



Roger León
Superintendent

Newark Board of Education

Where Passion Meets Progress

Request for Proposal 9340 2021 Facility Conditions Assessment EVALUATION REPORT

I. List the names of all on the evaluation committee:

1. Christopher Caponegro, Lead
2. Rodney Williams, Director of Energy and Sustainability
3. Carlos Edmundo, Director of Field Operations
4. Wali Thomas, Director of Custodial Services
5. Vincent Hutcheson, Director of Project Control
6. Lisa Abdul, Management Specialist

II. List the names and summary of vendors who submitted a proposal:

Vendor	Summary of Proposal
1. Architects Alliance	Their proposal was to partner with an outside Engineering firm which made it less attractive for the Newark Board of Education. They have submitted a plan that was in accordance with the specifications, but the cost was slightly higher because in their proposal they were partnering with an outside engineering firm. This vendor is currently involved in several projects with the Newark Board of Education, and they have a good relationship with the district.
2. CHA Consulting, Inc.	Their proposal was very detailed and clearly illustrated how they can perform this assessment successfully and in a timely manner. This vendor is involved with our Energy Savings Improvement Plan. They are working with the district, and we are very satisfied with their organizational structure. Financially this was the best option with a very competitive proposal.
3. DMR Architects	In reviewing of this vendor proposal they have an impressive organization but have not done this type of assessment in any school district in New Jersey. Their bid was very comprehensive and detailed. They outlined all items we wanted addressed, but financially this proposal was higher than expected.
4. Mott MacDonald	This vendor has done work in this district but not a project of this magnitude. The proposal's pricing was reasonable but, they only had one School District project as a reference. They

	outlined in their proposal as per the specification a timeline and goals.
5. Netta Architects	Netta is a small architectural firm. Their proposal shows references of many building design projects, but they have not successfully completed a job in a school district. In their proposal they provided an outline and schedule but financially the Assessment fees were among the highest.
6. SBLM Architects	This vendor's proposal was the Second highest priced. This is a large firm with all Architects and Engineers under one roof. They outlined in their proposal a timeline and explained how they would achieve our goals.
7. Spillman Farmer Architects	This Vendor's proposal was submitted following the specifications and provided a timeline and schedule. This bidder was the highest price per building that we received. From a financial standpoint the Newark Board of Education couldn't proceed with this vendor.
8. SYSTRA Consulting, Inc.	This vendor provides a very competitive proposal from both a financial standpoint and Staffing/Capacity. They provided an outline that shows how they could achieve our goals. but has not operated in a K-12 school district environment. This is crucial as we know from New Jersey Dept. of Education & School Development Authority projects that have special compliance components.

III. Rank vendors in order of evaluation 1-8, 1 being the highest:

Vendor	Recommendation To Award	Overall Rank
1. CHA Consulting	YES	1
2. Architects Alliance	NO	2
3. SYSTRA Consulting	NO	3
4. Mott MacDonald	NO	4
5. DMR Architects	NO	5
6. Netta Architects	NO	6
7. SBLM Architects	NO	7

8. Spillman Farmer Architects	NO	8
-------------------------------	----	---

IV. Identify the vendor(s) recommended for awarded and why the vendor or vendors have been selected among others considered.

Vendor	Justification for Selection
CHA Consulting, Inc.	<p>This vendor is recommended for award. CHA Consultants proposal has fully addressed all of the items in our scope and they were the lowest overall vendor. CHA Consultants. has demonstrated the ability to operate in a large school district environment, and has a knowledgeable team. This vendor is also very familiar with the Newark Board of Education's properties because of the Energy Savings Improvement Program.</p>


V. Identify the terms, conditions, scope of services, as fees for vendors recommended for award.

The term is two (2) years. Please see the Summary of Proposals section I for the scope of services. The cost proposal is enclosed.

The contract will be awarded at a cost not to exceed \$ 1,500,00.00

Funding account(s) 10-11-000-262-330-351-000-000 and 10-11-000-262-300-352-000-000

Submitted by:



Christopher Caponegro, Lead

Christopher Caponegro 8/11/2021
Print Name/Date

9340 Facility Conditions Assessment

Cost Proposal Form

The evaluative process requires an assessment of cost for various services. This pricing table has been developed to provide uniformity for evaluative purposed. You may copy this form to a Microsoft Excel/Word document to present additional information. The format MUST be maintained.

Company Name CHA Consulting, Inc.	
Building Size	Price per Building
Small (Less than 50,000 SF)	\$9,870
Medium (50,001 to 100,000 SF)	\$16,980
Large (100,001 to 200,000 SF)	\$19,920
Extra Large (greater than 200,000 SF)	\$23,560
Administrative Fee	\$87,360



Authorized Signature of Proposing Firm

Gregory S. Corso

Printed Name

Power Sector, President

Title

Hourly Rates

Firm Name <u>CHA Consulting, Inc.</u>	
HOURLY RATE	
Professional Level	
Owner/Principal/Project Director/Program Manager/ Vice President/Technical Advisor	\$225
Project Executive/Senior Project Manager/Senior Consultant/Senior Construction Manager/Senior Professional	\$180
Project Manager/Construction Manager/Senior Engineer/QAQC Managers/Safety Manager	\$155
Senior Designer/Project Engineer II/Assistant Project Manager/ Assistant Construction Manager/Senior Cost Engineer/Senior Estimator/Senior Scheduler/Professional	\$130
Designer/Project Engineer/Cost Engineer/Scheduler/Inspector/Administrative Manager/Junior Professional	\$105
Designer Draftsperson/CADD/Designer/Senior Support Services	\$90
Draftsperson/Administrative Assistant/Project Accountant	\$65
Clerical/Support Services/Intern	\$45
<p>Travel/ Delivery/ Administrative: All related expenses must be included in cost listed above. All travel, incidental, delivery, and/or administrative expenses related to the services provided are the responsibility of the service provider. The District will not provide reimbursement for any travel and/or incidental expenses.</p>	