

Value-Based Selection Final Matrix

University of Utah
 George S. Eccles Student Life Center
 DFCEM Project No.08015750

June 26, 2013

Firms		A	B	C	D	E
Selection Criteria	Points Possible					
Cost	30	30.0	28.5	21.0	9.0	0.0
Schedule	20	16.7	16.0	16.0	16.0	16.0
DFCEM Past Performance Rating	10	9.5	9.5	9.0	9.4	9.8
Strength of Contractor's Team	20	16.7	16.7	13.3	14.0	16.0
Project Management Approach	20	18.7	14.7	14.7	16.7	18.0
Total	100	91.5	85.3	74.0	65.1	59.8

Following the evaluation of each of the firms that submitted on this project, the selection committee has selected Okland Construction as the firm that provides the best value for the State of Utah.

Justification for Selection of CMGC
for the George S. Eccles Student Life Center

Date: July 1, 2013
Manager: Rick James, Project Manager
Project: George S. Eccles Student Life Center
University of Utah
DFCM Project 08015750

RM
7/1/13.

Re: Selection of Okland Construction

Recommendation:

It is recommended to select Okland Construction to provide CMGC services for the George S. Eccles Student Life Center. The award includes the base bid and seven alternates.

Justification:

This selection is justified because of the following reasons:

- a) The selection was done with the Value Based Construction Method for CMGC Services. The process was conducted by the Project Manager according to the policy and rules for this procedure.
- b) The selection committee was appointed with three members as follows:
 - a. DFCM David McKay, Program Director
 - b. U of U Mike Perez, Associate VP Facilities Management
 - c. Citizen-at-Large: Brent Agnew, MHTN Architects.
- c) Scoring of the proposals:
 - a. All criteria categories were scored except costs before costs came in.
 - b. DFCM Past Performance Rating: The ratings were provided by DFCM and are the ratings currently on file for the five firms.
 - c. Strength of Team: The leading teams had high scores in this area.
 - d. Project Management Approach: The highest ranked firm was also ranked highest in this category.
 - e. Schedule: All teams indicated that they could have the project finished as required by the project. One team indicated that they could have the project done by November 28, 2014.
- d) Costs were scored after bid proposals, subcontractor lists and cost reduction proposals were seen by the committee. Cost reduction proposals were accepted from Firm as follows:

Justification for the CMGC Selection

Page Two

Firm A	Item	Comments
Alt 6 Cost to go to Stainless Steel Pool on the Pool described in Alt 1	\$724,000	This clarification was given by Firm A only. This is the net cost of the "Myrtha" type pool over the pool provided in Alt 1.
Alt 7 Cost to go to Stainless Steel Pool on the Pool described in Alt 2	\$181,000	This clarification was given by Firm A only. This is the net cost of the "Myrtha" type pool over the pool provided in Alt 12
Local Block	\$299,899	This item was proposed by three of the five firms.
Total	\$1,204,899	

Firm B	
Cost Reductions	No Cost Reductions Accepted
	\$0

Cost Reductions were also Accepted from Firm C, Firm D.