Project Name: Ewert Park Improvments

CMAR Firm Name: BRANCO

Evaluators Name: Korey Schulz

Date: 6/13/2024

A. Step I - Statement of Qualifications Submittal

Criteria	Description	Points Range	Score - AVG	SELECTION COMMITTEE									
				Staff #1	Staff #2	Staff #3	Staff #4	Staff #5	Staff #5	Olsson	Paragon	-	~~Water's Edge~~
[A.1] Methodology (30 pts total)	a. Letter of Interest	0-4	***3.9***	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	0	0
	b. Change Management	0-4	***3.5***	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	0	0
	c. Schedule Management	0-4	***3.6***	4	4	4	3	4	3	3.5	3.5	0	0
	d. Demonstrated CMAR project experience thru to completion	0-4	***3.6***	3	2	4	4	4	4	3.5	4	0	0
	e. Demonstrated years of CMAR experience	0-3	***2.8***	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	0	0
	f. Project scope and total cost similar ($5-6M)	0-4	***3.6***	4	3	4	4	4	3	3.5	3.5	0	0
	g. Construction Safety Record	0-3	***3.1***	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	0	0
	h. Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP)/costs within budget estimates	0-4	***3.6***	4	3	4	4	4	3	3	3.5	0	0
[A.2] Experience (40 pts total)	a. Similar park projects	0-5	***3.5***	4	3	4	5	4	3	2.5	2.5	0	0
	b. Similar splash park projects	0-5	***4.1***	4	3	5	5	4	3	4	4.5	0	0
	c. Similar ice skate ribbon projects	0-4	***0.5***	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0
	d. Greenscape/Hardscape Construction (Sports court surfacing, playground equipment and surfacing, splash park equipment and surfacing, ice ribbon equipment and surfacing, synthetic turf, landscaping)	0-5	***3.6***	5	2	4	3	4	4	3	3.5	0	0
	d. Architectural (Bathhouse renovations improvements, Covered basketball/multi-sport court structure, Amphitheater structure)	0-4	***3.8***	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	0
	e. Examples of Constructability / design innovations provided	0-5	***4.0***	4	5	4	3	3	4	4.5	4.5	0	0
	f. Efficient & practical inputs	0-4	***3.5***	4	4	3	3	3	3	4	4	0	0
	g. Aesthetics/Park renewal/Quality of work	0-4	***3.5***	4	4	4	3	3	3	3.5	3.5	0	0
	h. Community Expectations	0-4	***3.5***	4	4	3	3	3	3	4	4	0	0
[A.3] References (15 pts total)	a. Owner & CMAR relationship approach	0-5	***4.1***	4	2	5	5	5	3	4	5	0	0
	b. A/E & CMAR relationship approach	0-5	***3.9***	4	2	5	4	4	3	4	5	0	0
	c. Prior CMAR work with municipality as "Owner"	0-5	***3.8***	4	0	3	5	5	3	5	5	0	0
[A.4] Staff (15 pts total)	a. Team Organization Structure	0-5	***4.6***	5	4	5	5	4	4	5	5	0	0
	b. Office Location/key staff availability	0-5	***4.3***	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	0
	c. Management Personnel (experience and mgmt. style)	0-5	***4.6***	5	4	5	5	4	4	5	5	0	0
	A. Subtotal for Step I (AVG) = Qualifications Scores (pts):		**82.8**	88	70	87	87	86	74	83	87	0	0

Note: ONLY top 5 firms will be selected based on Step I Score to move to Step II submittal

B. Step II - PMP Proposal/Fee Submittal

Criteria	Description	Cost ($)
[B.1] Step II Fee Proposal	Lump sum fee for pre-construction SOW specified (Step II proposal)	***$5,000.00***
	% Construction Phase Service - Construction Manger's Fee (Step II proposal)	***2.50***
	General Conditions monthly fee (Step II proposal)	***$19,500.00***
	B.1.1 = Pre-Construction NTE ($) = Normalized Price*(pts) = 16.7+ ((1-[(CMAR cost - MIN cost) / (MAX cost - MIN cost)])x16.7 * highest cost and lowest cost used to normalize to 16.7 to 33.3 range for all costs received (i.e. highest cost proposal receives score of 16.7 pts, lowest cost proposal receives score of 33.3 pts and others are normalized within that range.	33.4
	B.1.2 = Percent (%) for Construction Phase = Normalized Price*(pts) = 16.7+ ((1-[(CMAR % - MIN %) / (MAX % - MIN %)])x16.7 * highest % and lowest % used to normalize to 16.7 to 33.3 range for all costs received (i.e. highest % proposal receives score of 16.7 pts, lowest % proposal receives score of 33.3 pts and others are normalized within that range.	16.7
	B.1.3 = General Conditions ($) = Normalized Price*(pts) = 16.6+ ((1-[(CMAR cost - MIN cost) / (MAX cost - MIN cost)])x16.6 * highest cost and lowest cost used to normalize to 16.6 to 33.3 range for all costs received (i.e. highest cost proposal receives score of 16.6 pts, lowest cost proposal receives score of 33.3 pts and others are normalized within that range.	33.2
	B.1 SUBTOTAL = Summation of Component PMP Scores (pts)	**83.3**

	MIN	MAX	
	2.25	2.50	% range of proposals
	$5,000	$12,800	$ range of proposals
	$19,500	$26,200	$ range of Monthly Cost

Criteria	Description	Points Range	Score	SELECTION COMMITTEE									
				Staff #1	Staff #2	Staff #3	-	Staff #4	Staff #5	Staff #6	Olsson	Paragon	~~Water's Edge~~
[B.2] Step II Project Management Plan (PMP) Score	a. Clear Scope Statement and Success Measurement: There is a well defined scope and specific, measurable success milestones.	0-10	***7.2***	8	9	10	0	10	8	10	8	9	0
	b. Outline of Deliverables and Work Breakdown Structure: There is a logical subdivision of project tasks presented to achieve the scope.	0-15	***9.9***	12	8	15	0	13	13	14	12	12	0
	c. Anticipated Schedule and Budget for CMAR Services: Draft, anticipated schedule CMAR services is presented.	0-15	***9.2***	13	9	12	0	14	12	12	12	8	0
	d. CMAR Personnel Allocation and Roles: Staff assignments defined and management/roles defined. (Project Manager, Pre-Construction Manager, Cost Estimator, Others)	0-10	***6.9***	7	9	10	0	9	8	9	8	9	0
	B.2 SUBTOTAL = Summation of Component PMP Scores (pts)		**41.5**	40	35	47	0	46	41	45	40	38	0

C. Interview

Criteria	Description	Points Range	Score	SELECTION COMMITTEE									
					Staff #1	Staff #2	-	Staff #3	Staff #4	Staff #5	Olsson	Paragon	Staff #6
(C) Interview	a. Management of Interview: questions, time management	0-15	***10.8***	0	15	12	0	13	13	12	15	15	13
	d. Team structure and Project Approach	0-15	***11.0***	0	15	15	0	14	13	12	14	13	14
	c. Competence & Expertise	0-20	***14.3***	0	18	18	0	18	18	15	19	20	17
	C SUBTOTAL = Summation of component Interview Scores (pts)		**45.1**	0	48	45	0	45	44	39	48	48	44

D. Best Value Determination

Qualification Scores	
(**A**) Statement of Qualifications	82.8
(**B.2**) Project Mgmt. Plan Basis	41.5
(**C**) Interview	45.1
Total Qualifications Score (pts)	169.4
Total Qualifications Score (%)	84.7%

Fee Proposal Scores	
(**B.1**) Fee Proposal	83.3
Total Fee Proposal Score (pts)	83.3
Total Fee Proposal Score (%)	83.3%

Total Scores	
Qualifications (45%)	38.1
Fee Proposal (55%)	45.8
D = FINAL BEST VALUE SCORE* for CMAR FIRM as combination of (**A**) Qualifications, (**B.2**) Project Management Plan, and (**C**) Interview Plus (B.1) Fee Proposal determined by:	**83.9**

* (**A**) + (**B.2**) + (**C**) x 45% + (**B.1**) x 55% = FINAL BEST VALUE SCORE out of total possible 100 pts

Project Name: Ewert Park Improvments

CMAR Firm Name: RE SMITH

Evaluators Name: Korey Schulz

Date: 6/13/2024

A. Step I - Statement of Qualifications Submittal

Criteria	Description	Points Range	Score - AVG	SELECTION COMMITTEE									
				Staff #1	Staff #2	Staff #3	Staff #4	Staff #5	Staff #6	Olsson	Paragon	-	~~Water's Edge~~
[A.1] Methodology (30 pts total)	a. Letter of Interest	0-4	***3.1***	3	1	2	4	4	4	3.5	3	0	0
	b. Change Management	0-4	***3.1***	3	3	3	3	3	3	3.5	3	0	0
	c. Schedule Management	0-4	***3.5***	3	3	3	4	4	3	4	4	0	0
	d. Demonstrated CMAR project experience thru to completion	0-4	***3.7***	4	4	3	3	4	4	3.5	4	0	0
	e. Demonstrated years of CMAR experience	0-3	***3.1***	3	4	2	3	3	4	2.5	3	0	0
	f. Project scope and total cost similar ($5-6M)	0-4	***4.0***	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	0
	g. Construction Safety Record	0-3	***2.3***	0	1	2	3	4	3	2.5	2.5	0	0
	h. Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP)/costs within budget estimates	0-4	***2.4***	1	0	3	3	3	3	3	3.5	0	0
[A.2] Experience (40 pts total)	a. Similar park projects	0-5	***4.1***	5	3	5	4	4	4	4	4	0	0
	b. Similar splash park projects	0-5	***3.6***	4	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	0
	c. Similar ice skate ribbon projects	0-4	***0.8***	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0
	d. Greenscape/Hardscape Construction (Sports court surfacing, playground equipment and surfacing, splash park equipment and surfacing, ice ribbon equipment and surfacing, synthetic turf, landscaping)	0-5	***3.9***	5	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	0	0
	d. Architectural (Bathhouse renovations improvements, Covered basketball/multi-sport court structure, Amphitheater structure)	0-4	***3.8***	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	0
	e. Examples of Constructability / design innovations provided	0-5	***3.8***	5	3	4	3	4	3	4.5	4	0	0
	f. Efficient & practical inputs	0-4	***3.3***	4	3	3	3	3	4	3	3.5	0	0
	g. Aesthetics/Park renewal/Quality of work	0-4	***3.9***	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	0	0
	h. Community Expectations	0-4	***3.6***	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	0	0
[A.3] References (15 pts total)	a. Owner & CMAR relationship approach	0-5	***4.1***	5	3	4	4	4	3	4.5	5	0	0
	b. A/E & CMAR relationship approach	0-5	***4.1***	5	3	4	4	4	3	4.5	5	0	0
	c. Prior CMAR work with municipality as "Owner"	0-5	***4.0***	5	0	4	5	5	3	5	5	0	0
[A.4] Staff (15 pts total)	a. Team Organization Structure	0-5	***4.2***	5	4	4	4	4	4	4.5	4	0	0
	b. Office Location/key staff availability	0-5	***4.8***	5	5	5	4	5	4	5	5	0	0
	c. Management Personnel (experience and mgmt. style)	0-5	***4.5***	5	5	5	4	3	4	5	5	0	0
	A. Subtotal for Step I (AVG) = Qualifications Scores (pts):		**81.3**	86	64	78	80	85	83	86.5	87.5	0	0

Note: ONLY top 5 firms will be selected based on Step I Score to move to Step II submittal

B. Step II - PMP Proposal/Fee Submittal

Criteria	Description	Cost ($)
[B.1] Step II Fee Proposal	Lump sum fee for pre-construction SOW specified (Step II proposal)	***$12,800.00***
	% Construction Phase Service - Construction Manger's Fee (Step II proposal)	***2.25***
	General Conditions monthly fee (Step II proposal)	***$26,200.00***
	B.1.1 = Pre-Construction NTE ($) = Normalized Price*(pts) = 16.7+ ((1-[(CMAR cost - MIN cost) / (MAX cost - MIN cost)])x16.7 * highest cost and lowest cost used to normalize to 16.7 to 33.3 range for all costs received (i.e. highest cost proposal receives score of 16.7 pts, lowest cost proposal receives score of 33.3 pts and others are normalized within that range.	16.7
	B.1.2 = Percent (%) for Construction Phase = Normalized Price*(pts) = 16.7+ ((1-[(CMAR % - MIN %) / (MAX % - MIN %)])x16.7 * highest % and lowest % used to normalize to 16.7 to 33.3 range for all costs received (i.e. highest % proposal receives score of 16.7 pts, lowest % proposal receives score of 33.3 pts and others are normalized within that range.	33.4
	B.1.3 = General Conditions ($) = Normalized Price*(pts) = 16.6+ ((1-[(CMAR cost - MIN cost) / (MAX cost - MIN cost)])x16.6 * highest cost and lowest cost used to normalize to 16.6 to 33.3 range for all costs received (i.e. highest cost proposal receives score of 16.6 pts, lowest cost proposal receives score of 33.3 pts and others are normalized within that range.	16.6
	B.1 SUBTOTAL = Summation of Component PMP Scores (pts)	**66.7**

	MIN	MAX	
	2.25	2.50	% range of proposals
	$5,000	$12,800	$ range of proposals
	$19,500	$26,200	$ range of Monthly Cost

Criteria	Description	Points Range	Score	SELECTION COMMITTEE									
				Staff #1	Staff #2	Staff #3	-	Staff #4	Staff #5	Staff #6	Olsson	Paragon	~~Water's Edge~~
[B.2] Step II Project Management Plan (PMP) Score	a. Clear Scope Statement and Success Measurement: There is a well defined scope and specific, measurable success milestones.	0-10	***5.9***	7	9	8	0	9	5	9	7	5	0
	b. Outline of Deliverables and Work Breakdown Structure: There is a logical subdivision of project tasks presented to achieve the scope.	0-15	***9.1***	13	7	12	0	12	12	12	9	14	0
	c. Anticipated Schedule and Budget for CMAR Services: Draft, anticipated schedule CMAR services is presented.	0-15	***8.1***	10	8	15	0	13	12	12	5	6	0
	d. CMAR Personnel Allocation and Roles: Staff assignments defined and management/roles defined. (Project Manager, Pre-Construction Manager, Cost Estimator, Others)	0-10	***7.0***	8	8	12	0	9	8	8	9	8	0
	B.2 SUBTOTAL = Summation of Component PMP Scores (pts)		**37.6**	38	32	47	0	43	37	41	30	33	0

C. Interview

Criteria	Description	Points Range	Score	SELECTION COMMITTEE									
				-	Staff #1	Staff #2	-	Staff #3	Staff #4	Staff #5	Olsson	Paragon	Staff #6
(C) Interview	a. Management of Interview: questions, time management	0-15	***10.3***	0	13	12	0	12	12	13	13	15	13
	d. Team structure and Project Approach	0-15	***10.0***	0	13	12	0	14	13	13	11	12	12
	c. Competence & Expertise	0-20	***13.4***	0	15	18	0	17	18	13	19	19	15
	C SUBTOTAL = Summation of component Interview Scores (pts)		**42.1**	0	41	42	0	43	43	39	43	46	40

D. Best Value Determination

Qualification Scores	
(**A**) Statement of Qualifications	81.3
(**B.2**) Project Mgmt. Plan Basis	37.6
(**C**) Interview	42.1
Total Qualifications Score (pts)	161.0
Total Qualifications Score (%)	80.5%

Fee Proposal Scores	
(**B.1**) Fee Proposal	66.7
Total Fee Proposal Score (pts)	66.7
Total Fee Proposal Score (%)	66.7%

Total Scores	
Qualifications (45%)	36.2
Fee Proposal (55%)	36.7
D = FINAL BEST VALUE SCORE* for CMAR FIRM as combination of (**A**) Qualifications, (**B.2**) Project Management Plan, and (**C**) Interview Plus (B.1) Fee Proposal determined by:	**72.9**

* (**A**) + (**B.2**) + (**C**) x 45% + (**B.1**) x 55% = FINAL BEST VALUE SCORE out of total possible 100 pts

Project Name: Ewert Park Improvments

CMAR Firm Name: HCC

Evaluators Name: Korey Schulz

Date: 5/17/2024

A. Step I - Statement of Qualifications Submittal

Criteria	Description	Points Range	Score - AVG	SELECTION COMMITTEE									
				Staff #1	Staff #2	Staff #3	Staff #4	Staff #5	Staff #6	Olsson	Paragon	-	~~Water's Edge~~
[A.1] Methodology (30 pts total)	a. Letter of Interest	0-4	2.0	2	1	2	3	3	1	2	2	0	0
	b. Change Management	0-4	1.8	1	2	2	2	3	1	1.5	1.5	0	0
	c. Schedule Management	0-4	2.0	1	2	2	2	3	1	2.5	2.5	0	0
	d. Demonstrated CMAR project experience thru to completion	0-4	1.3	0	0	0	3	3	1	1.5	2	0	0
	e. Demonstrated years of CMAR experience	0-3	0.9	0	0	0	2	2	1	1	1.5	0	0
	f. Project scope and total cost similar ($5-6M)	0-4	0.9	0	0	0	2	2	1	1	1.5	0	0
	g. Construction Safety Record	0-3	0.9	0	0	2	1	2	1	0.5	0.5	0	0
	h. Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP)/costs within budget estimates	0-4	1.3	0	0	2	2	2	1	1.5	1.5	0	0
[A.2] Experience (40 pts total)	a. Similar park projects	0-5	2.1	1	1	3	3	3	1	2	3	0	0
	b. Similar splash park projects	0-5	2.4	1	3	3	3	3	1	2.5	3	0	0
	c. Similar ice skate ribbon projects	0-4	0.5	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0
	d. Greenscape/Hardscape Construction (Sports court surfacing, playground equipment and surfacing, splash park equipment and surfacing, ice ribbon equipment and surfacing, synthetic turf, landscaping)	0-5	2.4	1	2	3	2	3	1	3.5	4	0	0
	d. Architectural (Bathhouse renovations improvements, Covered basketball/multi-sport court structure, Amphitheater structure)	0-4	2.0	1	1	2	3	3	1	2.5	2.5	0	0
	e. Examples of Constructability / design innovations provided	0-5	2.6	1	4	3	2	3	1	3.5	3.5	0	0
	f. Efficient & practical inputs	0-4	2.1	1	2	2	2	2	1	3	4	0	0
	g. Aesthetics/Park renewal/Quality of work	0-4	2.2	2	1	2	3	3	1	2.5	3	0	0
	h. Community Expectations	0-4	2.3	3	0	2	2	2	1	4	4	0	0
[A.3] References (15 pts total)	a. Owner & CMAR relationship approach	0-5	1.8	1	0	2	3	3	1	2	2	0	0
	b. A/E & CMAR relationship approach	0-5	1.8	1	0	2	3	3	1	2	2	0	0
	c. Prior CMAR work with municipality as "Owner"	0-5	2.0	1	0	2	4	4	1	2	2	0	0
[A.4] Staff (15 pts total)	a. Team Organization Structure	0-5	2.8	1	3	3	3	4	2	3	3	0	0
	b. Office Location/key staff availability	0-5	2.7	1	3	2	4	4	2	3	2.5	0	0
	c. Management Personnel (experience and mgmt. style)	0-5	3.3	1	4	3	4	4	2	4	4	0	0
	A. Subtotal for Step I (AVG) = Qualifications Scores (pts):		**43.9**	21	29	44	59	66	26	51	55.5	0	0

Note: ONLY top 5 firms will be selected based on Step I Score to move to Step II submittal

B. Step II - PMP Proposal/Fee Submittal

Criteria	Description	Cost ($)
[B.1] Step II Fee Proposal	Lump sum fee for pre-construction SOW specified (Step II proposal)	$0.00
	% Construction Phase Service - Construction Manger's Fee (Step II proposal)	0.00
	General Conditions monthly fee (Step II proposal)	$0.00
	B.1.1 = Pre-Construction NTE ($) = Normalized Price*(pts) = 16.7+ ((1-[(CMAR cost - MIN cost) / (MAX cost - MIN cost)])x16.7 * highest cost and lowest cost used to normalize to 16.7 to 33.3 range for all costs received (i.e. highest cost proposal receives score of 16.7 pts, lowest cost proposal receives score of 33.3 pts and others are normalized within that range.	#DIV/0!
	B.1.2 = Percent (%) for Construction Phase = Normalized Price*(pts) = 16.7+ ((1-[(CMAR % - MIN %) / (MAX % - MIN %)])x16.7 * highest % and lowest % used to normalize to 16.7 to 33.3 range for all costs received (i.e. highest % proposal receives score of 16.7 pts, lowest % proposal receives score of 33.3 pts and others are normalized within that range.	#DIV/0!
	B.1.3 = General Conditions ($) = Normalized Price*(pts) = 16.6+ ((1-[(CMAR cost - MIN cost) / (MAX cost - MIN cost)])x16.6 * highest cost and lowest cost used to normalize to 16.6 to 33.3 range for all costs received (i.e. highest cost proposal receives score of 16.6 pts, lowest cost proposal receives score of 33.3 pts and others are normalized within that range.	#DIV/0!
	B.1 SUBTOTAL = Summation of Component PMP Scores (pts)	**#DIV/0!**

MIN	MAX	
0.00	0.00	% range of proposals
$0	$0	$ range of proposals
$0	$0	$ range of Monthly Cost

Criteria	Description		Score	SELECTION COMMITTEE									
[B.2] Step II Project Management Plan (PMP) Score	a. Clear Scope Statement and Success Measurement: There is a well defined scope and specific, measurable success milestones.	0-10	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	b. Outline of Deliverables and Work Breakdown Structure: There is a logical subdivision of project tasks presented to achieve the scope.	0-15	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Anticipated Schedule and Budget for CMAR Services: Draft, anticipated schedule CMAR services is presented.	0-15	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. CMAR Personnel Allocation and Roles: Staff assignments defined and management/roles defined. (Project Manager, Pre-Construction Manager, Cost Estimator, Others)	0-10	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	B.2 SUBTOTAL = Summation of Component PMP Scores (pts)		**0.0**	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

C. Interview

Criteria	Description		Score	SELECTION COMMITTEE									
(C) Interview	a. Management of Interview: questions, time management	0-15	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Team structure and Project Approach	0-15	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Competence & Expertise	0-20	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	C SUBTOTAL = Summation of component Interview Scores (pts)		**0.0**	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

D. Best Value Determination

Qualification Scores	
(**A**) Statement of Qualifications	43.9
(**B.2**) Project Mgmt. Plan Basis	0.0
(**C**) Interview	0.0
Total Qualifications Score (pts)	43.9
Total Qualifications Score (%)	22.0%

Fee Proposal Scores	
(**B.1**) Fee Proposal	#DIV/0!
Total Fee Proposal Score (pts)	#DIV/0!
Total Fee Proposal Score (%)	#DIV/0!

Total Scores	
Qualifications (45%)	9.9
Fee Proposal (55%)	#DIV/0!
D = FINAL BEST VALUE SCORE* for CMAR FIRM as combination of (**A**) Qualifications, (**B.2**) Project Management Plan, and (**C**) Interview Plus (B.1) Fee Proposal determined by: * (**A**) + (**B.2**) + (**C**) x 45% + (**B.1**) x 55% = FINAL BEST VALUE SCORE out of total possible 100 pts	**#DIV/0!**

Project Name: Ewert Park Improvments

CMAR Firm Name:

Evaluators Name: Korey Schulz

Date:

A. Step I - Statement of Qualifications Submittal

Criteria	Description	Points Range	Score - AVG	Paul Bloomberg	Greg Bertoncino	Tony Robyn	Leslie Haase	Dakota Rusk	Robert Beachner	Patrick Tuttle	Olsson	Paragon	Water's Edge
				SELECTION COMMITTEE									
[A.1] Methodology (30 pts total)	a. Letter of Interest	0-4	*0.0*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	b. Change Management	0-4	*0.0*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Schedule Management	0-4	*0.0*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Demonstrated CMAR project experience thru to completion	0-4	*0.0*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	e. Demonstrated years of CMAR experience	0-3	*0.0*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	f. Project scope and total cost similar ($5-6M)	0-4	*0.0*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	g. Construction Safety Record	0-3	*0.0*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	h. Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP)/costs within budget estimates	0-4	*0.0*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
[A.2] Experience (40 pts total)	a. Similar park projects	0-5	*0.0*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	b. Similar splash park projects	0-5	*0.0*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Similar ice skate ribbon projects	0-4	*0.0*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Greenscape/Hardscape Construction (Sports court surfacing, playground equipment and surfacing, splash park equipment and surfacing, ice ribbon equipment and surfacing, synthetic turf, landscaping)	0-5	*0.0*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Architectural (Bathhouse renovations improvements, Covered basketball/multi-sport court structure, Amphitheater structure)	0-4	*0.0*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	e. Examples of Constructability / design innovations provided	0-5	*0.0*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	f. Efficient & practical inputs	0-4	*0.0*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	g. Aesthetics/Park renewal/Quality of work	0-4	*0.0*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	h. Community Expectations	0-4	*0.0*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
[A.3] References (15 pts total)	a. Owner & CMAR relationship approach	0-5	*0.0*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	b. A/E & CMAR relationship approach	0-5	*0.0*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Prior CMAR work with municipality as "Owner"	0-5	*0.0*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
[A.4] Staff (15 pts total)	a. Team Organization Structure	0-5	*0.0*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	b. Office Location/key staff availability	0-5	*0.0*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Management Personnel (experience and mgmt. style)	0-5	*0.0*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	A. Subtotal for Step I (AVG) = Qualifications Scores (pts):		**0.0**	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Note: ONLY top 5 firms will be selected based on Step I Score to move to Step II submittal

B. Step II - PMP Proposal/Fee Submittal

Criteria	Description	Cost ($)
[B.1] Step II Fee Proposal	Lump sum fee for pre-construction SOW specified (Step II proposal)	*$0.00*
	% Construction Phase Service - Construction Manger's Fee (Step II proposal)	*0.00*
	General Conditions monthly fee (Step II proposal)	*$0.00*
	B.1.1 = Pre-Construction NTE ($) = Normalized Price*(pts) = 16.7+ ((1-[(CMAR cost - MIN cost) / (MAX cost - MIN cost)])x16.7 * highest cost and lowest cost used to normalize to 16.7 to 33.3 range for all costs received (i.e. highest cost proposal receives score of 16.7 pts, lowest cost proposal receives score of 33.3 pts and others are normalized within that range.	#DIV/0!
	B.1.2 = Percent (%) for Construction Phase = Normalized Price*(pts) = 16.7+ ((1-[(CMAR % - MIN %) / (MAX % - MIN %)])x16.7 * highest % and lowest % used to normalize to 16.7 to 33.3 range for all costs received (i.e. highest % proposal receives score of 16.7 pts, lowest % proposal receives score of 33.3 pts and others are normalized within that range.	#DIV/0!
	B.1.3 = General Conditions ($) = Normalized Price*(pts) = 16.6+ ((1-[(CMAR cost - MIN cost) / (MAX cost - MIN cost)])x16.6 * highest cost and lowest cost used to normalize to 16.6 to 33.3 range for all costs received (i.e. highest cost proposal receives score of 16.6 pts, lowest cost proposal receives score of 33.3 pts and others are normalized within that range.	#DIV/0!
	B.1 SUBTOTAL = Summation of Component PMP Scores (pts)	**#DIV/0!**

MIN	MAX	
0.00	0.00	% range of proposals
$0	$0	$ range of proposals
$0	$0	$ range of Monthly Cost

Criteria	Description	Points Range	Score	Paul Bloomberg	Greg Bertoncino	Tony Robyn	Leslie Haase	Dakota Rusk	Robert Beachner	Patrick Tuttle	Olsson	Paragon	Water's Edge
				SELECTION COMMITTEE									
[B.2] Step II Project Management Plan (PMP) Score	a. Clear Scope Statement and Success Measurement: There is a well defined scope and specific, measurable success milestones.	0-10	*0.0*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	b. Outline of Deliverables and Work Breakdown Structure: There is a logical subdivision of project tasks presented to achieve the scope.	0-15	*0.0*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Anticipated Schedule and Budget for CMAR Services: Draft, anticipated schedule CMAR services is presented.	0-15	*0.0*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. CMAR Personnel Allocation and Roles: Staff assignments defined and management/roles defined. (Project Manager, Pre-Construction Manager, Cost Estimator, Others)	0-10	*0.0*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	B.2 SUBTOTAL = Summation of Component PMP Scores (pts)		**0.0**	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

C. Interview

Criteria	Description	Points Range	Score	Paul Bloomberg	Greg Bertoncino	Tony Robyn	Leslie Haase	Dakota Rusk	Robert Beachner	Patrick Tuttle	Olsson	Paragon	Water's Edge
				SELECTION COMMITTEE									
(C) Interview	a. Management of Interview: questions, time management	0-15	*0.0*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Team structure and Project Approach	0-15	*0.0*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Competence & Expertise	0-20	*0.0*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	C SUBTOTAL = Summation of component Interview Scores (pts)		**0.0**	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

D. Best Value Determination

Qualification Scores	
(**A**) Statement of Qualifications	0.0
(**B.2**) Project Mgmt. Plan Basis	0.0
(**C**) Interview	0.0
Total Qualifications Score (pts)	0.0
Total Qualifications Score (%)	0.0%

Fee Proposal Scores	
(**B.1**) Fee Proposal	#DIV/0!
Total Fee Proposal Score (pts)	#DIV/0!
Total Fee Proposal Score (%)	#DIV/0!

Total Scores	
Qualifications (45%)	0.0
Fee Proposal (55%)	#DIV/0!
D = FINAL BEST VALUE SCORE* for CMAR FIRM as combination of (**A**) Qualifications, (**B.2**) Project Management Plan, and (**C**) Interview Plus (B.1) Fee Proposal determined by: * (**A**) + (**B.2**) + (**C**) x 45% + (**B.1**) x 55% = FINAL BEST VALUE SCORE out of total possible 100 pts	**#DIV/0!**