



October 31, 2022

NOTICE OF INTENT TO AWARD

RFP# CSUSTRFP00000309-2022

AUXILIARY AUDIT SERVICES

In accordance with the provisions set forth in Request for Proposal #CSUSTRFP00000309-2022, it is California State University, Stanislaus's intent to award a contract to the following company on November 7, 2022:

Aldrich CPA's + Advisors, LLP

This Notice of Intent to Award should not be considered a binding commitment by California State University, Stanislaus. No such commitment may ensue until both parties have signed a formal contract.

Thank you for your interest in responding to the needs of California State University, Stanislaus.

Sincerely,

Julie Anderson, Buyer III

cc: Dennette Dores, Auxiliary Account Manager, Business & Finance
David Sawyer, Director of Procurement & Contracts Services, Business & Finance

Procurement & Contract Services

One University Circle | MSR270 | Turlock, CA 95382 | T 209.664.6592 | JMAnderson@csustan.edu
A proud member of the 23-campus California State University system.

ENGAGING · EMPOWERING · TRANSFORMING

<u>Summary</u>	<u>Total</u>
Aldrich	85
Glenn Burdette	81
Cohn Reznick	81

Quality of Presentation		Aldrich						
	Max Pts / Item	Interviewer #1	Interviewer #2	Interviewer #3	Interviewer #4	Interviewer #5	Interviewer #6	Total
1. Tab 1: Cover Letter: was a cover letter provided that referenced the RFP and confirms that all elements of the RFP including Scope of Work and Solicitation Provisions have been read/understood. Was there confirmation that the cover letter is in response to RFP and that respondent agrees to enter into an agreement if selected? Signed by authorized individual with name/title presented?	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	
2. Tab 2: Description of firms audit approach. Does the description seem reasonable, understandable and complete?	6	5	6	6	5	6	6	
3. Overall appearance of packet; is it organized, comprehensive	6	5	6	6	5	5	6	
4. Finalist Presentation	10	8	8	10	9	8	9	
25 points Maximum Subtotal Points for Quality of Presentation		21	23	25	22	22	24	23

Cost								
	Max Pts / Item	Interviewer #1	Interviewer #2	Interviewer #3	Interviewer #4	Interviewer #5	Interviewer #6	Total
1. Review guaranteed not-to-exceed fee for entire engagement. The lowest combined cost proposed shall receive the maximum points. Proposals with higher overall price are awarded points by dividing the lowest proposal price by the higher proposal price and multiplying it by the maximum points.	25	16	16	16	16	16	16	
25 points Maximum Subtotal Points for Cost		16	16	16	16	16	16	16

Experience of Staff Proposed								
	Max Pts/ Item	Interviewer #1	Interviewer #2	Interviewer #3	Interviewer #4	Interviewer #5	Interviewer #6	Total
1. Tab 4: review partner, manager, and in-charge accountant biographies who will be assigned to Stanislaus State. Does the staff listed have the qualifications to perform the audit services outlined in the scope?	10	8	10	9	9	10	10	
2. Maximum points awarded with the firm's demonstrated experience with the procedures required by the CSU Chancellor's Office on FASB auxiliaries; partial points awarded for experience only GASB auxiliaries.	15	13	15	10	14	15	15	
25 points Maximum Total Points for Experience of staff proposed		21	25	19	23	25	25	23

References								
	Max Pts/ Item	Interviewer #1	Interviewer #2	Interviewer #3	Interviewer #4	Interviewer #5	Interviewer #6	Total
1. Did the firm provide three references with at least one CSU Auxiliary Organization?	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
2. Did the firm provide one reference who is a FASB CSU Auxiliary Organization?	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
3. Review of reference check questions (see supplemental sheet)	8	6	6	6	6	6	6	
18 points Maximum Total Points for References		16	16	16	16	16	16	16

Peer Review								
	Max Pts/ Item	Interviewer #1	Interviewer #2	Interviewer #3	Interviewer #4	Interviewer #5	Interviewer #6	Total
1. Did firm provide a completed peer review dated within the most recent three (3) years, receiving an unmodified opinion on the review?	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
2. Were there any concerns noted in the peer review? 2 points granted for a clean review; 0 points when concerns (going concern, deficiencies, etc.) were noted.	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
7 points Maximum Total Points for Peer Review		7	7	7	7	7	7	7

Total Points Proposal / 100 points Maximum	Max Pts	Score
Total Points	100	85

Quality of Presentation		Glenn Burdette						
	Max Pts / Item	Interviewer #1	Interviewer #2	Interviewer #3	Interviewer #4	Interviewer #5	Interviewer #6	Total
1. Tab 1: Cover Letter: was a cover letter provided that referenced the RFP and confirms that all elements of the RFP including Scope of Work and Solicitation Provisions have been read/understood. Was there confirmation that the cover letter is in response to RFP and that respondent agrees to enter into an agreement if selected? Signed by authorized individual with name/title presented/	3	2	3	2.5	3	2	2	
2. Tab 2: Description of firms audit approach. Does the description seem reasonable, understandable and complete?	6	4	4	4.5	5	5	4	
3. Overall appearance of packet; is it organized, comprehensive and in the format requested?	6	4	5	4	6	4	5	
4. Finalist Presentation	10	4	7	7	8	8	7	
25 points Maximum Subtotal Points for Quality of Presentation		14	19	18	22	19	18	18

Cost								
	Max Pts / Item	Interviewer #1	Interviewer #2	Interviewer #3	Interviewer #4	Interviewer #5	Interviewer #6	Total
1. Review guaranteed not-to-exceed fee for entire engagement. The lowest combined cost proposed shall receive the maximum points. Proposals with higher overall price are awarded points by dividing the lowest proposal price by the higher proposal price and multiplying it by the maximum points.	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	
25 points Maximum Subtotal Points for Cost		25	25	25	25	25	25	25

Experience of Staff Proposed								
	Max Pts/ Item	Interviewer #1	Interviewer #2	Interviewer #3	Interviewer #4	Interviewer #5	Interviewer #6	Total
1. Tab 4: review partner, manager, and in-charge accountant biographies who will be assigned to Stanislaus State. Does the staff listed have the qualifications to perform the audit services outlined in the scope?	10	7	6	9	9	9	9	
2. Maximum points awarded with the firm's demonstrated experience with the procedures required by the CSU Chancellor's Office on FASB auxiliaries; partial points awarded for experience only GASB auxiliaries.	15	9	7	10	15	12	14	
25 points Maximum Total Points for Experience of staff proposed		16	13	19	24	21	23	19

References								
	Max Pts/ Item	Interviewer #1	Interviewer #2	Interviewer #3	Interviewer #4	Interviewer #5	Interviewer #6	Total
1. Did the firm provide three references with at least one CSU Auxiliary Organization?	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
2. Did the firm provide one reference who is a FASB CSU Auxiliary Organization?	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	
3. Review of reference check questions (see supplemental sheet)	8	6	6	6	6	6	6	
18 points Maximum Total Points for References		11	11	11	11	11	11	11

Peer Review								
	Max Pts/ Item	Interviewer #1	Interviewer #2	Interviewer #3	Interviewer #4	Interviewer #5	Interviewer #6	Total
1. Did firm provide a completed peer review dated within the most recent three (3) years, receiving an unmodified opinion on the review?	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
2. Were there any concerns noted in the peer review? 2 points granted for a clean review; 0 points when concerns (going concern, deficiencies, etc.) were noted.	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
7 points Maximum Total Points for Peer Review		7	7	7	7	7	7	7

Total Points Proposal / 100 points Maximum	Max Pts	Score
Total Points	100	81

Quality of Presentation		Cohn Reznick						
	Max Pts / Item	Interviewer #1	Interviewer #2	Interviewer #3	Interviewer #4	Interviewer #5	Interviewer #6	Total
1. Tab 1: Cover Letter: was a cover letter provided that referenced the RFP and confirms that all elements of the RFP including Scope of Work and Solicitation Provisions have been read/understood. Was there confirmation that the cover letter is in response to RFP and that respondent agrees to enter into an agreement if selected? Signed by authorized individual with name/title presented?	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	
2. Tab 2: Description of firms audit approach. Does the description seem reasonable, understandable and complete?	6	4	4	6	4	6	6	
3. Overall appearance of packet; is it organized, comprehensive and in the format requested?	6	4	5	6	6	5	6	
4. Finalist Presentation	10	5	5	10	8	7	10	
25 points Maximum Subtotal Points for Quality of Presentation		16	17	25	21	21	25	21

Cost		Cohn Reznick						
	Max Pts / Item	Interviewer #1	Interviewer #2	Interviewer #3	Interviewer #4	Interviewer #5	Interviewer #6	Total
1. Review guaranteed not-to-exceed fee for entire engagement. The lowest combined cost proposed shall receive the maximum points. Proposals with higher overall price are awarded points by dividing the lowest proposal price by the higher proposal price and multiplying it by the maximum points.	25	15	15	15	15	15	15	
25 points Maximum Subtotal Points for Cost		15	15	15	15	15	15	15

Experience of Staff Proposed		Cohn Reznick						
	Max Pts / Item	Interviewer #1	Interviewer #2	Interviewer #3	Interviewer #4	Interviewer #5	Interviewer #6	Total
1. Tab 4: review partner, manager, and in-charge accountant biographies who will be assigned to Stanislaus State. Does the staff listed have the qualifications to perform the audit services outlined in the scope?	10	8	7	10	10	9	10	
2. Maximum points awarded with the firm's demonstrated experience with the procedures required by the CSU Chancellor's Office on FASB auxiliaries; partial points awarded for experience only GASB auxiliaries.	15	8	10	15	15	15	15	
25 points Maximum Total Points for Experience of staff proposed		16	17	25	25	24	25	22

References		Cohn Reznick						
	Max Pts / Item	Interviewer #1	Interviewer #2	Interviewer #3	Interviewer #4	Interviewer #5	Interviewer #6	Total
1. Did the firm provide three references with at least one CSU Auxiliary Organization?	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
2. Did the firm provide one reference who is a FASB CSU Auxiliary Organization?	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
3. Review of reference check questions (see supplemental sheet)	8	6	6	6	6	6	6	
18 points Maximum Total Points for References		16	16	16	16	16	16	16

Peer Review		Cohn Reznick						
	Max Pts / Item	Interviewer #1	Interviewer #2	Interviewer #3	Interviewer #4	Interviewer #5	Interviewer #6	Total
1. Did firm provide a completed peer review dated within the most recent three (3) years, receiving an unmodified opinion on the review?	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
2. Were there any concerns noted in the peer review? 2 points granted for a clean review; 0 points when concerns (going concern, deficiencies, etc.) were noted.	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
7 points Maximum Total Points for Peer Review		7	7	7	7	7	7	7

Total Points Proposal / 100 points Maximum	Max Pts	Score
Total Points	100	81

Glenn Burdette Aldrich Cohn Reznick

Exhibit A	\$ 323,272.15	\$ 591,060.63	\$ 618,300.00
Exhibit B- Taxes	\$ 101,818.00	\$ 84,474.59	\$ 97,897.50
5 year cost:	\$ 425,090.15	\$ 675,535.22	\$ 716,197.50

Exhibit A	\$ 146,183.00	\$ 882,348.18	\$ 903,075.75
Exhibit B- Taxes	\$ 464,130.12	\$ 126,105.51	\$ 142,986.99
7 year total:	\$ 610,313.12	\$ 1,008,453.70	\$ 1,046,062.74

5 Year Points	25	16	15
---------------	----	----	----

*Lowest cost automatically receives full points (25)