

RFP EVALUATION PANEL REPORT

Project: City County Building Capital Needs Assessment
Location: 210 Martin Luther King Jr Blvd, Madison, WI 53703
Aldermanic District: 4
RFP: 14044-0-2025-AH
Date: Nov. 24, 2025

REVISIONS:

- REV-1: Section C.3 has been amended to correct mistyped HGA details, updating the Total Hours from 201 to 682 and revising the associated "Average Cost per Hour" accordingly.

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

The City of Madison, Wisconsin has included funding in the Capital Improvement Plan to complete a Capital Needs Assessment (CNA) of the City-County Building (CCB) located at 210 Martin Luther King Jr Blvd, Madison, WI 53703. The CCB is a government facility that is jointly owned by the City of Madison (40.8%) and Dane County (59.2%). Dane County is responsible for facility maintenance and custodial activities. The scope of this CNA shall include all common area facility elements and systems, and all city-owned tenant space elements and systems. This CNA excludes the County owned tenant spaces - including jail facilities. The CNA shall be a comprehensive inspection of the property that estimates the future costs of property maintenance and repairs, including the cost to repair urgent issues. The goal is to evaluate the facility's physical condition, identify deficiencies, and provide a draft and final report that includes all the findings, and a projection of future capital expenses needed for ongoing preservation, particularly for long-term planning.

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

The A/E services for this contract shall include detailed physical inspections, research, and interviews to determine both short-term and long-term capital needs. Inspections shall be conducted on-site, research shall include review of all relevant City and County facility documents, and interviews shall be held with County maintenance and custodial staff as well as City Engineering-Facilities staff.

The A/E scope shall provide:

- Recommendations for ongoing maintenance schedules for all building systems and components.
- Recommendations for replacement schedules for all buildings, systems, and components.
- Estimates of short-term (10 years or less) and long-term (30–50 years) probable costs, including escalation assumptions.
- Assessments of interior and exterior elements and systems, covering major building and site components such as site entries, signage, fencing, landscaping, sidewalks, drives, lighting, sewer utilities, gas and electric infrastructure, structural components, enclosure systems, elevators, mechanical and ventilation systems, water heating systems, plumbing, electrical service and wiring, low voltage systems, lighting, fire protection systems, finishes, and other significant site systems.

The A/E scope shall encompass all phases of inspection, documentation, recommendations, and reporting to ensure a comprehensive evaluation of facility needs and future planning.

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. The RFP format, scoring and awarding was overseen by City of Madison, Finance-Purchasing.

2. RFP Response and Evaluation Timeline - 2025

Jul 17	RFP is issued
Aug 01	Questions Due
Aug 12	Addendum 1 posted
Aug 15	Addendum 2 posted
Aug 22	Proposals Due
Sep 10	Evaluation meeting #1. Distribute submissions to Evaluation Panelists.
Sep 25	Scoring is due to City Purchasing
Sep 26	Evaluation meeting #2. Panel discussed technical scores, local preference scoring, and fee proposal scoring. The Panel selected the top (3) finalists pending the response from one finalist. (1) panelist found unresponsive.
Oct 8,9,13	Questions and interview format sent to three finalists
Oct 9,10,14	Finalist interviews
Nov 4	Evaluation meeting #3, Panel discussed interviews
Dec 09	Referral/Recommendation at Common Council
Jan 05	Referral/Recommendation at Finance Committee
Jan 14	Referral/Recommendation at Board of Public Works
Jan 27	Action at Common Council

3. Original RFP Respondents (5)

- 1) Concord
- 2) CR BPS
- 3) HGA Consulting
- 4) InSite Consulting
- 5) McKinstry

4. Evaluation Panel

The evaluation panel was comprised of a total of four panelists. The panelists were tasked with scoring the technical requirements of the RFP proposal and included the following: 2 panelists from City Engineering-Facilities Management and 2 panelists from Dane County Facilities Management.

5. Evaluation Structure and Scoring

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 Finance’s Purchasing Unit. 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 in the RFP in Section 5. Scope of Work and Required Information. Panelists followed Purchasing guidelines and predetermined grading scales for each evaluated deliverable as detailed in section 5.3 Required Information and Content of Proposals.

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 for each of the Respondents. Purchasing scored the following deliverables based on City Purchasing guidelines: 5.4 Cost Proposal.

During ROUND-1 reviews, a proposal was designated non-responsive per a significantly lower fee than all other proposals. Specifically, the proposal was \$92,015 or 63% lower than the next lowest proposal, which is a direct result from the unresponsive vendor’s notably lower estimated hours to complete the proposed Scope Of Work. The proposal was removed from consideration at this time.

Panelists recommended three of the four remaining Finalists move on to Round 2 of the evaluation process as noted in section C1 below.

ROUND - 2

Finalists were provide 7 questions to be addressed during an interview presentation. Panelists evaluated each Finalist team – using ROUND – 1’s Scoring Criteria. Panelists considered each Finalist team on how well they did or did not address initial questions, how well they responded to questions by the Panelists after their presentation, and how well the overall presentation went.

Panelists evaluated and scored each Finalists interview and submitted their scoring evaluation to Purchasing. Purchasing weighted and averaged all of the interview scores.

Panelists then met to discuss the consolidated scoring and recommended one Finalist as noted in section C2 below.

C. Summary of Evaluation

1. Scoring Round 1

	Max Points	Concord	CR BPS	HGA	InSite	McKinstry
Technical	65	32.88	43.25	38.38	44.94	NA
Cost	30	18.11	22.62	30.00	11.40	NA
Local Vendor	5	0	0	0	5.00	NA
Total	100	50.99	65.87	68.38	61.34	NA
Ranking		4	2	1	3	

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

	Max Points	CR BPS	HGA	InSite
Technical	65	51.38	41.38	42.75
Cost	30	22.62	30.00	11.40
Local Vendor	5	0	0	5.00
Total	100	74.00	71.38	59.15

Ranking		1	2	3

3. Fee Breakdown

Cost Evaluation	CR BPS	HGA	InSite
Basic + Additional Services of Scope	\$193,858	\$147,151	\$384,625
Total Hours	1,408	682	2,464
Average Cost per Hour	\$ 137.69	\$ 215.76	\$ 156.10
Purchasing Cost Score	23	30	11

REV-1

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 CR-Building Performance Specialists (CR BPS) be approved as the consultant for the professional services required for the City County Building Capital Needs Assessment.