

The Facilities Committee met Tuesday, 9/16/08, to evaluate proposals for architectural services. These services are for the design of all currently proposed CVCS campus buildings. The proposals were made necessary by our use of state funding for Epod (multi-purpose building), and require following the procedures outlined in PSFA's instructions.

We received five proposals, and each of the proposals was independently graded by the five members of the evaluation team. The evaluators were: Marcel Kerkmans, Ruth Milner, Jim Shepherd, and Russell Wrenn of the facilities committee, and Rico Valpato, our PSFA District Representative.

The procedures specify that the rankings from each evaluator are totaled to give an overall ranking. If this procedure does not indicate a conclusive preference a set of interviews with the short listed firms is allowed. The rankings are 1 for most preferred and 5 for least preferred.

The results are:

	J Barton	ASA	Autotroph	EDI	Studio SW
1	5	2	3.5	1	3.5
2	5	4	3	1	2
3	5	1	4	3	2
4	5	2	3.5	1	3.5
5	5	4	2	1	3
Total	25	13	16	7	14

Two proposals, J Barton and Autotroph, technically qualify as "non-responsive." Autotroph's proposal is one page too long, and J Barton's submittal letter is more than one page and their proposal is seven pages too long. Fortunately, these were the two lowest rated firms, based on other criteria, and the decision of whether to disqualify them is insignificant to the results. The results for only the three qualifying firms are:

EDI 7, ASA 11, Studio SW 12.

The evaluation team voted to not conduct further interviews (4 yes, 1 no), and voted to recommend EDI as the architect for CVCS (4 yes, 1 no).

The next steps will be to notify the participating firms of the results, and negotiate a contract with EDI. We will seek governing council approval when a contract is available.

Jim Shepherd