

SELECTION COMMITTEE REPORT

For

RFQ 12600931

Engineering for Elevator Modernization

January 2026

Prepared by:

Stefanee Ramirez, Management Analyst II
Department of Transportation/Fresno Area Express
2223 G Street
Fresno CA, 93706

Selection Committee Sign-Off

The following Selection Committee voting members have read the enclosed report and concur with the findings as written:



Cha Thao
Custodial Supervisor
Department of Transportation



John Turnipseed
Project Manager
Department of Transportation



Alan Jacobson
Transit Supervisor II
Department of Transportation

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Department of Transportation/ Fresno Area Express (FAX) Issued a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for Engineering for Elevator Modernization. The solicitation sought qualified firms to provide professional engineering services related to elevator systems, assessment and associated design support in accordance with the Scope of Services outlined in the RFQ.

The RFQ was limited to professional Architectural and Engineering (A&E) services and did not include construction, installation, maintenance, or other services. Selection was to be based solely on demonstrated qualifications, competence and experience, with price negotiations to occur only after selection of the most qualified firm, as required under Brooks Act and applicable FTA procurement regulations.

FAX received one (1) proposal from ThyssenKrupp Elevator (TKE) and upon review, the Selection Committee determined that the submission did not meet the requirements of the RFQ due to non-responsiveness and recommends a rejection of all proposals.

The result of the Selection Committee evaluation is as follows:

Evaluation Criterion	Criteria Score
Approach to Work	7.5
Past Performance and Experience	20.5
Qualifications of Key Personnel	17.5
References	12.25

II. COMMITTEE MEMBERS

ORIE RUBALCAVA *Committee Chair (Non-Voting)*

CHA THAO *Committee Member (Voting)*

JOHN TURNIPSEED *Committee Member (Voting)*

ALAN JACOBSEN *Committee Member (Voting)*

RICHARD BALDON *Advisor (Non-Voting)*

STEFANEE RAMIREZ *Advisor (Non-Voting)*

III. SIGNIFICANT EVENTS

November 10, 2025 – Solicitation Posted
November 20, 2025 – Pre-Proposal Conference
December 10, 2025 – Proposals Due
December 17, 2025 – Committee Meeting
January 12, 2026 – Committee Meeting

IV. EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Selection Committee evaluated the proposal based on five categories

a. Approach to Work (30%)

The firm's ability to demonstrate the understanding of the project's scope and its proposed methodology to achieve the objectives of the project. The methodology should clearly demonstrate its merits by outlining the logic, advantage, and proven approach of the firm's methodology.

b. Past Performance and Experience (30%)

What is the Contractor's experience and history in planning services for Elevator Modernization that is relevant to FAX's needs, including a description of direct experience on projects of similar size, scope, complexity, and references?

c. Qualifications of Key Personnel (25%)

Technical experience in performing work of a closely similar nature; experience working with public agencies; experience in providing specifically this type of service, strength and stability of the firm; strength, stability, experience, and technical competence of sub-consultants; assessment by client references; references with demonstrated success in providing similar services.

d. References (15%)

The Proposer shall provide a minimum of three (3) references. For each reference, provide the agency name, address, contact person, telephone number and email address. FAX reserves the right to contact references provided by the Proposer and solicit additional references to determine best value.

The Selection Committee's individual scoring were averaged and are presented below.:

APPROACH TO WORK		
Proposer	Comments	Criteria Score
ThyssenKrupp Elevator	The proposal does not clearly demonstrate an understanding of the RFQ scope for engineering design services. The proposed approach does not adequately describe the required engineering methodology or deliverables outlined in the RFQ.	7.5

PAST PERFORMANCE AND EXPERIENCE		
Proposer	Comments	Criteria Score
ThyssenKrupp Elevator	The proposal demonstrates experience providing elevator-related services; however, it does not consistently demonstrate experience with projects of similar size, scope or complexity relevant to the engineering services requested.	20.5

QUALIFICATIONS OF KEY PERSONNEL		
Proposer	Comments	Criteria Score
ThyssenKrupp Elevator	The proposal identifies key personnel; however, the proposal does not demonstrate sufficient engineering design experience relevant to the RFQ requirements.	17.5

REFERENCES		
Proposer	Comments	Criteria Score
ThyssenKrupp Elevator	The proposer provided the required references in accordance with the RFQ requirements.	12.25

V. EVALUATION RESULTS

After evaluating TKE's proposal, the Selection Committee noted that a great deal of the proposal addresses services outside the scope of the RFQ. These additional services included the performance of construction and on-going maintenance after construction, similar to what is seen in a design-build-maintain (DBM) style contract.

The solicitation is funded in part using Federal Transit Administration (FTA) dollars, which imposes specific requirements on A&E contracts. Those requirements include that the solicitation be qualification based in accordance with Brooks Act and that FAX avoids awarding to contractors who have unequal access to information in accordance with 2 CFR 200.319(b). TKE's proposal could not be accepted in its current form as it would cause non-compliance with the above-mentioned requirements. These requirements were addressed in the pre-proposal meeting, in which a TKE representative was present.

VI. NEGOTIATIONS

The Selection Committee did not enter negotiations.

VII. RECOMMENDATION

The Selection Committee recommends rejection of all proposals due to non-responsiveness of the single proposal.