

CONSULTANT SELECTION COMBINED CONSENSUS SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description	
Community I	Nursing Care Homes Predesign
Project Number	
	2022-419
Name of Selection Pane	el Chair
	Kristina Kallar

Type text here

	I IIIS SCOI	esneet becomes	Public Reco	u		111101111	J 1 (O11O1	
Phase 1 - SO	Q	Date:	9/2/2021			Number of Subm	nitting Firms:	2
	Firms	Kristine Keller Rank Order	Bob Hubenthal Rank Order	Panelist Names Larry Covey Rank Order	Jeff Flesner Rank Order	Jim Cortner Rank Order	TOTAL PANEL RANKED SCORE	PHASE 1 RANK ORDER
1 Ankrom	Moisan	2	2	2	2	2	10	2
2 BCRA		1	1	1	1	1	5	1
3				•			-	•
4								
5								
6								
7								
8								
9								
10								
11								
12								
13								
14								
15								
16								
17								
18								
19								
20			044040004		L			
Phase 2 Inter	view	Date:	9/13/2021			lumber of Firms	Interviewed:	2
			RANK ORDE	R OF COMMITTE	E 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								

Robert J. Hubenthal



CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE I SCORING SHEET

rolک	ect	de	scr	ıpt	ion	ı

Community Nursing Care Homes Predesign

Consensus Date

Project Number

9/2/2021

2022-419

Name of Selection Panel Member

Kristine Keller

CRITERIA	Qualificati Perso		Relevent E	levent Experience F		ormance	Life Cycle Cost Analysis Experience		Sustainable Design Experience		TOTAL RAW	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	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:										·			

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Kristine Keller

Date



CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE I SCORING SHEET

Project d			lire	ino	 	سمالا		D		
			uris	31119				· · · · · ·	Jes	ign
Consens					Proj	ect N	umber			
	9/2	/20	21			2	022	-41	9	

Name of Selection Panel Member

Bob Hubenthal

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

CRITERIA		ation of	Relevent Past Performance		Life Cyc Anal Exper		Sustainable Design Experience		TOTAL RAW	WEIGHTED	RANK ORDER		
Sco	res 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		1
3													
4									:				
5													
6													
7													
8													
9							:						
10									:				
11													
12							:						
13									:				
14					,								
15													
16									:				
17													
18													
19							,		:				
20													
COMMENTS:		l.		L					1			<u> </u>	



CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE I SCORING SHEET

Project description	
Community Nursing Ca	are Homes Predesign
Consensus Date	Project Number
9/2/2021	2022-419
Name of Selection Panel Member	
Larry C	ovey

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

CRITERIA		Qualifica Key Per			Relevent Experience		Past Performance		Life Cycle Cost Analysis Experience		nable sperience		TOTAL WEIGHTED	RANK
	Scores	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														
10														
11														
12														
13														
14														
15														
16														
17														
18														
19														
20														
COMMENTS:														



CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE I SCORING SHEET

Project description

Community Nursing Care Homes Predesign

Consensus Date Project Number

9/2/2021 2022-419

Name of Selection Panel Member

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Jeff Flesner

CRITERIA	Qualifica Key Per				Past Perfe	Past Performance		Life Cycle Cost Analysis Experience		inable xperience	TOTAL TOTAL RAW WEIGHTED SCORE SCORE		RANK ORDER
Score	s 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	8.0	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:													



CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE I SCORING SHEET

Project description	
Community Nursing Ca	are Homes Predesign
Consensus Date	Project Number
9/2/2021	2022-419
Name of Selection Panel Member	
Jim Co	rtner

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

	•		onoot Bt	o i dono i	5 5 0.1								
CRITERIA		lification of Personnel		Relevent Experience		Past Performance		Life Cycle Cost Analysis Experience		inable kperience		TOTAL WEIGHTED	RANK ORDER
	Scores Raw So	ore 20%	Raw Score	35%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score		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													

Jim Cortner Date

COMMENTS:

CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

Project description	
Community Nursing	Care Homes Predesign
Date of Evaluation 9/13/2021	Project Number 2022-419
Name of Selection Panel Member	
Kristin	ne Keller

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

I nis Scoresneet Be	comes	Public	Record				LZLIS	suile N	JIIGI		
CRITERIA	Mainhtin	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%	70.0	14.0	90.0	18.0						
Management Plan: How is the team set up to manage this project	for the Clier	nt. What is	their philoso	phy towords	working co	llaboratively	with clients	and other o	utward look	ing issues.	
Team Member Qualifications: Are the relevent team members pre	sent and wha	at role are th	ney assumin	ng in the disc	ussion						
Capacity/Prodution Capabilities: Does the firm explain their worklo	oad for the d	uration of th	e project an	d how this p	roject fits in	to the firm's	overall plan	ning			
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	20%	70.0	14.0	90.0	18.0						
Scope Management: Based on the information provided and the f of project scope in the past.	inalist's exp	erience, hov	w well has th	ne team ace	rtained basi	c project req	uirements a	ind how well	have they	managed de	velopment
Budgeting & Cost Control: What strategies does the firm use to ea	stablish and	manage pro	ject budget	s. How succ	essful have	they been v	vith past pro	jects			
Project Scheduling: How does this finalist team develop schedule:	s. How well	do they liste	n to client s	chedule nee	ds and then	meet client	schedule ne	eds.			
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	viewed avai	lable projec	t informatior	, attended i	nformational	mtg, or dor	ne independ	ent researcl	n to better ur	nderstand
Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to define of	hallenges ar	ıd/or opportı	unities they	see for the p	roject?						
EXPERIENCE	20%	80.0	16.0	90.0	18.0						
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss past	t work the fire	m has done	and how th	at relates or	provides gu	uidance for t	his project?				
Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual tea					project type	e or complex	tity?	1			
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	10%	90.0	9.0	90.0	9.0						
Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive L and ELCCA?	ife Cycle Co	st exercise	in decision i	making? Ar	e they famili	ar with the C	FM require	ments? Are	they differe	entiating betw	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	ct. How car	n the sustair	nability strate	egys mesh v	vith the proje	ect budget.	!			
DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN (indicate included or not included)	Not Scored										
TOTAL Raw SCORE	100%	480.0		540.0							
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE	10070		78.0	V.IV.	90.0						
FINAL RANK ORDER			2		1						
COMMENTS:											

| <u>9/13/2021</u>
| Kristine Keller | Date

CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

are Homes Predesign				
Project Number				
2022-419				

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Inis Scoresneet Be	comes	Public	Record		Bob Hubentnai								
CRITERIA	Weighting		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	t for the Clie	nt. What is	their philoso	phy 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	ney assumin	g in the disc	cussion								
Capacity/Prodution Capabilities: Does the firm explain their workle	oad for the d	uration of th	e project an	d how this p	project fits in	to the firm's	overall plan	ning					
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	20%	85.0	17.0	80.0	16.0								
Scope Management: Based on the information provided and the of project scope in the past.	Finalist's exp	erience, ho	w well has th	ne team ace	rtained basi	c project rec	uirements a	ind how well	have they i	managed de	velopment		
Budgeting & Cost Control: What strategies does the firm use to e	stablish and	manage pro	ject budget	s. How suc	cessful have	they been v	vith past pro	jects					
Project Scheduling: How does this finalist team develop schedule	s. How well	do they liste	n to client s	chedule nee	eds and then	meet client	schedule ne	eds.					
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	lable projec	t informatior	n, attended i	nformationa	mtg, or dor	ne independ	ent researcl	n to better ur	nderstand		
Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to define of	challenges 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 pas													
Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual tea				l		e or complex	ity?						
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	10%	80.0	8.0	80.0	8.0								
Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive I and ELCCA?	_ife Cycle Co	st exercise	in decision i	making? Ar	e they famili	ar with the C	FM require	ments? Are	they differe	entiating betw	veen 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	ct. How ca	n the sustair	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>
Bob Hubenthal	Date

CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

Project description	
Community Nursing	Care Homes Predesign
Date of Evaluation 9/13/2021	Project Number 2022-419
Name of Selection Panel Member	
Larry	/ Covey

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

			IXECUIT					ily Cov	- J		
ODITEDIA	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%	80.0	16.0	80.0	16.0						
Management Plan: How is the team set up to manage this project					•	llaboratively	with clients	and other o	utward look	ing issues.	
Team Member Qualifications: Are the relevent team members pre											
Capacity/Prodution Capabilities: Does the firm explain their workl	oad for the d	uration of th	e project an	nd how this p	oroject fits in	to the firm's	overall plan	ning			
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	20%	70.0	14.0	90.0	18.0						
Scope Management: Based on the information provided and the	Finalist's exp	erience, ho	w well has th	ne team ace	rtained basi	c project rec	uirements a	nd how well	have they i	managed de	velopmen
of project scope in the past.											
Budgeting & Cost Control: What strategies does the firm use to e	stablish and	manage pro	ject budget 	s. How suc	cessful have	they been v	vith past pro	jects 			
<u>Project Scheduling</u> : How does this finalist team develop schedule	s. How well	do they liste	n to client s	chedule nee	ds and then	meet client	schedule ne	eeds.			
PROJECT APPROACH	20%	90.0	18.0	90.0	18.0						
Understanding of this project: Has the Finalist demonstrated that	they have re	viewed avai	lable projec	t informatior	n, attended i	nformationa	mtg, or dor	ne independ	ent researcl	h to better u	nderstand
the project and the project requirements											
<u>Challenges & Opportunities</u> : Has the Finalist attempted to define of	challenges ar	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 pas	t work the fir	m has done	and how th	at relates o	provides gu	uidance for t	his project?				
Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual te	am members	have expe	rience that r	elates to the	project type	e or complex	city?				
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	10%	80.0	8.0	90.0	9.0						
Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive and ELCCA?	Life Cycle Co	st exercise	in decision	making? Ar	e they famili	ar with the C	OFM require	ments? Are	they differe	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 car	n the sustair	nability strat	egys mesh v	vith 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:											

CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

Project description	
Community Nursing Date of Evaluation	Care Homes Predesign Project Number
9/13/2021	2022-419
Name of Selection Panel Member	

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Inis Scoresneet Be	comes	Public	<u> Recora</u>				Je	tt Flesr	ner		
			n 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%	15.0	3.0	16.0	3.2						
Management Plan: How is the team set up to manage this proje	ct for the Clie	nt. What is	their philoso	phy toword	s working co	llaboratively	with clients	and other o	utward looki	ing issues.	
Team Member Qualifications: Are the relevent team members pr	esent and wh	at role are t	hey assumir	ng in the dis	cussion						
Capacity/Prodution Capabilities: Does the firm explain their work	load for the o	duration of th	ne project ar	nd how this p	oroject fits in	to the firm's	overall plar	ning			
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	20%	10.0	2.0	15.0	3.0						
Scope Management: Based on the information provided and the of project scope in the past.	Finalist's exp	perience, ho	w well has th	ne team ace	rtained basi	c project red	uirements a	and how well	have they i	managed de	velopment
Budgeting & Cost Control: What strategies does the firm use to	establish 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 schedul	es. How well	do they liste	en to client s	chedule nee	eds and then	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	t they have re	eviewed ava	ilable projec	t information	n, attended i	nformationa	l mtg, or do	ne independ	ent researcl	h to better u	nderstand
Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to define	challenges 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 pa	st work the fi	rm has done	and how the	nat relates o	r provides g	uidance for t	his project?				
Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual t	eam member					e or complex	city?	1		_	1
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	10%	4.0	0.4	8.0	8.0						
Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive LCCA and ELCCA?	Life Cycle Co	ost exercise	in decision	making? Ar	e they famili	ar with the C	OFM require	ments? Are	they differe	entiating bety	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 sustair	nability strat	egys mesh v	with the proje	ect budget.	•			
DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN (indicate included or not included)	Not Scored										
TOTAL Raw SCORE	100%	65.0		79.0							
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE			11.6		14.0						
FINAL RANK ORDER			2		1						
COMMENTS:											

Jeff Fjesner 9

Date

CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

Project description Community Nursing Care Homes Predesign Date of Evaluation 9/13/2021 Name of Selection Panel Member Jim Cortner

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

ODITEDIA.	18 /2 i mlatim m	Ankrom Moisan		BCRA							
CRITERIA	Weighting	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted 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 Clien	t. What is t	heir philoso	phy towords	working col	laboratively	with clients a	and other ou	ıtward lookir	ng issues.	
<u>Team Member Qualifications</u> : Are the relevent team members pres	sent and wha	at role are th	ey assumin	g in the disc	ussion						
Capacity/Prodution Capabilities: Does the firm explain their worklo	ad for the du	uration of the	e project an	d how this p	roject fits inte	o the firm's	overall plann	ing			
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	20%	90.0	18.0	95.0	19.0						
Scope Management: Based on the information provided and the F	inalist's exp	erience, hov	well has th	e team acer	tained basic	project requ	uirements ar	nd how well	have they m	anaged dev	elopment o
project scope in the past.	A de la la de la constant		to at her desident		6 . 1	41	(4) 4				
Budgeting & Cost Control: What strategies does the firm use to es			·								
Project Scheduling: How does this finalist team develop schedules			I		ds and then	meet client	schedule ne	eds.	ı	1	1
PROJECT APPROACH	20%	95.0	19.0	90.0	18.0						
<u>Understanding of this project</u> : Has the Finalist demonstrated that t the project and the project requirements	they have rev	viewed avail	lable project	information	, attended in	formational	mtg, or done	e independe	nt research	to better und	lerstand
<u>Challenges & Opportunities</u> : Has the Finalist attempted to define c	hallenges an	d/or opporti	unities they	see for the p	roject?						
EXPERIENCE	20%	90.0	18.0	95.0	19.0						
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss past							. ,				
Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual tea						or complexi	ty?	ı	I	1	ı
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	10%	90.0	9.0	95.0	9.5						
Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive L and ELCCA?	ife Cycle Co	st exercise i	n decision n	naking? Are	they familia	r with the O	FM requiren	nents? Are	they differer	itiating betwe	en LCCA
SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE	10%	90.0	9.0	90.0	9.0						
What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate f	or this project	ct. How can	the sustain	ability strate	gys mesh w	ith the proje	ct budget.				
DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN (indicate included or not included)	Not Scored										
TOTAL Raw SCORE	100%	545.0		560.0							
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE			91.0		93.5						
FINAL RANK ORDER			2		1						
COMMENTS:											

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.