



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Multi-Modal Transit Facility Architect and Engineering Services

STATISTICS:

- ◆ **One-Hundred Fifty (150) Firms were notified via the MITN e-procurement website**
- ◆ **Five (5) proposals were received**
- ◆ **Two (2) proposals were short listed and brought in for interviews**
- ◆ **Hubbell, Roth and Clark, Inc was the most qualified firm by receiving the highest weighted score**

The following two (2) firms received the indicated final scores as a result of the proposal and interview scores. Only these top two (2) rated firms were invited to participate in an interview with the City.

Firm	SCORE
Hubbell, Roth and Clark, Inc	108.93
URS Corporation	101.73

Attachments:

- ✓ Weighted Final Scoring Including Experience and Qualifications, Capacity to Perform, and Interview Scoring
- ✓ Evaluation Process



WEIGHTED FINAL SCORING
Inter-Modal Transit Facility

Final Score Calculation:

$$\begin{array}{r}
 60\% \text{ Experience \& Qualifications Score} \\
 40\% \text{ Capacity to Perform Score} \\
 100\% \\
 \text{Optional: } 20\% \text{ Interview Score} \\
 120\% \qquad \qquad \qquad = \text{Final Weighted Score}
 \end{array}$$

In order to equate the price to the weighted evaluation process scoring, the prices had to be converted into a score with the base of 100.

Weighted Average Score for Experience and Qualifications: 60%

RATERS	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	AVERAGE
Vendors:								
Norr Architects Engineers Planners	32.0	37.0	44.1	36.0	19.0	35.0	57.0	37.2
URS Corporation	38.0	56.5	59.5	56.0	55.0	58.0	53.0	53.7
Bergmann Associates	32.0	45.0	53.5	37.0	46.0	48.0	53.0	44.9
DLZ Michigan, Inc.	39.0	24.0	38.5	30.0	18.0	23.0	46.0	31.2
Hubbell, Roth & Clark, Inc.	52.0	51.5	60.0	49.0	48.0	49.0	55.0	52.1

Weighted Average Score for Capacity to Perform: 40%

RATERS	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	AVERAGE
Vendors:								
Norr Architects Engineers Planners	13.0	22.5	27.0	18.0	13.0	24.0	32.0	21.4
URS Corporation	8.0	35.5	37.8	36.0	31.0	36.0	33.0	31.0
Bergmann Associates	11.0	22.5	36.5	19.0	10.0	23.0	30.0	21.7
DLZ Michigan, Inc.	31.0	16.0	23.5	15.0	8.0	13.0	29.0	19.4
Hubbell, Roth & Clark, Inc.	40.0	36.5	39.5	38.0	40.0	36.0	33.0	37.6

SUMMARY: Experience/Qualifications and Capacity to Perform Scores

VENDORS:	Norr Architects Engineers Planners	URS Corporation	Bergmann Associates	DLZ Michigan, Inc.	Hubbell, Roth & Clark, Inc.
Score					
Experience/Qualifications Score:	37.2	53.7	44.9	31.2	52.1
Capacity Score:	21.4	31.0	21.7	19.4	37.6
Final Score:	58.6	84.70	66.60	50.6	89.70

Interviews were conducted for only the two (2) top rated firms (Maximum # of points 20)



Optional:
 Weighted Average Score for Interviews: 20%

Raters:	1	2	3	Average
Vendors:				
URS Corporation	88x.20=17.6	76.5x.20=15.3	91x.20=18.2	17.03
Hubbell, Roth & Clark, Inc.	96.5x.20=19.3	93.5x.20=18.7	98.5x.20=19.7	19.23

FINAL SCORE:

VENDORS:	URS Corporation	** Hubbell, Roth & Clark, Inc
Experience / Qualification Score	53.70	52.10
Capacity to Perform Score	31.00	37.60
Interview Score	17.03	19.23
FINAL SCORE	101.73	108.93

**HIGHEST RATED VENDOR – RECOMMENDED AWARD



SELECTION PROCESS

EVALUATION AND BROOKS ACT: For Federally-funded, design-related service contracts, the procurement of engineering services for construction projects is done through a qualification-based process based on the Brooks Act. The intent of the Brooks Act is to develop a wide pool of potential service providers to select from. This Act requires that contracts be advertised and companies ranked based on published criteria for competence and qualifications. The cost (price) cannot be a criterion during the evaluation phase of the selection process; however, the cost (price) can be used in the negotiation and final selection process.

Once the top firms have been rated, negotiations begin with the top rated firm. If the type of professional services required cannot be agreed upon at fair and reasonable prices, the agency can proceed to negotiate with the next highest firm.

All firms will be required to meet minimum established criteria in order to be evaluated under technical factors. Proposals will be evaluated independently by a Selection Team that consists of City representatives. The following technical factors will be considered in making the selection:

- a) Experience and Qualifications (organization and staffing, experience, competence and reputation of firm and proposed individual(s), assigned). **60 Points**
- b) Capacity to Perform Full Scope of Services Required Within the Timeframe Required by the City. **40 Points**

Upon completion and ranking of the technical factors, proposals may be shortlisted to the top scoring firms for interviews. After interviews, if held, the cost proposal of the highest ranked firm will be opened and further price negotiations shall take place with the highest ranked firm. Should the City and the highest ranked firm not come to agreement on pricing, negotiations will cease, and the City will proceed with opening the next highest ranked firm's pricing and conduct price negotiations with this firm. This process will continue as is necessary until final selection is made. **Pricing structure must meet and be acceptable to MDOT requirements** for duration of engagement.

Each proposal submitted in response to this RFP shall focus on these criteria. In addition, the Selection Team also may consider the past performance of the Respondent on other contracts with the City or other entities and the City may conduct interviews. The City reserves the right to make such additional investigations as it deems necessary and may require the submission of additional information. The City reserves the right to adjust scoring based on the results of investigations, interviews, etc.