

QIC CMGC / Best Value Focus Group

April 24, 2013

Attending:

- Jay Hosay – Co-Chair Messer
- Allan Cox – Co-Chair Bell & Associates
- Brian Hay Hardaway
- Don Freeman Rentenbach Construction
- Brian Wirth Flintco
- Larry Hart Thomas Miller Partners
- Page Inman Inman-EMJ
- Lisa Namie Fleming Architects
- Alan Robertson Office of the State Architect

1. Discussion on Preconstruction Fees continued from the previous meeting.
2. Preconstruction fees currently being proposed do not correspond to the level of preconstruction services the project requires/deserves and that the clients are willing to pay. It was suggested that the State could state in the RFP the preconstruction fee amount that will be paid for the specific project and include it on the Cost Proposal form. This way the preconstruction fee, a professional service fee, is not “bid” and becomes the same for all competitors. Options to establish the preconstruction fee include creating a schedule table, or establishing a percentage fee based upon the project’s cost and design phase at which the CM will become involved.
3. It is apparent that many times during the cost proposal evaluation portion of the selection process evaluators only look at the bottom line. This is done with no regard to whether all costs items requested are included, if staffing levels are included at the levels that match the percentage of staff involvement as presented in the qualifications section. Examples such as not including bond costs, only having the Project Manager at half time in the cost proposal and full time in the qualifications, etc. Having an independent third party advisor from the construction community familiar with the state procurement process to assist the review committee who identifies these inconsistencies would allow the review committee the opportunity to contact the responding company for clarification.
4. The decision was made to continue the preconstruction fee conversation.
5. Discussion regarding evaluator competency. While it is recognized representatives from the institution for whom the project is being designed and constructed should be involved in the CM/GC selection process, we don't agree with random users being placed on the evaluation team, professors, administrators, etc. Evaluators should be familiar with the specific requirements of the project, have some understanding of the design and construction process and then go through a briefing conducted by the SPA, architect, and the independent advisor, on the specifics they should be looking for during their evaluations prior to beginning their actual evaluations.

6. There was discussion that current RFP's do not take into consideration proposer's being local versus those that are not. There didn't seem to be anyone against the idea including some factor for local preference. If such criteria is added to future RFP's then it needs to be defined and disclosed to the proposers.
7. Discussions regarding streamlining the RFP/RFQ process. Lisa Namie provided comments for the group's consideration. See attachment. Other comments include be more specific to the project in the questions being asked such as if the project has a concrete frame, does it require specialized acoustic construction, does it require experience with deep foundations in close proximity to existing structures that remain in operation – project specific criteria. Typical SPA RFQ's ask the same generic questions in Section A - Qualifications each time. The State should consider requesting this information from potential CM/GC's once or twice a year and file it in a location accessible to all SPA's for review as necessary during their evaluation process. CM/GC's would be responsible to provide updates if they occur between State requested updates. Same is true for Section C – Technical Approach. This will be discussed further at the next full QIC meeting.
8. Alan advised the group that the State will soon begin to review, update, and possibly otherwise revise the contract document forms and other related documents utilized by the State to procure design and construction related services on all State Building Commission approved projects. Members of the committee look forward to participating in this process and already have specific items which need review.
9. There wasn't enough time to begin discussion on CM/GC fees.

Lisa Namie

Allan – my comments are based on the TN Tech dorm RFP in 2007. I did not see the amount of available points for each category so I will have to follow up on that with a more recent RFP scoring process I observed. This format is slightly different from the 3 rfps' that I have previously seen. My thoughts on the points will be along the line that some items are more heavily weighted than others and I disagree with some of the max points.

Here are some comments:

1. Pre-proposal conferences should be mandatory for all potential bidders
2. Pre-proposal conferences should be at user site, not in Nashville.
3. The entire RFP submittal should be condensed/streamlined as I think most of them are reviewed in one sitting which would take hours if given proper review. I guess streamlining is what this process is all about.
4. Designer should be more involved in the process. At one time, we were - so I don't know what happened. A designer must have leaked some confidential info is my guess. And I never could understand why the designer was not privy to the General conditions cost submitted by CM/GC. We only saw A, B, and C technical sections.
5. There needs to be scoring guidelines for evaluators. I have seen final scores all over the page, so evaluators should be prepped. Selection of evaluators is another topic, right?

Section A of TN Tech:

6. I think this section should be formatted so that everyone's response is shortened and looks about the same. some of these are Yes/No questions which could require a box to be checked. some can be answered in 1 -2 sentences. The less paragraph type text for evaluators, the easier it will be to read and evaluate. Attachments can always be referenced, if needed.
7. Subcategories – I don't like them. too many for scoring. More should be grouped together. Ex. B.2.c.1 too much. Speaking of.....
8. B.2.c1 and 2. – this is a really important criteria for the designer. We want to see some continuity carried from precon to construction. I don't recall this getting a high value in terms of scoring. I don't think evaluators know how to score this. what are they looking for?
9. B.3 – I have seen a variety of responses to this question from listing architects and engineers to mpe subs. This needs to be clarified. I always get questions on this one.
10. B.4.b – contractors have a dilemma here – should they put down all of their work and not get the job because they are too busy or act like they aren't busy and hope the state interprets that positively. I get calls on this too. keep in mind, I can't answer any of them – they have to go thru TBR.

11. B.4.c – is a contractor penalized for not having ever done work with the state? How does one get that first job is this is scored high?
12. C.2 – a lot of categories, Look at C.2.d and e – it is asking for anywhere from 4-6 or more items. Request should be more structured.. this is where one could get a lot of info or very little in the response.

When I return to office next Monday, I will look at the CM/GC rfp that I am more familiar with. I think I have notes on the pages written after the last scoring event.

I am not sure if this is what you are looking for, but if not save it for a rainy day. It will come. I did not realize that there was not one consistent rfp format for the CM/GC process. The TN tech one I think is more abbreviated than what I am familiar with.

I personally think that if we are going to improve the CM/GC rfp process , it is going to take the subcommittee a separate meeting to sit down together and sort thru this. every question can lead to some serious discussion of its value and consequences. There is a lot of material here and we just want to make sure it is a fair process for all.