

**MONMOUTH COUNTY BOARD OF CHOSEN FREEHOLDERS**

Freeholder Meeting Venue:

Date: Jul 11, 2013 - 7:00 PM

Location: Hall of Records  
 Freeholders' Meeting Room  
 1 East Main Street  
 Freehold, NJ 07728

Agenda: Resolution establishing the preferred method for the solicitation and selection of architectural and engineering consultants by the County of Monmouth

Official Document #	Res# 2013-0537						
Meeting Date	07/11/2013						
Introduced Date	07/11/2013						
Adopted Date	07/11/2013						
Agenda Item	9						
FREEHOLDER	PRES.	ABS.	MOVE	SEC	AYE	NAY	ABST.
Rich	<				<		
Curley	<		<		<		
Burry	<				<		
DiMaso	<			<	<		
Arnone	<				<		

**CERTIFICATION**

I HEREBY CERTIFY THE ABOVE TO BE A TRUE COPY OF A RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF CHOSEN FREEHOLDERS OF THE COUNTY OF MONMOUTH AT A MEETING HELD

*July 11, 2013*  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Clerk

Administrator

**RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING THE PREFERRED METHOD  
FOR THE SOLICITATION AND SELECTION OF  
ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS BY  
THE COUNTY OF MONMOUTH**

**WHEREAS**, the County of Monmouth solicits numerous proposals from architectural and engineering consultants; and

**WHEREAS**, the procedures for the solicitation and evaluation of proposals were established through the County's Fair and Open Process, Resolution No. 06-178 adopted on February 23, 2006; supplemented by the January 14, 2010 Resolution No. 10-53 establishing a cost-sensitive mathematical formula for proposal evaluations; and

**WHEREAS**, consulting firms have raised concerns regarding the amount of time and cost required to submit a full technical and cost proposal in responding to the County's Fair and Open Request for Proposals (RFP) process, which burden may have deterred consultants in responding to County's solicitations; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board of Chosen Freeholders considers it beneficial to the County to encourage greater participation by consultants in response to the County's solicitations; and

**WHEREAS**, in order to lessen the burden on the consultants and encourage greater participation by consultants, this Board has considered replacing the current RFP process with a two (2) step solicitation and selection process consisting of (1) a Request for Professional Qualifications (RFPQ) and (2) a Request for Proposals (RFP), whereby the RFPQ will be open to all interested consultants and the RFP will be open to three (3) or four (4) best qualified consultants as determined by an evaluation of the submitted qualifications; and

**WHEREAS**, the proposed two (2) step process will also include a project performance evaluation of the selected consultant; and

Introduced on: July 11, 2013  
Adopted on: July 11, 2013  
Official Resolution#: 2013-0537

**WHEREAS**, the proposed two (2) step solicitation and selection process, along with the respective evaluation criteria for each step, was presented to numerous representatives of the consulting community at an information meeting on April 16, 2013, followed by a thirty (30) day comment period; and

**WHEREAS**, the proposed solicitation and selection process was received favorably with minor comments which have been reviewed and responded to; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board considers it appropriate to adopt the proposed two (2) step solicitation and selection process for architectural and engineering professional services contracts.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Board of Chosen Freeholders of the County of Monmouth that the County hereby adopts the two (2) step solicitation and selection process, as outlined in the attached guideline last revised July 11, 2013, as the preferred method for the solicitation, selection and performance evaluation of architectural and engineering consultants for the County of Monmouth.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that any portion of the guideline, including the evaluation criteria for Step 1 RFPQ and Step 2 RFP may be modified or revised to be project specific subject to the discretion of the County staff.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that all resolutions or parts of resolutions inconsistent with this resolution, including but not limited to Resolution No. 10-53 and Resolution No. 06-178, are hereby rescinded.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that for County projects with outside funding sources, such as the Federal or State agencies, the procurement requirements of the funding source and/or as set forth in the funding agreement shall govern, to the extent that they require a process which differs from the process established by this resolution.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that this resolution shall take effect on July 15, 2013.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Clerk of the Board shall forward a certified true copy of this resolution to the Office of County Counsel, all County Department Heads, the County Engineer, the County Finance Office, and the County Director of Purchasing.

**Guidelines to Solicit and Select  
Architectural and Engineering Consultants for  
Professional Services Contracts  
(Two Step Process)**

**Step 1 (RFPQ):**

- Request for Professional Qualifications (RFPQ) through Monmouth County website.
  - Limit qualifications write-up to four (4) pages, plus relevant resumes.
  - Score responders based on qualifications:
    1. Location (10%) – Typically, engineers and architects will be required to visit both the project site and the offices of the County Department requesting the professional services. Physical proximity to each of these locations in relation to the location of the consultant’s office improves efficiency and reduces cost.
    2. Qualifications / Experience of Firm in Similar Work (30%) – The score for this criterion will reflect the professional qualifications and experience of the firm and its proposed project team in performing work that is similar to that described in the RFPQ.
    3. Current Monmouth County Open Contracts (Billable Balance) (25%) – The County seeks to maintain a healthy competitive atmosphere with regard to the solicitation of proposals from engineers and architects for County projects. Likewise, the County is wary of having too many of its projects assigned to any one consultant. Therefore, the score for this criterion will be based upon the following formula, which compares the current billable balance for contracts between the applicant and the requesting County Department with the overall billable balance of all outstanding requesting County Department contracts for engineering or architectural work:

<u>Applicant’s share of current County contract</u>	<u>Score</u>
0% thru 4%	5
5% thru 9%	4
10% thru 14%	3
15% thru 19%	2
20% or more	1

The current billable balance will be as shown on the requesting County Department’s most recent accounting summary for engineers or architects, respectively, which is available on the date when the proposals are received.

4. Past Monmouth County Project Performance (35%) – The scores for those applicants who have had prior experience working on a County project will reflect the County’s level of satisfaction with those services. The score for those consultants who have not had any prior experience will be a “neutral” score of 3.

Going forward, for each Monmouth County project, Performance Evaluation of a consultant will be performed at the 50% mark and after the completion of the project based on the following criteria:

**Performance Evaluation:**

1. Quality of Work Product (30%) – The score for this criterion will reflect whether work (plans, specifications, reports, permit applications, etc.) submitted were acceptable or require repeated resubmissions.

Introduced on: July 11, 2013

Adopted on: July 11, 2013

2. **Project Management (30%)** – The score for this criterion will reflect the demonstration of the consultant team’s project management such as the project team: is organized and proficient with administrative, procedural and technical skills; performs the work of the project as required in the Scope and as directed by the County; supervises the progress of the work of its staff and that of its subconsultant(s); is proficient with verbal and written communications skills; is cooperative with County project team; keeps the County advised of general matters and informs of issues as they arise; is available for County calls and meetings; notifies the County prior to the occurrence of extra or additional work; and adequately addresses any other project demands.
  3. **On Budget (30%)** – The score for this criterion will reflect whether the project work is below, on or over budget.
  4. **On Schedule (10%)** – The score for this criterion will reflect whether the work is completed in advance of the agreed schedule date, work is on time, some work is delayed but does not affect the overall project schedule, work is delayed and the project schedule is affected.
- Select and invite 3 or 4 firms for Step 2 (RFP). Generally, three (3) firms will be invited to submit Step 2 proposals; however, a fourth firm may be invited to submit a proposal for larger, more complicated projects.

#### Step 2 (RFP):

- Request for Proposals (RFP)
  - From only the selected 3 or 4 firms.
  - Score the proposals based on technical and cost criteria.
    1. **Understanding of Scope of Work and Project Needs (25%)** – The score for this criterion will reflect the proposer’s demonstrated understanding of the work to be performed and the various components of the project that will be required for its successful completion.
    2. **Approach to Project (Efficiency, Thoroughness, Innovation) (25%)** – The score for this criterion will reflect quality of the proposer’s approach to design or construction administration, including the use of design elements and construction methods that are likely to improve project performance, reduce construction costs, shorten project length and/or extend the useful life of the project.
    3. **Cost & Man Hour / Lump Sum (Reasonableness) (50%)** – The score for this criterion will reflect the reasonableness of the total projected work hours, the distribution of those hours among staff of different skill levels, and the hourly rates for the assigned staff to establish the contract fee ceiling or the proposed lump sum for the project. In this context, the proposer offering the lowest cost may not receive a favorable score in relation to the other applicants, nor will the applicant offering the highest cost necessarily receive an unfavorable score in relation to the other proposers.
  - Award to highest scored proposer.