MEMORANDUM

COUNTY OF PLACER

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

PROCUREMENT SERVICES DIVISION

TO: Honorable Board of Supervisors

FROM: Jim Boggan, Acting Purchasing Manager JB

DATE: September 18, 2007

SUBJECT: Approve the Award of Competitive Request for Qualifications No. 9686 for Plan Check Services and Adopt Two (2) Lists of Qualified Firms for Use by the Building and Engineering Departments, to be Valid for a Three-Year Period

---

ACTION REQUESTED

Approve the award of competitive Request for Qualifications (RFQ) No. 9686 for plan check services and adopt two (2) lists of qualified firms for use by the Building and Engineering Departments, to be valid for a three-year period.

BACKGROUND

The Building Department (Building) and the Engineering and Surveying Department (Engineering) are both under the Community Development Resource Agency (CDRA). Each department requires assistance from outside consultants from time to time to perform plan check services. Building requires these services for County projects, as well as for commercial and residential permit applications submitted by developers and general residents. Engineering requires similar services related to civil site improvement plans submitted by developers and/or for County projects.

RFQ No. 9686 was developed to address the needs of both the Building and Engineering Departments. The RFQ advised of the County's intent to establish two lists of firms, one for each department's requirements. The solicitation invited potential respondents to submit their qualifications for one or both of the qualified lists. Notices announcing the availability of the RFQ were mailed to 165 firms, and the RFQ was posted on Procurement's website. A total of 16 firms submitted their statements of qualifications for the Building list; and 9 firms submitted responses for the Engineering list.

Separate evaluation committees rated the submittals for each list, as outlined in the evaluation criteria published in the RFQ. Attachment A shows the individual and collective scores submitted by each committee. The committee that evaluated the proposals for the Building Department determined that the top 8 firms should be named to the qualified list. The committee that rated proposals for the Engineering Department determined that the top 6 firms should be named to that list. Each of these lists will be effective for a three-year period.

FISCAL IMPACT

There is no immediate fiscal impact resulting from this action. The departments will contract with a selected firm as required and the resulting expenditures will be funded from their 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 Spreadsheets

cc: Wes Zicker, Director of Engineering and Surveying
Bob Martino, Chief Building Official

COUNTY OF PLACER, AUBURN, CA
EVALUATION OF RFQ NO. 9686 - Plan Check Services for Engineering

CONSULTANTS	Location	Cost (15 pts possible)	Dan Dottai Engrg/Surveying		Rick Eiri Engrg/Surveying		Landy Darrow DPW		Subtotal	Local Vendor Preference *(1)*	FINAL SCORE	FINAL RANK
			Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank				
Bureau Veritas	Citrus Heights	9.53	84.53	*1*	89.53	*2*	73.53	*2*	247.59	0.00	247.59	*1*
Willdan	Roseville	10.00	75.00	*2*	90.00	*1*	58.00	*5*	223.00	11.15	234.15	*2*
Harris & Associates	Sacramento	8.44	63.44	*3*	63.44	*5*	70.44	*3*	197.32	0.00	197.32	*3*
P&D Consultants	Lincoln	9.42	29.42	*7*	64.42	*4*	77.42	*1*	171.26	0.00	171.26	*4*
CSG Consultants	Sacramento	9.20	54.20	*5*	54.20	*7*	60.20	*4*	168.60	0.00	168.60	*5*
Coastland	Auburn	9.64	59.64	*4*	69.64	*3*	29.64	*7*	158.92	7.95	166.87	*6*
Interwest Consulting Group	Roseville	10.38	50.38	*6*	50.38	*8*	39.38	*6*	140.14	7.01	147.15	*7*
Stantec Consulting	Sacramento	8.49	28.49	*8*	48.49	*9*	29.49	*8*	106.47	0.00	106.47	*8*
AR Associates	Auburn	15.00	25.00	*9*	55.00	*6*	20.00	*9*	100.00	0.00	100.00	*9*

(1) Local Vendor Preference credit of 5% of consultant's own score is granted to those firms who have filed a qualified LVP Affidavit with the County prior to the close of the RFQ. Some or the firms who are located within Placer County did not receive the LVP credit because they failed to file the required affidavit.

COUNTY OF PLACER, AUBURN, CA
EVALUATION OF RFQ NO. 9686 - Plan Check Services for Building Dept.

CONSULTANTS	Location	Cost (15 pts possible)	Rater 1		Rater 2		Rater 3		Subtotal	Local Vendor Preference	FINAL SCORE	FINAL RANK
			Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank				
Interwest Consulting Group	Roseville	12.05	90.05	*1*	88.05	*1*	90.05	*1*	268.15	13.41	281.56	*1*
Coastland	Auburn	11.10	89.10	*2*	87.10	*4*	85.10	*4*	261.30	13.07	274.37	*2*
Bureau Veritas	Citrus Heights	11.69	81.69	*6*	87.69	*2*	87.69	*2*	257.07	0.00	257.07	*3*
CSG Consultants	Sacramento	10.00	85.00	*4*	86.00	*5*	86.00	*3*	257.00	0.00	257.00	*4*
Tom Jennings	Roseville	13.25	85.25	*3*	87.25	*3*	73.25	*6*	245.75	0.00	245.75	*5*
Willdan	Roseville	9.46	81.46	*7*	81.46	*9*	68.46	*8*	231.38	11.57	242.95	*6*
McKenny Krug Inc.	Gold River	11.52	83.52	*5*	84.52	*6*	65.52	*11*	233.56	0.00	233.56	*7*
Buehler & Buehler	Sacramento	8.83	78.83	*8*	83.83	*7*	66.83	*10*	229.49	0.00	229.49	*8*
EsGil Corporation	San Diego	12.01	75.01	*10*	83.01	*8*	68.01	*9*	226.03	0.00	226.03	*9*
P&D Consultants	Lincoln	10.19	72.19	*12*	78.19	*11*	74.19	*5*	224.57	0.00	224.57	*10*
Shums Coda Associates	Pleasanton	11.52	75.52	*9*	80.52	*10*	61.52	*13*	217.56	0.00	217.56	*11*
Harris & Associates	Sacramento	10.06	65.06	*14*	77.06	*12*	69.06	*7*	211.18	0.00	211.18	*12*
4Leaf Inc.	Pleasanton	13.25	74.25	*11*	70.25	*14*	56.25	*14*	200.75	0.00	200.75	*13*
BJY Northwest	West Sacramento	11.87	59.87	*16*	72.87	*13*	64.87	*12*	197.61	0.00	197.61	*14*
Bevier Structural Engineering	Gold River	11.87	66.87	*13*	65.87	*15*	41.87	*16*	174.61	0.00	174.61	*15*
Building Department Service	El Dorado Hills	15.00	60.00	*15*	65.00	*16*	45.00	*15*	170.00	0.00	170.00	*16*

(1) Local Vendor Preference credit of 5% of consultant's own score is granted to those firms who have filed a qualified LVP Affidavit with the County prior to the close of the RFQ. Some of the firms located within Placer County did not receive the LVP credit because they failed to file the required affidavit.