



**CALIFORNIA**  
**AMERICAN WATER**

**To:** Project File – MPWSP  
Desalination Infrastructure

**From:** Selection Committee

**Pages:** 7 (including attachments)

**Date:** May 31, 2013

**California American Water  
Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project  
Desalination Infrastructure  
Statement of Qualifications Analysis**

**I. Summary and Selections**

This Statement of Qualifications (“SOQ”) Analysis describes the evaluation process used to shortlist the Design-Build Entities (“DBEs”) that will pre-qualify as eligible to submit a proposal in response to the forthcoming Request for Proposals for Design and Construction of Desalination Infrastructure for the Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project (“RFP”). **After a thorough evaluation, the Selection Committee has pre-qualified the following DBEs:**

- **CDM Constructors Inc. (“CDM Smith”)**
- **MWH Constructors, Inc. (“MWH”)**
- **Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. (“Kiewit”)**
- **Black & Veatch Construction, Inc. (“Black & Veatch”)**
- **CH2M Hill Engineers, Inc. (“CH2M Hill”)**

**II. Background**

A Request for Qualifications for the Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project Desalination Infrastructure (“RFQ”) was issued by California American Water on April 1, 2013. Prior to issuance of the RFQ, a Selection Committee was established to consider the SOQs and shortlist the DBEs to receive the RFP. The Selection Committee consists of the following California American Water employees:

- *Richard Svindland, Vice President, Engineering*
- *Gary Paquette, Business Performance Director*
- *Eric Sabolsice, General Manager, Coastal Division*
- *Anthony Cerasuolo, Vice President, Legal – Operations*

On May 1, 2013, California American Water received nine (9) SOQs from the following DBEs:

- ARB, Inc. (“ARB”)
- Bay Water Partners, LLC (“BWP”)
- Black & Veatch
- CDM Smith
- CH2M Hill
- Filanc/Balfour Beatty Joint Venture (“Filanc”)
- Kiewit
- MWH
- Walsh Construction Company (“Walsh”)

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 & Weighting

The following categories were used to score each SOQ. The weighting of the categories was evaluated and developed based on the characteristics of this specific project.

<b>Team/Technical Qualifications.....</b>	<b>70%</b>
<i>Design/Build Team</i>	6%
<i>Key Personnel/Project Team</i>	20%
<i>Project Profiles</i>	24%
<i>Project References</i>	5%
<i>Project Approach</i>	15%
<b>Financial Qualifications.....</b>	<b>30%</b>
<i>Financial Strength</i>	20%
<i>Ability to obtain required security for performance</i>	10%

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

### IV. Category Scoring

A scoring system was developed to evaluate each of the categories (or sub-categories thereof) indicated above.

The Selection Committee evaluated and scored the DBEs individually based on the selection criteria identified in the RFQ and received support from internal staff and external consultants during the evaluation process. The evaluation process included meetings as well as interviews with references identified in the SOQs. Each category or sub-category was scored based on a scale of 0 to 10, with “10” being the highest score a DBE could receive in a category.

## V. Detailed Analysis of Scoring

The final scores for each DBE are as follows:

1. CDM Smith	7.7
2. MWH	7.4
3. Kiewit	7.2
4. Black & Veatch	7.1
5. CH2M Hill	7.0
6. ARB	6.2
7. Filanc	6.1
8. Walsh	5.8
9. BWP	4.8

Below is a summary of each evaluation category:

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

### A. Design Build Team (6%)

Filanc, CH2M Hill, and CDM Smith scored the highest in this category, by clearly outlining the proposed DBE's organizational structure and the key team members' roles and responsibilities. The firm profiles clearly and concisely summarized their history and experience.

ARB, BWP, and Walsh scored the lowest in this category. In some cases, their organizational structure was not clearly identified, and the roles and responsibilities of the key team members were not clear and concise.

### B. Key Personnel – Project Team Experience (20%)

CDM Smith, Filanc, and MWH scored the highest in this category. These DBEs had very experienced project team members and the most relevant project experience.

ARB, BWP, and Kiewit scored the lowest in this category. While each DBE had at least one strong component in this section, overall, they scored lower than other DBEs that presented project teams with strong desalination experience for all key personnel.

### C. Project Profiles (24%)

CDM Smith, Kiewit, and MWH received the highest scores in this category. These DBEs had projects that were relevant and demonstrated a high level of experience.

ARB, BWP, and Walsh scored the lowest in this category. Their project profiles did not demonstrate as much relevant design-build experience that will be required for this project as the other DBEs.

**D. Project References (5%)**

Generally, most DBEs scored well in this category. ARB and BWP received the lowest scores by presenting project references that were not as strong as those submitted by the other DBEs.

**E. Project Approach (15%)**

Again, most DBEs generally scored well in this category. ARB, BWP, Kiewit and Walsh received lower scores for providing project approaches with more generic submittals that did not demonstrate the DBEs' approach to addressing the size, scope, and complexity of this project as well as other DBEs.

**F. Financial Qualifications (30%)**

Most DBEs generally scored well in this category. The financial review represented 30% of the DBE's total score. Most DBEs demonstrated a strong ability to obtain the requisite bonding. Kiewit, CH2M Hill, and MWH demonstrated strong financial strength positions, including large lines of credit and strong amounts of working capital against their backlogs. Filanc, on the other hand, presented a low working capital against its backlog, reducing its score.

**VI. Conclusion**

After thoroughly evaluating the SOQs in accordance with the RFQ, the Selection Committee has pre-qualified the following DBEs to receive the RFP:

- **CDM Smith**
- **MWH**
- **Kiewit**
- **Black & Veatch**
- **CH2M Hill**

## **ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1 - Description of Evaluation Categories

Attachment 2 - General Rankings

## **Attachment 1 - Description of Evaluation Categories**

*Design/Build Team* – This category includes the organizational chart, demonstrating the proposed make-up of the participants in the DBE'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 design, construction, and commissioning. This category also includes firm profiles with company history and significant accomplishments, providing evidence that established 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.

*Key Personnel / Project Team Experience* – This category includes the resumes of key personnel who will be assigned to this project and who will contribute a significant effort. Each resume includes name, qualifications and the anticipated degree of involvement during each of the design, construction, and commissioning phases of the project. The resumes provide evidence that the key personnel have sufficient experience and training to competently manage and complete the design and construction of the project.

*Project Profiles* – This category includes the portfolios of project profiles representative of the DBE's experience. Each project profile was required to clearly identify the relevance of the project described to this project, and include a narrative addressing the design/construction philosophy and salient features for each project. The profiles indicate the degree of involvement by key construction personnel proposed in the SOQ for each project. Project profiles were submitted for the DBE, the Engineer of Record, the General Contractor, and any other key team members.

*Project References* – This category's evaluation is based on the information provided by the reference project's owner or the project owner's representative, via phone interviews.

*Project Approach* – This category includes the philosophy and approach to the design of projects similar in size, scope, and complexity. The evaluation includes how well the DBE 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. The majority of this information was provided in the DBE's response to the eleven questions in the "Project Approach" section of the RFQ.

*Financial Qualifications* – This category includes the evaluation of the DBE's submitted financial information, including financial statements, that establishes that the DBE has the financial strength to perform the work under the Project and to obtain all required payment and performance bonding as identified in the RFQ.

**Attachment 2 - General Rankings**

<b>CATEGORY</b>	<b>ARB</b>	<b>BWP</b>	<b>BLACK &amp; VEATCH</b>	<b>CDM SMITH</b>	<b>CH2M HILL</b>	<b>FILANC</b>	<b>KIEWIT</b>	<b>MWH</b>	<b>WALSH</b>
Design/Build Team (6%)	7*	9	5*	2	3	1	5*	4	7*
Key Personnel - Project Team Experience (20%)	7*	9	4*	2	4*	3	7*	1	4*
Project Profiles (24%)	7	9	5	1	4	6	2	3	8
Project References (5%)	8	9	5*	3*	5*	3*	1*	1*	5*
Project Approach (15%)	6*	9	4*	2	4*	3	6*	1	6*
Financial Information (30%)	2*	7*	1	4	5	9	2*	7*	6
<b>OVERALL RANKING</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>

*Note: The category rankings do not reflect the individual scoring or weighting assigned to each subcategory. The overall rankings do.*

*\* Denotes a tie ranking*