

Categories (Section)	Description	Wt.	ATRM	Cannon Designs	Diamond and Schmitt	MJM Architects	RDH Architects	Shore Tilbe Architects	ZAS Architects
A	Methodology & Work plan								
A-1	Proponent has provided a logical work plan that meets the milestone dates of the RFP	5	3	3	4	3	3	4	3
A-2	Proponent has identified the appropriate staffing level required to achieve the project goal	5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
A-3	Proponent has demonstrated a feasible overall approach throughout that incorporates required Client consultation.	5	3	3	3	4	3	3	3
A-4	Proponent has provided a schedule indicating the project tasks and milestone dates, reflecting proper sequencing and reasonable time durations for each task and has provided a reasonable approach to managing the schedule, which achieves all critical schedule dates in this RFP.	5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
A-5	Proponent has provided a schedule that incorporates an adequate time allowance for review and comment by the Client.	5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
A-6	Proponent has evidenced understanding of the project requirements and has provided a suitable and innovative approach to deliver this project.	5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Sub-total		30	18	18	19	19	18	19	18
Summary		25	15	15	16	16	15	16	15
B	Corporate Qualifications								
B-1	Proponent is an individual firm-not a joint venture.	5	4	5	5	5	4	4	5
B-2	Proponent has outlined the qualifications of the firm.	5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
B-3	Architect / Prime Consultant demonstrates experience with buildings of comparable scope, value and complexity in the last 5 years including pools and arenas.	5	3	3	3	4	3	3	3
B-4	Proponent has demonstrated quality control and assurance procedures and has outlined practices that will be implemented.	5	2	3	3	3	3	3	3
B-5	Key sub-consultant firms demonstrate experience with buildings of comparable scope, value and complexity in the last 5 years including pools and arenas.	5	3	3	3	4	3	3	3
Sub-total		25	15	17	17	19	16	16	17
Summary		20	12	14	14	15	13	13	14
C	Individual Team Qualifications								
C-1	All Sub-Consultant Design Leaders have demonstrated experience with buildings of comparable scope, value and complexity in the last 5 years including pools and arenas.	5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
C-2	Proponent has named a dedicated Contract Administration staff person that is part of the design team with at least 5 years experience providing administration services to projects of a comparable scope and size including pools and arenas.	5	3	3	3	3	3	3	2
Sub-total		10	6	6	6	6	6	6	5
Summary		30	18	18	18	18	18	18	15
Sub-total (A,B,C)		75	45	47	48	49	46	47	44
D	Consultant Fee								
D-1	The fee proposal will be calculated during the Evaluation Meeting. Points will be awarded per the formula outlined in the evaluation guidelines.	25	15	16	0	17	25	16	24
Sub-total		25	15	16	0	17	25	16	24
Total Proposal Summary Score		100	60	63	48	66	71	63	68
E	Interview Questions								
E-1	The Client is concerned the intended scope of work for this project may exceed all available funds. Please advise the methods you employ to ensure the complete scope of the project can be delivered at the most competitive cost possible.	5	4	5	0	4	3	5	4
E-2	Please tell us about your internal organization, how you operate and interact with members of the design team and how you will ensure the City receives a well coordinated and well organized design development service.	5	3	2	0	4	3	4	4
E-3	Are there any areas where you can foresee potential problems in the advancement of the schedule? How do you plan to address those potential schedule related problems?	5	5	3	0	3	3	5	4
E-4	Please tell us about your contract administration approach, frequency of site reviews, communication processes, documentation practices and methodology for dealing with problems that arise on site with the GC.	5	4	4	0	4	3	5	4
E-5	Could you tell the Committee where you draw your design ideas from and how you see integrating those ideas with the visions of the design committee and the community.	5	4	4	0	4	4	4	4
E-6	Committee overall evaluation of Presentation and Interview based on content, delivery, enthusiasm and quality.	10	8	6	0	9	4	9	3
Interview Sub-total		35	28	24	0	28	20	32	23
Total Proposal Summary Score		100	60	63	48	66	71	63	68
Interview Sub-total		35	28	24	0	28	20	32	23
Total Score		135	88	87	48	94	91	95	91