

**CITY OF EL PASO, TEXAS  
AGENDA ITEM DEPARTMENT HEAD'S SUMMARY FORM**

**DEPARTMENT:** Engineering

**AGENDA DATE:** May 5, 2009

**CONTACT PERSON/PHONE:** R. Alan Shubert, (915) 541-4423

**DISTRICT(S) AFFECTED:** Citywide

**SUBJECT:**

City Manager's report of current events and issues:

1. Capital Improvement Program status – 2005 to present
2. Architect/Engineer Selection Process revisions
3. Contractor Performance Evaluation process

**BACKGROUND / DISCUSSION:**

The Engineering Department will report on the following issues:

1. The status of the City's Capital Improvement Program in terms of all capital projects implemented since 2005 by funding category
2. The revised A/E Selection process and it's planned implementation
3. The proposed process to evaluate Contractor Performance

**PRIOR COUNCIL ACTION:**

Has the Council previously considered this item or a closely related one? N/A

**AMOUNT AND SOURCE OF FUNDING:**

N/A

---

**BOARD / COMMISSION ACTION:**

Enter appropriate comments or N/A

---

\*\*\*\*\*REQUIRED AUTHORIZATION\*\*\*\*\*

**LEGAL:** (if required) \_\_\_\_\_ **FINANCE:** (if required) \_\_\_\_\_

**DEPARTMENT HEAD:** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Example:  if RCA is initiated by Purchasing, client department should sign also)  
*Information copy to appropriate Deputy City Manager*

**APPROVED FOR AGENDA:** \_\_\_\_\_

**CITY MANAGER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**DATE:** \_\_\_\_\_



# A/E Selection Policy *Update*



**May 5, 2009**



## Purpose

- **Expedite the execution of typical projects**
  - **Current process is not efficient**
- **Revise the prequalification and scoring criteria to be responsive and objective**
- **Put emphasis on past performance during prequalification**



## Purpose

- **Raise the quality of consultant services**
- **Award on-call contracts once on a yearly basis**
- **Save time and money for City and Consultant**



# Summary of Improvements

## Prequalification Process

- Prequalification score constantly updated
  - Total max of 100 points
- 65 Points on Past Performance
  - City will review each score with consultant after project
- Average of last 3 projects used



# Summary of Improvements

## Prequalification Process

- 35 Points for review of submittal
  - Reviewed on yearly basis
  - Firms prequalified into separate disciplines:
    - Traffic
    - Civil
    - Electrical
    - Mechanical
    - Survey
    - Environmental
    - Architectural
    - Geotechnical
    - Materials Testing
    - Landscaping
    - Construction Management
    - Structural
    - Commissioning
    - Cost Estimating
- A firm can be prequalified into various categories



# Summary of Improvements

## Selection Process

- RFQs sent to firms with prequalification scores of 65 points and above
  - Minimum of 10 firms if available
- Submittal Score valued at 100 points max.
  - Prequalification, 10 points (prequalification score divided by 10)
  - Project Understanding, 35 points
  - Value Added, 10 points
  - QA/QC, 10 points
  - Project Manager/Consultant Experience, 35 points



# Summary of Improvements

## On-call vs. Project Specific Contracts

- Various on-call contracts used
  - Varying capacity
  - Subject to anticipated workload for the year
  - Projects under \$2,500,000 tasked to on-call contracts
- Projects contracted individually
  - Value over \$2.5 million
  - Uniqueness/complexity



# Summary of Improvements

## On-call vs. Project Specific Contracts

- Projects tasked to on-call contracts (multiple firms)
  - Information requested:
    - On-call contract value and existing available capacity
    - Proposed staffing plan
    - Current workload
    - Experience relative to the project
- Committee will make final selection



# Schedule

## Ad-hoc Committee

- Over past 3 months meetings held with CEC and AIA representatives
- 1-30-09, Committee met to finalize language
- 2-5-09, LRC-Planning & Development met and approved process
- Implementation phase will begin with populating database and prequalifying all firms
  - Target implementation late Summer 2009
- City staff will continue to meet with ad-hoc committee on issues related to A/E contracts and services



# **Contractor Performance Evaluation** *Update*



## Purpose

- Refine policy and procedures
- Standardize supporting documentation
- Make recommendations consistent with standard



## **Summary of Improvements**

- Formal evaluation score sheet to be completed**
  - Identifies factors requiring analysis**
  - Establishes a threshold to meet responsibility criteria**
  - Each contractor receives a score for every project completed**
- Records of score sheets maintained**
- Scores also proposed to be used in the Competitive Sealed Proposal process**



***In addition to Price, factors considered to determine responsibility include:***

- Previous Contractor Experience
- Resource Quality
- Qualifications
- Responsiveness/Schedule
- Personnel Qualifications
- Contract Compliance
- Submittals
- Financial Resources
- Warranty Requirements
- Resources
- Overall Outcome of Project
- Negotiations
- Safety
- Contract Defaults

### DRAFT Contractor Performance Evaluation Form

CONTRACTOR:  
PROJECT:  
DATE:  
BRIEF PROJECT SCOPE:

BID AWARD:  
CONSTRUCTION TIME:  
CHANGE ORDERS:  
SUBSTANTIAL COMPLETION:

MET CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS  
Unacceptable      Poor      Fair      Good      Excellent  
0                      1                      2                      3                      4

<b>1. RESOURCE QUALITY</b> ( <i>bid documents section 6-1</i> ) Rate the quality, availability, and adaptability of the supplies, materials, equipment or contractual services, to the particular use required.						
<b>2. QUALIFICATIONS</b> ( <i>bid documents section 6-2</i> ) Rate the qualifications, ability, capability, and skill of the Bidder to perform the contract or provide the service required. Rate whether they were team players, managed subcontractors, provided accurate and timely paperwork, and provided accurate analysis of issues and recommendations. Rate the communication for accuracy and clearness.						
<b>3. RESPONSIVENESS/SCHEDULE</b> ( <i>bid documents section 6-3</i> ) Rate the responsiveness of the bidder and whether the Bidder has adhered to the time they will and can perform the contract and/or provide the service provided in the time required in the contract, without delay or inconvenience. Rate whether the bidder followed approved schedules.						
<b>4. PERSONNEL QUALIFICATIONS</b> ( <i>bid documents section 6-4</i> ) Rate the character, responsibility, integrity, and experience of the Bidder (includes subs and project management personnel).						
<b>5. CONTRACT COMPLIANCE</b> ( <i>bid documents section 6-6</i> ) Rate the previous and current compliance of the Bidder with laws governing the contract or service.						
<b>6. SUBMITTALS</b> ( <i>bid documents section 6-7</i> ) Rate any non-compliance of the Bidder in providing required submittals, such as certificates, or information such as models, drawings, payrolls, etc.						
<b>7. FINANCIAL SOUNDNESS</b> ( <i>bid documents section 6-8</i> ) Rate the sufficiency of the Bidder's financial resources to perform the contract and the contractor's ability to pay subcontractors and suppliers.						
<b>8. WARRANTY REQUIREMENTS</b> ( <i>bid documents section 6-9</i> ) Rate the ability of the Bidder to provide maintenance, spare parts, and service for the duration of the contract.						
<b>9. OVERALL CONTRACT PERFORMANCE</b> ( <i>bid documents section 6-14</i> ) Rate the overall performance on project.						
<b>10. NEGOTIATION</b> ( <i>bid documents section 6-15</i> ) Rate the past performance of the contractor in cooperation and responsiveness in contract changes negotiations.						
<b>11. SAFETY</b> ( <i>bid documents section 6-16</i> ) Rate the Safety of the contractor, did they follow the safety standards, provided safe traffic, traffic control was maintained and site maintenance.						
<b>12. CONTRACT DEFAULT</b> Did the contractor default on the contract.						
<b>TOTAL</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0



# ***Competitive Sealed Proposal Update***



## Summary of Improvements

- **Make recommendations consistent with standard**
- **Utilize new Contractor Performance Evaluation score**
- **Streamline the process**



## **Existing Process**

- 1. Determine the Responsiveness of Bidders (Purchasing)**
- 2. Conduct the CSP evaluation process**
- 3. Staff recommends to City Council the selection of the highest ranked proposal**
- 4. Staff negotiates the final contract terms with the offeror**
- 5. Staff recommends to City Council the final construction contract award**



## Proposed Process

1. Determine the Responsiveness of Bidders
2. Determine the Responsibility of Bidders
3. Review past performance - Score Bidders
  - New performance evaluation
4. Staff recommends to City Manager the selection of the highest ranked proposal
  - Appeal process being developed
5. Staff negotiates the final contract terms with the offeror
6. Staff recommends to City Council the final construction contract award



## Next Steps

- **Finalize policies and forms**
- **Share with impacted stakeholders**
- **Bring resolution forward on Competitive Sealed Proposal process**
- **Implement and populate records**
  - **Target Start: July 2009**



# *Questions/Comments*