max 3

TOTAL SCORE: 600 Max 3

- 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 400 points and is equivalent to the maximum points available for qualifications. 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. Determine score from each evaluator's TECHNICAL (DESIGN) / COST SELECTION/EVALUATION FORM (A2). Note: The maximum score for design is 300 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.

Scoring of Fees

Firm A: 20 points + $\frac{\$100,000^*}{\$100,000} \times 280$ points = _____ points

Firm B: 10 points + $\frac{\$100,000^*}{\$125,000} \times 280$ points = _____ points

Firm C: 0 points + $\frac{\$100,000^*}{\$150,000} \times 280$ points = _____ points

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 Kittredge Complex can be viewed at:

<HTTP://WWW.COLORADO.EDU/CAMPUSMAP/MAP.HTML?BLDG=KITW>

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

Project Site



APPENDIX C

PROGRAM PLANS

The Kittredge West Residence Hall Renovation Program Plan can be viewed at:

<http://fm.colorado.edu/planning/projects/documents/ProgramPlanfinaldocument01-5-11.pdf>

The Kittredge Central Residence Hall and Commons Program Plan can be viewed at:

<http://fm.colorado.edu/planning/projects/documents/KittredgeProgramPlan4.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 Kittredge Commons can be viewed at:

<http://www.colorado.edu/campusmap/map.html?bldg=KITT>

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