

RFQ# 942566 -New Campus Substation and Generation Facility Project for the Omohundro WTP-Round 1

Evaluation Criteria (Max Points)	Blakley Construction Services	Cumberland Valley Constructors	Garney Companies, Inc.
Project Approach & Management (35 Points)	22	31	33
Experience on Similar Projects (30 Points)	15	19	29
Project Team Qualifications and Experience (25 Points)	16	23	24
Diversity Plan (10 Points)	5.5	9	9.5
Total (100 Points)	58.50	82.00	95.50

RFQ# 942566 -New Campus Substation and Generation Facility Project for the Omohundro WTP-Round 2

Evaluation Criteria (Max Points)	Blakley Construction Services	Cumberland Valley Constructors	Garney Companies, Inc.
Interviews/ Questions and Answers (100 Points)	Did not advance to round 2.	87	80
Round 2 Total (100 Points)	0.00	87.00	80.00

RFQ# 942566 -New Campus Substation and Generation Facility Project for the Omohundro WTP-Round 3

Evaluation Criteria (Max Points)	Blakley Construction Services	Cumberland Valley Constructors	Garney Companies, Inc.
Cost Criteria (100 Points)	Did not advance to round 3.	100	0.00
Round 3 Total (100 Points)	0.00	100.00	0.00
Cumulative Total Score (Rounds 1-3)	58.50	269.00	175.50

Strengths & Weaknesses

Blakley Construction Services (58.50 Points)

Strengths: Detailed critical path description of issues that could hinder the construction process; detailed bonding capacity letter; detailed explanation of providing two micro-piles for part of the scope of work.

Weaknesses: Team's innovative approach to reduce cost or improve the value of the finished project lacked details; management summary identifying key personnel/subcontractors was unorganized; plan of project construction regarding the number of crews lacked details; failed to provide a risk register; failed to provide information regarding NES coordination during project; narrative demonstrating an understanding of the project lacked details; risk mitigation plan lacked details; project construction approach lacked details; failed to provide projects of similar size, scope, and complexity; organizational chart lacked details; resumes for key personnel lacked relevant project experience; subcontractors lacked relevant electrical experience on similar projects; failed to describe why the firm is best suited for the project; past performance of SMWSDVBs lacked details; strategic approach to maximize SMWSDVBs lacked details; methods to ensure prompt payment of SMWSDVBs lacked details.

Cumberland Valley Constructors (269.00 Points)

Strengths: Detailed description of team's approach to quality management; detailed valued engineering process; detailed bonding capacity letter; detailed explanation of team's approach to coordinating with NES; detailed explanation of critical path issues that could hinder the construction process; projects of similar scope; relevant project experience regarding the proposed team; detailed organizational chart; detailed description of why the team is best suited for the project; detailed response regarding firm's plan to meet the 20% DBE requirement over the life of the project and working with the Business Assistance Office to ensure outreach efforts are conducted that results in successful participation of identified trades.

Weaknesses: Failed to provide projects of similar size and complexity; failed to address process for testing generators; resumes for subcontractors did not include experience with generators; information regarding past performance of SMWSDVBs lacked details; description of the organization of the execution team lacked details; largest project constructed not similar in size; subcontractor quality control oversight response lacked details; construction mitigation response regarding Colonial Gas Pipeline lacked details; response regarding anticipation of the top three risks for the project lacked details; NES coordination process lacked details; response to anticipation of approaching costs for unclassified excavation lacked details; failed to address team's experience with installing duct banks on micro piles; failed to address team approach for obtaining backfill material approval; failed to address past working relationships with subcontractors; execution and commissioning plan for power distribution and control system lacked details.

Garney Companies, Inc (175.50 Points)

Strengths: Detailed narrative demonstrating an understanding of the project; detailed description of team's approach to quality management; detailed innovative approach to reduce cost or improve the value of the finished project; projects of similar size, scope, and complexity; detailed description of why the team is best suited for the project; detailed organizational chart.

Weaknesses: Explanation of critical path issues that could hinder the construction process lacked details; risk mitigation lacked details; proposed team did not work together on all of the projects listed; information on subcontractors working on previous similar projects lacked details; methods to ensure prompt payment of SMWSDVBs lacked details; presentation unorganized; recordable company incidents in the past three years; presented an incomplete job as a part of the response to the largest project company constructed; subcontractor quality control oversight response lacked details; process for documenting and resolving subcontractor quality control issues lacked details; failed to address usage of generators as a part of the new electrical system modification process; response regarding anticipation of the top three risks for the project lacked details; failed to address firm's anticipation of NES delays or issues; description of critical path issues lacked details; response to anticipation of approaching costs for unclassified excavation lacked details; failed to address approach for special inspection requirements for the project; subcontractors project involvement and execution lacked details; firm's response to past working relationships with subcontractors lacked details; execution and commissioning plan for power distribution and control system lacked details; response to job costs in accordance with the plans and specifications lacked details; response regarding firm's plan to meet the 20% DBE requirement over the life of the project and working with the Business Assistance Office to ensure outreach efforts lacked details; failed to submit cost criteria before the solicitation deadline.

Enter Solicitation Title & Number Below

New Campus Substation and Generation Facility Project for the
Omohundro Water Treatment Plant; RFQ# 942566

Offeror's Name	Bids	RFP Cost Points
Cumberland Valley Constructors	\$42,857,514.00	100 100.00