

# RFP EVALUATION PANEL REPORT

**Project:** Far West Public Works Operations Building  
**Location:** 402 South Point Road  
**Aldermanic District:** 1  
**RFP:** 14005-0-2025-BP (Contract 9665)  
**Date:** May 2, 2025

This Evaluation has been reviewed and approved by a Principal Architect 2, Principal Engineer 2, Deputy City Engineer, Deputy Division Manager, or the City Engineer. ☒ Yes ☐ No

## A. Project Details

---

### 1. Background Information

Continued expansion of the City of Madison west of the West Beltline Hwy. has made it necessary to provide the public with snow plowing, trash and recycling pick up, and other basic public works services from a far west location instead of from Central Madison.

This project consists of the design and construction of a Public Works Operations Building to be located at 402 South Point Road in Madison, WI. This facility will be similar in size and function to the existing facilities on West Badger Rd. and Sycamore Ave. and will be used by Streets Division, Fleet Services, and Parks Division.

The preliminary design and construction budget for this project is ~\$45M. Design is scheduled for the remainder of 2025 and into 1<sup>st</sup> quarter 2026. Construction is estimated to begin late 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter 2026 and be completed approximately 2 years later in 2028.

### 2. Role of Architecture and Engineering Services (A/E)

The A/E design services for this contract shall include plans and specifications for site planning, landscaping, architectural design of interior and exterior spaces, finishes, MEP/FP/T (mechanical, electrical, plumbing, fire protection, and technology) systems design, constructions specifications, cost estimating, and the coordination of Art by an approved artist into the project to meet the Percent for Art ordinance.

The A/E scope shall be for all design phases, preparation for bidding, construction administration and the warranty phase.

## B. Purchasing Details

---

### 1. Purchasing guidelines for RFP evaluation

The City of Madison solicited proposals from qualified vendors through a Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP, addenda, tabulations, awards and related announcements were posted on two distribution networks – VendorNet and DemandStar – on January 7, 2025. The RFP format, scoring and awarding was overseen by City of Madison, Finance-Purchasing.

### 2. RFP Response and Evaluation Timeline - 2025

Jan 7	RFP is issued
Jan 17	Questions are due
Jan 27	Addendum 1 posted, extended due date and additional questions for responses due to adding artist requirements.
Feb 14	Final questions are due
Feb 21	Addendum 2 posted, no due date extensions
Feb 21	Addendum 3 posted, no due date extensions
Feb 28	Response submissions are due
Mar 4	Distribute submissions to evaluation Panelists and first evaluation meeting
Mar 17	Scoring is due to City Purchasing

Mar 17	Second evaluation meeting with panel to discuss technical scores, artist scoring, local preference scoring, and fee proposal scoring. The Panel selected the top 4 Finalists pending the approval of disqualifications.
Mar 20	Disqualifications were approved by Purchasing Supervisor
Mar 27	Questions and interview format sent to Finalists
Apr 11 & 14	Finalist interviews
Apr 18	Evaluation meeting #3, Panel discussed interviews, publishing of addendum 4 and requesting a Best and Final Offer from finalists
Apr 21	Addendum 4 sent to Finalists with request for Best and Final Offer (BAFO)
Apr 25	BAFO due to Purchasing
May 1	Evaluation meeting #4 with Panelists to select Finalist
May 20	Referral/Recommendation at Common Council
May 21	Referral/Recommendation at Board of Public Works
May 27	Referral/Recommendation at Finance Committee
Jun 3	Action at Common Council

### 3. Original RFP Respondents (11)

Angus-Young Associates, Inc.  
 Barrientos Design & Consulting, Inc.  
 Bloom Companies, LLC  
 Charles Vincent George Architects, Inc.  
 Dimension IV – Madison, LLC  
 Engberg Anderson  
 Kueny Architects, LLC  
 OPN Architects  
 Potter Lawson, Inc.  
 Sketchworks Architecture, LLC  
 Stantec Architecture Inc.

### 4. Evaluation Panel

The evaluation panel was comprised of a total of 8 panelists. Six of the panelists were tasked with scoring the technical requirements of the RFP proposal and included the following: 2 panelists from City Engineering-Facility Management, 2 from Streets Division, 1 from Fleet Services, 1 From Parks Division. Two additional panelists from Planning Division were tasked with specifically evaluating and advising the panel on information provided for the required Artist, a sub-consultant required to meet the City Percent for Art Ordinance.

### 5. Evaluation Structure and Scoring

Due to the high number of Respondents the evaluation for this RFP was conducted in two rounds.

Evaluations were documented through a quantifiable scoring mechanism – see Section C of this document. The evaluation was conducted in a structured manner and administered by City Purchasing. See below for additional details.

#### ROUND - 1

Per instructions within the Request for Proposal, Respondents were asked to provide a series of deliverables, a portion of which were evaluated by the Panel. Evaluated deliverables included RFP sections 5.2 Required Information and Content of Proposals. Panelists followed Purchasing guidelines and predetermined grading scales for each evaluated deliverable. Further, the following deliverables were given a score based on City Purchasing guidelines; 4.1 Local Vendor Preference and 5.3 Basis of Selection. Please note the RFP provided detailed instruction and grading scales for each evaluated deliverable.

Panelists evaluated and scored the technical qualification and information section of each proposal and submitted their scoring evaluation to Purchasing where all the Panelist scores were averaged and weighted for evaluation between all of the Respondents. Purchasing also scored local preference and fee proposal. Panelists then met to discuss the consolidated scoring, recommended disqualification of 2 respondents (as noted in section 5 above) and also recommended that 4 respondent finalists move on to Round 2 of the evaluation process.

#### ROUND - 2

The 4 Finalists were provided with 6 specific criteria that needed to be addressed during their interview presentation. The Panelists evaluated each Finalist team on how well they did or did not address the criteria, how well they responded to questions by the Panelists after their presentation, and how well the overall presentation went.

The 4 Finalists were asked to provide their Best and Final Offer for cost based on the scope of work provided in the original RFP, the 3 original addendums, and a final request to include stormwater management design in the cost proposal.

Panelists evaluated and scored each Finalists interview and submitted their scoring evaluation to Purchasing. Purchasing weighted and averaged all of the interview scores, tabulated in the original Round 1 scores and the Best and Final Offer Fee Proposal.

Panelists then met to discuss the consolidated scoring and recommended one Finalist as noted in section C1 below.

## 6. Disqualifications

There were 2 disqualifications during the first round of evaluations. Both were presented to, and approved by Mary Richards in Purchasing on March 22:

- 1) Dimension IV was deemed Non-Responsive by the review panel as not meeting the minimum requirements of the RFP. Dimension IV was the only respondent that did not include a specific artist and artist qualifications as required. Funds were allocated in their fee proposal for an artist.
- 2) Kueny Architects was deemed Non-Responsible by the review panel as not being able to actually fulfill the requirements of the RFP. While Kueny had the lowest fee proposal they had significantly fewer hours in 4 of the 7 fee proposal areas and had the lowest score in the technical response section as well.

## C. Summary of Evaluation

---

### 1. Scoring Round 1

Firm	Technical Proposal (65 Points)	Cost Proposal (30 Points)	Local Vendor (5 Points)	Total Points (100 Points)	Rank
Angus-Young	48.37	28.20	0.00	76.57	1
Barrientos	37.82	29.18	0.00	67.00	3
Bloom	37.95	24.83	0.00	62.78	6
CVG	37.85	19.27	0.00	57.12	8
Dimension IV	DQ	DQ	5.00	0.00	DQ
Engberg Anderson	40.30	21.20	0.00	61.58	7
Kueny	DQ	DQ	0.00	0.00	DQ
OPN	47.33	16.89	0.00	64.22	5
Potter Lawson	40.35	21.48	5.00	66.83	4
Sketchworks	40.10	30.00	5.00	75.10	2
Stantec	40.38	13.65	0.00	54.03	9

#### Notes:

1. The RFP proposal review is an opportunity to narrow the field of candidates via an initial round of scoring primarily based on response to the RFP guidelines. A smaller group of Finalists then moved on to an interview round.
2. A full description of requested material and grading weights can be found in the associated RFP documents.
3. Please review Section 4, below regarding Local Vendor Preference.

## 2. Scoring Round 2

Firm	Technical Proposal 1 <sup>st</sup> Round (65 Points)	Interview 2 <sup>nd</sup> Round (65 Points)	BAFO Cost Proposal (60 Points)	Local Vendor (10 Points)	Total Points (200 Points)	Rank
Angus-Young	48.37	43.97	54.01	0.00	146.34	2
Barrientos	37.82	38.60	57.00	0.00	133.42	3
Potter Lawson	40.35	52.60	42.52	10.00	145.47	4
Sketchworks	40.10	39.57	60.00	10.00	149.67	1

## 3. Fee Breakdown – Best and Final Offer of the 4 Finalists

Cost Evaluation	Angus-Young	Barrientos	Potter Lawson	Sketchworks
Basic Services of Scope	\$ 1,757,345.00	\$ 1,674,546	\$ 2,244,760.00	\$ 1,590,783.00
Total Hours	9,460	9,514	17,148	11,506
Average Cost per Hour	\$ 186.82	\$ 176.02	\$ 130.91	\$ 138.26
Purchasing Cost Score	54.01	57.00	42.52	60.00

## 4. Local Preference

The City of Madison has adopted a Local Preference Purchasing Policy (RES-07-00421, FILE ID 05943) granting a scoring preference to local suppliers. Only suppliers who meet the criteria and are registered as of the bid's due date will receive preference.

Was the outcome of this bid changed by the local purchasing ordinance?

☒ Yes

☐ No

## 5. Recommendation

Based on the scoring and evaluation outlined above the selection Panel recommends that Sketchworks Architecture, LLC be approved as the consultant for the professional services required for the Far West Public Works Operations Building Project.