

A/E Selection Guide Exhibit XV – Evaluation Board Report

Memorandum

DATE:

FROM: Selection Board Chairperson

TO: Contracting Officer, Engineering Services Seattle

SUBJECT: [solicitation number], [project title] -
Evaluation Board Report

The Architect/Engineering Selection Board was created on [date] by [name][title] with appointment of the following members:

[ENGINEER 1 NAME, P.E., Chairperson, Mechanical Engineer, OES]

[ARCHITECT 1 NAME, R.A., Architect, OES]

[ENGINEER 2 NAME P.E., Electrical Engineer, OES]

[ENGINEER 3 NAME, P.E., Civil Engineer, LOCATION Area IHS]

[ENGINEER 4 NAME, P.E., Civil Engineer, LOCATION Area IHS]

[ENGINEER 5 NAME,P.E., General Engineer, LOCATION Area IHS]

In the initial month of the Board's existence, the Chairperson conducted a teleconference meeting on [date] from [location] with all the above members. [contract specialist name], Contract Specialist for this contract, was also present. During this meeting, the synopsis was drafted and the ranking and weight factors were established. It was determined that the contract was to be Indian set-aside based on the recent response to the [project title] design contract. A tentative schedule for future meetings was revised.

The rating criteria for this type of contract are outlined in the Federal Acquisition Regulations, Sub-part 36.6, Architect/Engineer Services, 36.602-1, Selection Criteria. Rating criteria language was based on these guidelines with modifications deemed appropriate for this specific contract. The rating criteria and established related weights were then submitted for approval by the Contracting Officer.

The synopsis was published in the Commerce Business Daily on [date].

[number of proposals] submittals were received by the [date] deadline. All were determined to qualify as 100% Indian-owned firms.

The Selection Board convened on [date] at [location] with all members to review and initially rank the submittals. See the attached, initial scoring summary sheet. The rating indicated the three top firms: [FIRM A, XX points; FIRM B, XX points; FIRM C, XX points] with a definite break from the remaining firms. The fourth firm had [XX] points. Thus, three firms were short-listed. The Contracting Officer gave approval for verbal notification to the successful firms. This was done on [date], with written notification to the short-listed firms on [date]. Interviews were scheduled for [date] at [location].

On [date], the three short-listed firms were interviewed at [location]. All board members were present. The result of the interviews was a unanimous ranking of [FIRM A] first with [XX] points; [FIRM B], second with [XX] points; and [FIRM C] third with [XX] points. The ranking order had not changed from the preliminary evaluation rankings.

Attached is a summary of factors that were instrumental in determining the Board's ratings.

The Board recommends that negotiations be initiated with [FIRM A].

/s/[Board Chairperson]

Attachments

A/E Selection Guide Exhibit XV – Evaluation Board Report

[FIRM A NAME]

Strengths:

Professionally highly qualified, multi-discipline firm including value engineering, indoor air quality, energy monitoring and control (EMCS) systems, total quality management (TQM) experience. One project manager for each IHS area as single point of contact including negotiations.

Well-developed experience in health care facilities in LOCATION area's cold, remote, and rural locations.

Excellent knowledge of area and located within it LOCATION.

Very strong past performance with BIA, VA, HUD, IHS, OES with references and repeat customers to support quality, on budget and on schedule. Uses Redicheck with TQM approach.

Very strong record of teamwork with all consultants.

Indian participation strong: registered DISCIPLINE principal, engineering technician, with established summer internship for Indian students.

Ample capacity to handle workload with temporary backup by consultant if necessary.

Weaknesses:

May not have capacity to handle all XX IHS areas simultaneously.

Contractor estimates have been somewhat less than bid results in the area.

[FIRM B NAME]

Strengths:

Very well qualified professionals, multi-disciplined firm on AutoCad, metric experience.

Broad background in health care facilities.

Some experience and knowledge of area.

Repeat customers with letters of recommendation to attest quality, on time, on budget. Estimates within 5-10% of low bidder.

Approximately 90% in-house, with strong record of teamwork with consultants.

Indian participation: registered DISCIPLINE principal, XX technicians.

Full in-house capacity to handle workload with temporary consultant backup.

Weaknesses:

Located outside area LOCATION, not quickly accessible to sites.

Limited experience in area.

No letters of recommendation for consultants.

Estimates consistently over estimated relative to bids.

[FIRM C NAME]

Strengths:

In-house professionals: two registered architects, one mechanical engineer, one electrical engineer.

Strong medical consultants.

Some knowledge and experience of area.

A/E Selection Guide Exhibit XV – Evaluation Board Report

Indian participation: two registered DISCIPLINE, two employees.

Capacity to handle workload with consultant backup.

Weaknesses:

Located outside area LOCATION.

Experience limited to LOCATION.

In-house team has very little medical experience.

Key electrical engineer not registered.

No previous experience with medical consultants.