

				Project description			
FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES					ity Nursing C	Care Home	s Predesi
				Project Number	2020	140	
CONSULTANT SELECTION						2-419	
				Name of Selection		12 11	
This Scores	sheet Becomes	Public Reco	rd		Kristin	e Keller	
Phase 1 - SOQ	Date:	9/2/2021			Number of Subr	nitting Firms:	2
			Panelist Names	3	[	TOTAL	PHASE 1
Firms	Kristine Keller		Larry Covey	Jeff Flesner	Jim Cortner	PANEL RANKED SCORE	RANK ORDER
1 Ankrom Moisan	Rank Order 2	Rank Order 2	Rank Order 2	Rank Order 2	Rank Order 2	10	2
2 BCRA	1	1	1	1	1	5	1
3	·····	1	1	1	1		1
4							
5				1			
6							
7							
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
Phase 2 Interview	Date:				lumber of Firms	Interviewed:	2
		RANK ORDE	R OF COMMITT	EE MEMBERS		]	
Firms	Kristine Keller	Bob Hubenthal	Larry Covey	Jeff Flesner	Jim Cortner	TOTAL ASSIGNED RANKS	FINAL RANK ORDER
	Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order		
1 Ankrom Moisan	2	1	2	2	2	9	2
2 BCRA	1	2	1	1	1	6	1
3							
4							
5				1			

Type text here

NO Kristine Keller

ovey arry. Larry Covey 0 Jame & CC Jim Cortner

Robert J. Hubenthal

Bob Hubenthal



# CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE I SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

### Project description

Consensus Date

**Community Nursing Care Homes Predesign** 

Project Number

2022-419

9/2/2021
Name of Selection Panel Member

# **Kristine Keller**

CRITERIA	Qualification of Key Personnel Relevent Experience		Past Performance		Analysis Experience		nce Experience		TOTAL RAW	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RANK		
Scores	Raw Score	20%	Raw Score	35%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score	10%	SCORE	SCORE	
1 Ankrom Moisan	90.0	18.0	90.0	31.5	88.0	22.0	90.0	9.0	90.0	9.0	448.0	89.5	2
2 BCRA	95.0	19.0	95.0	33.3	95.0	23.8	90.0	9.0	90.0	9.0	465.0	94.0	1
3													
4													
5													
6													
7													
8													
9													
10													
11													
12													
13													
14													
15													
16													
17													
18													
19													
20													
COMMENTS:													

9/2/2021 Date

Kristine Keller



# CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE I SCORING SHEET

Project description
Community Nursing Care Homes Predesign
Consensus Date
9/2/2021
2022-419

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Bob Hubenthal

Name of Selection Panel Member

CRITERIA		Qualification of Key Personnel		Relevent Experience		Past Performance		Experience		Design Experience		TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE	RANK
-	Scores Raw Score	20%	Raw Score	35%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score	10%	SCORE	SCORE	
1 Ankrom Moisan	86.0	17.2	35.0	12.3	10.0	2.5	20.0	2.0	10.0	1.0	161.0	35.0	2
2 BCRA	90.0	18.0	33.0	11.6	9.0	2.3	25.0	2.5	10.0	1.0	167.0	and the second s	1
3													
4	15												
5													
6													
7													
8													
9													
10									:				
11													
12													
13													
14													
15							:						
16									:				
17	5A												
18													
19													
20													

Huberthal

9/2/2021 Date



## CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE I SCORING SHEET

Project description

Community Nursing Care Homes Predesign

Larry Covey

Consensus Date

2

Project Number

2022-419

9/2/2021
Name of Selection Panel Member

CRITERIA		Qualification of Key Personnel		Relevent Experience		Past Perfo	ormance	Life Cyc Anal Experi	ysis	Sustai Design Ex			TOTAL WEIGHTED	
	Scores R	Raw Score	20%	Raw Score	35%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score	10%	SCORE	SCORE	
1 Ankrom Moisan		80.0	16.0	80.0	28.0	70.0	17.5	80.0	8.0	90.0	9.0	400.0	78.5	2
2 BCRA		90.0	18.0	80.0	28.0	80.0	20.0	80.0	8.0	80.0	8.0	410.0	82.0	1
3														
4														
5														
6														
7														
8														
9														
0														
1														
12														
13														
14														
15														
16														
17														
18														
19														
20														

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Larry Covey

9/2/2021 Date



# CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE I SCORING SHEET

Project description

Community Nursing Care Homes Predesign

Consensus Date

**Jeff Flesner** 

2022-419

Project Number

9/2/2021 Name of Selection Panel Member

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

CRITERIA	Qualification of Key Personnel		Relevent Experience		Past Performance		Experience		Design Experience			TOTAL WEIGHTED	RANK ORDER
Scores	Raw Score	20%	Raw Score	35%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score	10%	SCORE	SCORE	
1 Ankrom Moisan	10.0	2.0	30.0	10.5	15.0	3.8	6.0	0.6	8.0	0.8	69.0	17.7	2
2 BCRA	12.0	2.4	30.0	10.5	16.0	4.0	5.0	0.5	7.0	0.7	70.0	18.1	1
3													
4													
5													
6													
7													
8													
9													
10													
11													
12													
13													
14													
15													
16													
17													
18													
19													
20													
COMMENTS:													

9/2/2021 Date



## CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE I SCORING SHEET

Project description

Community Nursing Care Homes Predesign

**Jim Cortner** 

Consensus Date

Project Number

2022-419

9/2/2021
Name of Selection Panel Member

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

CRITERIA		Qualification of Key Personnel		Relevent Experience		Past Performance		Experience		Design Experience		TOTAL WEIGHTED	RANK
Score	es Raw Score	20%	Raw Score	35%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score	10%	SCORE	SCORE	
1 Ankrom Moisan	60.0	12.0	80.0	28.0	70.0	17.5	70.0	7.0	80.0	8.0	360.0	72.5	2
2 BCRA	90.0	18.0	90.0	31.5	80.0	20.0	80.0	8.0	90.0	9.0	430.0	86.5	1
3													
4													
5													
6													
7													
8													
9													
10													
11													
12													
13													
14													
15													
16													
17													
18													
19													
20													
COMMENTS:											•		

Jame & CO Jim Cortner

9/2/2021 Date

					Project des	scription					
					c	ommuni	ty Nursi	ing Care	Homes	Predesig	gn
FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES					Date of Ev	aluation		-	Project Nu	mhor	
CONSULTANT SELECTION						9/13/	2021			2022-41	9
PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET					N						<u> </u>
PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET					Name of a	Selection Pa					
This Scoresheet Be	comes	Public	Record				Kri	stine Ke	eller		
CRITERIA	Mainhtin a		n Moisan	во	RA						
CRITERIA	Weighting	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score
ORGANIZATION	20%	70.0	14.0	90.0	18.0						
Management Plan: How is the team set up to manage this projec	t for the Clie	nt. What is	their philoso	ophy toword	s working co	ollaboratively	with clients	and other o	utward look	ing issues.	
Team Member Qualifications: Are the relevent team members pre	esent and wh	at role are tl	hey assumir	ng in the dis	cussion						
Capacity/Prodution Capabilities: Does the firm explain their workl	oad for the d	luration of th	ne project ar	nd how this p	project fits in	to the firm's	overall plar	nning			
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	20%	70.0	14.0	90.0	18.0						
<u>Scope Management</u> : Based on the information provided and the of project scope in the past.	Finalist's exp	,				c project rec	uirements	and how well	have they	managed de	velopment
Budgeting & Cost Control: What strategies does the firm use to e						e they been v	vith past pr	ojects			
Project Scheduling: How does this finalist team develop schedule	s. How well	do they liste	en to client s	chedule nee	eds and ther	n meet client	schedule n	eeds.			
PROJECT APPROACH	20%	80.0	16.0	90.0	18.0						
<u>Understanding of this project</u> : Has the Finalist demonstrated that the project and the project requirements	they have re	eviewed ava	ilable projec	t informatio	n, attended i	nformationa	l mtg, or do	ne independ	ent researc	h to better u	nderstand
Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to define of	challenges a	nd/or opport	unities they	see for the	project?						
EXPERIENCE	20%	80.0	16.0	90.0	18.0						
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss pas	t work the fir	m has done	and how th	hat relates o	r provides g	uidance for t	his project?	)			
Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual te	am members	s have expe	rience that r	elates to the	e project typ	e or complex	city?				
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	10%	90.0	9.0	90.0	9.0						
Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive I and ELCCA?	Life Cycle Co	ost exercise	in decision	making? Ar	re they famil	iar with the C	OFM require	ements? Are	e they differe	entiating bet	veen LCC
SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE	10%	90.0	9.0	90.0	9.0						
What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate	for this proje	ect. How ca	n the sustai	nability strat	egys mesh	with the proje	ect budget.				
DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN	Not										
(indicate included or not included)	Scored										
TOTAL Raw SCORE	100%	480.0		540.0							
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE			78.0		90.0						
FINAL RANK ORDER			2		1						
COMMENTS:											
L	/										
	1/11	1- 0									

KAKS

)

<u>9/13/2021</u> Date

Kristine Keller

					Project des	cription					
FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES					С	ommuni	ty Nursi	ng Care	Homes	Predesig	gn
					Date of Eva		0004		Project Nu		^
CONSULTANT SELECTION						9/13/				2022-41	9
PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET					Name of S	Selection Pa	anel Memb	er			
This Scoresheet Be	comes	Public	Record				Bob	Huber	nthal		
CRITERIA	Mainhting	Ankrom	Moisan	вс	RA						
CRITERIA	Weighting	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score
ORGANIZATION	20%	85.0	17.0	85.0	17.0						
Management Plan: How is the team set up to manage this project	for the Clier	nt. What is	their philoso	ophy towords	s working co	llaboratively	with clients	and other o	utward look	ing issues.	
Team Member Qualifications: Are the relevent team members pre	sent and wh	at role are tl	hey assumir	ng in the dise	cussion						
Capacity/Prodution Capabilities: Does the firm explain their worklo	oad for the d	uration of th	e project ar	nd how this p	project fits ir	to the firm's	overall plar	ning			
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	20%	85.0	17.0	80.0	16.0						
<u>Scope Management</u> : Based on the information provided and the I of project scope in the past.	-inalist's exp	erience, ho	w well has th	ne team ace	rtained basi	c project rec	uirements a	and how well	have they	managed de	velopment
Budgeting & Cost Control: What strategies does the firm use to e	stablish and	manage pro	oject budget	s. How suc	cessful have	they been v	with past pro	ojects			
Project Scheduling: How does this finalist team develop schedule	s. How well	do they liste	en to client s	chedule nee	eds and ther	meet client	schedule n	eeds.			
PROJECT APPROACH	20%	90.0	18.0	85.0	17.0						
<u>Understanding of this project</u> : Has the Finalist demonstrated that the project and the project requirements	they have re	viewed ava	ilable projec	t informatior	n, attended i	nformationa	l mtg, or do	ne independ	ent researc	h to better u	nderstand
Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to define of	hallenges ar	nd/or opport	unities they	see for the	project?						
EXPERIENCE	20%	95.0	19.0	90.0	18.0						
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss past	work the fir	m has done	and <i>how</i> th	at relates o	r provides g	uidance for t	his project?				
Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual tea	am members	have expe	rience that r	elates to the	e project typ	e or complex	kity?				
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	10%	80.0	8.0	80.0	8.0						
Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive L and ELCCA?	ife Cycle Co	ost exercise	in decision	making? Ar	e they famil	ar with the C	OFM require	ements? Are	e they differ	entiating bet	ween LCCA
SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE	10%	85.0	8.5	85.0	8.5						
What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate	for this proje	ect. How ca	n the sustai	nability strat	egys mesh v	with the proje	ect budget.				
DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN	Not										
(indicate included or not included)	Scored										
TOTAL Raw SCORE	100%	520.0		505.0							
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE			87.5		84.5						
FINAL RANK ORDER			1		2						
COMMENTS:											

Robert J. Hubenthal

<u>9/13/2021</u> Date

Bob Hubenthal

					Project des	cription					
					C	ommuni	ty Nursi	ing Care	Homes	Predesig	gn
FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES					Date of Eva	aluation			Project Nu	mher	
CONSULTANT SELECTION					Duto of LV	9/13/	2021			2022-41	9
PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET					Name						<u> </u>
					iname of a	Selection Pa					
This Scoresheet Be	comes	Public	Record	1			La	arry Cov	/ey		
CRITERIA	Weighting		Moisan	вс	RA						
GRIERIA	weighting	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score
ORGANIZATION	20%	80.0	16.0	80.0	16.0						
Management Plan: How is the team set up to manage this project	t for the Clie	nt. What is	their philoso	ophy toword	s working co	llaboratively	with clients	and other o	utward look	ing issues.	
Team Member Qualifications: Are the relevent team members pre	sent and wh	at role are tl	hey assumir	ng in the dis	cussion						
Capacity/Prodution Capabilities: Does the firm explain their worklo	oad for the d	luration of th	ne project ar	nd how this p	project fits ir	to the firm's	overall plar	nning			
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	20%	70.0	14.0	90.0	18.0						
<u>Scope Management</u> : Based on the information provided and the l of project scope in the past.	Finalist's exp	,			ertained basi	c project rec	uirements	and how wel	have they	managed de	velopment
Budgeting & Cost Control: What strategies does the firm use to e	stablish and	manage pro	oject budget	s. How suc	cessful have	e they been v	with past pr	ojects			
Project Scheduling: How does this finalist team develop schedule	s. How well	do they liste	en to client s	chedule nee	eds and ther	meet client	schedule n	eeds.			
PROJECT APPROACH	20%	90.0	18.0	90.0	18.0						
<u>Understanding of this project</u> : Has the Finalist demonstrated that the project and the project requirements	they have re	eviewed ava	ilable projec	t information	n, attended i	nformationa	l mtg, or do	ne independ	ent researc	h to better u	nderstand
Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to define of	hallenges a	nd/or opport	unities they	see for the	project?						
EXPERIENCE	20%	80.0	16.0	85.0	17.0						
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss past	t work the fir	m has done	and how th	nat relates o	r provides g	uidance for t	his project?	>			
Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual tea	am members	s have expe	rience that r	elates to the	e project typ	e or complex	kity?		-		-
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	10%	80.0	8.0	90.0	9.0						
Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive L and ELCCA?	life Cycle Co	ost exercise	in decision	making? Ar	re they famil	ar with the 0	OFM require	ements? Are	they differ	entiating bet	ween LCC
SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE	10%	70.0	7.0	70.0	7.0						
What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate	for this proje	ect. How ca	n the sustai	nability strat	egys mesh	with the proje	ect budget.				
DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN	Not										
(indicate included or not included)	Scored										
TOTAL Raw SCORE	100%	470.0		505.0							
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE			79.0		85.0						
FINAL RANK ORDER			2		1						
COMMENTS:											
		0	~								

Larry Covey AM CM \_\_\_\_\_\_ <u>9/13/2021</u> \_\_\_\_\_ Date

					Project des	scription					
FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES					C	ommuni	ty Nursi	ng Care	Homes	Predesig	gn
					Date of Ev	aluation			Project Nu	mber	
CONSULTANT SELECTION						9/13/	2021		2	2022-41	9
PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET					Name of S	Selection Pa	anel Memb	ber			
This Scoresheet Bed	comes	Public	Record				Je	eff Flesi	ner		
CRITERIA	Weighting	-	Moisan	вс	CRA						
GRIERIA	weighting	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score
ORGANIZATION	20%	15.0	3.0	16.0	3.2						
Management Plan: How is the team set up to manage this project	for the Clie	nt. What is	their philoso	ophy toword	s working co	ollaboratively	with clients	and other o	utward look	ing issues.	
Team Member Qualifications: Are the relevent team members pre	sent and wh	at role are tl	hey assumir	ng in the dis	cussion						
Capacity/Prodution Capabilities: Does the firm explain their worklo	ad for the c	luration of th	e project ar	nd how this	project fits ir	nto the firm's	overall pla	nning			
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	20%	10.0	2.0	15.0	3.0						
Scope Management: Based on the information provided and the I of project scope in the past.	-inalist's exp	perience, ho	w well has t	he team ace	ertained bas	ic project red	quirements	and how wel	I have they	managed de	velopment
Budgeting & Cost Control: What strategies does the firm use to e	stablish and	manage pro	oject budget	s. How suc	cessful have	e they been	with past pr	ojects			
Project Scheduling: How does this finalist team develop schedules	s. How well	do they liste	en to client s	chedule nee	eds and the	n meet client	schedule n	eeds.			
PROJECT APPROACH	20%	8.0	1.6	15.0	3.0						
<u>Understanding of this project</u> : Has the Finalist demonstrated that the project and the project requirements	they have re	eviewed ava	ilable projec	t informatio	n, attended	informationa	I mtg, or do	ne independ	lent researc	h to better u	nderstand
Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to define c	hallenges a	nd/or opport	unities they	see for the	project?						
EXPERIENCE	20%	18.0	3.6	15.0	3.0						
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss past	t work the fi	rm has done	and how the	nat relates o	r provides g	uidance for	this project'	?			
Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual tea	am member	s have expe	rience that i	elates to the	e project typ	e or comple	xity?	5 I		1	
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	10%	4.0	0.4	8.0	0.8						
Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive L LCCA and ELCCA?	ife Cycle Co	ost exercise	in decision	making? Ar	re they famil	iar with the (	OFM require	ements? Are	e they differ	entiating betw	ween
SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE	10%	10.0	1.0	10.0	1.0						
What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate	for this proje	ect. How ca	n the sustai	nability strat	egys mesh	with the proj	ect budget.	3 <b>.</b>			
DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN (indicate included or not included)	Not Scored										
TOTAL Raw SCORE	100%	65.0		79.0		1					
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE			11.6		14.0						
FINAL RANK ORDER			2		1						
COMMENTS:					-			-			

Jeff. The John Jeff Flesner

9/13/21 Date

Project description **Community Nursing Care Homes Predesign** FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES Date of Evaluation Project Number 9/13/2021 2022-419 CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET Name of Selection Panel Member This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record Jim Cortner BCRA Ankrom Moisan CRITERIA Weighting Weighted Weighted Weighted Weighted Weighted Raw Score Raw Score Raw Score Raw Score Raw Score Score Score Score Score Score ORGANIZATION 20% 90.0 18.0 95.0 19.0 Management Plan: How is the team set up to manage this project for the Client. What is their philosophy towords working collaboratively with clients and other outward looking issues. Team Member Qualifications: Are the relevent team members present and what role are they assuming in the discussion Capacity/Prodution Capabilities: Does the firm explain their workload for the duration of the project and how this project fits into the firm's overall planning 95.0 PROJECT MANAGEMENT 20% 90.0 18.0 Scope Management: Based on the information provided and the Finalist's experience, how well has the team acertained basic project requirements and how well have they managed development of project scope in the past. Budgeting & Cost Control: What strategies does the firm use to establish and manage project budgets. How successful have they been with past projects Project Scheduling: How does this finalist team develop schedules. How well do they listen to client schedule needs and then meet client schedule needs. PROJECT APPROACH 20% 95.0 19.0 90.0 18.0 Understanding of this project: Has the Finalist demonstrated that they have reviewed available project information, attended informational mtg, or done independent research to better understand the project and the project requirements Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to define challenges and/or opportunities they see for the project? 20% 90.0 95.0 18.0 19.0 EXPERIENCE Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss past work the firm has done and how that relates or provides quidance for this project? Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual team members have experience that relates to the project type or complexity? 90.0 9.0 95.0 10% 9.5 LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive Life Cycle Cost exercise in decision making? Are they familiar with the OFM requirements? Are they differentiating between LCCA and ELCCA? SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE 90.0 9.0 90.0 10% 9.0 What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate for this project. How can the sustainability strategys mesh with the project budget. Not DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN (indicate included or not included) Scored 545.0 560.0 TOTAL Raw SCORE 100% 91.0 93.5 TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE FINAL RANK ORDER 2 1 COMMENTS:

Jame & CC Jim Cortner

9/13/21

Date

#### PROPOSAL EVALUATION PROCESS

The Selection Panel may consider all factors relevant to its decision including but not limited to Proposal content, the skills of proposed team members, references, personal knowledge, and design solution. The information provided in response to the Evaluation Section of the RFP will be scored based on the following:

A. The Finalist Consultant Team's understanding of the basic project requirements.

B. The degree to which the Proposed Consultant Team understands the Owner's/DES' goals and objectives with respect to the project; and

C. The strength of the Proposed Finalist Team's management plan for the project, including not only the specific topics and specialized components outlined in the RFP, but also any other component or element that the Proposed Finalist Team deems essential to the success of the Project.

#### SCORING GUIDELINES

In evaluating each of the criteria, the Selection Panel will identify significant and minor strengths and weaknesses from the interview and discussion. The Selection Panel will then use the following guidelines to evaluate the Finalists for each Selection Criterion, based on the weighting assigned in the RFQ and any addenda. After initial scoring, the selection team will come to a consensus ranking of the Firms.

**Excellent** (81-100 percent of points available in each criterion): The Evaluative Criteria demonstrates an approach that is considered to exceed the Project Goals and the RFQ requirements and provide a consistently outstanding level of quality. To be considered *Excellent*, it must be determined to have significant strengths and/or a number of minor strengths and few or no appreciable weaknesses.

**Good** (61-80 percent of available points in each criterion): The Evaluative Criteria demonstrates an approach that is considered to meet the RFQ in a beneficial way (providing advantages, benefits, or added value to the Project) and offers quality. To be considered *Good*, it must be determined to have strengths and few, if any, significant weaknesses. Minor weaknesses are offset by strengths.

**Fair** (41-60 percent of available points in each criterion): The Evaluative Criteria demonstrates an approach that contains minor and/or significant weaknesses and limited appreciable strengths.

**Deficient** (0-40 percent of available points in each criterion): The Evaluative Criteria demonstrates an approach that contains significant weaknesses and no appreciable strengths.

**Non-Responsive:** Does not meet the Minimum Qualifications required for evaluation. In addition, the Owner, at its sole discretion, may reject any Evaluative Criteria deemed non-responsive to any of the requirements.