

CONSTRUCTION GOAL: PROVIDE BEST VALUE TO THE OWNER

Best Value Projects Require a Good Team

- Owner, Architect, Contractor
- If you have a good team you will have a good job.
- If you're worried about getting a good contractor make part of the selection process qualification based.

Best Value Projects Require the Best Price

- The best way to get the best price is to bid the job.
 - a) New construction
 - b) Existing, unoccupied construction

Best Value Examples Provided by Competitive Bidding

- Comparison of bid to CM/GC.
- Bid spread on the general conditions.
- Windfall gains from bidding.
- Increased competition from bidding.

EXHIBIT C / EVALUATION CRITERIA

1. Firm Background/Experience: 20% weighting

- 1 / A Firm Profile: Provide an outline of the proposing company, including age / number of years in continuous operation as a general contractor in the pacific northwest, annual gross dollar volume of work placed for last 5 years company-wide and in the educational market, current construction capabilities (types of work in which company specializes, preferred range of job size, etc.) and names of all persons with ownership interest in the company. List primary bank, insurance underwriters, accounting firm, and legal firm references currently used by company; include names and phone numbers.
- 1 / B State whether the company is or has been named as a plaintiff or defendant in any mediation, arbitration, litigation or other legal actions with an owner or client, in the previous 10 years regardless of the outcome of such proceeding. State whether, during its last 10 years, company has made a settlement (without specifying the amount) or been ordered by a court or arbitrator to make a payment to a plaintiff or claimant, or has been found in violation of a regulatory statute which has resulted in fine, disbarment or other action by regulatory agencies. (Note: Information agreed to be kept confidential in any settlement agreement need not be disclosed in proposal).
- 1 / B List and briefly describe a minimum of five school projects with respective client references (names and phone numbers) with whom the firm has worked. References should be able to comment on work similar to that addressed in this RFP. If your project history does not include school projects, list and briefly describe a minimum of five projects of comparable size and complexity to the proposed project.

2. Personnel: 15% weighting

- 2 / A Identify the project manager, project engineer and field superintendent(s) proposed for the project. Provide resumes related to their construction experience with similar projects. List current and anticipated projects for these individuals, with scheduled start and finish dates.
- 2 / B Identify previous projects completed by proposed team.
- 2 / C Provide a staffing plan indicating how the firm will manage and supervise a project of this scope and schedule. Provide sufficient detail to describe the support structure for the project manager, engineer and superintendent.

3. Cost/Schedule/Quality Control: 15% weighting

- 3 / A Describe what project cost and schedule control methodology is intended to be used on this project.
- 3 / B Provide a proposed quality control program for the project.
- 3 / C Identify potential problems, which could affect cost, schedule and / or quality control, and offer comments and advice on how best to solve those problems.

4. Fees and compensation: 50% weighting

- 4 / A Provide a lump sum amount to complete the work in accordance with paragraph 5.1. The lump sum amount shall be provided as a part of the bid form as provided in the contract documents.

- DRAFT -**Table 1: Cost Normalization, As of January 1999**

	Findley ¹¹	Scholls ¹²	Difference
Total Construction Cost	\$7,680,779	\$6,157,023	\$1,523,756
Normalization			
Dewatering Expenses ¹	<\$126,823>		<\$126,823>
Phone/Data Wiring ²	<\$49,640>		<\$49,640>
Design Change - Size Reduction ³	<\$300,000>		<\$300,000>
Design Change - Upper Level	<\$92,000>		<\$92,000>
Flooring System ⁴			
2 nd Floor Access Bridge and Related	<\$15,500>		<\$15,500>
Retaining Wall ⁵			
Offsite Sidewalks ⁶	<\$15,000>		<\$15,000>
Fire Doors ⁷	<\$12,000>		<\$12,000>
Water Treatment Swale and	<\$115,000>		<\$115,000>
Landscaping/Soil Removal ⁸			
Forced Main Sewage System ⁹	<\$67,605>		<\$67,605>
Change Orders ¹⁰	<\$32,457>		<\$32,457>
Subtotal	<\$826,025>		<\$826,025>
CM/GC Fee Associated with Cost			
Adjustments(3.77%)	<\$31,141>		<\$31,141>
Total Normalization Factors	<\$857,166>		<\$857,166>
Normalized Cost	<u>\$6,823,613</u>	<u>\$6,157,023</u>	<u>\$666,590</u>
Percent Difference			<u>11%</u>

Note: The actual cost differences between the schools cannot be finally determined until Scholls is completed, at which time this analysis may need to be updated.

1. There were groundwater issues at Findley requiring dewatering services not required at Scholls.
2. The cost of phone/data wiring was accounted for separately on the Scholls contract.
3. A design change at Scholls reduced the size of the school by approximately 30,000 ft³.
4. A design change at Scholls simplified the flooring system for the single story upper level. The single story upper level at Findley uses a slab on grade design requiring a heavy retaining wall for structural support. At Scholls a framed floor system was used eliminating the need for an 8000 ft² slab, a retaining wall, damp proofing for the slab and wall, and metal decking.
5. The topography at Findley required a 2nd floor access bridge and related retaining wall be built. This was not required at Scholls.
6. The cost of offsite sidewalks is included as part of the Findley scope of work. This scope of work was the responsibility of the general contractor developing the surrounding community at Scholls. Therefore, no offsite sidewalk work was included in the Scholls project cost.
7. The Findley location made use of fire doors that were not required at Scholls due to a jurisdictional code interpretation.
8. The Findley location required substantially more site preparation than Scholls. The dredging of a water treatment swale and its associated soil removal and landscaping added work not required at Scholls.

BID RESULTS

PROJECT: Chemeketa Community College McMinnville TI 03-039
McMinnville, Oregon

DATE: October 7, 2003

Todd Construction, Inc.	\$1,729,000
Brokamp & Jaeger	\$1,747,973
2KG	\$1,750,000
Triplett-Wellman, Inc.	\$1,753,000
O'Brien Construction	\$1,797,799
Darrit Construction Co.	\$1,806,000
Fortis	\$1,807,881
CORP, Inc.	\$1,830,000

BID RESULTS

PROJECT: Evergreen School District – Elementary/Middle School #00020
Vancouver, Washington

DATE: July 18, 2000

Robinson Construction	\$18,650,000
OC America	\$19,629,000
Todd Construction, Inc.	\$20,273,000

BID RESULTS

PROJECT: **New Camas High School** **#01-021**
 Camas, Washington

DATE: **October 3, 2001**

Todd Construction, Inc.	\$29,231,000
Hoffman	\$29,645,000
Deacon	\$29,990,000
Dunn	\$30,370,000
Swinerton	\$31,441,796
Kewitt	\$31,859,000