

Agenda Item 3  
Site Selection Committee  
Of the Independent Citizens' Oversight Committee  
April 13, 2005

**Background**

The purpose of the Request for Proposal (RFP) was to solicit governmental entities (GE) and building owners (BO) to submit to the State a joint proposal for a fully functional administrative office space for the California Institute for Regenerative Medicine (CIRM) meeting all the terms and conditions of the RFP.

The State of California, Department of General Services (DGS) in conjunction with CIRM created an RFP designed to specifically consider all of CIRM's office space needs/requirements and preferences along with DGS/State building codes and requirements.

The RFP required that the GE be the primary submitter for the RFP and certifying all information and certifications proposed by the GE and BO are accurate and that the facility be delivered in accordance with the RFP. See Attachment A for a copy of the final RFP.

The RFP was released on February 28, 2005 and bids were due on March 16, 2005. Ten bids were received. A list of the bidders is given in Attachment B.

**Discussion**

The RFP included Minimum Requirements that all bidders were required to meet for both the GE and BO in order to proceed with the scoring of the bidders' preferences. The Preferences for the GE and BO were assigned a point value for a total of 200 possible points.

A team, consisting of six team members - three from DGS and three from CIRM – was formed to evaluate the proposals and make a recommendation to the Site Search Committee. The team members were: Rebecca Donnachie, Staff Real Estate Officer, DGS; Eddie Chu, Staff Space Planner, DGS; Sheral Gates, Assistant Chief of Professional Services, DGS; Amy Duross, Chief of Staff, CIRM; Christina Olsson, Legal Counsel, CIRM; and Walter Barnes, on loan from the State Controller's Office.

Prior to opening the ten bids, the team developed an evaluation plan and scoring document. The plan was provided to four members of the Site Selection Committee – one from each region from which bids were received – to ensure that there was no regional bias. There were no objections to the plan. A copy of the scoring method, which incorporates the plan, is provided in Attachment C and an explanation of the point value assigned to each of the preferences is given in Attachment D.

The evaluation and scoring of each bid was done by team consensus. The evaluation team began the process of evaluating each bid by first determining if the bid met all the Minimum Requirements. Of the ten bids received, only four met all the Minimum Requirements. In case the evaluation team overlooked certain information imperative to the bidders' proposals, each of the six bidders considered to be non-compliant with any of the Minimum Requirements of the RFP was contacted via email and asked to identify and reference where in the submitted proposal those Minimum Requirements had been met. Of the email responses we received, none pointed out where in the RFP the information was referenced. No additional information was allowed to be submitted or considered. The evaluation team deemed these six bids to have failed the Minimum Requirements. A list of the Minimum Requirements that were not met by these six bidders is provided in Attachment E.

The evaluation team began scoring the Preferences of each of the remaining four bids. Some value points were assigned based on the information in the bids and other value points were assigned based on a comparison of information provided in each of the four bids. Attachment F is a matrix that shows the points awarded to each bidder for each of the Preferences.

Of the 200 possible points, the evaluation team assigned a highest point value of 158 points. The bidders in order of ranking are as follows:

1. San Francisco/King Street 158
2. Sacramento/One Capitol Mall 133
3. San Diego/Torrey Pines Mesa 116
4. Emeryville/Horton Plaza 113

The evaluation team grouped the Incentives Preference into three categories: the first two categories are based on the "Incentives" bullet under the Building Owner Preferences section of the RFP. Where applicable, incentives that have been offered by parties other than the Building Owner and which exceed the requirement named in the RFP have been grouped into a third category, called "community incentives." (The three categories are set forth in Attachment G - Building Owner Preferences Incentives Table.) The initial scoring of the site proposals was based only on an evaluation of the first two categories. The community incentives can be considered and scored by the Site Selection

Subcommittee of the ICOC during the final round of scoring to be made during the members' site visits.

### **Next Steps**

In accordance with the State process for evaluating bid responses, the following decisions need to be made today:

- Approve the determination of non-compliance of the six bids listed in Attachment E.
- Approve or amend the scores assigned by the evaluation team. (While the committee members may revise the scores assigned, they cannot change the value points given to each of the Preferences. Any changes made at this point in the process may be subject to challenge by other bidders and may cause delay.)
- Agree that all four final sites require a site visit.
- Decide on the Evaluation Criteria to be assessed during the site visit and on how assessment decisions are to be used to make the final decision on the winning and runner-up sites. (Suggested criteria and points to be assigned are given in Attachment H.)
- Select the teams that will visit and further evaluate the sites.

### **Recommendation**

1. Approve the recommendation to eliminate from consideration the six bidders listed in Attachment E because they failed to meet the Minimum Requirements in the RFP.
2. Approve the scores assigned for Preferences for the four bidders as listed in Attachment F.
3. Approve site visits for all four sites listed in Attachment F.
4. Determine the evaluation criteria and points to be assigned based on the site visits. Suggested evaluation criteria and points are listed in Attachment H.

With regard to the selection of teams to conduct the site visits, we recommend that no team have more than one member from the location where the site to be evaluated is located.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment A - Copy of RFP (supporting documents not included)  
Attachment B - List of Bidders

Attachment C - Copy of Scoring Chart

Attachment D - Point Value Assigned to Each of the Preferences

Attachment E - List of Failed Minimum Requirements for Six Disqualified Bidders

Attachment F - Matrix Showing Points Awarded to each of Four Finalist Bidders

Attachment G - Building owner Preferences Incentives Table

Attachment H - Suggested Evaluation for Site Committee