

Outline:

- I. Procurement Planning
 - a. Early Outreach
 - b. Project Team - Roles and Responsibilities
 - b. Selection/Evaluation Team
 - c. Informational Meetings - RFI
 - d. Independent audit
- II. Bid Document Preparation
 - a. RCW 39.10.350-The public solicitation of proposals shall include
 - b. Other Evaluation Factors to Consider
 - c. Writing the RFQ/RFP
 - i. Evaluation Criteria
 - ii. Response Format
 - d. Price Proposal Form- and communicating intent regarding Total Contract Cost categories (link to example Cost Matrix)
 - e. Outline of the documents required for a RFQ/RFP
- III. Advertisement
 - a. Pre-Proposal Meeting
 - b. Question and Answer Period / Addendum
- IV. **GC/CM Selection Process – Better define steps and terminology**
 - a. RFQ
 - i. Evaluation of Proposals (SOQ)
 - ii. Shortlist
 - b. RFP
 - i. Evaluation of Proposals (RFP)
 - ii. Interviews
 - iii. Site Walk/Proprietary Meetings (not scored)
 - c. RFFP - Bid Openings and Final Ranking
- V. Debriefing
- VI. Awarding the Pre-Construction Services Contract

I. Procurement Planning

1.1. Early Outreach

GC/CM projects may be large and complex undertakings, and owners should consider a variety of outreach efforts to build interest and solicit feedback from potential contractors well in advance of the projects – ideally at least six months in advance, but for larger projects a year or two in advance of the solicitation release date may be advisable. A variety of outreach methods can be employed such as listing the project in agency forecasts of upcoming opportunities, project websites, speaking at industry forums and meeting with potential proposers, subcontractors, consultants and stakeholders.

Continuing the outreach effort up to the RFP release will benefit the project by obtaining useful feedback on how to structure the selection to obtain the most qualified candidates and best value.

1.2 Owner Project Team

During procurement, the Owner will develop and refine the project goals, review staff and consultant resources, and identify characteristics needed from the GC/CM (skills and capabilities).

Project success depends on the assembled team being the right team. RCW 39.10.350 requires an “experienced team” and the statute requires documentation of this information in project approval applications to CPARB PRC. The most important elements are experienced GC/CM practitioners (who may be owner staff and consultants) and team members who have the time and capacity to be dedicated to the project from selection (start) to close-out (finish).

The typical roles may be different from design-bid-build contract delivery responsibilities. The list of tasks typical in a GC/CM contract delivery should be reviewed and roles and responsibilities assigned once the project team is assembled.

1.3 Selection/Evaluation Team

In addition to the Owner’s core project team (may include designers), the Selection Committee members may include the key stakeholders, or technical experts, as well as end users. Having key stakeholders can help underscore the collaboration needed to make GC/CM a success from the start. There is an option to have key stakeholders or technical experts as observers but not as a voting member. A team of 3 or 5 members is recommended to keep the process efficient. There should be a designated non-voting representative or facilitator who will ensure fairness in the process, keep the selection process on schedule, and ensure each committee member understands the procedures for a fair and uncontested selection. Potential selection committee members should be carefully vetted for any potential conflicts of interest. See Chapter 3 Owner Readiness.

1.4. Informational Meetings - RFI

Conducting informational meetings to generate interest and obtain input from potential GC/CM proposers and other interested parties may be helpful. The Owner may consider issuing a formal or informal Request For Information (RFI) to solicit feedback on key issues and concerns from bidding community, which can help in attracting firms to propose on the project. If possible, issuing key draft documents for comment by potential proposers prior to solicitation release can be helpful.

1.5 Contractor One-On-One Meetings

Contractors may request an informal one-on-one meeting with the Owner prior to the solicitation process. These meetings provide the Contractor an opportunity to ask questions regarding the project, discuss established goals, and the procurement process. One-on-one meetings are not required for submitting a proposal and are typically not evaluated. The Owner may have a list of questions they ask at each meeting in order to learn more about market conditions, etc. The meetings can be held prior to issuance of the solicitation, and also during selection if available and conducted with all proposers by the Owner.

1.6. Independent Audit

For alternative subcontracting and/or heavy civil, an independent audit, paid for by the public body, must be conducted to confirm the proper accrual of costs. If these options may be part of the project,

the general scope of the audit should be outlined in the solicitation documents and defined in the contract. RCW 39.10.385(11) and 39.10.908(9). Additional audit provisions may be a part of the Owner processes or requirements, these should also be outlined during the solicitation process.

II. Bid Document/Solicitation Preparation

2.1. Determine Selection Process

Request for Qualifications / Request for Proposal (RFQ/RFP)

Owners must determine whether to use a two-step process (RFQ and RFP) or one-step (RFP Only). Here are some considerations for each.

- **TWO STEP RFQ/RFP** - An RFQ/SOQ is used to help the Owner to shortlist the number of proposals to evaluate and possibly interview the top qualified proposers to identify a smaller group to participate in a more detailed RFP process. Some Owners use the RFQ strictly to determine if the firms are qualified and do not carry the points into the final scoring. This can help encourage GCCMs to propose who may not have as much experience as others by still advancing the qualified firms, but the RFP/Proposal stage scoring will focus on the project approach versus past experience. Also, limiting the required experience to a specific scope may reduce the numbers of proposers. Most GCCM's have some qualification materials ready and easy to submit, however putting together a tailored RFP response can be costly and time consuming. Consideration for the time for proposers to develop an RFP response and the evaluators to rate the RFP responses is an important consideration in determining if an SOQ/RFQ is an appropriate step for the process.
- **ONE STEP RFP Only** - If the project is such that all proposers submitting a SOQ will be closely qualified and shortlisting is unlikely to occur, then it can save a lot of time and effort to go straight to the RFP. If the RFQ/RFP phase are combined, reserve your right to shortlist and limit the number of interviews to the highest scored firms.

Interviews are not required by RCW, but are recommended. The project team should decide the best Interview format for the project.

Interview considerations:

Interactive meeting - Let the proposers lead the presentation with questions from the evaluation panel. The Owner may give a list of topics to address. The intent is to draw out the interactive and collaborative behavior of the proposed GCCM team members.

Presentation/Questions and Answers - 1) a presentation by the proposing team and 2) a question-and-answer period. In this case, the Selection Committee could prepare topics/questions to send proposers in advance, ask set questions of all proposers or ask questions in order to better understand a the proposal.

1. Have GCCM bring named key staff plus one or two of their choosing.

GC/CM Committee

2. Consider providing sample problems/scenarios to see how the team functions together; consider providing the subject or a portion of the question in advance with additional scenarios or follow-up questions during the interview
3. Interviews are different from One-on-One meetings. Consider having the one-on-one/ interactive meetings with proposers prior to the written submittals and prior to the formal interview to solicit input on goals, terms, project requirements and feasibility of possible approaches.

Shortlist expectations need to be set and communicated in the solicitation. Shortlist typically occurs where there is a natural break in the scoring. If shortlisting, 3-5 firms is ideal considering the points and feasibility of being selected. Understand that it is likely appealing for proposers to have a smaller group advancing to the shortlist and the heavier lift portion of the solicitation. Proposers have a lot of options for projects and at times decisions on which projects to pursue can be influenced by the level of effort and probability of a win.

Example 1

RFQ/RFP, Interview, Final (Price) Proposal

1. RFQ/Statement of Qualifications (scored)
2. Shortlist to qualified firms
3. RFP responses (scored)
4. Shortlist to most qualified firms (in the competitive range i.e., feasibly have a chance to win)
5. Interview (scored)
6. Shortlist to most qualified firms in competitive range
7. Final (price) proposal
8. Selection based on highest combined points

Example 2

RFP: Qualifications + Approach, Interview, Final (Price) Proposal

1. RFP responses (qualifications and proposed approach) (scored)
2. Shortlist to most qualified firms (in the competitive range i.e., feasibly have a chance to win)
3. Interview (scored)
4. Shortlist to most qualified firms in competitive range
5. Final (price) proposal
6. Selection based on highest combined points

2.2 Writing the RFQ/RFP

The solicitation should include the draft agreement addressing the following items at a minimum: (RCW 39.10.350)

- Alternative dispute resolution procedures to be attempted before the initiation of litigation;

GC/CM Committee

- Obligate the public owner to, in writing, accept, dispute, or reject a request for equitable adjustment, change order request, or claim within a specified time period but no later than 30 calendar days after the receipt by the public body of related documentation;
- Submission of project information, as required by the board [CPARB]; and
- Contract documents that require the contractor, subcontractors, and designers to submit project information required by the board.
- Project description, including programmatic, performance, technical requirements and specifications and drawings, when available
- The reasons for using the general contractor/construction manager procedure
- A description of qualifications to be required of the firm, including the submission of the firm's accident prevention program
- A description of the process the public body will use to evaluate qualifications and proposals, including evaluation factors, the relative weight of factors
- Protest procedures including time limits for filing a protest, which in no event may limit the time to file a protest to fewer than four business days from the date the proposer was notified of the selection decision
- Audit – a description of what is audited and when (alternative subcontracting/heavy civil)
- The form of the contract (preconstruction and construction)
- Estimated Maximum Allowable Construction Cost (MACC)
- Bid instructions to be used by the GC/CM finalists

Other information that may be included:

- Owner-provided information that helps the proposers understand the goals of the project. Be clear on goals, risks, and success metrics for the project. Provide a project description that will allow the proposer to understand the scope and breadth of the job including any intricacies that may affect staffing and or lump sum price proposal items. This could include things like pre-design documents, permits, etc. – Be clear on whether the information provided may be relied upon or if it is for information only. Information that is provided and can be relied on will reduce the contingencies/costs.
- Description of interview process, what topics may be covered in the questions/what will be provided, expected format of the interview, how we will evaluate, scoring, etc.
- Draft Pre-Construction Services Work Plan. Potentially acquire a price for preconstruction services as part of the RFFP of the solicitation versus negotiating the level of effort and pricing with the highest ranked firm. Some Owners choose to acquire an estimated price for preconstruction services, based on a detailed scope of work with anticipated tasks and deliverables. Pros and cons include:
 - The proposals can cover very different levels of effort.
 - Evaluators could become biased by looking at the estimated cost without consideration for the level of effort that is included.
 - This provides an opinion of cost and allocations of resources that can show a proposer's

understanding of the undertaking.

- This should not be a scored element due to the inability to have an apples-to-apples comparison.

- Proposed project schedule including Pre-Construction and Construction milestones
- Diversity (DBE/SBE) goals and requirements
- Project Labor Agreement and Priority Hire, if applicable.
- Funding source information (e.g., federally funded)
- Applicable prevailing wage rates
- Description of how external references will be utilized. Communicate that you may use your own agency performance evaluations and other sources to validate performance information.
- Set expectations regarding staffing and commitment to maintaining the staff throughout the project. Depending on the RFQ timing and RFP timing, consider allowing the option to modify resumed individuals at the second phase. If this is allowed, reserve your right to adjust scoring in the event the new individuals do not have the same qualifications as those originally proposed. Ensure good language to prevent avoidable changes in staff during contracting. Some contracts impose penalties for this. Don't be unrealistic around an equal versus a mutually acceptable replacement when changes are needed during project execution.
- Summary matrix of cost allocation (see section XX for further detail):

The Owner needs to develop the summary cost matrix line items specific to each project, the example provided outlines best practice and potential considerations when developing this document. Specifically, what would be in FEE vs. SGC vs. NSS. Make sure it reflects the scope and expectations for the project. For instance, some projects might make sense to put the site clean-up in the SGCs, while others should be part of the NSS. Think about how that item will be paid, when it will be quantifiable and who will be responsible for performing the work. Consider the complexity of the project, duration of the projects, and the level of development of the scope of work versus a routine job.

2.3 Evaluation Criteria

The evaluation criteria should (1) be tailored to meet the defining characteristics of the project; (2) address all key areas of importance; (3) support meaningful comparison of competing proposals; and (4) clearly reflect factors affecting award and their relative importance.

In addition, the RFP should address critical success factors for the project, and grading should be tied to the ability of the proposers to address goals and risks. The known risks should be identified, and the proposer should be asked to identify other potential risks.

The following evaluation factors are required per RCW and may be captured in either the RFQ or RFP depending on approach selected. Evaluation factors for qualifications of the GC/CM shall include, but not be limited to:

| | RFQ | RFP |
|--|-----|-----|
| | | |

| | | | |
|----|---|---|---|
| 1. | Experience and technical competence of key personnel | X | X |
| 2. | The proposer's past performance with negotiated or similarly complex projects | X | X |
| 3. | The proposer's capacity to perform the work | X | X |
| 4. | The scope of work the firm proposes to self-perform and its past performance of that scope of work | | X |
| 5. | The proposer's approach to executing the project, including ability to meet the project time and budget requirements | | X |
| 6. | The proposer's past performance in utilization of disadvantaged business enterprises and small business entities and the inclusion plan for small business entities and disadvantaged business enterprises as subconsultants, subcontractors, and suppliers | | X |

Other Evaluation Factors to Consider include:

- Ability of the firm to bond for the estimated value of construction
- Ability of the firm to meet insurance requirements
- Approach to Project Management, specifically the communication management plan
- Approach to safety
- Approach to quality control and management
- Approach to risk identification, analysis and management
- Approach to cost and schedule management
- Ability to facilitate informed decision making
- Building Information Modeling capability
- Experience on projects with similar sustainability goals
- Proximity of firm to project location (federal projects may not allow proximity as evaluation)/(could add under self-performance criteria)
- Experience with conceptual cost estimating
- Experience and effective use of constructability reviews
- An understanding of value engineering and cost trending

To encourage greater innovation and market entry by less experienced firms: Consider the relative weighting of GC/CM Specific firm qualifications and experience (or eliminating from final scoring) as opposed to an increased emphasis on other relevant experience, key personnel, approach and pricing.

2.4 Scoring

The finalists are selected based on points. Scorers should be aligned in how scoring will be approached for each factor – i.e., what is the basis for scoring to create consistency in evaluations. Each person does score differently but the team needs to understand how they score together. These points can come

from a combination of the Proposal (RFQ and/or RFP), Interview and Price Proposal Form. The RFQ/RFP should explain the determination for price and the formula.

If the Owner has chosen to release a two-step process, the solicitation shall identify if the points will carry through to the end or if the scores reset with the RFP.

Scoring Example:

The firm with the highest total score (Total Possible: 100 points) resulting from the selection committee’s scoring of the Qualifications, Proposal, Interview, and the results of the Price Proposal, will be selected to provide Preconstruction Services and for MACC negotiations. In the event of a tie in the total score the firm with the lowest conforming Price Proposal (bid) will be selected.

Total Points Possible: 100

- | | | |
|----|---|----|
| 1. | RFQ (15 points) | |
| | Experience and technical competence of key personnel | 5 |
| | The proposer's past performance with negotiated or similarly complex projects | 5 |
| | The proposer's capacity to perform the work | 5 |
| 2. | RFP (40 points): | |
| | The scope of work the firm proposes to self-perform and its past performance of that scope of work | 10 |
| | The proposer's approach to executing the project, including ability to meet the project time and budget requirements | 20 |
| | The proposer's past performance in utilization of disadvantaged business enterprises and small business entities and the inclusion plan for small business entities and disadvantaged business enterprises as subconsultants, subcontractors, and suppliers | 10 |
| 3. | Interview: (35 points) | 35 |
| 4. | Price : (10 points) | |
| | Formula: $[(\text{Final Price Proposal being evaluated}) - (\text{Lowest Conforming Final Price Proposal})] / (\text{Lowest Conforming Proposal})$ | |
| | Low Responsive Price Proposal (10 points) | |
| | Proposals within 5% of lowest (8 points) | |
| | Proposals within 10% of lowest (6 points) | |
| | Proposals within 15% of lowest (4 points) | |
| | Proposals within 20% of lowest (2 points) | |
| | Proposals not within 20% (0 points) | |

Total Points _____

The point spread can be modified per project depending on how important price is to the selection.

The spread is typically between 10-15% and a best practice is around 10% for low responsive price proposal.

Example of a pro rata:

This scoring approach may be helpful in limiting the potential of price proposal inadvertently driving the selection.

1. Proposals will be scored as follows:

- a. Lowest responsive price - 15 points
- b. Higher prices will be awarded points based on a pro rata percentage, for example 50% higher price results in 50% fewer points

2.5 Response Format

Specific formatting requirements need to be defined before publishing the solicitation.

- Submittal requirements: date, time and location of submittal
- Proposal transmittal letter to include proposers name, address, contact person, WA state UBI number, Unique Entity Identifier, and type of firm (corporation, partnership, joint venture).
- Total number of pages. Be clear on if the count includes front and back or not. (Note that there may be required documents that may be excluded from the response/proposal total page count – e.g. accident prevention plan)
- Hardcopy or electronic format (PDF), including any size limitations of the file
- Other @@@@

2.6 Price Proposal Form

Review the Price Proposal Form specifically for each project. This should be developed along with the Summary Matrix of Costs while thinking about MACC, SGCs, and NSS by asking the evaluation team, what costs should be bid and how different types of costs are accounted for in the Total Contract Cost (TCC). In addition, thinking through the build-up of costs and how different costs are calculated in the industry will also help inform the Price Proposal Form in addition to the Summary Matrix of Costs. For example, Bonds are calculated by Sureties based on the total revenue or TCC as a percentage. If bonds are asked to be included in a fixed value, it can be difficult to predict the fixed value and/or deal with changes either up or down in the future TCC. As another variation in this example, some Owners may choose to require actual bond costs to be passed through to the Owner, as opposed to a bond percentage on the TCC.

The solicitation must clearly communicate how the cost categories within the Total Contract Cost will be accounted for. By providing specific details of what is considered specified general conditions work, percent fee, and NSS cost, the GC/CM can accurately price the work and the owner can compare the proposals and provide clarity for future MACC negotiation.

The RCW states the final proposal must include sealed bids for the percent fee and which may include

GC/CM Committee

other price-related factors identified in the request for proposal. Any price-related factors chosen must be clearly stated in the RFP and followed throughout the solicitation.

The “other price-related factors” if used, described in the RCW may be based on one or more criteria such as the fee plus specified general conditions, and/or staffing.

Here are a few examples of variations:

1. **Bid MACC % Fee** – This provides the most flexibility and best used when an Owner is prepared to negotiate staffing and staff rates. This can cause complications when looking at allowable costs if auditable rates are used due to differences in compensation packages between contractors.
2. **Bid MACC % Fee and Key Personnel Hourly Rates** - This provides the most information and flexibility to have a cost factor, lock in billable rates for staff and provide a competitive environment for both. This is best used on complex or phased projects where the staffing needs are not likely known at proposal time and will be developed during the preconstruction period as more clarity and coordination is completed relative to schedule. By having rates set at proposal time, the team also avoids the need to audit rates and the accounting cost associated with that process while still ensuring competitive pricing through their use on the price proposal form.
3. **Bid MACC % Fee and either fixed monthly price for specifically identified SGC’s or fixed monthly price for all** – This provides the most cost certainty for the specified general conditions including staff. This is best used on simple projects where staffing and general requirement costs are easily identified prior to the preconstruction effort.
4. **Key Personnel Cost Considerations**
 - Key Personnel/Staffing Hourly Rate Best Practices: Owner lists positions (experience/ years in field) that they think are required to get the job accomplished. The goal of getting a list of positions with rates is not to get the final staff count or hours. The goal is to have a range of positions and levels of experience that can be compared apples to apples on the price proposal form and can be used later to negotiate with GC/CM what is actually required for the work once the final level of effort has been determined. For example, Project Manager - list anticipated years of experience and short description of expectations for the position. GC/CM's will right fit their titles based on the years and description. If the list covers entry level positions through executive anyone added in the final level of effort exercise will be able to be comparatively inserted at a rate with some level of accuracy.
 - When asking for the rates make sure and ask that a full-time 100% dedicated to the project rate be provided for comparison purposes. The actual level of effort will be determined at a later date. This ensures that a proposer is not discounting the rate with the assumption that the position is part-time. Once again this will allow an apples-to-apples comparison.
 - The Price Proposal Form should then have an estimated number of hours to be applied against the rate to a total for all rates based on the theoretical hours. This then becomes the basis of comparison for points to be applied as a part of the price comparison. Note that this total is for price proposal evaluation only, actual level of effort will be determined and collaboratively set during preconstruction based on the actual needs of the project. In addition, it should be noted that there is an understanding that if additional titles or positions

are needed on the project for success, that rates will be negotiated by using similar level of experience positions included in the price proposal form at a later date.

- Ask for billable rates. Because it will be included in the price evaluation the rates will be competitive and include a fee that is acceptable to the proposer. This removes the challenge of an audit that may view different companies compensation packages differently.
- Determine a "base year" for the rates and either set a % increase for subsequent years or allow the % increase to be a negotiation. Best practice is to set the rate for subsequent years. Proposers will make modifications to the base rates as needed to adjust for any differences from their internal historical averages. This approach insures that as staff are added or removed from the project based on project needs the rate paid will not be inflated or too low because a timeweighted rate was used at proposal time.



5. Other Cost Considerations

- **Bonds:** As part of the price proposal, it is best practice to have bonds and insurance as a separate line item on the price proposal form as a % of the anticipated TCC. This includes a proposer's bond rate as a competitive evaluation factor. An alternative to this is to pay bonds at actual cost. Note that all contractors do not have the same bond rate, if the pass-through reimbursement approach is used for bonds, the project may pay a higher or lower rate based on the successful firm, thus the best practice to use the rate as a part of the price evaluation. The bid percentage will eventually be applied to the TCC.
- **Builder's risk insurance:** All Risk insurance can either be provided by Owner or GC/CM. If the Owner provides, then provide a copy of the policy to proposers in the RFP. If coverage can't be clearly defined at the time of proposal, the GC/CM may provide the coverage and the Owner can reimburse at cost. Comprehensive coverage is in the best interest of the project. Consult your insurance provider. If the Contractor is being asked to provide the policy as a part of the proposal, the Contractor needs to know the coverages expected, for example, if Earthquake insurance is included or not. Typically, the project will see the best value if one policy is purchased for all items that includes comprehensive coverage. Difference in Coverage policies, for example, to cover earthquake or flood are significantly more costly than including this coverage in the base policy. Who buys the policy is less important than ensuring one policy provides all coverage. This cost item could be by Owner or NSS or SGC. Timing of purchase may also dictate how it is paid. This should be clarified in the Cost Allocation Matrix or insurance requirements.


6. Specified General Conditions (SGCs)

The Work that falls within the Specified General Conditions consists of general Project activities and covers the cost for meeting all of the requirements of the contract – including without limitation, management, supervision, contract administration, administration of the subcontracting plan, cost accounting, progress scheduling, project meetings, safety plan, quality control, and warranties. – for which the GC/CM is responsible in accordance with the requirements of the Contract Documents that do not fall within the Negotiated Support Services. Although the list is not intended to be exclusive, the Specified General Conditions Work should be detailed in cost allocation matrix. Specified General Conditions work must be performed at the expense of the GC/CM and may not be made part of a subcontract bid package except when so required by the Specifications. When considering items to be included in the


Specified General Conditions the most important consideration regardless of the timing of setting the SGC's is if the scope of the work being asked to be included can be quantified at the time of setting the SGC's. If it cannot be quantified, NSS is likely a better location for that particular cost item. SGC's are typically performed as a lump sum line item in the TCC regardless of if they are set at proposal or during MACC negotiations, this should be considered when identifying items to be included as there will be no audit or transparency into the actual realized cost of these items once the lump sum amount has been set and agreed upon. See the price proposal form section above for alternative ways to address GC/CM staffing costs which most often fall within the SGC's.

SGCs are either bid as part of the selection or negotiated at MACC. SGC could be bid as either a lump sum, a monthly fixed not-to-exceed amount  or a fixed percentage of the construction cost amount to cover the cost of the general conditions. A percentage of the construction amount is the least accurate way to set this value and not recommended. A disadvantage of bidding the SGCs is it may be difficult to accurately bid the SGCs this early in the design as the risks are not as well-known, project phasing is not likely to have been established and the actual construction may not begin for many years. An advantage of bidding the SGC's is that it prevents a contractor from bidding low on the fee and trying to increase the cost of the SGC's at MACC. 

There are multiple options on how and whether to bid the SGCs and Owner should consider the complexity and length/schedule, how well defined is the scope, and likelihood of the SGCs to change. The greater the likelihood of change, the less relevant the SGC's are to bid lending more to either a negotiated or hourly rate approach.

A best practice that combines a competitive approach with the ability to collaboratively negotiate the level of effort during preconstruction or the MACC negotiations is included in the Price Proposal Form section and includes billable rates submitted as a part of the proposal. The cost responsibility matrix should be mindful of the approach to when or how SGC's will be incorporated. 

SGC's must be clearly defined for bidding so that all contractors are proposing on the same scope of work. The Owner needs to review and identify each category of work. Specifically, what would be in SGC vs. NSS. Ensure the cost category reflects the scope and expectations for the project. For instance, some projects might make sense to put the site clean-up in the SGCs, while others should be part of the NSS. NSS benefits everyone on the job. Think about how that item will be paid and who will be responsible for performing it.


 SGC and MASC/subcontractor bid package - It is not acceptable for the GCCM to include items in the general conditions costs (for payment by the public owner) and then subsequently charge specialty contractors for the same items. All cost items included within the project should be properly defined within the cost allocation matrix and contract provisions to avoid any overlap between various cost categories.

7. Cost Allocation Matrix

GC/CM Committee

The Cost Allocation Matrix is your “road map” for understanding and managing costs throughout the life of the project. It keeps the cost category allocations clear and ensures everyone is bidding the same work. This table lists the costs that are excluded and that are included from the Percent Fee on MACC, SGCs, NSS, Alternative Subcontracts and Preconstruction. This matrix should be published with the solicitation in order to clearly communicate where costs should be accounted for within the TCC and also included as an attachment to the GC/CM contract.

This tool helps the GC/CM and owner have a common understanding of what can be included in the GC/CM percent fee. It helps avoid disagreements between the GC/CM and the owner about what the GC/CM can include in an invoice. Potential benefits include transparency and trust among project stakeholders, which can be beneficial in case there are disagreements down the road. Consequently, construction can proceed smoothly and efficiently because of the reduced inquiries about invoices and what can and cannot be included.

Cost Allocation Matrix – Example:  Add as an appendix)

3.0 Advertisement

In accordance with RCW 39.10.360: *“requires the public solicitation of proposals for general contractor/construction manager services. At a minimum, the public body shall publish at least once in a legal newspaper of general circulation published in, or as near as possible to, that part of the county in which the public work will be performed, a notice of its request for qualifications from proposers for general contractor/construction manager services, and the availability and location of the request for proposal documents.*

The public body is encouraged to post the general contractor/construction manager opportunity in additional areas, such as websites for business associations or the office of minority and women's business enterprises.”

Other options include: Daily Journal of Commerce, local and small business outlets, social media outreach (eg linkedin, Tabor 100, email blasts through Owner systems), National Association of Minority Contractors (NAMC), Washington Procurement Technical Assistance Center (PTAC), Association of General Contractors (AGC).

3.1 Pre-Proposal Meeting

A Pre-Proposal Meeting ensures an opportunity for interested firms to meet the Owner’s project team and ask questions. The Owner should provide a brief project summary and goals, critical success factors, construction requirements, environmental, safety, status on permitting or funding, diversity/WMBE goals, project labor agreements, discuss the project schedule and the deadline for questions. Other topics might include information on what Owner is looking for in a proposal and/or any information to help proposers produce quality proposals. Pre-proposal meeting may include a site walk.

3.1.1 Proprietary /One-on One Meetings

During the RFP stage, prior to the submittal of proposals, it may be beneficial to provide each interested firm the opportunity to take part in an individual interactive meeting with the selection committee. The purpose is to allow prospective proposers to ask questions, request clarification and gather information which may be relevant to assembly of their proposal.

It is critical that the objectives and the message is clear and consistent between all the proposers. Establish clarity of expectations with the proposers about the format for proprietary meetings. Who is leading the meetings, the contractor or the agency? Which party is responsible for the agenda, schedule, attendees, et cetera? Internally, an agency should explain to the selection panel the rules and expectations of the one-on-one meetings.

Typically, these meetings are considered proprietary, meaning the agency will not share ideas discussed in the meeting with other proposers. However, if an owner needs to clarify or change the assumptions provided in the RFP, they should provide written clarifications or addenda to all teams rather than provide verbal clarifications in the one on one meetings. Proposers should have the same access to information in the same time frame.

3.2 Question and Answer Period / Addendum

A question-and-answer period should be established by the Owner and published in the RFQ/RFP. If any question results in a change to the RFQ/RFP requirements, the Owner should issue an Addendum. It is important to review the budget prior to end of Q&A period in case any revisions to MACC or the bid form are necessary due to any addenda that were issued during this period.

4.0 GC/CM Selection Process

A high-level summary of the evaluation process, criteria and maximum points will be published in the solicitation. Once published, the Selection Committee must follow those criteria.

It is important for the evaluation panel to support their scoring with specific comments to the proposal submission. If an evaluation member feels strongly about a lower score, specifics must be documented to support the position and to provide constructive feedback to the firms if debriefs are requested.

Many Owner's use a consensus scoring process where different views and scoring are discussed and a single score is arrived at through consensus at a meeting of the Selection Committee. A high-level selection summary citing points made by the Selection Committee during the consensus discussion should be made publicly available.

The following is an example of consensus scoring with word score definitions. The points given to the firm shall be within the percentage range of the points available:

| Word Score Definitions | % Range |
|------------------------|---------|
|------------------------|---------|

| | |
|---|-------------------|
| <p>Outstanding: A proposal or interview response that satisfies all of the RFP requirements with extensive detail, such as elaborating on how the experience or narrative satisfies the requirement or criterion. Response demonstrates the feasibility or viability of the proposer’s approach to successfully complete the project and offers numerous significant strengths that may be offset by one minor weakness in the understanding of RFP objectives. There exists an overall low degree of risk of the proposer not meeting the RFP requirements and goals for the project.</p> | <p>85% - 100%</p> |
| <p>Good: A proposal or interview response that satisfies most of the RFP requirements with adequate detail to demonstrate feasibility or viability of that proposer's approach to successfully complete the project. Response offers some significant strengths or numerous minor strengths that are offset by some minor weaknesses in the understanding of RFP objectives. There exists an overall low to moderate degree of risk of the proposer not meeting the RFP requirements and goals for the project.</p> | <p>70% - 84%</p> |
| <p>Acceptable: A proposal or interview response that satisfies some of the RFP requirements with only minimal detail to demonstrate feasibility or viability of the proposer’s approach to successfully complete the project. Response demonstrates a minimal understanding of the RFP objectives. There exists an overall moderate or high degree of risk of the proposer not meeting the RFP requirements and goals for the project.</p> | <p>50% - 69%</p> |
| <p>Unacceptable: A proposal or interview response that contains major errors, omissions, or deficiencies. Response demonstrates a lack of understanding of the issues identified in the RFP and an approach that cannot be expected to meet or has a very high risk of not meeting the requirements and objectives of the RFP. None of these conditions can be corrected without a major rewrite or revision of the proposal or interview response, as applicable.</p> | <p>0% - 49%</p> |

A critical component to the evaluation and selection process is fair and intentional scoring to avoid unintended consequences. People have a tendency to score in a tight grouping. For example, best project approach gets an 18 out of 20, second best gets a 16 out of 20 and so on. The challenge is that without significant amplitude in the scoring, the final determination will ultimately come down to price. Ways to avoid this include education and examples on what type of amplitude is needed to make the process function as desired. A best practice of using the rubric approach outlined above is an example of a scoring methodology that provides scorers with guidelines that will create consistency and ensure a fair approach to the process avoiding turning the best value competition into a pricing based selection.

RCW 39.10.360: The public body shall notify all finalists of the selection decision and make a selection summary of the final proposals available to all proposers within two business days of such notification.

4.1 Evaluation of Proposals (SOQ/RFP)

The Selection Committee will score in accordance with the published scoring criteria. Evaluations will be conducted in a confidential environment. The proposals should be reviewed for page count and responsiveness per the RFP criteria and the proposers should be reviewed for responsibility as defined in the statute.

4.2 Interviews

Interviews are optional but considered a best practice. Interview considerations are discussed above in Section 2.

4.3. RFFP - Bid Openings and Final Ranking

A public bid opening will be held to read each sealed price submittal by the final short-listed proposers. The previous scores should be shared at this time so that by the conclusion of the bid opening, the total scores and apparent highest ranked proposer is identified. The Owner will notify proposers of the results and post the scores publicly.

5.0 Debriefing

The RFQ/RFP should offer proposers the option to request a debriefing after final ranking and selection. Providing a narrative summary of strengths and weaknesses of the proposal and interview will help proposers understand where they may improve for future proposals. During the debrief, it is also helpful to solicit feedback from proposers on how the process may be improved for future projects.

6.0 Awarding the Pre-Construction Services Contract

- The Project Team will finalize the pre-construction services work plan/level of effort to include rates and deliverables with the highest ranked proposer, which will itemize such things as project management, meetings, cost estimates, construction schedules, etc. It should contain GCCM staff allocations of time and should have estimated dates of check-ins and completion for each.
- Owner will collect proof of insurance and other contracting requirements. Payment and performance bonds are not due until the MACC is determined or early construction work is agreed to.

Check Labor and Industries requirements for Intents and Affidavits. The effective date of the prevailing wage differs between the preconstruction and construction phases.

Exhibits/Appendix/Attachments:

- Sample contract
- Sample bid forms
- Cost Allocation Matrix

Insert Preconstruction Workflow Chart