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Qualifications-Based Selection (QBS)

Promoting the Value of Quality First
Objectives

- Provide an overview of Qualifications-Based Selection.
- Understand the QBS process & how to administer the steps.
- Recognize the value & benefits QBS provides to agencies, design professionals & the public.
QBS

**Competitive Procurement Process** used to hire Design Professional Services based on Qualifications.

“Notwithstanding any other provision of law, selection by a state or local agency head for professional services...shall be on the basis of demonstrated competence and on the professional qualifications necessary for the satisfactory performance of the services required.”

Engineering, Land Surveying, Architectural, Construction Project Management & Environmental

First evaluated on qualifications, experience & competence

No consideration for comparing cost of service between submittals
Typical Steps of QBS Process

STEP 1
Agency identifies project & need for professional services.

STEP 2
Request for Qualifications is published.

STEP 3
Statement of Qualifications are received, reviewed & submittals are ranked.

STEP 4
Interviews are conducted with a limited number of the highest ranked firms (typically 3).

STEP 5
Firms are ranked by the agency.

STEP 6
Negotiations begin with the #1 highest ranked firm to settle on a fair & reasonable price for the scope of work. If those negotiations fail, the agency moves on to #2, etc.
QBS | Different than Hiring Contractors

Contractors
- Compete for a specified product.
- Innovation rewarded when means & methods result in lower cost.

Professional Services
- Procuring professional services is unique, not a commodity.
- Factors like experience, innovation & qualifications are key elements that are likely to reduce claims and life-cycle costs.
Professional Services

Cost of professional services relates to *time spent working on the project*.

The quality of professional service impacts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction documents, details &amp; costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential for problems &amp; delays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; project risks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Value is based on the demonstrated competence, experience, background and reputation of the professional(s) who will be doing the work.*
Benefits of QBS

- Addresses Community Priorities
- Cost-Effective
- Client Satisfaction & Trust
## Addresses Community Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safeguards Public Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer construction delays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design for Long-Term Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes Technological Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces infrastructure maintenance costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients collaborate with professionals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cost-Effective

Need to consider all project related costs

1. Construction, maintenance, operation, sustainability
2. Construction claims or delays
3. Design services are key to controlling construction & life-cycle costs
4. Biggest potential for savings/benefits is at the earliest phases of a project (before the project is on a fixed path)

Construction Cost Increases*

- Industry Average 10%
- QBS projects 3%

*Source: An Analysis of Issues Pertaining to Qualifications-Based Selection, 2009
Client Satisfaction & Trust

2009 Study showed 93% of owners surveyed rated the success of final projects as high or very high.

Trust Variable appeared to receive “consistently high scores from the design team” respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level for Six Trust Variables</th>
<th>1- Low to 5- High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evenhanded Negotiations</td>
<td>0% 17% 10% 47% 27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act Opportunistically</td>
<td>23% 43% 13% 20% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Confidence</td>
<td>30% 53% 13% 3% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesitant With Vague Specifications</td>
<td>23% 40% 30% 7% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>3% 0% 17% 40% 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Experience</td>
<td>3% 3% 7% 43% 43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: An Analysis of Issues Pertaining to Qualifications-Based Selection, 2009
Resources

Primers

A Primer on Qualifications-Based Selection Process

QBS is the ideal procurement method for the hiring of qualified design professionals. It is the best process to emphasize public safety and client satisfaction.

What is QBS?
QBS is a competitive procurement process that requires a project owner to first evaluate design professionals’ backgrounds, bid qualifications, and how they will perform the services. After the firms are short-listed, the public agency begins to negotiate a fee and request that the short-listed firms complete a detailed proposal based on the scope of services included in the proposal. This is different than traditional bidding, where the lowest bid is accepted. The number of short-listed firms is dependent on the complexity of the project.

What is the QBS Process?
QBS is required in both federal and California law. It is also considered an “intermediary best practice” by the AIA. To ensure that qualifications are competitive, QBS must have a uniform, step-by-step process to be followed by the soliciting agency.

1. Develop an information request (or RFP) that outlines the requirements of the project.
2. Request bids from the short-listed firms based on the RFP requirements.
3. Evaluate and compare the results of the short-listed firms.
4. Select the firms that best meet the project’s requirements.
5. Award the contract to the selected firm.

Templates

Sample Request for Statement of Qualifications

The statement of qualifications (SOQ) is a document that describes the qualifications of the firm. The SOQ is used to determine if the firm is qualified to perform the project. The SOQ should include the firm’s experience, qualifications, and capabilities.

The proposal may include the following information:

- Description of Firm: Describe the firm’s legal status, name, purpose, location, and other information that would help to characterize the firm. Provide the name of the principal person responsible for the project, as well as the name, address, and contact information of the Project Manager.
- Experience: Describe the projects that the firm has worked on that are similar to the project being requested. Mention the types of projects that the firm has completed, the size of the projects, and the scope of the projects.
- Financial Stability: Provide the financial statement of the firm for the past two years. This information should include the firm’s balance sheet, profit and loss statement, and cash flow statement.
- Personnel: Provide the names and qualifications of the staff who will be involved in the project. Include a list of the key personnel and their roles in the project.
- References: Provide a list of references for the firm. This list should include the names and contact information of previous clients.

- Project Approach: Describe how the firm will approach the project. Include a detailed outline of the steps that will be taken to complete the project. This outline should include the timeline, milestones, and deliverables.

- Contract Management: Describe how the firm will manage the contract. Include a detailed outline of the steps that will be taken to manage the contract. This outline should include the roles and responsibilities of the project manager, the contract administrator, and the contract specialist.

- Project Budget: Provide a detailed budget for the project. Include a breakdown of the costs associated with each phase of the project.

- Project Timeline: Provide a detailed timeline for the project. Include a breakdown of the tasks that need to be completed and the dates that each task is scheduled to be completed.

- Project Risk Management: Describe how the firm will manage project risks. Include a detailed outline of the steps that will be taken to identify and mitigate project risks.

- Project Deliverables: Describe the deliverables that will be produced as a result of the project. Include a detailed outline of the deliverables and the timelines for delivery.

- Other: Include any other information that would be helpful to the client.

Sample Statement of Qualifications

The statement of qualifications is a document that describes the qualifications of the firm. The statement of qualifications should include the following information:

- Firm Information: Provide the name and contact information of the firm.
- Experience: Describe the projects that the firm has worked on that are similar to the project being requested. Mention the types of projects that the firm has completed, the size of the projects, and the scope of the projects.
- Financial Stability: Provide the financial statement of the firm for the past two years. This information should include the firm’s balance sheet, profit and loss statement, and cash flow statement.
- Personnel: Provide the names and qualifications of the staff who will be involved in the project. Include a list of the key personnel and their roles in the project.
- References: Provide a list of references for the firm. This list should include the names and contact information of previous clients.

- Project Approach: Describe how the firm will approach the project. Include a detailed outline of the steps that will be taken to complete the project. This outline should include the timeline, milestones, and deliverables.

- Contract Management: Describe how the firm will manage the contract. Include a detailed outline of the steps that will be taken to manage the contract. This outline should include the roles and responsibilities of the project manager, the contract administrator, and the contract specialist.

- Project Budget: Provide a detailed budget for the project. Include a breakdown of the costs associated with each phase of the project.

- Project Timeline: Provide a detailed timeline for the project. Include a breakdown of the tasks that need to be completed and the dates that each task is scheduled to be completed.

- Project Risk Management: Describe how the firm will manage project risks. Include a detailed outline of the steps that will be taken to identify and mitigate project risks.

- Project Deliverables: Describe the deliverables that will be produced as a result of the project. Include a detailed outline of the deliverables and the timelines for delivery.

- Other: Include any other information that would be helpful to the client.
Support for QBS

“The American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) believes that the selection of Professional Engineers as prime consultants and subcontractors should be based on the qualifications of the engineering firm. Qualifications including education, training, experience, past-performance, capabilities, personnel and workloads should be evaluated when selecting an engineering firm.” (ASCE Policy Statement 304)

“The successful selection of a consultant is the most important decision in a successful project. The process that best utilizes a fair & equitable selection is Qualifications-Based Selection (QBS).”

(APWA Red Book on Qualifications-Based Selection Guidelines)

“It is the policy of the National Society of Professional Engineers (NSPE) that all engineering services should be performed by qualified engineers on the basis of design ability, experience, integrity and judgement. Engineering is a learned profession, requiring of its members sound technical experience, personal ability, education, honesty and integrity.” (NSPE Professional Policy 131)
Statutes

The federal and State laws that guide all public agency procurement of design professionals in California
The Brooks Act

Federal QBS Statutes

- Signed into law October 27, 1972
- Requirement to use federal funding
- 46 states followed federal lead
- “Sec. 902. The Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the Federal Government to publicly announce all requirements for architectural and engineering services, and to negotiate contracts for architectural and engineering services on the basis of demonstrated competence and qualification for the type of professional services required and at fair and reasonable prices.”
- Simplified Acquisition Process
The Little Brooks Act

California QBS Statutes

- Government Code 4526: “Notwithstanding any other provision of law, selection by a state or local agency head for professional services of private architectural, landscape architectural, engineering, environmental, land surveying, or construction project management firms shall be on the basis of demonstrated competence and on the professional qualifications necessary for the satisfactory performance of the services required.”

- Required of State and local agencies

- Selection shall be based on qualifications and demonstrated competence (cost cannot be a factor)

- Step-by-step process mandated in statute

- Caltrans
  - Division of Local Assistance, LAPM Chapter 10
Section 4527(a) sets forth the specific procedures that a state agency must follow in providing notice of an RFP and the criteria for “selection” (as that term is used in Section 4526) of responsive firms. In making the selection, the state agency “shall evaluate current statements of qualifications and performance data on file with the agency, together with those that may be submitted by other firms regarding the proposed project.” Consideration of costs is not authorized.”
QBS Process

- Section 4527(a) authorizes discussions with no less than three firms regarding

- Discussion can include:
  - Anticipated concepts and the relative utility of alternative methods of approach for furnishing the required services

- Agencies then shall select therefrom, in order of preference, based upon criteria established and published by the agency, no less than three of the firms deemed to be the most highly qualified to provide the services required.
Section 4528(a) authorizes selection of the best qualified firm as follows:

(1) ... at compensation which the agency head determines is fair and reasonable to the agency.

(2) Should the agency head be unable to negotiate a satisfactory contract with the firm considered to be the most qualified, at a price the agency head determines to be fair and reasonable ... The agency head shall then undertake negotiations with the second most qualified firm.

(3) Should the agency head be unable to negotiate a satisfactory contract with any of the selected firms, the agency head shall select additional firms in order of their competence and qualifications ...
Local Agencies – “Shall” v. “May”

- Section 4528(b) states “(b) When the selection is by a local agency head, the agency head may undertake the procedures described in subdivision (a).”

- California statutes allow local agencies flexibility to choose the steps they follow to comply with QBS or to follow the State procedure—but cost components cannot be a factor until after the initial selection. (See Section 4526)
▪ Proposition 35 (2000) overruled mandatory use of QBS

▪ Upheld in *Professional Engineers in California Government v. Kempton* decision
  
  ▪ held that Proposition 35 did not impliedly repeal the QBS statutes, which remained in full force and effect
A&E CONTRACTS
QUALIFICATION BASED SELECTION (QBS)
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A&E CONTRACTS
QUALIFICATION BASED SELECTION (QBS)

• Architectural and Engineering (A&E) contracts are used for professional services requiring a particular license, registration, or certification.

• A&E services include, but are not limited to, architectural, landscape architectural, environmental engineering, land surveying, right of way engineering, construction engineering, and construction management and project management services.

• A&E contracts are necessary due to fluctuation in workload and/or specialized work for which Caltrans does not have the necessary staff and/or expertise.

• The authority to contract for A&E services is governed by Article XXII of the California Constitution, and Government Codes 4525 et seq.
A&E CONTRACTS
QUALIFICATION BASED SELECTION (QBS)

• Brooks Act: Architectural-Engineering (A-E) services be publicly announced, and be negotiated on the basis of demonstrated competence and qualifications for the type of professional services required, at fair and reasonable prices.

• The Act established a specific qualification based procurement process to be used in procurements for architectural-engineering services.
A&E CONTRACTS
QUALIFICATION BASED SELECTION (QBS)

- Code of Federal Regulations, Title 23, Part 172
- California Code of Regulations, Title 21, Section 1520.6
- Government Code § 4525-4529 et. seq.
- Caltrans Deputy Directive DD-09-R5, Incompatible Activities and Conflict of Interest
After expiration of the period stated in the announcement prescribed in Section 1520.5, the Director shall evaluate statements of qualifications and performance data that have been submitted to the Department.

Discussions shall be conducted with no less than three firms regarding the required service.

From the firms with which discussions are held, the Director shall select no less than three, in order of preference, based upon the *established criteria, that are deemed to be the most highly qualified to provide the services required.
A&E CONTRACTS
QUALIFICATION BASED SELECTION (QBS)

Trigger for Procurement
60 Days of Look Ahead Report
+ Contract Request Package from District to DPAC

ADVERTISEMENT
3 Business Days (DPAC prepare RFQ)
22 Business Days (30 cd Advertisement)
25 Business Days

SOQ EVALUATION
Panel members evaluate SOQs per established SOQ criteria
5 Business Days

CONSULTANT INTERVIEWS
Panel members evaluate consultant team per established interview criteria
5 Business Days

NEGOTIATION & EXECUTION
(Detailed Below)
40 Business Days

75 Business Days
**A&E CONTRACTS**

**QUALIFICATION BASED SELECTION (QBS)**

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA • DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING (A&E) CONSULTANT EVALUATION FORM**

**INITIAL EVALUATION**

ADM-2027A (NEW 04/2020)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(a) x (b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Experience of the Consultant Contract Manager and availability.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Composition of the proposed team (professional and technical level</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personnel of the prime and subconsultants) to fulfill the requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the Scope of Work in the Request for Qualifications, including</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conflict and availability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Education, experience, and licensing of the key personnel to be</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assigned.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Nature of completed relevant projects.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All relevant experience should include state, federal and local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>projects (Caltrans projects will not be given a higher rate).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Past Performance Data.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Caltrans [Consultant Performance Evaluation Report, ADM-2031 Series], and additional reference checks by Caltrans staff may be used if available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**
## INITIAL EVALUATION

A&E CONTRACTS
QUALIFICATION BASED SELECTION (QBS)

### SUGGESTED SCORING SYSTEM
FOR
A&E CALTRANS CONSULTANT SELECTION COMMITTEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIER</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>• Proposer has <em>exceptional qualifications</em>.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SOQ supports an <em>extremely strong</em> expectation of successful Project performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SOQ indicates significant strengths with few minor weaknesses, if any.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SOQ contains an outstanding level of quality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>• Proposer has <em>strong qualifications</em>.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SOQ supports a <em>very good</em> expectation of successful Project performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SOQ contains a few minor weaknesses that are outweighed by the strengths.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Weaknesses, if any, are very minor and can be readily corrected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>• Proposer has <em>adequate qualifications</em>.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SOQ supports a <em>good</em> expectation of successful Project performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SOQ contains strengths that are balanced by weaknesses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Weaknesses are minor and can be corrected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>• Proposer has <em>limited qualifications</em>.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SOQ supports a <em>fair</em> expectation of successful Project performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There are a significant number of weaknesses and very few strengths.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Weaknesses could adversely affect successful project performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>• Proposer has <em>little or no qualifications</em>.</td>
<td>0 - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SOQ supports a <em>weak</em> expectation of successful Project performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SOQ contains significant weaknesses with very minor strengths, if any.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# A&E CONTRACTS

## QUALIFICATION BASED SELECTION (QBS)

### Architectural & Engineering (A&E) Consultant Evaluation Form

**Presentation and Interview**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>(a) Score (0-10.0)</th>
<th>(b) Weight</th>
<th>(c) = (a) x (b) Weighted Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. TECHNICAL EVALUATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part A: Example Take Home Task Order:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Demonstrated knowledge of the Scope of Work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Identified challenges associated with the Contract.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Responded to Task Order and Contract needs and discussed approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Qualifications and availability of proposed ten (10) employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Demonstrated ability to deliver the Example Task Order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part B: Technical Scenario Questions:</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Consultant’s breadth of technical knowledge and approach to address contract specific technical challenge questions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Closing statement comments regarding Technical Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. INITIAL EVALUATION TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SOQ score -10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SCORE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

[Caltrans Logo]
### SUGGESTED SCORING SYSTEM for A&E CALTRANS CONSULTANT SELECTION COMMITTEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIER</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well Qualified</td>
<td>Exceptional understanding of the scope and challenges associated with the contract. Outstanding comprehension of all key deliverables and exceptional ability to deliver Contract deliverables. Technical Evaluation A (Example Task Order): Exceptional understanding of all the challenges associated with the Example Task Order. Personnel cover all or majority of the required services and secure adequate across the board major classifications. Qualifications exceed Caltrans requirements and have more than adequate availability in the coming one year of the contract. Have direct and similar experience to the requested services. Solid methodological approach to deliver the Example Task Order. Technical Evaluation B (Technical Questions): Answered all technical challenge questions comprehensively and demonstrated technical expertise that exceeds Caltrans expectations.</td>
<td>8.5 - 10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td>Acceptable understanding of the scope and challenges associated with this contract. Covered majority of key deliverables of the Contract and a good ability to deliver the Contract deliverables. Technical Evaluation A (Example Task Order): Complete understanding of all the challenges associated with the Example Task Order. Personnel just barely cover the majority of the required services and it includes barely adequate across the board major classifications. Qualifications just meet Caltrans requirements and just have adequate availability in the coming one year of the contract. The proposed individuals have similar experience to the requested services. Adequate methodological approach to deliver the Example Task Order. Technical Evaluation B (Technical Questions): Answered half of technical challenge questions satisfactorily and demonstrated technical expertise that meets Caltrans expectations.</td>
<td>5.0 - 6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Qualified</td>
<td>Lack of an acceptable understanding of the scope and challenges associated with this contract. Did not cover key deliverables of the Contract and poor ability to deliver the Contract deliverables. Technical Evaluation A (Example Task Order): Did not demonstrate understanding of key and or majority of the challenges associated with the Example Task Order. Personnel do not cover the majority of the required services and do not cover across the board major classifications. Qualifications do not meet Caltrans requirements and have little or no availability in the coming one year of the contract. The proposed individuals do not have direct or similar experience to the requested services. Deficient methodological approach to deliver the Example Task Order. Technical Evaluation B (Technical Questions): Answered less than half of technical challenge questions satisfactorily and demonstrated lack technical expertise that meets Caltrans expectations.</td>
<td>0.0 - 4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Consultant Perspective to QBS

Getting Ready for the QBS 
A Simple View

- Hiring Qualified Staff For Projects/Upcoming Opportunities
- Finding the Projects/Opportunities
- Positioning
- Go-No-Go
- RFQ/RFP
- Proposal
Hiring Quality Staff

- Investments: PM, RE, Inspectors & Supporting Staff
- Keeping staff
  - Benefits, Salaries, Vacation, Safety, Education/Training, Keeping them busy
- Properly adhering to Prevailing Wage Laws
  - Increase each July (2015-2020) $2.05 -> 2:45 (socal); $1.75 -> $3.45 (nocal)
- Managing professional staff on projects – keeping clients happy
Finding the Projects

- Investment in research/meetings/webinars/luncheon/breakfast
- Networking, building relationships – clients/teaming partners
- Look 1-2 Years out
- Keep track of progress
- Learning & Understanding client/project needs
- Go-No-Go & updates as information is found
Positioning

- Finding Events Related to Projects
  - Webinars, Breakfast/Luncheon’s

- Getting together with potential teaming partners
  - Competition, Specialty Firms

- Visiting with Potential Client
  - Meetings with staff members

- Finding the right qualified person/team
The RFQ/RFP

- Finding Complete Review of RFP/RFQs
  - PM, BD, Marketing
- What we know/understand about the project
  - Competition, relationships, GNG-Win Odds, teaming partners
- Staffing
  - Availability, Org Chart, Needed Qualifications
- Proposal Cost vs potential fee’s
The Proposal - Condensed

- Review of Costs ($50k cost vs $1M contract – 10% > 5%)
  - Marketing staff time
  - Technical staff time (PM, RE)
  - PM/RE/Inspector costs (prevailing wage/increases)
  - Printing
  - Interview Prep/Materials/Time for Interview
The Proposal - Condensed

- Potential Teaming Partners
  - Qualifications, Past history on other projects, relationship

- Final Decision on GNG....Then....
  - Proposal Matrix/Directive – due dates, sub outreach, who does what, deadlines, follow-up, questions etc.
The Questions – Confusing in RFQ/RFP

- Forms
  - Which forms agencies want within the proposal
  - Include all supporting documents when released i.e. conflict of interest forms; lobbying forms, etc.

- Requesting of Financials
  - There is no evaluation criteria and no mark down in rfq
  - Some Proposals could have 15 subs, then no interview, waste of time
  - Suggest request with interview
The Questions – Confusing in RFQ/RFP

- Federally Funded Projects
  - RFP notes using federal fund other funds and but there is no DBE % (On-Calls w/many projects)
    - Suggest allowing firms to add DBE’s after selection based upon project requirements

- Conclusion
  - Less precise RFP creates more questions--your staff is now spending more time answering questions than other tasks
  - Maybe have someone else read in different department who is unfamiliar
Costs As Part of Evaluation Criteria For a Public Agency?

- It's not qualification-based selection anymore
  - Not looking for the best quality, i.e. taking time looking for a product

- Potential to re-evaluate -- whether or not to propose
  - So less proposals because based on cost

- Potential low-ball cost to get in and potentially a change order putting project over budget
Costs As Part of Evaluation Criteria For a Public Agency?

- Small businesses can’t afford to continue putting in proposals
  - Not get selected because of cost and not based on staff qualifications

- Two Step process (qualifications, then cost) allows to sit down and negotiate
  - Assumptions are made on the written scope by each firm- not comparing same apples to apples
  - Opportunity to sit down and talk about scope to get to your price
Questions?
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