

**MEMORANDUM
COUNTY OF PLACER
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DEPARTMENT
PROCUREMENT SERVICES DIVISION**

TO: Honorable Board of Supervisors
FROM: David Seward, Purchasing Manager 
DATE: July 11, 2006
SUBJECT: Recommendation to Award RFQ No. 9551 for Project Inspection and Construction Management Services and Adopt a List of Qualified Firms

ACTION REQUESTED

Adopt a qualified list of consulting firms to provide project inspection and construction management services for various projects in Placer County, effective for a three-year period.

BACKGROUND

The Procurement Services Division has developed a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for project inspection and construction management services. These services would be requested on an as-needed basis, and may be utilized by departments such as CDRA Engineering and DPW. RFQ No. 9551 was released to 82 firms, and published on Procurement's website. Formal responses were received from 22 firms.

An evaluation panel was established to rate the submittals in accordance with the evaluation criteria contained in the RFQ. Attachment A shows their individual and collective scores. The RFQ stated an intent to award to approximately five (5) firms. However, based on the overall scores, the panel determined that it is more appropriate to award to the top seven (7) firms.

Your Board's approval is required to ratify the panel's recommendation. As the result, the firms will be placed on a qualified list, to be effective for 3 years.

FISCAL IMPACT

There is no immediate fiscal impact resulting from this action. Individual contracts will be negotiated with one or more firms as needed, and the resulting expenditures will be funded from existing budgets or project funds, as appropriate. Contracts of less than \$50,000.00 may be executed by the Purchasing Manager. Contracts of \$50,000.00 or more will require your Board's approval.

Attachment A: Evaluation Spreadsheet

cc: Wes Zicker, CDRA
Peter Kraatz, DPW

Attachment A

**COUNTY OF PLACER, AUBURN, CA
EVALUATION OF RFQ NO. 9551 - Project Inspection & Construction Management**

CONSULTANTS	Location	W. Placer Areas	Tahoe Area	Rater 1		Rater 2		Rater 3		FINAL SCORE	FINAL RANK
				Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank		
Harris & Associates	Sacramento	X	X	99.50	1	82.00	5	90.00	1 (tie)	271.50	1
Blackburn Consulting	Auburn	X	X	95.00	3	87.00	2	85.00	3	267.00	2
Parsons Brinckerhoff	Sacramento	X	X	92.00	4	92.00	1	83.00	6 (tie)	267.00	3
Kleinfelder	Sacramento	X	X	91.00	5 (tie)	80.50	7	90.00	1 (tie)	261.50	4
Psomas	Roseville	X	X	91.00	5 (tie)	79.00	10	84.00	4 (tie)	254.00	5
Vali Cooper & Associates	Sacramento	X	X	91.00	5 (tie)	83.50	3	79.00	11 (tie)	253.50	6
Willdan	Roseville	X	X	84.00	14	82.50	4	86.00	2	252.50	7
Nolte Associates	Sacramento	X		97.00	2	70.50	14	82.00	8	249.50	8
Wood Rogers	Reno, NV	X	X	83.50	15	80.00	8 (tie)	83.00	6 (tie)	246.50	9
TRS Consultants	Sacramento	X	X	87.00	10	81.50	6	77.00	14	245.50	10
Forsgren Associates	Rancho Cordova	Did not indicate		85.00	13	80.00	8 (tie)	75.00	17 (tie)	240.00	11
Consolidated CM	Sacramento	X	X	86.00	11 (tie)	72.50	12	80.00	10	238.50	12
CALTROP Corporation	Emeryville	X	X	89.50	8	73.00	11	75.00	17 (tie)	237.50	13
URS	Roseville	X		88.00	9	72.00	13	76.00	15 (tie)	236.00	14
Stantec Consulting	Reno, NV	X	X	82.00	16	67.50	15	84.00	4 (tie)	233.50	15
Mendoza Associates	Sacramento	X	X	86.00	11 (tie)	64.00	16	73.00	19 (tie)	223.00	16
MACTEC Engineering	Reno, NV	X	X	80.50	17	56.50	18	81.00	9	218.00	17
ICM Group	Folsom	X		79.00	18	62.00	17	71.00	21	212.00	18
Bureau Veritas	West Sacramento	X		67.00	19	49.00	19	73.00	19 (tie)	189.00	19
Converse Consultants	North Highlands	X	X	17.00	21	33.00	20	76.00	15 (tie)	126.00	20
Innovative Construction Svcs	Citrus Heights	Did not indicate		33.00	20	30.00	21	60.00	22	123.00	21
Don Todd Associates	Oakland	X	X	16.00	22	13.50	22	79.00	11 (tie)	108.50	22

74

- NOTES:
1. The Public Contract Code prohibits consideration of Local Vendor Preference for these services, as they are considered "pre-construction activities".
 2. Cost has not been considered in this evaluation.
 3. Firms were asked to indicate which areas they wanted to be considered for; Western Placer and/or Tahoe. Two of the firms did not indicate.