

**Riverside Unified School District  
Operations Division**

**Operations/Board Subcommittee Meeting**

**Friday, March 27, 2015**

**1:00 – 3:00 p.m.**

**3380 14<sup>th</sup> Street, Riverside, CA 92501**

**Conference Room 3**

**A G E N D A**

As required by Government Code 54957.5, agenda materials can be reviewed by the public at the District's administrative offices, Reception Area, First Floor, 3380 Fourteenth Street, Riverside, California.

**Action/Discussion Items**

The following agenda items will be discussed and the Subcommittee members may choose to introduce and pass a motion as desired.

**1. Approval of Minutes**

The subcommittee will be asked to approve the minutes of the December 10, 2015, meeting.

**2. Approval a School Facilities Needs Analysis and Adoption of Alternative School Facility Fees – Public Hearing and Resolution**

This item was presented as a Public Hearing and Action item for Board of Education approval at the March 2, 2015, meeting. The Board of Education took action to table the item so that it could be discussed at an Operations/Board Subcommittee meeting. It is anticipated that the item will be brought back to the Board of Education for approval at the April 13, 2015, regularly scheduled meeting.

Staff will present the item for discussion by the subcommittee.

**3. Prop 39 Energy Savings – Proposal for Year 2**

Staff will present the energy savings projects identified for Prop. 39, Year 2.

**4. Process for Selecting Professional/Consultant Services – Upcoming Projects**

As information, staff will present the Request for Proposal (RFP) process that is used for selection of consultants that may be identified for upcoming projects.

Staff is requesting that the Operations/Board Subcommittee provide direction for a process to select professional service consultants for the following:

- GO Bond Council (Kim Byrens – Best, Best, and Krieger)
- GO Bond Communications/Election Consultant – (TBWB – Jared Boigon)
- GO Bond Survey/Polling Consultant – (Tim McCarney – True North)
- GO Bond Master Plan Consultant – (RFP)

**5. Update and Review of Properties of Interest**

Staff will review the properties recently discussed by the Board of Education.

**6. Riverside Polytechnic High School Chiller Plants**

At the request of Mr. Hunt and Mr. Lee, this item has been placed on the agenda for discussion.

**Public Relations**

**7. Unscheduled Communications**

The Committee will consider requests from the public to comment. Comments should be limited to three minutes or less.

**8. Subcommittee Members Comments**

**Adjournment**

**Riverside Unified School District**  
**Operations Division**  
Board Operations Subcommittee Meeting  
Conference Room 3 A/B  
3380 14<sup>th</sup> Street, Riverside, California 92501  
December 10, 2014 – 2:00 to 5:00 p.m.

**MINUTES**

**CALL TO ORDER:** 2:20 p.m. by Mr. Hunt

**PRESENT:** Kathy Allavie, Tom Hunt, Brent Lee, and Kirk Lewis

Also present were David Hansen, Mike Fine, Hayley Calhoun, Kevin Hauser, Orin Williams, and Lizette Delgado (Recorder).

**Action/Discussion Items**

The following agenda items will be discussed and the Subcommittee members may choose to introduce and pass a motion as desired.

**1. Approval of Minutes**

Mrs. Allavie moved and Mr. Hunt seconded to approve the minutes of the February 28, 2014, and April 11, 2014, meetings.

**2. Strategic Planning of Properties for Sale, Lease, or Exchange**

The subcommittee reviewed the Real Property “7-11” Committee Report to the Board of Education and additionally discussed potential strategies for the disposition of the following properties:

Cleveland and Myers – 20 ac.

The subcommittee agreed that the District should keep the property for potential educational use.

District Office – 1.1 ac.

The subcommittee requested a Board Study Session to discuss this property further.

Grant Educational Center – 5.5 ac.

The subcommittee requested a Board Study Session to discuss this property further.

“Old” Hawthorne I – 6.85 ac.

The subcommittee recommended to staff to have the property evaluated for potential sale.

Van Buren (between Van Buren and the Martin Luther King Jr. High School Detention Basin) – 1.72 ac.

The subcommittee agreed that the District should hold on to the property until further discussion.

The subcommittee recommended hiring a real property advisor to assist staff evaluate the properties and to provide guidance. Subcommittee members also recommended to staff to seek community partnerships for the sale and/or development of the properties. The subcommittee additionally discussed and identified other properties of interest for possible purchase.

**3. Redevelopment Funds**

The subcommittee discussed information received from staff concerning the availability of RDA funds and the potential use of those funds. The subcommittee agreed that Redevelopment Funds should be used for the Ramona High School Theater Remodel Project. The subcommittee also recommended that a formula for future distribution of funds to each trustee area should be developed.

**4. Proposition 39 Year 1 and Year 2 Projects**

Staff discussed the status of implementation of the plan for the first year and the initial planning that is underway to develop a plan for year two. Staff informed the subcommittee that the district received \$1,993,255 for year 1 energy projects. From that allocation, \$597,977 was set aside for planning. Year 1 projects totaled \$1,105,136, leaving a remaining balance of \$978,119 for year 2 projects. It was also mentioned that the district is still waiting for the award amount for year 2, and that it is expected that LEAs will receive the same amount as year 1 for years 2 through 5. However, possible declining revenues generated from taxes for Prop 39 may reduce the district's award amount. Also, key changes to Prop 39 guidelines are expected.

Year 1 projects include:

- Lighting retrofit project in the amount of \$51,213, was completed in November 2014. It is anticipated the project will generate rebates in the amount of \$8,025.
- HVAC upgrades project with a cost estimate of \$984,935, will go out to bid in the spring of 2015 for completion in the summer 2015. It is anticipated the project will generate rebates in the amount of \$17,976.

Year 2 projects are in the development stage and include lighting retrofit and HVAC replacement at Fremont Elementary and Riverside Polytechnic High schools.

**5. Bus Yard**

Staff provided an update on the bus yard. After a brief discussion, subcommittee members asked staff to give a Mailout report to the Board on the status of the bus yard.

**6. Casa Blanca**

Staff gave an update to the subcommittee. The subcommittee briefly discussed the potential opening of a preschool in Casa Blanca and recommended to staff to contact the City to discuss the possibilities.

## **Public Relations**

### **8. Unscheduled Communications**

There were no requests to speak to the subcommittee.

### **9. Subcommittee Members Comments**

There were no comments from the subcommittee members.

## **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

# School Facilities Needs Assessment

## Annual Report 2015

Dr. Lewis, Assistant Superintendent of Operations  
Hayley Calhoun, Director, Planning and Development

# 2015

- ▶ New consultants hired to prepare the SFNA
- ▶ Sought input from City and County Agencies to confirm projections and gather input and comments
- ▶ BIA complementary to the findings of the report as stated, “Once again I want to tell you that we greatly appreciate your communication and contact with us as partners with RUSD. The BIA is not disappointed that the recommendation is for what many may feel is a moderate \$0.07 increase to the current \$3.77 Level II school fee. I did not find any outstanding errors or issues with the data analysis of in the study and we agree with the determined assumptions of the average unit size yielding 3400 sqft and 562 future units over the course of the next 5 years.” in an email to Doug Floyd, Koppel and Gruber, March 2, 2015

# Comparison Level 2 School Fees in Surrounding Areas

District	Fee	Date Adopted
Yucaipa/Calimesa	\$5.91	July 2014
Val Verde	\$5.57	May 2014
Perris	\$5.01	June 2014
San Bernardino	\$4.40	April 2014
Jurupa	\$4.30	November 2014
Moreno Valley	\$4.02	July 2014
Hemet	\$4.00	April 2014
RUSD	\$3.77	March 2014
Rialto	\$3.77	July 2014
Fontana	\$3.76	May 14
Alvord	\$3.36	May 2014
Corona Norco	\$3.36	April 2014



# Riverside Unified School District

## Developer Fees

Presentation by: Koppel & Gruber Public Finance

# Overview

- ▶ School districts have the authority to levy school fees to offset the impact to school facilities from students generated from new development
- ▶ Can be used to fund construction or reconstruction of school facilities, interim housing, administrative and operations facilities
- ▶ Types:
  - Level 1 Fees (Statutory Fees)
  - Level 2 and 3 Fees (Alternative Fees)

# Level 1 Fees

- ▶ Level 1 Fees are capped and apply to both residential and commercial/industrial development
- ▶ The Fee Caps are adjusted every other year (even years) by the State Allocation Board (SAB)
- ▶ SAB last adjusted the Fee Caps on January 22, 2014
- ▶ Fee Caps were adjusted from \$3.20/sq. ft. to \$3.36/sq. ft. for residential development and from \$0.51/sq. ft. to \$0.54/sq. ft. for commercial/industrial development

# Alternative Fees

- ▶ Upon meeting certain requirements, school districts have the option of adopting Alternative Fees (Level 2/3)
- ▶ Applies to new residential construction only
- ▶ Beyond the share of maximum statutory fees
- ▶ Level 2 Fee is intended to represent 50% of facilities costs
- ▶ Level 3 Fee is intended to represent 100% of facilities costs (currently suspended)
- ▶ Must prepare and adopt School Facilities Needs Analysis (SFNA)
- ▶ Effective immediately; valid for 1 year after adoption

# Level 2 Formula

- Historical Student Generation Rates (last 5 years)
- Projected Number of Units by type (SFD, SFA, MF) over next 5 years

# Level 2 Formula (cont.)

- Per Pupil Grants (established annually by State)
- Site Development/Site Acquisition Costs (50%)

Level 2 Fee
\$3.84

# Level 2 Fee Comparison (Year-to-Year)

2014 Level 2	Recommended 2015 Level 2	Dollar Difference	Percentage Change
\$3.77	\$3.84	\$0.07	1.86%

# Historical – Level 2 Residential Fee

Year	Level 2 Fee
2008	\$4.30
2009	\$3.84
2010	\$3.47
2011	\$3.26
2012	\$3.83
2013	\$3.77
2014	\$3.77*
2015 (proposed)	\$3.84

\*\$4.00 justified in 2014 SFNA



# Findings

# Questions?



**Riverside Unified School District**  
Operations Division  
Maintenance and Operations Department  
Energy Services Department and Mechanical Trades Department  
March 11, 2015

**Proposition 39 Energy Efficiency Projects**

**Executive Summary:**

Riverside Unified School District has received year 2 Proposition 39 allotment of \$1,741,118. The California Energy Commission (CEC) has made key changes to the Prop 39 guidelines. Local Educational Agencies (LEA's) are now allowed to combine all District Prop 39 projects to meet the "savings to investment ratio" (SIR) of 1.05 instead of a site by site requirement. This change allows for much needed smaller energy efficiency projects to be done on multiple sites. Following are the projects consisting of replacing portable/classroom HVAC units, retrofitting classroom lighting, installing EMS systems, and upgrading outside campus lighting at the following sites:

**Fremont:**

Drop classroom ceilings, HVAC and lighting upgrades to 32 classrooms, Administration office, and Library.

**Longfellow:**

Drop ceiling in Administration office, HVAC upgrade to Administration office, and MPR. Lighting retro fit in office.

**Chemawa:**

HVAC replacement, lighting retro fit, and EMS installation to 8 portables.

**Central Registration Center:**

EMS installation and outside lighting upgrade throughout entire site.

**Poly:**

HAVC replacement to 18 portables and lighting retro fit to 94 classrooms/portables.

**Arlington:**

HVAC replacement and lighting retro fit to 21 portables.

**Ramona:**

HVAC replacement and EMS installation to 8 portables, lighting retro fit to 85 classrooms/portables, and outside lighting upgrade throughout entire campus.

Total Apportionment:	\$1,741,118
Fremont	\$ 528,170
Longfellow	\$ 38,880
Chemawa	\$ 111,576
CRC	\$ 19,320
Poly	\$ 269,298
Arlington	\$ 263,907
Ramona	<u>\$ 161,043</u>
Estimated project total:	\$1,392,194
Contingency (5%)	<u>\$ 69,610</u>
Project Grand Total	\$1,461,804
Total Annual Estimated Savings	\$ 144,269
Return on Investment	10 Years, 1 Month
Required SIR	1.05
Project SIR	1.32

**Riverside Unified School District**  
**Proposition 39 Energy Efficient Project**  
*Year 2*

*(2) 32 Watt Lamps With Reflector*

Remove (2) 32 Watt Lamps, Install Socket Holder With Reflector Kit, and Clean Lenses

<b>Energy Reduction:</b>			
24 lamps x 32 watts			.768 KWH
Daily run hours			9
Number of days/year			180
Total reduction of Kilo Watt Hour			1245 KWH
Cost per Kilo Watt Hour			\$ .18/KWH
<b>Project Cost:</b>			
Labor	\$ 46/hr.	8 hrs.	\$368.00
Parts	\$ 12/ea.	12 fixtures	\$144.00
Gross Cost			\$512.00
RPU rebate incentive			-\$75.00
Net Cost/Classroom			\$437.00
Annual Savings per room			\$223.00
Return on Investment			2 Yr.

**Pros**

- Even lighting distribution District-wide
- Lower initial installation cost
- Reducing 64 watts per light fixture
- Quicker return on Investment
- We will retain a surplus lamp stock from de-lamping

**Non-energy Benefits:**

- Significantly improve life-cycle cost per fixture
- Potential increased and consistent foot candles at the student desk top
- Improved and consistent visibility may assist in the instructional process
- Reduce current Electrical department backlog (saves staff time)
- Reduced heat load in classrooms thereby reducing HVAC demand
- Reduce slightly HVAC department backlog and equipment wear (saves staff time)
- Initial custodial time savings for other school needs
- Reduce KW demand thereby reducing "peak demand" charges
- When extended use is required the extended use expense is less

**Riverside Unified School District**  
**Proposition 39 Energy Efficiency Project**  
*Year 2*

*Drop Ceiling Installation*

<b>Energy Reduction:</b>			
Current Annual Consumption			22,278 KWH
Daily run hours			9
Number of days/year			180
Total reduction of Kilo Watt Hour			5570 KWH
Cost per Kilo Watt Hour			\$ .18/KWH
<b>Project Cost:</b>			
Labor			\$2,000.00
Parts			\$1,427.00
Gross Cost			\$3,427.00
Net Cost/Classroom			\$3,427.00
Annual Savings per room			\$1,003.00
<b>Return on Investment</b>			<b>3 Yr. 5 Mo.</b>

**Pros**

- More even light distribution
- More even HVAC distribution
- Quicker return on Investment (S.I.R)

**Non-energy Benefits:**

- Potential increased and consistent foot candles at the student desk top
- Improved and consistent visibility may assist in the instructional process
- Reduced heat load in classrooms thereby reducing HVAC demand
- Reduce slightly HVAC department backlog and equipment wear (saves staff time)
- Initial custodial time savings for other school needs
- Reduce KW demand thereby reducing "peak demand" charges
- When extended use is required the extended use expense is less

**Riverside Unified School District**  
**Proposition 39 Energy Efficiency Project**  
*Year 2*

*Roof Top HVAC Unit Replacement*

Replace (1) R22 Low Efficiency Roof Top Unit With (1) R 410A High Efficiency Roof Top Unit

<b>Energy Reduction:</b>			
Daily run hours			9
Number of days/year			180
Total reduction of Kilowatt Hour			4261 KWH
Cost per Kilowatt Hour			\$ .18/KWH
<b>Project Cost:</b>			
Labor	\$ 80/hr.	10 hrs.	\$800.00
Parts	\$ 11,200/ea.		\$14,200.00
Gross Cost			\$15,000.00
RPU rebate incentive			-\$210.00
Net Cost/Classroom			\$14,790.00
Annual Savings per room			\$960.00
Return on Investment			15yrs. 3 mth.

**Pros**

- 20+ years life expectancy
- Change out done from R22 to R410A to meet EPA compliance by 2020
- During installation ducts will be cleaned removing dust, etc.
- More efficient unit reduces KWH usage
- Improved indoor air quality
- Improved acoustics
- Significantly improved life-cycle cost per unit

**Non-energy Benefits:**

- Improve occupant comfort
- Improved indoor air quality may assist in the instructional process
- Improved acoustics may assist in the instructional process
- Reduce current HVAC department backlog (saves staff time)
- Higher efficient economizer (automatic vs. manual)
- Reduce KWH due to higher efficiency
- Reduce KW demand thereby reducing "peak demand" charges
- When extended use is required the extended use expense is less
- Quicker temperature recovery improves occupant comfort
- Stockpile R-22 refrigerant for future use ( no longer manufactured)

**Riverside Unified School District**  
**Proposition 39 Energy Efficiency Project**  
*Year 2*

*Portable Bard Unit Replacement*

Replace (1) R22 Low Efficiency Bard Unit With (1) R 410A High Efficiency Bard Unit

<b>Energy Reduction:</b>			
Daily run hours			9
Number of days/year			180
Total reduction of Kilowatt Hour			4261 KWH
Cost per Kilowatt Hour			\$ .18/KWH
<b>Project Cost:</b>			
Labor	\$ 80/hr.	10 hrs.	\$800.00
Parts	\$ 11,200/ea.		\$11,200.00
Gross Cost			\$12,000.00
RPU rebate incentive			-\$168.00
Net Cost/Classroom			\$11,832.00
Annual Savings per room			\$767.00
Return on Investment			15yrs. 3 mth.

**Pros**

- 20+ years life expectancy
- Change out done from R22 to R410A to meet EPA compliance by 2020
- During installation ducts will be cleaned removing dust, etc.
- More efficient unit reduces KWH usage
- Improved indoor air quality
- Improved acoustics
- Significantly improved life-cycle cost per unit

**Non-energy Benefits:**

- Improve occupant comfort
- Improved indoor air quality may assist in the instructional process
- Improved acoustics may assist in the instructional process
- Reduce current HVAC department backlog (saves staff time)
- Higher efficient economizer (automatic vs. manual)
- Reduce KWH due to higher efficiency
- Reduce KW demand thereby reducing "peak demand" charges
- When extended use is required the extended use expense is less
- Avoid DSA review and related soft cost
- Quicker temperature recovery improves occupant comfort
- Stockpile R-22 refigerant for future use ( no longer manufactured)



**Riverside Unified School District**  
**Proposition 39 Energy Efficiency Project**  
*Year 2*

*Ramona Outside Lighting HPS and MH Conversion to CFL Lighting*

Replace 59 Fixtures With CFL Type Fixtures

<b>Energy Reduction:</b>			
40-70W HPS to 42W CFL			1386 KWH
3- 250 HPS to 26 W CFL			832 KWH
4-400W MH to 48 W CFL			1743 KWH
12- 60 W inc to 13 W CFL			698 KWH
Daily run hours			5.5
Number of days/year			225
Total reduction of Kilo Watt Hour			4658 KWH
Cost per Kilo Watt Hour			\$ .18/KWH
<b>Project Cost:</b>			
Labor	\$ 46/hr.	118 hrs.	\$5,428.00
Parts		59 fixtures	\$3,268.00
Gross Cost			\$8,696.00
RPU rebate incentive			-\$233.00
Net Cost/Campus			\$8,463.00
Annual Savings			\$839.00
Return on Investment			10 years

**Pros**

- More uniform lighting.
- A single color throughout the campus.
- Large reduction in KWH usage.

**Riverside Unified School District**  
**Proposition 39 Energy Efficient Project**  
*Year 2*

*Energy Management System Installation - Central Registration*

Replace Totaline Thermostats and Time Clocks With Siemens EMS System

<b>2014 Energy Consumption</b>			<b>Cost</b>
Electricity		138,180 KWH	\$20,761.61
Natural Gas		656 Therms	\$916.98
<b>Gross Project Cost:</b>			
Zone cost	\$ 1,381./ea		\$1,381.00
Total number of Zones	14		\$19,334.00
RPU rebate incentive			\$866.00
<b>Net Cost</b>			<b>\$18,468.00</b>
Contingency (3%)			\$554
Estimated total project cost			\$19,022
<b>Total Annual Savings</b>			<b>\$2,719</b>
<b>Return on Investment</b>			<b>6yrs.10mo.</b>

**Pros**

- More constant temperature throughout site.
- Parking lot safety by having better control of outside lighting.
- Enhanced and even remote troubleshooting of units.
- Reduced energy consumption.

**Non-energy Benefits:**

- Improve occupancy comfort.
- Reduce KWh due to tighter controls.
- Reduce KW demand thereby reducing "peak demand" charges.
- When extended use is required the extended use expense is less.
- Avoid DSA review and related soft cost.



## Drop Ceiling and Lighting Upgrades



Existing Condition



Existing Condition



Drop Ceiling After Improvement



Existing Condition

## Delamping and Reflector Kit Installation



Existing



Retrofitted Light Fixture With Reflector Kit and Reduction of 4 to 2 Lamps

## Roof Top HVAC Package Unit Replacement With Prop 39



Before



After



## Ramona High School



## Existing Condition With Multiple Color Renderings



Higher Energy Efficiency and Consistent Color Rendering With Prop 39

## Portable Bard Unit Replacement



Existing



New High Efficiency and Quieter HVAC Unit



## Riverside Unified School District

### Operations Division – Planning and Development

3070 Washington Street, Riverside, CA 92504-4697 • (951) 788-

HAYLEY CALHOUN  
Director, Planning and Development

#### RUSD Request For Proposal Process

#### Sample RFP components

#### NOTICE CALLING FOR PROPOSALS CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT SERVICES

RFQ Posting Website:

<https://remote.rusd.k12.ca.us/planholdersregistration/>

RFQ Deadline: **Thursday, November 13, 2014 at 2:00 p.m.**

Place of Proposal Receipt:

**Riverside Unified School District  
Purchasing Department  
6050 Industrial Avenue  
Riverside, California 92504**

Project Identification Name: **Construction Management Services**

RFQ Number: 2014/15-XX

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Riverside Unified School District of Riverside County, acting by and through its Governing Board, hereinafter referred to as "District," will receive up to, but no later than the above-stated time, sealed Proposals for the award of an Agreement for the above-stated services. All Proposals must be time stamped by the District's Purchasing Department time clock to ensure accurate recording of time of receipt.

Proposals shall be received in the above-stated place. Proposals must be sealed in an envelope and marked as "Construction Management Services - RFQ Number 2014/15-XX", with the Vendor's name on the outside. It is each Vendor's sole responsibility to ensure its proposal is timely delivered and received at the location designated as specified above. Proposals not received with the requested forms and at the above-stated time and place, or after any extension due to material changes will NOT be considered, and will be returned unopened. No faxed Proposals or alternative proposal will be accepted by the District.



**1.0 Background**

**2.0 Statement of Purpose**

**3.0 Definitions**

**4.0. TIMELINE**

4.1 Release of Request for Proposal

**October 15, 2014**

4.2 Deadline for District Receipt of Questions

**October 30, 2014 @ 2:00 pm**

4.2.1 E-mail: tgrattan@rusd.k12.ca.us

4.2.2 Mail: Riverside Unified School District  
Purchasing Department

Attn: Tanisha Grattan, Contract Analyst

6050 Industrial Avenue

Riverside, California 92504

4.2.3 Fax: (951) 778-5711

4.3 Deadline for Proposals

**November 14, 2014 @ 2:00 pm**

4.4 Interviews

**November 21, 2014**

**4.5 Tentative Date for Awarding RFP**

**December 1, 2014**

**5.0 Effective Period**

**6.0 Proposal Submittal**

**7.0 General Requirements**

**8.0 Required Format of Proposals**

**9.0 Evaluation Criteria**

**10.0 Evaluation Process**

**11.0 Interpretation of RFP**

**12.0 Contract Development**

**13.0 Cancellation of Procurement Process**

**14.0 Confidentiality and Proprietary Data**

**15.0 Non-Collusion Declaration**

**Scope of Services**

**Deliverables**

**Performance timeline**

**Cost Proposal**

**Scoring Questions for CM RFP and Rating Scale Matrix**

See attached

**Riverside Unified School District**  
**Evaluation of Written Proposal – Criteria**

**Firm** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Evaluator** \_\_\_\_\_

Grading Criteria	Total Points	Score
<b>(a) <i>Demonstrate approach to developing and performing similar projects</i></b>	-	
▪ Completeness and thoroughness of the proposal	5	
▪ Clarity, succinctness and organization of proposal	5	
▪ Plan to involve and gather input from all stakeholders during the planning process	5	
▪ Creativity in developing project scope and specs that are specific to a particular school site and/or District's energy needs	5	
▪ Demonstrated understanding of District energy needs	5	
▪ Experience in preparing performance specifications for energy efficiency projects	10	
▪ Knowledge of technically and economically feasible energy efficiency projects	5	
▪ High performance school design efficiency strategies	5	
▪ Experience in evaluating a project's life cycle costs	10	
▪ Experience in reviewing and conducting measurement and verification plans	5	
▪ Knowledge of utility incentive programs	10	
▪ Experience providing utility rate analysis	5	
▪ Demonstration of architecture and design	5	
▪ Project team knowledge and certification in "green" technology (LEED, CHPS, etc.)	10	
▪ Knowledge of the building and equipment commissioning process	5	
▪ Cost estimating	10	
▪ Knowledge of project development timelines	10	
▪ Demonstrated knowledge in a variety of energy conservation measures	20	
<b>(b) Financial Capacity to develop, bond and perform similar projects</b>	-	
▪ Demonstration of Financial Strength	5	
▪ Completeness of recent audited financial report	5	
▪ Bond ratings and evidence of insurability	5	
▪ Potential financial benefits to our organization	5	
<b>© Safety protocols, procedures, rating, etc...</b> Relevance and quality of examples demonstrating knowledge and understanding of:		
▪ Evidence of Safety procedures	5	
▪ In house safety employees	5	
▪ Certificate of insurance	5	
▪ Demonstrated affirmative action, MBE, WBE	5	
<b>(d) <i>Demonstrate success in securing funding for similar projects.</i></b>	-	

Relevance and quality of examples demonstrating knowledge and understanding of:		
▪ Experience in different funding opportunities for energy efficiency or renewable projects.	15	
▪ Use of all available utility company rebates, incentives, funding and third party resources with attention to detail and specific site needs	10	
▪ Experience in initiating a bond process	5	
<b>(e) Strength of California K-14 references</b> Relevance and quality of examples demonstrating knowledge and understanding of:	-	
▪ Validation of experience and performance as reflected in client reference questions	5	
▪ Energy efficiency case studies that showcase successful program projects in K-12 public schools.	10	
▪ Track record of reducing energy costs for K-14 Public schools (Minimum of 6 required-score 5)	10	
▪ Ability, experience and resolution dealing with DSA and OPSC.	10	
▪ Additional Energy services provided	5	
▪ Media and Community Outreach programs/experience	5	
<b>(f) Water conservation alternate</b>		
• Demonstrated knowledge in water conservation measures (alternate)	15	
<i>Proposed fee for Part I services</i>	<b>\$</b>	
<b>Total Score (Part I)</b>	<b>265</b>	
<b>(g) Installation of projects (Part II)</b>		
▪ Evidence of providing guarantees	5	
▪ Knowledge of consequences of underperforming systems	5	
▪ History of overproduction 0=no, 5=yes	5	
▪ System warranties provided	5	
▪ Able to Maintain and monitor systems	5	
▪ Compliance with GC section 4217.12	5	
▪ Preferred PV type and system locations (inclusion)	5	
<b>Total Score (Part I and II)</b>	<b>300</b>	

**Riverside Unified School District**  
**Construction Management Interviews**  
**Construction**  
\_\_\_\_\_, 2015 - @ 1:45 p.m.

**RATING SCALE**

0	Fails to Fit
1	Poor Fit
2	Fair Fit
3	Good Fit
4	Very Good Fit
5	Excellent Fit

1. Describe what unique characteristics makes your firm different from other construction management firms.

Rating\_\_\_\_\_

2. Describe your constructability and quality control process and how do you ensure recommended changes are incorporated?

Rating\_\_\_\_\_

3. Describe preconstruction and post construction services and how the district can benefit from your firm's early involvement in the project.

Rating\_\_\_\_\_

4. Describe your experience in administering public works bidding for school districts.

Rating\_\_\_\_\_

5. Describe early signs you have a problem contractor? What are your strategies to ensure their success? Examples?

Rating\_\_\_\_\_

6. Describe your process to ensure safety of faculty and students on an operating campus?

Rating\_\_\_\_\_

7. Do you have any preferred projects you feel your firm is more qualified for?

Rating\_\_\_\_\_

8. Is there anything you would like to add in addition to what we have already asked?

Rating\_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer Name\_\_\_\_\_

Total Rating for \_\_\_\_\_ Construction\_\_\_\_\_

# NAME OF PROJECT

Reviewer Name: REVIEWER #

EMPHASIS		
Criterion	Rating Scale	
Qualifications	0	Fails to Fit
Experience of Key Personnel	1	Poor Fit
Cost / Fee	2	Fair Fit
Scope of Services	3	Good Fit
Previous/Relevant Experience	4	Very Good Fit
Other: Response to Questions	5	Excellent Fit

## VENDOR #1 NAME

Evaluation

Criterion	Rating

Notes:

## VENDOR #2 NAME

Evaluation

Criterion	Rating

Notes:

## VENDOR #3 NAME

Evaluation

Criterion	Rating

Notes:

**VENDOR #4 NAME**

**Evaluation**

Criterion	Rating

**Notes:**

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**VENDOR #5 NAME**

**Evaluation**

Criterion	Rating

**Notes:**

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## CM Written Proposal Screening and Interview panel

### **Written proposal screening panel**

Hayley Calhoun, Director, Planning and Development

Kevin Hauser, Assistant Director, Facilities Projects

Kiersten Reno-Fausto, Principal

Marcus Ridley, Contract Analyst

Jane Jumnongslip, Director, Purchasing

### **Interview Panel**

Hayley Calhoun, Director, Planning and Development

Kevin Hauser, Assistant Director, Facilities Projects

Coleman Kells, Principal

Orin Williams, Director, M & O

Jane Jumnongslip, Director, Purchasing