

State Construction Conference
March 28, 2013
Informal Projects
Contractor Evaluations

Contractor Evaluations

Agenda:

1. The process.
2. The factors.
3. Scoring the evaluations.
4. The evaluation form and instructions.
5. The Rules.

The Process

- State Building Commission appointed a working committee to revise existing contractor evaluation form for formal projects.
- Work group included:
 - William Bagnell
 - Rodney Dickerson
 - Greg Driver
 - Mac Fake
 - Luke Hoff
 - Jorge Quintal
 - Gordon Rutherford
 - Willy Yamamoto

The Process

- Working group met a number of times between July to December 2012.
- First: Review and propose revisions to Informal Projects General Conditions (IPGC).
- IPGCs sent out for review in December 2012.
- Relevant comments incorporated.

The Process

- Next: Draft contractor evaluations.
- Final draft issued for review in March 2013.
- Relevant comments incorporated.
- Please submit comments to Greg Driver.
- To be presented to the SBC in April for review and approval.

Overview- The Factors

- Based on contract requirements.
- Relevant importance. All are important, not equally important.

Overview- The Factors

- Number 1-Management of submittal process.
- Number 2-Cooperation with other contractors, the designers and the owner's representative.
- Number 3-Maintain qualified and effective supervision and personnel.
- Number 4-Implement construction quality control plan.

Overview- The Factors

- Number 5-Management of contract changes.
- Number 6- Plan, implement, coordinate and execute the project.
- Number 7- Close out the project in an effective manner.
- Number 8- Implement the HUB participation contract requirements.

Overview- The Factors

- Number 9- Management of the construction site.
- Number 10-Timely payments to subcontractors and suppliers.
- Number 11-Process contracts and payment requests as indicated.

Overview- Instructions

- PM shall request input from others at the agency involved with the project. In particular, person responsible for HUB program at the agency.
- PM shall request input from the designer.
- PM shall provide to the contractor a draft of the proposed evaluation for review and comment. CPC shall consider contractor comments.
- Reference contractual expectations in the instructions.
- PM shall submit final contractor evaluation to SCO.

Overview- Scoring and Expectations

- Scoring range for each category- 0 to 3. No partial points.
- Examples of expectations provided for each factor (select one example and go over the example).
- Criteria for scoring are provided for each factor (select one example and go over the example).

Overview- Form



Overview- Form

- Form will be accessible through SCO's Interscope.
- Score each factor on the form.
- Make comments as required.
- Overall score earned.

Overview- Form

- Unacceptable performance, less than 50% of available points in one project, initiates Hearing process.
- Poor performance.
- Satisfactory performance.
- Excellent performance. Nomination for award.

The Rules

- Certificate of Merit Award Program:
 - Contractors receiving excellent performance rating are eligible to be nominated for the State Building Commission Certificate of Merit Award Program.
- Unacceptable performance:
 - Contractor earns less than 50% points available in one project, initiates Hearing process.

The Rules

- Unacceptable performance:
 - Hearing initiated by the Director of SCO on behalf of the State Building Commission.
 - Director convenes Panel.
 - Three possible outcomes are recommended to the State Building Commission:
 - Disqualification of contractor from bidding state work for two years.
 - Rejection of disqualification. Issue letter of warning to contractor.
 - Discard evaluation.

The Rules

- Appeal of contractor evaluations:
 - The Director of SCO appoints a Panel.
 - Panel issues a report and decision reached to Director of SCO.
- Appeal of disqualification from bidding:
 - Appeal to Office of Administrative Hearings.

Contractor Evaluations

- Questions.