

PR003965  
Williams Village IIa Residence Hall

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS for  
DESIGN/BUILD SERVICES (D/B)

ADDENDUM No. 2

---

**Date Issued:** March 26, 2009

**Contact:** Thomas E. Goodhew, Facilities Planner  
Phone: (303) 492-0347 / Fax: (303) 492-4082  
Email: Thomas.Goodhew@colorado.edu

**Proposal Due:** April 2, 2009; 4:00pm

---

The following clarifications, additions, deletions, and revisions to the Request for Proposals are hereby made and do become a part of these Contract Documents.

---

It will be the responsibility of Respondents to submit the information contained in this addendum to all their sub-consultants. Acknowledge receipt of all addenda in the space provided on the Proposal Form. Failure to do so may subject the Respondent to disqualification.

---

**Addendum No. 2, dated 03/26/09, consists of 8 pages.**

**CHANGES TO THE DOCUMENTS**

<b>Item Reference</b>	<b>Document Reference</b>	<b>Description of Change</b>
-----------------------	---------------------------	------------------------------

---

	<b>APPENDIX</b>	<b>Evaluation Forms</b>
--	-----------------	-------------------------

---

- |           |  |   |
|-----------|--|---|
| <b>A</b>  | <b>PRELIMINARY SELECTION/EVALUATION FORM<br/>DESIGN / BUILD CONTRACTOR</b>                         | To be replaced in its entirety (see Attachment) |
| <b>A1</b> | <b>ORAL INTERVIEW EVALUATION FORM<br/>DESIGN / BUILD CONTRACTING SERVICES</b>                      | To be replaced in its entirety (see Attachment) |
| <b>A2</b> | <b>TECHNICAL (DESIGN) / COST SELECTION/EVALUATION FORM<br/>DESIGN / BUILD CONTRACTING SERVICES</b> | To be replaced in its entirety (see Attachment) |

**APPENDIX A**

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

Name of Firm: \_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Project: Williams Village Residence Hall IIa – PR003965  
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 Build Experience? Y / N  
\_\_\_\_\_ Bond Letter? Y / N

Acknowledgement and Attestation included:

Y \_\_\_\_ N \_\_\_\_

**SCORE (FIRM'S QUALIFICATIONS):**

Weight<sup>1</sup> x Rating<sup>2</sup> = Score

1. RESOURCES OF FIRM

- |  |          |   |       |   |       |
|--|----------|---|-------|---|-------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Organizational Structure    | <u>1</u> | x | _____ | = | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Line of Authority           | <u>2</u> | x | _____ | = | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Staffing Schedule           | <u>1</u> | x | _____ | = | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current workload (assigned) | <u>2</u> | x | _____ | = | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Location/access             | <u>2</u> | x | _____ | = | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Subcontracted services      | <u>1</u> | x | _____ | = | _____ |

2. PROJECT MANAGEMENT APPROACH OF FIRM

- |  |          |   |       |   |       |
|--|----------|---|-------|---|-------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Approach to successful D/B Services | <u>2</u> | x | _____ | = | _____ |
| a. Schedule effectiveness                                    | <u>3</u> | x | _____ | = | _____ |
| b. Quality effectiveness                                     | <u>3</u> | x | _____ | = | _____ |
| c. Cost effectiveness  | <u>3</u> | x | _____ | = | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Self Performed Work                 | <u>2</u> | x | _____ | = | _____ |

**3. PRIOR EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE/REFERENCES OF FIRM**

- Related experience/references \_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_ x \_\_\_ = \_\_\_
  - a. Relevant experience project list
  - b. Projects 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. Claims
  - f. Acceptability
  
- Project #2 \_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_ x \_\_\_ = \_\_\_
  - a. Timeliness
  - b. Budget Considerations
  - c. Quality
  - d. Disruption
  - e. Claims
  - f. Acceptability
  
- Project #3 \_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_ x \_\_\_ = \_\_\_
  - a. Timeliness
  - b. Budget Considerations
  - c. Quality
  - d. Disruption
  - e. Claims
  - f. Acceptability

**5. MISCELLANEOUS**

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

**TOTAL SCORE: 37 x 5 = 185 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 DESIGN / BUILD CONTRACTING SERVICES

Name of Firm: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Name of Project: Williams Village Residence Hall IIa – PR003965  
 Evaluator No: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

### SCORE (PROJECT TEAM QUALIFICATIONS)<sup>1</sup>:

Weight<sup>2</sup> x Rating<sup>3</sup> = Score

#### 1. PROJECT TEAM ORGANIZATION

- Team Structure \_\_\_\_\_ 3 x \_\_\_\_\_ = \_\_\_\_\_
- Job Descriptions/Responsibilities/Locations \_\_\_\_\_ 3 x \_\_\_\_\_ = \_\_\_\_\_
- Staffing Schedule/Current Work Loads \_\_\_\_\_ 3 x \_\_\_\_\_ = \_\_\_\_\_
- Roles/Responsibilities of D-B team as project evolves \_\_\_\_\_ 2 x \_\_\_\_\_ = \_\_\_\_\_

#### 2. PROJECT MANAGEMENT APPROACH OF TEAM

- Approach to successful D/B Services \_\_\_\_\_ 4 x \_\_\_\_\_ = \_\_\_\_\_
  - a. Schedule effectiveness
  - b. Quality effectiveness
  - c. Cost effectiveness
- Self Performed Work \_\_\_\_\_ 2 x \_\_\_\_\_ = \_\_\_\_\_
- Competitively Bid/Subcontracted work \_\_\_\_\_ 2 x \_\_\_\_\_ = \_\_\_\_\_
- Method of procuring subcontractors \_\_\_\_\_ 2 x \_\_\_\_\_ = \_\_\_\_\_
- 'Best Value' and Quality Assurance Programs \_\_\_\_\_ 2 x \_\_\_\_\_ = \_\_\_\_\_

#### 3. PRIOR EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE/REFERENCES OF TEAM

- University and Student Housing experience \_\_\_\_\_ 4 x \_\_\_\_\_ = \_\_\_\_\_
- LEED experience \_\_\_\_\_ 4 x \_\_\_\_\_ = \_\_\_\_\_
- Proposed team experience \_\_\_\_\_ 3 x \_\_\_\_\_ = \_\_\_\_\_
- General experience/references \_\_\_\_\_ 2 x \_\_\_\_\_ = \_\_\_\_\_

#### 5. MISCELLANEOUS

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

**TOTAL SCORE:** 43 x 5 = 215 Max <sub>3</sub>

- 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: Williams Village Residence Hall IIa – PR003965  
Evaluator No: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

---

#### SCORE (TECHNICAL (CONCEPTUAL DESIGN) QUALIFICATIONS)<sup>1</sup>:

Weight<sup>2</sup> x Rating<sup>3</sup> = 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 design guidelines

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 <sub>3</sub>

6. COST PROPOSAL (score based on example below)      = 300 Max <sub>3</sub>

**TOTAL SCORE:**      600 Max <sub>3</sub>

- 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:       $\frac{\$100,000}{\$100,000} \times 300 \text{ points} = \underline{\hspace{2cm}}$  points

Firm B:       $\frac{\$100,000}{\$125,000} \times 300 \text{ points} = \underline{\hspace{2cm}}$  points

Firm C:       $\frac{\$100,000}{\$150,000} \times 300 \text{ points} = \underline{\hspace{2cm}}$  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.

**END OF ADDENDUM #1**