

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER:

Community Works Design Group

EVALUATOR:

Britt

TOTAL SCORE:

100

of 100 Points

Let's Do Business with people that
we know, but only if the price is right!

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify "critical issues" to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm's ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 25

NOTES:

We are working with this firm currently
I would like the same understanding on projects
to be considered when Pricing or bidding on
any ~~Real~~ park projects. It's all in the
numbers bottom line.

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. ***The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted*** – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded:

28

NOTES:

They have been down this path before
by now CWDG knows how we work and yes
we want their best people working giving us
the city our dollars worth of EXPENDISE.

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 25

NOTES:

All Companies have great Staff Qualification
When the show hits the pavements and all
concerns of our community have been met only
then I will be happy about Staff Qualification
just means that we are getting our money
worth -

and this goes for all companies that
are bidding

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 15

NOTES:

I can only use Bod Borden park as
a guideline, so far so good if they
can come in under budget and on time
you will see a smile on my face.

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded:

10

NOTES:

6/20/16 for Commission Review
on time and under budget!!!

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER: DAVID EVANS ASSOCIATES

EVALUATOR: BRILL

TOTAL SCORE: 100 **of 100 Points**

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify "critical issues" to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm's ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 25

NOTES: looking at these history looks like this firm has an understanding of what we need. But it all comes down to cost.

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. *The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted* – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded:

25

NOTES:

Like the fact that DEA will
prepare up to five plans for each unit

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 25

NOTES:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no handwriting or other markings on the paper.

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 15

NOTES:

Seems that we "The City of Rialto" have worked with them before

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded: 10

NOTES:

We are in Aab I hope they can keep
and stay on schedule

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

**NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER:**

DVD

EVALUATOR:

Boett

TOTAL SCORE:

100

✓ of 100 Points

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify "critical issues" to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm's ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 25

NOTES:

This Company has done their homework on Frisbie Park and are asking the right questions like "perhaps multiuse practice space is needed". I have always believed that all of our citizens should be able to use and experience all parks in Rialto and no one should left behind.

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. ***The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted*** – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 25

NOTES:

ON time and under budget is what makes
me happy - From start to finish

I like when they say "Ability to stay within Budget"
But with any contract if this starts to go South
we need an exit plan that will cover our behind.

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 25

NOTES:

This section of this report to me is
consider ~~puff~~, all firm should have top
guns working on staff, I want to know
how much money ^(DVD) they made for the years
2013 — 2015 and if they have broken any
contracts for non performance?

this goes for all companies that are bidding

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 15

NOTES:

OK - Not trying to be funny but all
Firms tell the same story, with me "Show Me"
this makes me seem harmless but I have been
in business for some 35 years bottom line
will always be the bottom line. Can they put
out a great product at a decent cost?

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Points Awarded: 10

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the paper.

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER:

Hinesett

EVALUATOR:

Brett

TOTAL SCORE:

99

of 100 Points

this is one for the firms we have business with

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify "critical issues" to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm's ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 24

NOTES:

HAI seems to have a more tech background that can demonstrate that they have an understanding of certain projects but do the others.

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. ***The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted*** – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 25

NOTES:

WE have done work from the projects that were completed in one city were great so as long as the cost are within our budget and drawing are clear I can give a nod and have them come to the table with a decent bid.

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 25

NOTES:

the staff and contractors all seem
to have experience

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 15

NOTES:

Base on Margaret Todd Park

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded: _____

NOTES:

[illegible]

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

**NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER:**

Nirvis

EVALUATOR:

Brett

TOTAL SCORE:

100

of 100 Points

I leave mark to this firm

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify “critical issues” to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm’s ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 25

NOTES:

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. ***The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted*** – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 25

NOTES:

[illegible]

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded:

25

NOTES:

[illegible]

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 15

NOTES:

[illegible]

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Points Awarded: 10

[illegible]

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

**NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER:**

RHA

EVALUATOR:

Joe Bell

TOTAL SCORE:

100

of 100 Points

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify "critical issues" to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm's ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 25

NOTES:

I believe with what I've read this Firm has the experience and understands what our needs were.

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. ***The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted*** – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 25

NOTES:

11/2/17 Concerns one Cost!

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 25

NOTES:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are approximately 20 lines visible. The paper appears to be a standard notebook or worksheet page.

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 13

NOTES:

Firm has history which is
impressive, however I believe Fergusson Park
cost us too much. great park

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded: 10

NOTES:

I HAVE no problem with this time
frame as long as you can keep to it
and come in on time

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

**NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER:**

RRM

EVALUATOR:

Brett

TOTAL SCORE:

99

of 100 Points

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify "critical issues" to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm's ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 25

NOTES:

By looking at their proposal on understanding of our projects the presentation seems great, Layed out in excellent form.

But I base my opinion on performance and price

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. *The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted* – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 24

NOTES:

Their vision on Scope of work seems adequate. Can we get all this and more at a rate that we can afford?

Performance & cost makes me happy

How much did this firm do in City projects in CA. 2014 – 2015?

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 25

NOTES:

Staff Qualification is adequate a little top heavy, can we afford them?

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 15

NOTES:

RRM is currently working Retho - interesting!
They show great conceptual park plans

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded: 10

NOTES:

Grant Presentation!

but with all firms we need a built
IN exit clause

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

**NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER:**

SCHMIDT DESIGN ✓

EVALUATOR:

Brett

TOTAL SCORE:

98

of 100 Points

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify “critical issues” to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm’s ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 25

NOTES:

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. ***The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted*** – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 25

NOTES:

My concerns are always on cost of
project

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 25

NOTES:

Mr. Justus seems to have Qualifications
for our project but the proof will be in
what he and his team can produce.

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 13

NOTES:

Based on their proposal

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded: 10

NOTES:

time frame seems to be ok if they
can hold to it.

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER: Community Works Design Group

EVALUATOR: Rafael Trujillo

TOTAL SCORE: 99 **of 100 Points**

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify "critical issues" to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm's ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 25

NOTES: Community Works places heavy emphasis on community outreach and creativity (both in design and in reducing construction costs). They boast a huge team of subcontractors with expertise in each aspect of the design work. They are also proud of their 3-D animation and have visuals of some of the other projects previously worked on by the firm. They believe in a hands-on approach.

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. ***The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted*** – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 25

NOTES:

Offers ~~file~~ must be in the SOW

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 25

NOTES:

Tim Maloney: Tim has municipal experience. He is the founder of the firm. He will be in attendance of all of the public meetings. Zoo Master Plans

Scott Rice: He has 14 years w/ firm & worked for a National Skate Park design-build firm.

Bud: He has public works managerial experience. He is a U.S. Army Lt. Colonel (retired).

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 15

NOTES:

CWDG has been in business since 1985. Staff is
municipality-experienced. They draw upon a team of
experienced subcontractors.

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded: 9

NOTES:

The project schedule is 14 months, one month of community survey and planning w/ Commission and City Council approval.

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER: David Evans & Associates

EVALUATOR: Rafael Trujillo

TOTAL SCORE: 87 **of 100 Points**

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify "critical issues" to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm's ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 22

NOTES: The emphasis is on project management. Direct purchase
will be used as a tool to lower costs.

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. ***The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted*** – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 22

NOTES:

- 1) Neighborhood/Community assessment
- 2) Conceptual plans
- 3) 2 final plans
- 4) EIR
- 5) construction docs
- 6) ongoing tech support

— It's very detailed.

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 20

NOTES:

^{Project Manager}
Chris Giannini:

- 22 years of park master planning & design (Bat DEA & 9 at CWDG)
- previously with Community Works Design Group

No other specific qualifications of other staff mentioned, such as Principal-in-charge Kim Rhodes, or any of the subcontractor staff mentioned.

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 13

NOTES:

DEA has been in business for over 30 years, Has worked on the
"E" street Park in San Bernardino.

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded: 10

NOTES:

Project schedule is 13 months, including 2 1/2 months
of community needs assessment with 5 conceptual plans each.

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER: David Volz Design

EVALUATOR: Rafael Trujillo

TOTAL SCORE: 72 **of 100 Points**

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify "critical issues" to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm's ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 16

NOTES:

- Proposal has some emphasis on taking ideas from staff and trying them out on the community
- they have particular interest in exploring drought tolerant landscapes

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. ***The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted*** – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 15

NOTES:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are approximately 20 lines visible. The paper has a slight shadow on the right side, suggesting it's resting on a surface. There is no handwriting or other markings on the paper.

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 21

NOTES:

2020 availability
40% availability
David Volz - 30 years of experience w/ projects in more than 100 agencies - ^{Principal} ~~Founder~~ ^{Chair}
Gary Vasquez - 20 years of experience - Senior Project Manager/Director Design
Paul Cassar - 13 years of experience - Project Manager
Reberto Leo - 8 years of experience - landscape architect
Angela Lee - 3 years - Project Designer
Larry Pordexter - 30 years - Building Designer

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 12

NOTES:

- Founded in 1997
- LEED Accredited
- last 2 projects won Award of Excellence from CPRS
- Corporate office in La Quinta & San Jose

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded: 8

NOTES:

5 months scheduled - one month of neighborhood
community needs assessment & one month of community
engagement. The first agency review to take place at the
beginning of month 3.

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER: Hirsh & Associates, Inc.

EVALUATOR: Rafael Trujillo

TOTAL SCORE: 82 **of 100 Points**

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify "critical issues" to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm's ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 20

NOTES:

- This proposal focuses on the environmental impact & traffic study and understanding the layout of the land.

- Interesting note: The proposal looks into doing telephone random sampling to survey residents w/ a 5-minute of questions.

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. ***The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted*** – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 18

NOTES:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are approximately 20 lines visible. On the left side, there is a vertical margin line, creating a narrow left margin. The paper appears to be from a notebook or a standard ruled document.

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 24

NOTES:

Charles Foley - Project Manager - 15 years

Patrick Hirsch - President & CEO - 39 years

Mark Hirsch - Senior Project Manager - 24 years

Janet Brown - Project Manager - 13 years

Naomi Hirsch - Project Manager - 7 years

Bob Jenkins - Designer - 10 years

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 13

NOTES:

- previously completed work on Margaret Todd Park
(I don't remember the ask for input, just provided updates to Parks Commission)

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded:

7

NOTES:

The schedule ranges up to 10 months (2 weeks of interviews with the community & One month of stakeholder meetings)

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER: Nuvis Landscape Architecture

EVALUATOR: Rafael Trujillo

TOTAL SCORE: 79 **of 100 Points**

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify "critical issues" to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm's ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 18

NOTES: There is heavy emphasis on understanding current
conditions of the 3 lands, including accessing geotechnical
information. Some concern for safety is expressed.

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. ***The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted*** – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 21

NOTES:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no handwriting or other markings on the paper.

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 20

NOTES:

Jamas Muñoz - Principal - 37 years
Perry Cardoza - Exec. VP - 30 years
No other staff qualifications

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 13

NOTES:

Nuvia's in business since 1971. It has led 100s of design teams for 45 years. About 90% of work where NUVIA is the principal consultant.

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded: 7

NOTES:

This proposal has a schedule for 8 months, including
2 weeks of onsite interviews. There are 2 community meetings
and a separate presentation for city council & parks commission.

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER: RHA Landscape Architects Planners, Inc.

EVALUATOR: Rafael Trujillo

TOTAL SCORE: 88 **of 100 Points**

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify "critical issues" to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm's ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 23

NOTES: RHA Landscape Architects place the most emphasis on troubleshooting and problem solving. It boasts its ability to accurately estimate the ever-changing construction costs and keeps change orders to a minimum. RHA is committed to follow its schedule even while the City may experience delays.

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. ***The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted*** – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 23

NOTES:

[illegible]

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 20

NOTES:

Doug Grove: California Parks & Recreation Society Board of Directors, California Turf & Landscape Foundation at UCES, U.S. Green Building Council-IE - GO projects - formerly of Community Works Design Group!

There is no information on the specific qualifications of staff at PROS Consulting, ETC Institute, and LSA Associates who will be conducting community outreach, Needs Assessment, & environmental services. Also, CASC Engineering & Consulting, JSA Engineering, and Converse Consultants have no staff listed w/ credentials. Too many subcontractors w/ no specific staff information.

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 14

NOTES:

PLA has been in business since 1979. They worked on
Fergusson Park.

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded: 8

NOTES:

Project schedule is 1 year & 10 months, including
2 months of community outreach.

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER: RRM Design Group

EVALUATOR: Rafael Trujillo

TOTAL SCORE: 85 **of 100 Points**

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify "critical issues" to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm's ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 20

NOTES:

The proposal has five objectives with goals, the first one is on community outreach. They paid attention to past parks & recreation commission meetings showing the concerns over little available park space.

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. ***The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted*** – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 20

NOTES:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no handwriting or other markings on the paper.

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 22

NOTES:

Mike Stenrod - Principal - 20 years - LEED accredited
Amanda Canahan - Project Manager - 9 years - LEED accredited
Lance Wierschem - Senior Planner - 9 years - LEED accredited
Bill Strand - Civil Engineer - 20 years
~~Steve~~ Michael Doremus - Structural Engineer - 10 years
Brian Borum - ^{Survey Crew Manager} - 18 years
Jim Wolfe - Recreational Programming Specialist - 38 years experience
Chris Dufaur - Irrigation Specialist - 16 years experience

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 14

NOTES:

- Currently working on the Downtown Senior Apartment Complex on Riverside & First streets.
- 40 years in business
- nearest office in Palm Desert
- provides lotsize comparables for Cactus Randall

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded: 9

NOTES:

There are
20 months in the project scheduling w/ 4 months of
community outreach - 2 ^{community} workshops at each site - 9/2016
is the target of providing conceptual alternative plans to the
Commission.

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER: Schmidt Design Group, Inc.

EVALUATOR: Rafael Trujillo

TOTAL SCORE:

55

of 100 Points

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify "critical issues" to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm's ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 10

NOTES:

The proposal provides
Emphasis on community outreach and artistic/creative
elements. ^{They are} Unique in that they are the only proposal
to use social media for community outreach.
Frequent mention of projects using streams highlights
a mismatch, though

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. ***The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted*** – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 17

NOTES:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are approximately 20 lines visible. On the left side, there is a vertical margin line, creating a narrow left margin. The paper appears to be from a notebook or a standard ruled document.

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 10

NOTES:

Jeff Justus - Principal / Project Manager - 25 conceptual park plans
No other staff qualifications presented!

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 10

NOTES:

- Schmidt has 39 years in business.

- specialize in trails and streams - not a good fit

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded: 8

NOTES:

The project schedule runs 11 months, including 2 months of community surveys & interviews. It includes 3 community workshops and a presentation to City Council & Parks Commission.

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER: Community Works Design Group

EVALUATOR: Perry Breutz

TOTAL SCORE: 89 **of 100 Points**

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify “critical issues” to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm’s ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 21

NOTES:

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. ***The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted*** – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 21

NOTES:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no handwriting or other markings on the paper.

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 25

NOTES:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the paper.

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded:

15

NOTES:

[illegible]

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded:

NOTES:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no handwriting or other markings on the paper.

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER: David Evans and Associates

EVALUATOR: Perry Brents

TOTAL SCORE: 95 **of 100 Points**

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify “critical issues” to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm’s ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 25

NOTES:

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. ***The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted*** – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 24

NOTES:

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Points Awarded: 23

[illegible]

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 13

NOTES:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are approximately 20 lines visible. The paper has a slight shadow on the right side, suggesting it's resting on a surface.

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded: 10

NOTES:

[illegible]

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER: David Volz Design

EVALUATOR: Perry Brents

TOTAL SCORE: 86 **of 100 Points**

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify “critical issues” to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm’s ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 22

NOTES:

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. ***The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted*** – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 22

NOTES:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no handwriting or other markings on the paper.

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 25

NOTES:

[illegible]

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 12

NOTES:

[illegible]

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Points Awarded:

5

Appears to be incomplete: Tasks 5-7

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER: Hirsch and Associates

EVALUATOR: Perry Brentz

TOTAL SCORE: 93 **of 100 Points**

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify “critical issues” to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm’s ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 25

NOTES:

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. ***The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted*** – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 21

NOTES:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no handwriting or other markings on the paper.

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded:

25

NOTES:

18

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 22

NOTES:

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded: 10

NOTES:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are approximately 20 lines visible. The paper appears to be a standard notebook page.

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER: NOVIS Landscape

EVALUATOR: Perry BreunB

TOTAL SCORE:

94

of 100 Points

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify “critical issues” to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm’s ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded:

25

NOTES:

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. ***The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted*** – each sub-task must be identified in the firm’s separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 22

NOTES:

[illegible]

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 25

NOTES:

[illegible]

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 15

NOTES:

[illegible]

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded: 7

NOTES:

Can't read chart dates

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

**NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER:**

RHA Landscape

EVALUATOR:

Perry Brents

TOTAL SCORE:

93

of 100 Points

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify “critical issues” to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm’s ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 25

NOTES:

This image shows a single page of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no handwriting or other markings on the paper.

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. ***The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted*** – each sub-task must be identified in the firm’s separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 22

NOTES:

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 25

NOTES:

[illegible]

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 13

NOTES:

[illegible]

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded: 8

NOTES:

[illegible]

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER: RRM Design

EVALUATOR: Perry Brents

TOTAL SCORE: 98 **of 100 Points**

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify “critical issues” to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm’s ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 25

NOTES:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no handwriting or other markings on the paper.

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 25

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no handwriting or other markings on the paper.

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 25

NOTES:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are approximately 20 lines visible. On the left side, there is a vertical margin line, creating a narrow left margin. The paper appears to be from a notebook or a standard ruled sheet.

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 15

NOTES:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are no margins or other markings visible.

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Points Awarded: 8

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are approximately 20 lines visible. The paper has a slight shadow on the right side, suggesting it's resting on a surface. The top edge of the paper is slightly irregular, like a torn piece of paper.

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER: Schmidt Design Group

EVALUATOR: Perry Breutz

TOTAL SCORE:

93

of 100 Points

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify “critical issues” to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm’s ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 20

NOTES:

[illegible]

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. ***The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted*** – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 23

NOTES:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are approximately 20 lines visible. The paper appears to be a standard notebook page or a sheet of stationery. The edges of the paper are slightly irregular, suggesting it might be a scan of a physical document. There is no handwriting or other markings on the page.

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded:

25

NOTES:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are approximately 20 lines visible. The paper appears to be a standard notebook page or a sheet of stationery. There is no handwriting or other markings on the page.

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded:

15

NOTES:

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded: 10

NOTES:

[illegible]

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER: Community Design Group

EVALUATOR: John Dutre-

TOTAL SCORE: 49 **of 100 Points**

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify "critical issues" to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm's ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 0

NOTES:

① Did not answer the question.

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. **The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted** – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 22

NOTES:

2 5 5 5 5

① Detail concept, but mention 3-s
concept plans designed. Did not
see final ^{plans} ~~maps~~ for consideration.

② The scope is thorough and can
be used in the agreement.

③ Detail Construction presentation and
CEQA review

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded:

8

NOTES:

5 3 0 0 0

① Did not fully answer the question for this section.

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 14

NOTES:

2 2 5 5

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded: 5

NOTES:

① Did not provide previous project schedule

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

**NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER:**

David Evans

EVALUATOR:

John Dutrey

TOTAL SCORE:

92

of 100 Points

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify "critical issues" to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm's ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 25

NOTES:

① Responded to all questions
satisfactorily

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. ***The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted*** – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded:

20

NOTES:

50555

① ~~the~~ ~~Cost~~ Budget estimate at
end of construction phase - 0 profit

② Scope is very detailed and can
be used in the agreement.

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 23

NOTES:

55355

① Provided extensive experience of project manager.

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 15

3 2 5 5

NOTES:

① Respond to all questions and provide firm's extensive park project experience.

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded:

9

NOTES:

5 4

① Had no dates on proposed project schedule.

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

**NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER:**

David Volz Design

EVALUATOR:

John Dutrey

TOTAL SCORE:

72

of 100 Points

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify "critical issues" to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm's ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 25

NOTES:

① Had extensive review of both sites.
In addition, had pictures of both sites

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. *The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted* – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 21

NOTES:

5 5 5 3 3

① The task could be more thorough, but were easy to understand

② The scope requires additional information for the agreement.

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 11
3 4 0 4 0

NOTES:

① Proposal was not clear who the lead consultant - Principal in Charge or Project Manager

② Listed only three projects completed for Project Manager

③ Did not list existing projects engaged

④ Did not identify if Project Manager has sufficient time.

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 15

NOTES:

3 2 5 5

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded: 0

NOTES:

① Did not provide part project schedule

② Proposed project schedule is incomplete.

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

**NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER:**

Hirsch & Ass

EVALUATOR:

John D. Aray

TOTAL SCORE:

88 79

of 100 Points

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify “critical issues” to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm’s ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 25

NOTES:

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. *The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted* – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded:

18

4 10 5 4 5

NOTES:

① Concept & design scope somewhat limited in detail.

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded:

17

NOTES:

S A A S S
1 1

① Not enough of sufficient park projects listed

② Almost all projects currently engaged are not park projects

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 12

NOTES:

3 2 4 3

① The firm experience in projects were listed elsewhere in the proposal. Hard to find.

② The firm's subcontractors were listed elsewhere in proposal. Hard to find.

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded: 7
5 8 2

NOTES:

① The Project schedule is difficult to read.

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

**NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER:**

Nuvus

EVALUATOR:

John Dotrey

TOTAL SCORE:

73

of 100 Points

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify "critical issues" to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm's ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 2 19
3 7 8 12

NOTES:

① Firm included proposal cost for both projects.

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. *The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted* – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 20

NOTES:

50555

① Project budget occurs after construction plans developed.

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 16

5 3 4 4 0

NOTES:

① No date provided of completed project

② Did not provide name of project currently underway

③ Did not provide previous firm name

④ Did not answer question of sufficient time to provide to project

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 14

NOTES:

2 2 5 5

① Did not provide address

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded:

4

NOTES:

0 4

① Did not provide prior project schedule

② Proposed project schedule somewhat hard to read

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

**NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER:**

RHA

EVALUATOR:

Sohn Dutrey

TOTAL SCORE:

77

of 100 Points

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify "critical issues" to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm's ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 10

NOTES:

2 0 4.

① Repeated Understanding from RFP

② Did not really address the critical issues.

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. ***The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted*** – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 20

50 5 5 5

NOTES:

① The budget estimate is after construction changes

② Proposal is comprehensive and the scope can be used in the agreement.

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 22

5 5 7 2 5 5

NOTES:

① Provide extensive evidence of park project

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 15

NOTES:

3 2 5 5

① Provided all information requested
and had ~~time~~ firm in past projects.

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded: 10

NOTES:

① Provided past project schedule
and proposed project schedule.

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

**NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER:**

RRM

EVALUATOR:

John Dutrey

TOTAL SCORE:

89

of 100 Points

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify "critical issues" to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm's ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 18 25

NOTES:

~~Did not identify key or critical scope & issues under A.2.~~

① Responded to the question for this section

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. ***The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted*** – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 25 20

NOTES:

① The scope in the is very detail and organized for use in the agreement

② The scope is logical and include all phases of the project, including construction completion

③ The scope includes SEQA preparation and approval.

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 19
5 4 4 2 4
we Num.
Lifespan

NOTES:

① Listed the name of two project lead managers

② Listed mostly successful completed projects resulted in parks

③ Some what proposed list of parks

④ Did not really address working years with current or past firms

⑤ ~~Did not identify how many~~
~~with direct time to projects.~~

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 15

NOTES:

3 2 5 5

① ~~List the name of two lead~~
pages

① Provide detail information about
firm

② Provide information on extensive
experience on park designs

③ Provide sub - content information

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded: 5

NOTES:

① Did not include schedule of previous completed projects

② Detail schedule for ~~Envision~~ project.

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

**NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER:**

Schmidt

EVALUATOR:

John Dotrey

TOTAL SCORE:

92

of 100 Points

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify "critical issues" to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm's ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 25

NOTES:

① Very thorough understanding
and included critical issues

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. **The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted** – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 19

50 ~~4~~ 55

NOTES:

- ① ^{Process for} ~~Core~~ Concept Drawing ~~Exhibit~~ acceptable
- ② The Preliminary Cost is after construction plans are prepared. - 0 point
- ③ Include construction plans, but no discussion of assembly for bid project (only prepare specs.)
- ④ Through Turn
- ⑤ Can be used in agreement

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 23

NOTES:

S S 3 S S

① Provided detail experience
with several past park projects.

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 15

NOTES:

3 2 5 5

① Provided detail information requested and park project experience.

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded: 10 

NOTES:

① Provided all information requested.

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER: Community Works Design Group

EVALUATOR: Katie Nickel

TOTAL SCORE: _____

90

of 100 Points

Designed Kialto - Bud Bender
Frisbie Park

Grant Prop 84 Park Traded Projects

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify "critical issues" to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm's ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 20

NOTES:

13 Questions to Define Key issues for design of successful park.

Concepts w/ 3D animation w/ fly around capabilities

Scope of work

2. Comm Design Day

4. Schematic Planning - mts no limit

5. 3 Concepts - 5 to 7 color dots - concepts, ^{amenities} location of amenities

6. 2 MP for each park

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. ***The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted*** – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 20

NOTES:

see previous page!

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 20.25

NOTES:

Pres Timothy Maloney } 35 yrs.
Principal Scott Rice }
Brosvenor Fish
Mike Houlahan w/ First Carbon Solutions
25 yrs. PM Technical

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 15

NOTES:

30 yrs. CA Parks & Rec Planning

1

Subs

^{1st contractor}
FCSolutions

Consulting

Survey

- Extract

TKE Eng - Civil

Cummings

- Cost Estimation

John R. Pyerly - Isotech

Resonance Group Marketing & Comm.

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded: 10

NOTES:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no handwriting or other markings on the paper.

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

**NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER:**

David Evans + Assoc. DEA

EVALUATOR:

Katie

TOTAL SCORE:

75

of 100 Points

Issues

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify "critical issues" to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm's ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded:

~~20~~ 15

NOTES:

lead design efforts -

Chris Brannini - landscape Architect.

Issues: higher construction costs

because of a busy economy

causing project funding issues / value eng.

Solution: provide options for bidding

Direct Purchase - Co-op

of equipment

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. **The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted** – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: ~~20~~ 15

NOTES:


Arellano Associates (AA)

Public Outreach Plan (POP)

1.4 ^{assist with} develop of collateral material pg 5.
Who is producing the materials?

1.2 Parcel Data of immediate area

1.3 online survey - English/Spanish
hard copy survey.

 pg 7 excluded from scope of work ^{why}

Psomas - 4 Environmental Docs.

DEA - Table 5 Construction Docs

Require Water provided for Geotechnical
Testing Report

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 25

NOTES:

DEA - Chris Giannini - 22yrs

MRC Eugene Electrical

Danilano Assoc. - Comm. Outreach

Environmental Pomas

Waste City Geo Tech

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 10

NOTES:

Rialto experiences not park related.

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded:

10

NOTES:

Only 3 months for task 1 - Comm Outreach.

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER: David Votz Design

EVALUATOR: Katie Nickel

TOTAL SCORE: _____

~~60~~

78

of 100 Points

no schedule for tasks 5-7

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify "critical issues" to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm's ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 20

NOTES:

Sustainable
challenge - create unique spaces + special
places draw inspiration from
environ / community

Community Inspired

*Friskie 13? to explore ideas - parking expanded, ~~the~~
great perimeter walking path (1 mile), new uses?,
reduce turf w/ drought tolerant landscape, storm water
treatment along edges of street, educational garden,*

*Cactus - active play spaces, soil issues address,
accommodate horse in design*

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. *The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted* – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 15

NOTES:

Provided summary format of scope of services,
no clear detail as which sub is providing which
scope of service.

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 20

NOTES:

David Volz - Principal 30 yrs.

more than 100 public agencies

Gary Vasquez Sr PM . 20 yrs .

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 15

NOTES:

18 yrs.

Team - subs

Civil Works Eng - Civil & Surveying

Design West Eng. - Electrical

LGC Ideotech

Edenroc Environ.

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded: 8

NOTES:

No schedule for task 5-7

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER:

Hirsch & Assoc.

EVALUATOR:

Katie Nickel

TOTAL SCORE:

~~43.75~~

73

of 100 Points

Construction Docs Optional(?)

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify "critical issues" to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm's ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 20

20

NOTES:

Define Comm Needs - Comm interviews, tabulation results, in person interview of stakeholders, open communication + sharing survey results.

Synthesize 5 CD at one time - simple spatial studies and functional diagrams

Develop plan w/enough detail to estimate const. cost -
Final CD - color, cross section cuts, 3D sketches,
Cost est calc initially based on quantitative
area + current const. material cost per unit

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. *The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted* – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded:

~~20~~ 15

NOTES:

1. 500 phone interviews - City provide contact info!

2. 5 concept plans

Tasks - SCE Coordination for power supply

Environmental → Const. Drawings optional!

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded:

20

20

NOTES:

Charles Foley - 1996

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 10

NOTES:

Subs -

Kennedy Comm

Ca Survey Research Services

Digital Mapping Co.

Duck Creek CEQA/Env.

Blue Peak Eng.

IDS Eng

Soil Exploration

Correa Eng Structural

TJW Eng - Traffic

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded:

8

NOTES:

Const Drawing optional

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER: Navis

EVALUATOR: Katie

TOTAL SCORE: 73 **of 100 Points**

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify "critical issues" to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm's ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded:

15

NOTES:

Lee Andrews Group facilitate w/ go
community Mtg for each Park
10 each site
20 1 on 1 interviews ; website for use

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. ***The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted*** – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded:

15

NOTES:

Phase I

Tetra Tech - Surveys + Base Maps

Team Nexus - 5 Conceptual designs

Crane Architectural Group - review ?
+ confirm CD for approval

CD Design JRP - Design LED parking

Phase II - Fees + Scope to be negotiated

EE Corp - Environmental Docs

AB52 consultation process by City

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 20

NOTES:

Tomaz Munoz 28 yrs. Navis 1978

Perry Cardona Navis 1986

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded:

15

NOTES:

Public Affairs - Lee Andrews Group - Facilitator
Tetra Tech - Survey
Sweeney + Its - Irrigation
CD Design - electrical eng
E Corp - environmental compliance
Engle Kirk - structural Eng.
Crane Architectural Group.
DIAZ YOUNG & ASSOC (DYA)
geotechnical

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded:

8

NOTES:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the paper.

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER:

RITA -

EVALUATOR:

Katie Nickel

TOTAL SCORE:

73

of 100 Points

RITA
(ETC Institute) Pros Consulting
CASC
LSA

Additional Studies not covered

Air Impact

Greenhouse Gas (GHG)

Noise Impact

Traffic Impact

Cultural Resource Assessment

Biological Resource Ass

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify "critical issues" to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm's ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded:

15

NOTES:

M Neg Dec by City
CEQA by City
EIR by City

Minimal to no CO - in-house thorough Plan Check ~~2x~~ 2x

resolve issues ^{within} 48 hrs during construction

timely completion

3-4 park projects per year w/ latest cost estimates

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. **The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted** – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 15

NOTES:

1. Comm Outreach - ETC Institute
400 survey

8 Key mtgs ; 2-8 focus mtgs
onsite interviews, photos, mapping

Task 3 -

Infiltration Testing key City-Why? Assumed city has
Geotech Engineering! ✓

Task 4 - LSIA Environmental Draft IS/MND, NOI mitigation

Monitoring + MMP (one review process)

Prepare + advertise NOI + file w/SB - who in City doing this?

Task 5 - Converse - Reports Geotechnical

CRASC - Street Imp Plans, Erosion Control, hydrology,
WQMP, SWPPP

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 20

NOTES:

Doug Gme - 31 yrs

30 projects conceptual park plans

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded:

15

NOTES:

RH A

Boys - over 100 parks

~~PROS~~

CPRS Award - City of Upland,

Norco, Riverside Co.

Designed = Fergusson Park 2012

Current - 9 Parks + Rec Projects

Subs :

PROs Cons

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded: 8

NOTES:

Jan 2017 start Construction - Jun 18
1 year.

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER: RRM Design Group

EVALUATOR: Katie Nickel

TOTAL SCORE: 70 **of 100 Points**

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify "critical issues" to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm's ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 20

NOTES: _____

Outreach to get community involve

Concept - Bridge across Cactus Channel
connect Cactus/Randall Parks & Anderson Park.

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. ***The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted*** – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded:

15

NOTES:

Day in the Park – City post & mail
(at Fuschie Park only) workshop notices.

City coordinate/reserve community meeting rooms
ii mail & post public meeting notices.

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 15

NOTES:

Mike Sherrod - 23 yrs experience
Amanda PM 9 yrs.
SR P'anner - lance 9 yrs
Bill Stroud - Civil 20 yrs

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 10

NOTES:

40 yrs - 112 staff FTB

Subs - Solbe Research - needs assessment
Morse Planning - Environmental
Visual Concept - Lighting Design
Ninzo & Moore - Geotechnical Eng
C.P. O'Halloran Assoc - Cost Estimation
Aquatic - Water
Wormhardt - Skate Park Design Expert

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded: 10

NOTES:

7-9 / 2017 Bid / Award.

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER:

Schmidt Design Group

EVALUATOR:

Katie Nickel

TOTAL SCORE:

85

85

of 100 Points

environmental prepared comment w/
construction drawings (at risk).

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify "critical issues" to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm's ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 20 20

NOTES:

building consensus - interconnected blend of outreach.

English + Spanish

embracing context - ^{rich} Canyon Wash geographic

composition - authentic sense of place

staging phases to avoid closure of current park.

Callus - entrance connectivity via

bike path; controlled inflow of water from

flood control for children play(?) ^{health} issues?

Interpretive display. Mt Baldy snow forest

navigates through city w/in Realto

Channel on to Santa Ana River

Daylighted creeks, prosials, detention basins

functions as aesthetic features.

Water conservation unaided landscapes.

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. **The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted** – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 20

NOTES:

1. Recruiting Methods - letters emails & telephone calls
Data Collection - online & phone follow-ups
1 mile radius survey.
BPO at Cactus.
2. SCD / ^{hand drawn} plans, Estimates, Comm. Workshops
Physicist feedback, red / green dots select design solutions
3. 2 FCD / plans - Computer rendering
image boards, cost estimates, comm. mtg.
4. ~~AOA~~ Reg. Tech Report GHG
Recommend a quantitative Health Risk Assessment ^{HRA}
Bio Survey & letter Report
Cultural Resource Tech Report
Traffic Impact Analysis
5. Const Docs - offsite street improvements excluded
Blades / shade structures are pre-fab.

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 20

NOTES:

Jeff Justus 26 yrs experience
25 Conceptual Plans

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: ~~10~~ 15

NOTES:

303 years.

200 Public Projects

Quality Control

Subs:

Fuscoe Engineers - Civil + survey

Alagria Eng. - Electrical

Helix Environmental - Environ

True North Research - Comm Survey

Group Delta - Geotech

AARE Eng - Structural.

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded: 10

NOTES:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the paper.

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

**NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER:**

Community Works

EVALUATOR:

Jeff Schater

TOTAL SCORE:

79

of 100 Points

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify “critical issues” to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm’s ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 20

NOTES:

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. ***The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted*** – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 20

NOTES:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no handwriting or other markings on the paper.

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 20

NOTES:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are approximately 20 lines visible. The paper has a slightly textured appearance and is set against a dark background.

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 12

NOTES:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are approximately 20 lines visible. The paper has a slightly textured appearance and some minor discoloration or shadows, suggesting it's a physical scan of a real object. There is no handwriting or other markings on the paper.

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded: 7

NOTES:

Bid 2/20/17

Construction Complete Jan 2018

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER: David Evans and Associates

EVALUATOR: Jeff Schafer

TOTAL SCORE: 75 **of 100 Points**

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify “critical issues” to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm’s ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 18

NOTES:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no handwriting or other markings on the paper.

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. ***The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted*** – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded:

21

NOTES:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are approximately 20 lines visible. The paper has a slightly textured appearance and some minor discoloration or shadows, suggesting it might be a scan of a physical document. There is no handwriting or other markings on the page.

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 19

NOTES:

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 12

NOTES:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no handwriting or other markings on the paper.

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded:

5

NOTES:

Bid Feb. 2017

No Construction Schedule provided

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER: David Volz Design

EVALUATOR: Jeff Schafer

TOTAL SCORE: 81 **of 100 Points**

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify “critical issues” to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm’s ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 22

NOTES:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no handwriting or other markings on the paper.

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. ***The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted*** – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 23

NOTES:

[illegible]

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 20

NOTES:

[illegible]

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 12

NOTES:

[illegible]

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded: 4

NOTES:

Schedule not provided past
Final concept plans

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

**NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER:**

Hirsch and Associates

EVALUATOR:

Jeff Schater

TOTAL SCORE:

75

of 100 Points

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify “critical issues” to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm’s ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 18

NOTES:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the paper.

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. ***The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted*** – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 21

NOTES:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are approximately 20 lines visible. The paper has a slight shadow on the right side, suggesting it's resting on a surface. There is no handwriting or other markings on the paper.

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Points Awarded: 20

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are approximately 20 lines visible. The paper appears to be a standard notebook page or a sheet of stationery. There is no handwriting or other markings on the page.

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 12

NOTES:

[illegible]

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded:

4

NOTES:

Schedule Incomplete

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

**NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER:**

Nuvix Landscape Architecture

EVALUATOR:

Jeff Schafer

TOTAL SCORE:

77

of 100 Points

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify “critical issues” to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm’s ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 18

NOTES:

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Rating Value = 25 Points

22

[illegible]

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 20

NOTES:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the paper.

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 12

NOTES:

[illegible]

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded: 5

NOTES:

Design Complete Sept 2016

No Construction Schedule

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER: RHA Landscape Architects

EVALUATOR: Jeff Schater

TOTAL SCORE: 79 of 100 Points

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify “critical issues” to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm’s ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 20

NOTES:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no handwriting or other markings on the paper.

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. ***The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted*** – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 22

NOTES:

[illegible]

1

20

20

[illegible]

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 12

NOTES:

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded:

5

NOTES:

Design Complete Dec. 2016

Construction Complete Jan. 2018

One resume, and several consultants

Designed Fergusson Park in Rialto

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER: RRM Design Group

EVALUATOR: Jeff Schater

TOTAL SCORE: 85 **of 100 Points**

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify “critical issues” to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm’s ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 22

NOTES:

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. ***The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted*** – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 29

NOTES:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are approximately 20 lines visible. On the left side, there is a vertical margin line, creating a narrow left margin. The paper appears to be from a notebook or a standard ruled document.

100

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Points Awarded: 2

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are approximately 20 lines visible. On the left side, there is a vertical margin line, creating a narrow left margin. The paper appears to be from a notebook or a standard ruled document.

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 13

NOTES:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the paper.

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded: 5

NOTES:

Design Complete July 2017

No construction schedule

Detailed scope of work

Well designed proposal documents

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 16-043
Engineering, Landscape Design and Project Management Services
For
Frisbie Park Expansion and Cactus/Randall Park Development Projects

NAME OF FIRM /
PROPOSER: Schmidt Design Group

EVALUATOR: Jeff Schater

TOTAL SCORE: 81 **of 100 Points**

A. Project Understanding (25 Points):

The firm's proposal adequately demonstrates an understanding of the Project and familiarity with the project area; familiarity with recreational projects (with an emphasis on parks and recreation facility design).

Note: Firms should not simply restate the information contained in this RFP; this evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify “critical issues” to the Project, identify an approach to resolving any critical issues, and otherwise provide additional information regarding the Project which supports the firm’s ability to perform if selected.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 22

NOTES:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no handwriting or other markings on the paper.

B. Scope of Work (25 Points):

Proposed approach to the Project including the expected time commitment of key personnel, technical approach to the Project, and the emphasis placed on individual elements of Phase 1 – Conceptual Design Drawings & Preliminary Cost Estimates, Phase 2 – Final Construction Drawings & Specifications, and Phase 3 – Construction Support.

Note: As this RFP has identified a General Scope of Work, evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify a detailed scope of work to successfully implement the Project. ***The detailed scope of work must be identical to the format in which the Cost Proposal has been submitted*** – each sub-task must be identified in the firm's separately sealed Cost Proposal with a corresponding fee.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 21

NOTES:

C. Staff Qualifications (25 Points):

Qualifications of the staff assigned to manage and provide services related to the Project; experience with park and recreational design projects, and experiences with navigating approval of conceptual design plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Note: This evaluation criteria requires that the proposal identify specific experience with the conceptual and final design of recreational parks and related projects involving review and approval of conceptual plans by various stakeholders. Relevant experience must be demonstrated.

Rating Value = 25 Points

Points Awarded: 21

NOTES:

[illegible]

D. Firm Qualifications (15 POINTS):

Past experience with recreational design projects, experience with navigating approval of conceptual park plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council).

Rating Value = 15 Points

Points Awarded: 12

NOTES:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no handwriting or other markings on the paper.

E. Project Schedule (10 POINTS):

Thoroughness and reasonableness of the project schedule with emphasis on navigating approval of conceptual plans involving various stakeholders (including various advisory committees, Commissions and City Council); ability to maintain the project within the selected time frame.

Rating Value = 10 Points

Points Awarded: 5

NOTES:

design complete Jan. 2017

No construction schedule

Excluded Off-Site Improvements