DESIGN/BUILD SERVICES SELECTION EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM

The following criteria will serve as evaluation guidelines for each Evaluation Committee Member.

The first and second categories of evaluation include overall firm and personnel qualifications, as well as planning, layout, design, construction, landscaping, and aesthetic development of the parking facility site, structure, and circulation systems. It is a method by which the Evaluation Committee can judge the Design/Build Proposal’s considerations of overall appearance, relationship to the site and existing adjacent structures, site access, stacking area for vehicles using the facility, use of materials, and other design considerations vital to the success of this project.

The third category of the evaluation includes Economic Value for the proposed project. The Value of Design category focuses on the owner’s ability to evaluate the Design/Build Firms’ proposal, as it relates to the economic value to the owner. The evaluation committee will compare the total cost of the proposed project to the owners “Level of Expectation” for the proposed project and the number of parking stall provided by the Design/Build Firms proposal.

1. QUALIFICATIONS (250 Points Maximum)

   A. Firm Qualifications (200 Points Maximum)

      1) Character, integrity, history, reputation, judgment, efficiency, and financial stability of Design/Build Firm.
      2) Performance History – Quality of Design/Build Firm’s previous contract performance.
      3) Design/Build Firm’s compliance with laws relating to construction contracts.
      4) Design/Build Firm’s ability to meet the University’s proposed construction schedule.
      5) Design/Build Firm’s ability, capacity, and skill to manage projects similar to that required.
      6) Completed minimum of 3 previous structures of similar nature.
      7) Project team organization and lines of communication.
      8) Completed Attachment No. 2

   B. Project Manager Qualifications (50 Points Maximum)

      1) Personal qualification and prior experience with project of similar type.
      2) Project Managers role during design and construction phase.

2. QUALITY OF DESIGN (750 Points Maximum)

   A. Visual/Aesthetic Design (200 Points Maximum)

      1) Design and massing is compatible with the scale and character of the nearby campus buildings, both present and proposed for the future.
      2) Exterior materials consistent and harmonious with campus’ architectural contexts, both present and proposed in the future.
      3) Well-developed Streetscape Plan.
      4) The Design/Build proposal provides an appropriate image to the University, the city, and adjacent community.
      5) The Design/Build Proposal takes into account variations in weather conditions and maintenance requirements.
      6) The Design/Build proposal demonstrates the incorporation of building signage in the proposed design. Signage is clear, concise, and easy to read and understand.
7) Proposed design responds effectively to Schematic Design architectural concepts and considerations.

B. Site Design (150 Points Maximum)

1) Efficient site utilization.
2) Parking structure access consistent with Schematic Design.
3) Pedestrian access to parking structure complies with ADA and other accessible issues.
4) Proposed site plan demonstrates the project’s relationship with pedestrians.
5) Landscape, lighting, and streetscape plan consistent with University of Nebraska standards.
6) Proposed design addresses Schematic Design Landscape and Site Considerations.

C. Functional Design (150 Points Maximum)

1) Proposed design provides clarity of circulation paths and minimal number of traffic conflicts.
2) Compliance with Schematic Design parking stall design. Accessible parking stalls comply with ADA requirements.
3) Design provides minimal visual obstructions at ingress/egress locations.
4) Proposed design address Schematic Design concerns with site ingress/egress and accessibility issues.
5) Compliance with Schematic Design requirements for parking controls and graphics/signage issues.
6) Elevator locations and number consistent with Schematic Design.
7) Propose design consistent with Schematic Design requirements for maintenance and durability.
8) Proposed design address Schematic Design parking considerations.

D. Environmental Design (50 Points Maximum)

1) Proposed design recognizes effects of headlight and building lighting spilling on adjacent buildings during nighttime usage.
2) Proposed design use natural ventilation to avoid accumulation of toxic fumes. Mechanical ventilation only provided where natural ventilation is prevented by code.
3) Proposed design provides high level of visibility within parking structure, elevator lobbies, waiting areas and stair towers.
4) No spaces for concealment in proposed design.

E. Structural Design (100 Points Maximum)

1) Proposed design addresses Schematic Design structural considerations.
2) Openness of proposed structural design.
3) Evidence that structural system proposed is compatible with Request for Proposal (RFP) proposed schedule.
4) No intrusions or vertical elements obstructing parking stalls.
5) Compliance with Schematic Design clear height requirements.
6) Minimization of ramp slopes per Schematic Design. Proposed system does not require supplemental heat system for winter conditions.
7) Proposed structural system provides adequate drainage.
8) Proposed structural system address Geotechnical survey results and requirements.

F. Mechanical/Electrical Design (100 Points Maximum)

1) Proposed design is compliant with Schematic Design and Design Scope Specifications for mechanical and electrical systems.
2) Proposed mechanical/electrical design is consistent with University of Nebraska Design Guidelines.
3) Illumination from interior lighting fixtures is contained within the parking structure.
4) Proposed design provides security and surveillance systems.
5) Proposed design demonstrates proper lighting levels at site and critical locations within the building.
6) Proposed design incorporates fire detection and suppression system as required for code compliance.
7) Design/Build proposal shows site utility to be relocated.

3. **ECONOMIC VALUE** (250 Points Maximum)

   **A. Value of Design** (250 Points Maximum)
   
   1) Proposed design has complied with RFP design requirements and Design Scope Specifications.
   2) Proposed Design has met or exceeded the owners ‘Level of Expectation’ as described in the RFP, Design Data Document/Program Statement, Schematic Design Report, and Design Scope Specifications.
   3) Proposed Design/Build Firm’s Design and Construction Cost, as required by the RFP Sect. III – Part B and submitted on the Proposal Price Form provide in the RFP Manual, has provided the owner with the lowest cost per stall, for this project.
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