CONSTRUCTION MANAGER AT RISK PROPOSAL EVAULATION MATRIX

COUNTY OF WAKE Marbles Kids Museum Expansion & Renovation

Forced Choice Factor Weighting Analysis

Evaluation Team Worksheet

						ı																	202.252				
							WEIGHT		AM. SOUTH		BARNHILL				BLU			BORDEAUX		CT WILSON		GILBANE		RODGERS		SKANSKA	
B C D E F		Н	I	J	K	L	Base weig		RAW	FINAL	RAW	FINAL	RAW	FINAL	RAW	FINAL	RAW	FINAL	RAW	FINAL	RAW	FINAL	RAW	FINAL	RAW	FINAL	
	A A	Α	Α	Α	Α	Α	plus actual weight																				
A 2 3 3 3 3		3	3	3	3	3	A =	30	2	60	4	120	3	90	2	60	2	60	3	90	2	60	3	90	3	90	
B B B E	3 B	В	В	В	В	В																					
B 3 3 3	3 2	2	3	3	3	3	B =	31	2	62	3	93	4	124	2	62	2	62	2	62	3	93	4	124	3	93	
c c c c	С	С	С	С	С	С																					
C 3 2 3	3	2	3	3	3	3	C =	26	2	52	4	104	4	104	3	78	2	52	4	104	4	104	4	104	4	104	
Evaluation Criteria D E [D D	D	D	D	D	D																					
A Past Performance on Similar Projects D 2 3	3 1	3	3	2	3	2	D =	18	2	36	4	72	4	72	3	54	3	54	3	54	3	54	4	72	4	72	
B Qualifications & Experience of Team E E	E	E	E	E	E	E																					
C Proposed Approach to CM Services E 3	3	3	3	3	3	3	E =	24	2	48	3	72	4	96	4	96	3	72	3	72	2	48	3	72	3	72	
D Local Trade Contractor & MBE Approach	G	Н	F	J	K	L																					
E Project Cost Control / Schedule Experience F 3 3 2			2	3	3	3	F =	3	2	6	2	6	3	9	2	6	3	9	2	6	3	9	2	6	2	6	
F Current Workload of Firm & Team	G	G	G	G	G	G																					
G Public CMAR Project Experience	G	2	3	2	1	2	G =	14	1	14	4	56	4	56	2	28	3	42	1	14	3	42	4	56	4	56	
H Significant Legal or Technical Problems H H				J	K	L																					
I Proximity & Familiarity with Local Area H 2				3	2	3	H =	12	1	12	4	48	4	48	4	48	2	24	3	36	4	48	4	48	2	24	
J Other Factors - Demonstrated Preconstruction Capabilities				J	K	L																					
K Other Factors - Acknowledged Maintenance Considerations I 3				3	2	3	I =	1	2	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	
L Other Factors - Demonstrated Commitment to Non-Profit Missions J J					J	J																					
M Interview Results J 3					3	3	J =	16	1	16	4	64	4	64	3	48	2	32	3	48	3	48	4	64	3	48	
					K	K																					
					K	2	K =	10	1	10	4	40	4	40	2	20	2	20	2	20	4	40	4	40	4	40	
Relative weight assigned to each Evaluation Criteria is based on						L																					
comparison of each criteria against all others using the following values:						L	L =	10	1	10	4	40	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	3	30	3	30	1	10	
Definite Higher Priority 3																											
Moderately Higher Priority 2							M =	50			3	150	2	100									4	200			
Slightly Higher Priority 1							TOTALS			328		869		817		514		441		519		580		910		618	

*A point value of **one (1)** is included as the initial basic weight for all Evaluation Criteria prior to beginning the analysis

2. Proposals are rated by evaluating each proposal against the RFP requirements using the above Evaluation Criteria. Raw score resulting from this evaluation is based on the following scale:

Excellent 4
Very Good 3
Good 2
Fair 1

Notes: