

SELECTION COMMITTEE REPORT

For

**Request for Qualifications No. 12601691
FAX AHSC TRA Bus Stop Improvement Services**

July 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:



Ray Ramos
Custodial Supervisor
Department of Transportation/FAX



Carol Abate
Planner II
Department of Transportation/FAX



Alan Jacobson
Transit Supervisor II
Department of Transportation/FAX

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Department of Transportation/ Fresno Area Express (FAX) issued a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for professional engineering services needed for the design of nineteen (19) bus stops to ensure Americans with Disability Act (ADA) compliance and provide transportation-related amenities (TRA) in accordance with the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program (AHSC).

The RFQ was limited to professional Architectural and Engineering (A&E) services. Selection was based solely on demonstrated qualifications, competence, and experience, and did not include construction, installation, maintenance, or other services. Selection was 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 Federal Transit Administration (FTA) procurement regulations.

FAX received three (3) proposals. They were from Provost & Pritchard, Lars Anderson & Associates, and Alan Mok Engineering. Based on the Selection Committee's evaluation, Provost & Pritchard received the highest overall average score and was determined to be the most qualified.

The result of the Selection Committee evaluation is as follows:

Evaluation Criterion	Criteria Score
Approach to Work	33.13
Past Performance and Experience	28.70
Qualifications of Key Personnel	29.50
References	5.00

II. COMMITTEE MEMBERS

SHARLEE FLORES *Committee Chair (Non-Voting)*

RAY RAMOS *Committee Member (Voting)*

CAROL ABATE *Committee Member (Voting)*

ALAN JACOBSON *Committee Member (Voting)*

JOHN TURNIPSEED *Advisor (Non-Voting)*

STEFANEE RAMIREZ *Advisor (Non-Voting)*

III. SIGNIFICANT EVENTS

April 1, 2026 – Solicitation Posted
April 16, 2026 – Pre-Proposal Conference
April 27, 2026 – Proposals Due
April 28, 2026 – Committee Pre-Evaluation Meeting
May 12, 2026 – Committee Scoring Meeting
June 29, 2026 – Committee Review of Cost Proposal
July 2, 2026 – Committee Recommendation for Award

IV. EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Selection Committee evaluated the proposal based on four categories

A. Presentation on Approach to Work: [35%]

An evaluation of the proposer's understanding, approach, and commitments with respect to scheduling and timely completion of the project and the management of the project.

B. Qualification of Key Personnel: [30%]

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.

C. Past Performance and Experience: [30%]

This category will examine the qualifications and experience of the firm, its staff, and the specific individuals that will be assigned to our project. Some things that will be considered when evaluating this category are:

- What is the experience of the firm in performing similar tasks/projects?
- What is the background and experience of the firm's staff?
- How long has the firm been in existence?

D. References [5%]

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 in the tables below.

APPROACH TO WORK		
Proposer	Comments	Criteria Score
Provost & Pritchard	Demonstrated a strong understanding of the project scope, schedule, coordination requirements and overall project management approach. The proposal was thorough and organized.	33.13
Lars Anderson	Demonstrated an understanding of the project requirements and overall scope of work; however, the proposal contained less detail and clarity regarding coordination, project management, and implementation approach.	29.98
Alan Mok Engineering	The proposal demonstrated a limited understanding of the project scope and requirements. The overall approach lacked detail and clarity regarding project execution and coordination.	19.48

QUALIFICATIONS OF KEY PERSONNEL		
Proposer	Comments	Criteria Score
Provost & Pritchard	Demonstrated strong technical qualifications, relevant public agency experience, and overall depth of resources.	29.50
Lars Anderson	Firm appeared qualified; however, the overall team depth and demonstrated experience with similar project types was less extensive compared to the higher ranked firm.	18.50
Alan Mok Engineering	The proposed team demonstrated limited relevant experience and technical qualifications in comparison to other firms evaluated for this project.	15.70

PAST PERFORMANCE AND EXPERIENCE		
Proposer	Comments	Criteria Score
Provost & Pritchard	Demonstrated extensive experience staff with similar projects and successful projects. The firm showed strong background, relevant project history, and proven performance in similar services.	28.70
Lars Anderson & Associates	The firm demonstrated relevant experience and project history, through the number and complexity of comparable projects presented were more limited.	15.000
Alan Mok Engineering	The proposal included limited demonstrated experience with comparable projects and less extensive project history related to the requested services.	15.70

REFERENCES		
Proposer	Comments	Criteria Score
Provost & Pritchard	References met the solicitation requirements.	5.00
Lars Anderson & Association	References met the solicitation requirements.	4.17
Alan Mok Engineering	References met the solicitation requirements.	4.17

V. EVALUATION RESULTS

Firm	Approach	Personnel	Experience	References	Total
Provost & Pritchard	33.13	29.50	28.70	5.00	96.33
Lars Anderson & Associates	29.98	18.50	15.00	4.17	67.65
Alan Mok Engineering	19.48	15.70	15.70	4.17	55.05

The Selection Committee independently evaluated each proposal in accordance with the criteria established in the RFQ. Individual evaluator scores were averaged to determine the final ranking of firms.

Provost & Pritchard received the highest overall score. The firm demonstrated a strong and comprehensive understanding of the project, supported by a detailed approach to work, experienced personnel, and extensive relevant project history. The proposal reflected a clear understanding of the project requirements and was determined to be the most qualified submission.

Lars Anderson & Associates received the second highest overall score. The firm demonstrated relevant technical experience and an understanding of the project scope; however, the proposal contained less detail and depth in comparison to the highest-ranked firm.

Alan Mok Engineering received the third highest overall score. While the firm demonstrated some relevant experience and qualifications, the proposal reflected limited detail, project approach, and comparable project experience relative to the other firms evaluated.

VI. NEGOTIATIONS

The Selection Committee recommended entering negotiations with Provost & Pritchard as the most qualified firm. Cost negotiations were held in accordance with Brooks Act and applicable FTA procurement requirements.

VII. RECOMMENDATION

The Selection Committee recommends award to Provost & Pritchard as the most qualified firm for FAX's AHSC TRA bus stop improvement services.