

Public Records Request #3039

The following materials have been gathered in response to public records request #3039. These materials include:

- Evaluation File Memo – August 31, 2018

This information was provided as a response to a public records request on 1/9/20 and is current to that date. There is a possibility of more current information and/or documents related to the stated subject matter.

Further Information

For further information about this request or the Citywide Records Program, please contact:

Cheyenne Flotree
Citywide Records Program Manager
City of Charlotte/City Clerk's Office
600 East 4th Street, 7th Floor
Charlotte, NC 28202
Cheyenne.Flotree@charlottenc.gov

Amelia Knight
Public Records Specialist
City of Charlotte/City Clerk's Office
600 East 4th Street, 7th Floor
Charlotte, NC 28202
Amelia.Knight@charlottenc.gov

MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 31, 2018

TO: Evaluation File

FROM: Mene Roming, Contracts Administrator

SUBJECT: Evaluation of Submittals in Response to RFQ 2018-357
Innovation Barn Renovations Construction Manager-at-Risk

The Evaluation Committee for RFQ 2018-357 Innovation Barn Renovations Manager-at-Risk Services convened on August 22, 2018, at the Charlotte–Mecklenburg Government Center. Having previously individually reviewed the 6 qualification packages submitted in response to the RFQ, the Evaluation Committee members discussed the strengths, weaknesses, risks, and opportunities associated with each package. The Committee decided to shortlist and invite Edifice, Inc. and J.E. Dunn Construction Company to participate in an informal interview process.

Conversations with the shortlisted firms were held at the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center on August 30 and 31, 2018. The Evaluation Committee had a candid exchange with both teams. Both teams have a reputation for excellence, making the final selection decision a difficult one. After open discussion and careful consideration, the committee reached consensus and chose to begin contract negotiations with J.E. Dunn Construction Company.

In reaching its decision, the Committee noted the following items with regards to each firm/team:

Balfour Beatty Construction, LLC

Balfour Beatty's Rail Division experienced many problems in constructing Charlotte's street car line and the light rail. City Council is familiar with these difficulties and it is unlikely that they would award another contract to Balfour Beatty at this time. Additionally, the evaluation committee noted that Balfour Beatty made no mention of Envision in its submittal, suggesting a lack of understanding regarding the project. The renovation projects cited were not substantially similar to the work that will be performed in renovating the Innovation Barn. Employees seemed to be new to the firm, without long term tenure. Balfour Beatty was not shortlisted for further discussions.

Edifice, Inc.

The evaluation committee rated Edifice very highly and noted their open book and full team involvement approach. Edifice was selected as one of two finalists for an informal interview. During the meeting, Edifice discussed the challenges of the project. While Edifice was positive in its verbal responses and approach, it also was cautious in some of its assessments, which is not unreasonable in light of the current condition of the building, the constrained budget, and accelerated schedule. Following the interviews and given the totality of circumstances, the evaluation committee felt that another firm would be the best fit for this particular project.

J.E. Dunn Construction Company

The evaluation committee felt that J.E. Dunn demonstrated the best understanding of the project. They have a great EMR score. Three key team members worked together on several projects. They use BIM and do mockups. They also pay their small business partners early. J.E. Dunn had a great informal interview with the evaluation committee and exuded confidence and stated that they had successfully completed projects with similar challenges in the past. Based on the totality of circumstances, the evaluation committee reached consensus and chose to begin contract negotiations for the Innovation Barn Renovation project with J.E. Dunn Construction Company.

MV Momentum Construction, LLC

MV Momentum did not have any projects that were big enough. They did not demonstrate any construction manager-at-risk experience and their similar projects were not similar to the project contemplated for the Innovation Barn. MV Momentum Construction was not selected for interview or contract award.

Shiel Sexton Company, Inc.

Shiel Sexton's cover letter explained how they understand the project. Team members were hand-picked. They have a good safety record and are good people to work with. Individuals listed did not appear to have CMR experience. They also did not have a dedicated person to handle CBI matters. And they did not mention Envision, nor did they address partnering with the City and Envision. Shiel Sexton was not selected for interview or contract award.

Southside Constructors, Inc.

The submittal seemed like a boilerplate put together without much effort. While Southside Constructors produced good results with the CMPD Eastway and CMPD Steelescreek projects, there were no renovation projects listed involving CMR. They did not list a dedicated CBI person and do not have a good safety record. Also, they did not appear to understand that packages would have to be bid out. Southside Constructors was not selected for interview or contract award.