## Prequalification Questionnaire Evaluation

## Cover Sheet and Instructions

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | APPROVED DOCUMENT – This document is approved by the Office of the President and Office of the General Counsel for use by the Facility and is available on computer diskette. | | | | |
|  | | |  | | | | |
| **PURPOSE OF DOCUMENT:** | Provide an evaluation matrix to Review Panel. | | | | | | |
| **CROSS-REFERENCE TO FACILITIES MANUAL:** | None | | | | | | |
| **CONTENTS:** | Prequalification Questionnaire Evaluation | | | | | | |
| **FOR USE WITH:** | Design Build Construction Documents | | | | | | |
| **COMPLETED BY:** |  | Filling in | |  | Adding Text |  | No Data Required |
| **ITS USE IS:** |  | Required | |  | Optional | | |

**Completion Instructions:**

1. Notes, suggested text, instructions and other information is formatted using the following methods:

* Hidden text within brackets. {This is an example of the format.} Read the material within the brackets and take the appropriate action (usually inserting text or selecting from a choice of texts.) When printing this document, the default print property will not print the hidden text.
* Coded instruction within brackets. The instructions and shading will disappear when the required information is typed.
* Suggested text is shaded in gray without brackets (see Modification and Additions below.)

**Modifications and Additions:**

1. Areas shaded in gray, without brackets, represent suggested text that may be modified by the Facility to meet the needs of the Project. This is an example of the format. Ensure that any modified or added text is consistent with the Contract Documents.
2. Areas not highlighted in gray, without brackets, shall not be altered without approval of the Office of the President.

3. Facility may modify this document. The criteria and point allocation in the document are examples, and should be modified for each project. There should be a rational relationship between the categories and their relative weight/importance.

**Comments:**

1. Release of this document is ***optional***. Facility may decide how much information to provide in the prequalification questionnaire evaluation. For example, Facility may (1) issue prequalification questionnaire without completing “assigned points” in the right hand column; (2) may issue this document without the “summary worksheet” on the final page; and/or (3) may decide not to issue this document at all.

2. Do not release the accompanying scoring sheet with names of Review Panel outside the University.

**END OF COVERSHEET AND INSTRUCTIONS**

**Prequalification Questionnaire Evaluation**

**{OPTIONAL: FACILITY MAY DECIDE HOW MUCH INFORMATION TO PROVIDE IN THE PREQUALIFCATION QUESTIONNAIRE EVALUATION. FOR EXAMPLE, FACILITY MAY (1) ISSUE PREQUALIFICATION QUESTIONNAIRE WITHOUT COMPLETING “ASSIGNED POINTS” IN THE RIGHT HAND COLUMN; (2) MAY ISSUE THIS DOCUMENT WITHOUT THE “SUMMARY WORKSHEET” ON THE FINAL PAGE; AND/OR (3) MAY DECIDE NOT TO ISSUE THIS DOCUMENT AT ALL, }**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No. | CATEGORY/POINT RANGE | Actual  **Points** | Asgnd Points | |
| 1. License | | | | |
|  | Has code license (minimum). |  | | 1 |
| Does not have code license. |  | | NPQ\* |
| 2. Construction Experience | | | | |
|  | Number of projects submitted by Proposer costing more than $, completed between and :  0-1  2 (minimum)  3  4-6  7-10 |  | | NPQ  1  3  5  10 |
| Completion Record. Based upon information received from Proposer regarding days past completion date, rate proposer’s average on-time performance on qualifying projects.  0-20 days  21-35 days  35 plus days |  | | 6  3  1 |
| 3. Design Experience | | | | |
|  | Number of projects submitted by Proposer costing more than $, completed between and :  0-1  2 (minimum)  3  4-6  7-10 |  | | NPQ  1  3  5  10 |

“NPQ” denotes “Not Prequalified.”

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4. Financial Data | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Financial Statement Evaluation Matrix  Proposers Name:  Not Prequalified \_\_\_\_\_\_     Meets Minimum Criteria \_\_\_\_\_\_    Exceeds Minimum Criteria \_\_\_\_\_\_  (Refer to Rating Instructions on next page) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Financial  Ratios | Ratio  Calculation | | Previous  Fiscal  Year | Ratio | | Most  Recent  Quarter | Ratio | Next  Most  Recent  Quarter | | Ratio | Average  Ratio | Rating |
| 1.  Current  Ratio | Current  Assets | |  |  | |  |  |  | |  |  |  |
| Current  Liabilities | |  |  |  | |
| 2.  Debt  Ratio | Total  Debt | |  |  | |  |  |  | |  |  |  |
| Total  Net Worth | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | |  |  |  | |  | Total |  |
| Financial Statement Evaluation Matrix – Rating Instruction   1. Calculate each ratio for each reporting period as noted. 2. Average each ratio over the reporting periods. 3. Assign points to each average ratio per the following Table(1): | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | 1. Current Ratio   Assets/Liabilities | | | Less than 1  1 to 1.25  Over 1.25 | | | | NPQ  1 Point  3 Points | |  | |
| 2. Debt Ratio  Debt/Net Worth | | | Over 35%  30 to 35%  Under 30% | | | | NPQ  1 Point  3 Points | |
| 1. Report the final rating on previous page. | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | CATEGORY/POINT RANGE | ActualPoints | AsgndPoints |
| 5. Design Build Experience | | |  |  |
|  | | Number of projects submitted by Proposer costing more than $, completed between and :  0-1  2 (minimum)  3  4-6  7-10 |  | NPQ  1  3  5  10 |
| **6. Claims History** | |  |  |
|  | 6.1 University or Surety Claims: From information submitted by Proposer, determine Percentage of Recovery and Percentage of Claims Frequency for claims made by University or sureties against Proposer or general contractor component on projects listed in Form A since which exceeded $.   * + 1. Percentage of Recovery shall be the total dollar amount recovered by University or sureties for all claims meeting the above-specified criteria, divided by the total dollar amount claimed by University or sureties.     2. Percentage of Claims Frequency shall be the total number of claims meeting the above-specified criteria asserted by University or sureties, divided by the total number of projects listed in Sections 2,3, and 5 of the Prequalification Questionnaire. |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | After determining the Percentage of Recovery and the Percentage of Frequency, use the Table below to determine the actual points. | | | | | |  | |
|  |  |  | % of Recovery | | |  | |  |
|  |  | % of Claims Frequency | 67% to 100% | 34% to 66% | 0% to 33% |  | |  |
|  |  | 33% to 100% | NPQ | NPQ | NPQ |  | |  |
|  |  | 6% - 32% | NPQ | 3 | 7 |  | |  |
|  |  | 0%-5% | NPQ | 7 | 10 |  | |  |
|  |  | (OR No claims meeting the above criteria = 10 points) | | | |  | |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | CATEGORY/POINT RANGE | | | | | | | ActualPoints | AsgndPoints | |
| **6. Arbitration and Litigation History** | | | | | | | |  |  | |
|  | 6.2 Proposer Claims: From information submitted by Proposer, determine Percentage of Recovery and Percentage of Claims Frequency for claims made by Proposer or general contractor component against University on projects listed in Form B since which exceeded $.  6.2.1 Percentage of Recovery shall be the total dollar amount recovered by contractor on all claims meeting the above-specified criteria, divided by the total dollar amount of all claims asserted by contractor meeting the above-specified criteria as submitted on Form(s) B.  6.2.2 Percentage of Claims Frequency shall be the total number of claims meeting the above-specified criteria asserted by contractor, divided by the total number of projects listed in Sections 2,3, and 5 of the Prequalification Questionnaire.  After determining the Percentage of Recovery and the Percentage of Frequency, use the Table below to determine the actual points. | | | | | |  | | |  |
|  | |  | | % of Recovery | | |  | | |  | |
|  | |  | % of Claims Frequency | 67% to 100% | 34% to 66% | 0% to 33% |  | | |  |  | |
|  | |  | 33% to 100% | NPQ | NPQ | NPQ |  | | |  |  | |
|  | |  | 6% to 32% | NPQ | 3 | 7 |  | | |  |  | |
|  | |  | 0% - 5% | NPQ | 7 | 10 |  | | |  |  | |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |  | | |  |  | |
|  | |  | (OR No claims meeting the above criteria = 10 points) | | | |  | | |  |  | |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |  | | |  |  | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | CATEGORY/POINT RANGE | ActualPoints | | | AsgndPoints |
| 7. Surety | | | | | | |
|  | * 1. From listing submitted by Proposer listing names of sureties, determine number of times contracts were taken over by surety since : | |  |  | | |
|  | One or more. | |  | NPQ | | |
|  | Never (minimum). | |  | 4 | | |
|  | 7.2 From declaration by surety, can Proposer obtain minimum bonding?  No  Yes | |  | NPQ  1 | | |
| 8. Insurance | | | | | | |
|  | 8.1 From statement submitted by Proposer, can Proposer obtain Minimum General Liability Insurance?  No  Yes  Automobile liability in minimum amount?  No  Yes  Professional liability in minimum amount:  No  Yes | |  | NPQ  1 | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | CATEGORY/POINT RANGE | | ActualPoints | | | AsgndPoints | | |
|  | 8.2 Letters from insurance company  No letter.  Does not meet limits.  Meets limits. | |  | | | | NPQ  NPQ  1 |
| 9. Disqualification | | | | | | | |
|  | | 9.1 Is Proposer currently disqualified from UC projects? NoYes |  | | 0  NPQ | | |
|  | * 1. Is Proposer currently disqualified by other contract entities?  NoYes | |  | | 0  NPQ | | |
| **10. Rates for Additional Design Services** | | |  | | | | |
|  | * 1. Rates submitted are reasonable in relation to current market conditions   Rates not reasonable  Rates are reasonable | |  | NPQ  1 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | CATEGORY/POINT RANGE | | ActualPoints | | AsgndPoints |
| 11. Proposed Design Build Team Members | | | | | |
|  | | Number of design build projects submitted by architect costing more than $, completed between and :  0-1  2  3  4-6  7-10  Number of design build projects submitted by project manager costing more than $, completed between and :  0-1  2  3  4-6  7-10  Number of design build projects submitted by other design professionals costing more than $, completed between and :  0-1  2  3  4-6  7-10 |  | NPQ  1  3  5  10  NPQ  1  3  5  10  NPQ  1  3  5  10 | |

Go to Summary Work Sheet on next page.

**FOR UNIVERSITY USE ONLY**

**Do Not Issue to Proposer**

#### PREQUALIFICATION EVALUATION SUMMARY WORK SHEET

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CATEGORY** | **Maximum**  **Assignable**  **Points** | **Actual**  **Points** | **Minimum Required**  **Points** |
| **1. Contractor’s License** | 1 |  | 1 |
| **2. Construction Experience**  2.1 Total amount  2.2 Completion record | 10  6 |  | 2  1 |
| **3. Design Experience** | 10 |  | 1 |
| **4. Financial Data** | 6 |  | 2 |
| **5. Design Build Experience** | 10 |  | 1 |
| **6. Claims History**  6.1 By University  6.2 By Proposer | 4  1 |  | 4  1 |
| **7. Surety**  7.1 Complete work  7.2 Bonding capacity | 1  1 |  | 1  1 |
| 1. **Insurance**   8.1 Limits   * General liability * Auto liability * Professional Liability   8.2 Letter | 1  1  1  1 |  | 1  1  1  1 |
| **CATEGORY** | **Maximum**  **Assignable**  **Points** | **Actual**  **Points** | **Minimum**  **Points** |
| **9. Prior Disqualification** By University of California 9.2 By other University | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |
| **10. Rates** | 1 |  | 1 |
| **11. Team Members** | 30 |  | 3 |
| TOTALS | 85\* |  |  |
| \*Total points to prequalify are points. Individual category points must meet minimumrequired points for each category for Proposer to be prequalified. | | | |