



**To:** Project File – MPWSP  
Conveyance Facilities

**From:** Selection Committee

**Pages:** 8 (including attachments)

**Date:** July 15, 2015

**California American Water  
Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project  
Conveyance Facilities  
Statement of Qualifications Analysis**

**I. Summary and Selections**

This Statement of Qualifications (“SOQ”) Analysis describes the evaluation process used to pre-qualify the companies (“Contractors”) that will be eligible to submit a proposal in response to the forthcoming Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project Request for Proposals for the Construction of Conveyance Facilities (“RFP”). **After a thorough evaluation, the Selection Committee has pre-qualified the following Contractors (listed alphabetically):**

<b>Company Name</b>
<b>Garney Pacific, Inc. (“Garney”)</b>
<b>Granite Construction Company (“Granite”)</b>
<b>Mountain Cascade, Inc. (“Mountain Cascade”)</b>
<b>Monterey Peninsula Engineering, a Partnership (“MPE”)</b>
<b>Steve P. Rados, Inc. (“Rados”)</b>
<b>Ranger Pipelines, Incorporated (“Ranger”)</b>
<b>W.A. Rasic Construction Co., Inc. (“Rasic”)</b>

**II. Background**

A Request for Qualifications for the Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project Desalination Conveyance Facilities (“RFQ”) was issued by California American Water on May 28, 2015. A Selection Committee was established to consider the SOQs and pre-qualify the Contractors to receive the RFP. The Selection Committee consists of the following California American Water employees:

- *Richard Svindland, Vice President, Operations*
- *Deana L. Donohue, Vice President, Engineering*
- *Jeff Dana, Vice President, Finance & Treasurer*
- *Todd Pray, Senior Manager, Rates*
- *Ian Crooks, Engineering Manager, Coastal Division*

On July 2, 2015, California American Water received seven (7) SOQs from the Contractors identified above.

The SOQs were evaluated and scored in accordance with the RFQ with 70 points allocated to Team/Technical Qualifications and 30 points allocated to Financial Qualifications.

### **III. Qualifications Assessment Categories**

The Selection Committee evaluated and scored the Contractors individually based on the selection criteria identified in the RFQ and listed below.

#### **Team/Technical Qualifications**

- Contractor/Project Team
- Project Manager
- Key Project Staff
- Construction Experience
- Schedule Management Experience
- Regulatory Compliance and Permitting Experience
- Commissioning Experience
- Safety Experience
- QA/QC Experience and Program
- Satisfaction of Acceptance and Performance Requirements
- Prevailing Wage and Other Labor Law Compliance Experience
- WMDVBE Firm Hire Experience
- Local Firm Hire Experience
- References

#### **Financial Qualifications**

- Financial Strength
- Ability to obtain required security for performance

*Please see "Attachment 1 - Description of Evaluation Categories" for a description of the above categories.*

### **IV. Category Scoring**

The criteria listed in the previous section were grouped into 7 categories (5 categories for Technical and 2 categories for Financial) and points were established for each category as shown in the table below.

The evaluation process involved two steps. The first step involved the Selection Committee members scoring each of the seven categories based on points allocated to each category. The categories are shown in the table below and described in **Attachment 1**.

Category	Points
<b>Technical Criteria</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>Project Delivery</b>	20
<b>Safety Record</b>	10
<b>Construction Management</b>	20
<b>Past Experience</b>	10
<b>Quality and/or Performance of Previous Work</b>	10
<b>Financial Criteria</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Ability to Obtain Required Security for Performance</b>	10
<b>Financial Qualifications</b>	20

The second evaluation step involved ranking the total points for each category on a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 being the highest total points and 7 being the lowest total points among all contractors. If more than one contractor received the same score, for example- 3 Contractors received the same highest total points for Project Delivery, each of those contractors received a “1” and the remaining contractors were then awarded ranking points from 4-7.

#### V. Detailed Analysis of Scoring

The final scores based on the average of the Selection Committee scores of all seven categories for each Contractor are as follows:

- |                     |     |
|---------------------|-----|
| 1. Garney           | 6.5 |
| 2. Granite          | 6.7 |
| 3. Mountain Cascade | 4.6 |
| 4. MPE              | 4.0 |
| 5. Rados            | 5.5 |
| 6. Ranger           | 5.4 |
| 7. Rasic            | 5.1 |

Below is a summary of each evaluation category:

*Please see “Attachment 2 – General Rankings” for a summary of the rankings in each category.*

#### 1. Technical Criteria (70 Points)

Technical Criteria counted for 70 points of the total Contractor Score.

##### A. Project Delivery (20 Points)

Most Contractors demonstrated a good understanding of the project with Garney and Granite providing the most detail regarding project delivery such as planning, schedule, environmental compliance, permitting, WMDVBE and local utilization. Most Contractors had a well-defined team with strong project management experience.

##### B. Safety Record (10 Points)

Garney, Granite, and Rados had the highest scores for safety based on workers compensation rating (EMR) and number of OSHA recordable incidents (ORIR).

The remaining contractors ranged from below average to commendable safety records.

**C. Construction Management (20 Points)**

Garney and Granite received the highest scores in this category. These Contractors demonstrated a high level of construction management experience with large construction projects and provided a well thought out plan for this project. They also provided a solid approach for execution, procurement, QA/QC and other elements of construction management.

In comparison, the remaining contractors' project profiles were less extensive but did show relevant projects experience.

**D. Past Experience (10 Points)**

Generally, most Contractors scored well in this category with projects and people experience that was relevant in type and scale.

**E. Quality and/or Performance of Previous Work (10 Points)**

All Contractors generally showed the projects were completed to the satisfaction of the owner within a reasonable schedule with change order status. The Contractors all scored well in this category. Slightly lower scores were received by Contractors that on average had more claims than the others, however, all claims were described in detail and justifications were provided.

**2. Financial Qualifications (30 Points)**

The financial review represented 30 points of the Contractor's total score.

**F. Financial Strength (20 Points)**

Garney and Granite were scored the highest in this category based on solid balance sheets, income, revenue, and value of annual work. The remaining Contractors had average or above average scores to qualify for the Project.

**G. Ability to provide security for performance (10 Points)**

All Contractors demonstrated bonding capacities capable of supporting the entire Project or portions of the Project.

## **VI. Conclusion**

After thoroughly evaluating the SOQs in accordance with the RFQ, the Selection Committee has pre-qualified the following Contractors (listed alphabetically) to receive the RFP:

- **Garney**
- **Granite**
- **Mountain Cascade**
- **MPE**
- **Rados**
- **Ranger**
- **Rasic**

## **ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1 - Description of Evaluation Categories

Attachment 2 - General Rankings

## Attachment 1 - Description of Evaluation Categories

### **Technical Criteria Evaluation Categories:**

*Project Delivery* – This category was evaluated based on the following:

- Contractor/Project Team
- Project Manager
- Key Project Staff
- WMDVBE Utilization & Local Resources Utilization Plans
- Prevailing Wage and other Labor Performance Requirements
- Local Firm Hire Experience

This category was evaluated based on evidence that the firm has completed (or demonstrated that the firm has the capability to complete) projects of similar size, scope and complexity to the proposed project.

This category includes the approach to the design of projects similar in size, scope, and complexity. This category also includes the organizational chart, demonstrating the proposed participants in the Contractor's team. The organizational chart was scored based upon its clarity in identifying the key teams and key personnel, and in describing the roles and relationships between the team members during construction, and commissioning. In addition, this category included WMDVBE & Local Resources Utilization Plans, prevailing water and other labor performance requirements, and local firm hire experience.

*Safety Record* – This category was evaluated based on the following:

- Safety Experience

This category includes the resumes of key personnel who will be assigned to this project and who will contribute a significant effort in ensuring the safety of the workers and job site(s). Each resume includes name, qualifications, and the project experience. The resumes provide evidence that the key personnel have sufficient experience and training to competently manage the safety effort for this project.

*Construction Management* – This category was evaluated based on the following:

- Construction Experience
- Schedule Management Experience
- Regulatory Compliance and Permitting Experience

This category includes the portfolios of project profiles representative of the Contractor's experience with meeting budget, schedule, and change order percentage. Resumes for the Construction manager and key construction team members were evaluated.

*Past Performance* – This category was evaluated based on the following:

- References

This category includes the portfolios of project profiles representative of the Contractor's experience. Each project profile was required to clearly identify the relevance of the project described to this project. The profiles indicate the degree of involvement by key construction personnel proposed in the RFQ for each project. Project profiles were submitted for the Contractor, Construction Manager, the Quality Control Manager, and any other key team members.

*Quality and/or Performance on Previous Work* – This category was evaluated based on the following:

- QA/QC Experience and Program
- Commissioning Experience
- Satisfaction of Acceptance and Performance Requirements

The evaluation of this category includes how well the Contractor defined its internal and external design review process, field inspection process, submittal review process, deficiency identification, correction and tracking process, nonconformance process, and level of senior management involved.

***Financial Criteria Evaluation Categories:***

*Financial Strength* – This category includes the evaluation of the Contractor's submitted financial information that establishes that the Contractor has the financial strength to perform the work under the Project Financial items considered, but not limited to, are revenues, income, balance sheet, credit ratings, bonding capacity, and line of credit.

*Ability to obtain required security for performance* - This category includes the evaluation of the Contractor's submitted financial security information showing that Contractor has ability to obtain all required payment and performance bonding as identified in the RFQ.

## Attachment 2 - General Rankings

CATEGORY	Garney	Granite	Mountain Cascade	MPE	Rados	Ranger	Rasic
<b>TECHNICAL CRITERIA (70 pts)</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>
Project Delivery (20 pts)	1*	1*	6*	6*	3*	3*	5
Safety Record (10 pts)	1*	1*	5*	5*	1*	5*	4
Construction Management (20 pts)	2	1	6	7	3*	3*	3*
Past Experience of Firm (10 pts)	1	2*	5*	7	2*	5*	2*
Quality and/or Performance of Previous Work (10 pts)	1*	1*	6*	6*	1*	1*	5
<b>FINANCIAL CRITERIA (30 pts)</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>
Ability to Obtain Required Security for Performance (10 pts)	2	1	6*	6*	4	3	5
Financial Qualifications (20 pts)	1*	1*	4*	7	4*	3	6
<b>OVERALL RANKING</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>

*\* Denotes a tie ranking*