

Ketchikan Gateway Borough
Pool A/E Services RFP
Scoring Summary

EVALUATION CRITERIA - USE THE FOLLOWING POINT VALUES 0=Does not meet criterion, 5 =Partially meets criterion, 10=Meets criterion, 15=Exceeds criterion Summary Page		Rim	Jensen Yorba Lott	Alaska Architects	Kumin Associates	BCRA Design	ORB Architects	MRV Architects
1	<p>Experience of the "A/E Design Team" (i.e., architectural designers, engineering team and other professional staff members).</p> <p>The maximum total score on this component is 20 points.</p> <p>Proposals will be measured in terms of whether project team members have held roles similar to the one planned for the Aquatic Center project for projects that meet the criteria in a) through i) below.</p> <p>A/E experience with swimming pools is critical. Recognition of the particular challenges presented by the climate in Ketchikan are also crucial.</p>							
	a). of similar scope (e.g., swimming pools, aquatic centers and expansion of existing facilities); similar cost (\$23.5 million), similar size (34,000 to 35,000 square feet)	4.0	4.0	4.7	3.7	3.3	4.0	3.7
	b). in Southeast Alaska or similar maritime environments	2.3	4.3	4.7	4.3	2.5	3.1	3.7
	c). other projects with the Borough or local or state government agencies;	0.9	1.1	1.3	1.4	1.0	0.9	1.1
	d). using CM/GC project delivery approach;	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.0	1.0	0.8	1.0
	e). involving value-engineering;	0.9	1.0	1.3	1.2	0.7	0.8	1.0
	f). using life-cycle cost estimating intended to promote value in terms of asset life; operations; and maintenance and repair;	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.0	1.0	0.6	1.0
	g). involving commissioning (a quality-oriented process for achieving, verifying, and documenting that the performance of facilities, systems, and assemblies meets defined objectives and criteria);	1.0	0.8	1.1	1.0	1.0	0.5	1.0
	h). including procurement of furnishings and moveable equipment; and	1.0	0.7	0.9	1.1	1.1	0.3	1.0
	i). involving stakeholders and/or a Building Committee in the design process	1.0	1.1	1.2	1.1	0.8	0.9	1.0
Total Score for Item 1:	13.1	15.2	17.5	16.1	12.4	11.7	14.6	

Ketchikan Gateway Borough
Pool A/E Services RFP
Scoring Summary

EVALUATION CRITERIA - USE THE FOLLOWING POINT VALUES 0=Does not meet criterion, 5 =Partially meets criterion, 10=Meets criterion, 15=Exceeds criterion Summary Page		Rim	Jensen Yorba Lott	Alaska Architects	Kumin Associates	BCRA Design	ORB Architects	MRV Architects
2	<p>Character, integrity, reputation, and judgment of the firm and project team.</p> <p>The maximum total score on this component is 20 points. A maximum of 3.33 points is available for each of the criteria set out in a) through c). A maximum of 10 points is available for the element set out in d).</p> <p>The criteria in a) through d) will be measured in terms of litigation and claims against professional liability insurance, whether the prime firm and members of the A/E team (when combined) have, during the past ten years:</p>							
	a). During the past 10 years had claims filed (past, pending, or anticipated) against errors and omissions insurance (or other professional liability insurance); (0 points for 3 or more claims; 5 points for 2 claims; 10 points for 1 claim; and 15 points for 0 claims).	1.6	2.7	2.2	1.1	2.4	2.9	3.1
	b). During the past 10 years had lawsuits filed (past or anticipated) alleging professional negligence or other liability in any projects same scoring system as in 2a);	1.6	1.8	2.4	2.9	1.8	3.3	3.3
	c). During the past 10 years have filed lawsuits or formal claims against owners for which the firm or team members provided professional services (same scoring system as in 2a); and	2.4	2.4	2.4	3.3	2.2	3.3	3.1
	d). This criterion involves evaluation of the respondent's philosophy, skill, and experience in avoiding and dealing with disputes, claims, and litigation (discretion is afforded to the PRT in evaluating this element; a maximum of 10 points is allowed, the score for this element will be entered in the far-right column).	8.0	8.8	9.8	9.0	5.0	9.6	9.6
	Total Score for Item 2:	13.6	15.7	16.9	16.3	11.4	19.1	19.1
3	<p>Performance regarding budget and schedule control on prior contracts.</p> <p>The maximum total score on this component is 10 points.</p> <p>The criteria are set out in a) and b):</p>							
	a). 90% of the construction projects for which Architectural and Engineering Design Services have been provided have been completed within budget; and	3.7	3.5	4.0	4.0	3.4	3.4	4.0
	b). 90% of construction projects for which Architectural and Engineering Design Services have been provided have been completed on schedule.	3.7	2.3	4.0	4.0	3.3	3.3	3.7
	Total Score for Item 3:	7.4	5.8	8.0	8.0	6.7	6.7	7.7

Ketchikan Gateway Borough
Pool A/E Services RFP
Scoring Summary

EVALUATION CRITERIA - USE THE FOLLOWING POINT VALUES 0=Does not meet criterion, 5 =Partially meets criterion, 10=Meets criterion, 15=Exceeds criterion Summary Page		Rim	Jensen Yorba Lott	Alaska Architects	Kumin Associates	BCRA Design	ORB Architects	MRV Architects
4	Whether the respondent has the capacity to meet the Borough's goals set out in Section 1.2 and to complete the scope of work outlined in Section 3 of this RFP within the target dates specified. The maximum total score on this component is 20 points. The criteria will be judged whether the respondent:							
	a). has provided a persuasive explanation that the A/E team members have the capacity to provide Architectural and Engineering Design services for this project within the times specified;	3.1	2.9	3.7	2.9	2.8	2.4	2.7
	b). has offered a credible statement the firm will help the Borough achieve the project goals outlined in Section 1.2 of this RFP;	2.4	2.9	3.5	2.7	2.7	2.4	2.7
	c). provided a realistic plan and schedule to meet all elements of the project scope;	2.9	2.1	3.5	2.9	2.1	2.1	2.7
	d). has convincingly stated the capacity, availability and accessibility of A/E team to perform work for this Ketchikan Aquatic Center project; and	2.4	2.9	3.7	2.9	2.4	1.6	3.2
	e). has a level of contractual or other obligations for other projects such that there is a reasonable likelihood that the respondent would be able to properly perform A/E design services for the Aquatic Center project on time and within budget	2.8	2.9	3.2	2.7	2.5	2.7	2.8
	Total Score for Item 4:	13.6	13.8	17.6	14.1	12.5	11.2	13.9
5	Project approach to successfully design the project in accordance with project goals. The maximum total score on this component is 20 points. These criteria are measured in terms of whether the respondent has provided a plan to ensure that:							
	a). Approach to work plan so project is designed and delivered in accordance with project goals	3.3	3.7	4.7	4.3	3.3	2.8	4.0
	b). Coordination with stakeholders and public during development of design for Aquatic Center;	3.7	3.3	5.0	3.7	3.0	3.0	3.7
	c). Cost and Schedule control	4.0	3.3	4.3	3.7	3.0	2.7	3.3
	d). Quality Control/Quality Assurance Procedures	3.7	3.3	4.7	3.7	3.3	3.0	3.0
	Total Score for Item 5:	14.7	13.7	18.7	15.3	12.7	11.5	14.0
6	Familiarity with the details of the project. The maximum total score on this component is 10 points.							
	a). This criterion is determined on the basis of the respondent's understanding the elements of the project	7.3	9.3	10.0	7.3	7.3	6.0	8.0
	Total Score for Item 6:	7.3	9.3	10.0	7.3	7.3	6.0	8.0
Total Weighted Score for All Categories:		69.6	73.5	88.7	77.2	63.0	66.2	77.4

Rim Architects

EVALUATION CRITERIA - USE THE FOLLOWING POINT VALUES 0=Does not meet criterion, 5=Partially meets criterion, 10=Meets criterion, 15=Exceeds criterion RIM Architects		1	2	3	4	5	Average
1	Experience of the "A/E Design Team" (i.e., architectural designers, engineering team and other professional staff members). The maximum total score on this component is 20 points. Proposals will be measured in terms of whether project team members have held roles similar to the one planned for the Aquatic Center project for projects that meet the criteria in a) through i) below. A/E experience with swimming pools is critical. Recognition of the particular challenges presented by the climate in Ketchikan are also crucial.						
	a). of similar scope (e.g., swimming pools, aquatic centers and expansion of existing facilities); similar cost (\$23.5 million), similar size (34,000 to 35,000 square feet)	5.0	4.995	3.3	3.3	3.3	4.0
	b). in Southeast Alaska or similar maritime environments	1.7	1.665	1.7	3.3	3.3	2.3
	c). other projects with the Borough or local or state government agencies;	1.0	0.475	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.9
	d). using CM/GC project delivery approach;	1.4	0.950	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
	e). involving value-engineering;	0.5	0.950	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.9
	f). using life-cycle cost estimating intended to promote value in terms of asset life; operations; and maintenance and repair;	1.4	0.950	0.5	1.0	1.0	1.0
	g). involving commissioning (a quality-oriented process for achieving, verifying, and documenting that the performance of facilities, systems, and assemblies meets defined objectives and criteria);	1.4	0.950	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
	h). including procurement of furnishings and moveable equipment; and	1.0	0.950	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
	i). involving stakeholders and/or a Building Committee in the design process	1.4	0.950	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Total Score for Item 1:	14.7	12.8	11.2	13.3	13.3	13.1	

Rim Architects

EVALUATION CRITERIA - USE THE FOLLOWING POINT VALUES 0=Does not meet criterion, 5=Partially meets criterion, 10=Meets criterion, 15=Exceeds criterion RIM Architects		1	2	3	4	5	Average
2	Character, integrity, reputation, and judgment of the firm and project team. The maximum total score on this component is 20 points. A maximum of 3.33 points is available for each of the criteria set out in a) through c). A maximum of 10 points is available for the element set out in d). The criteria in a) through d) will be measured in terms of litigation and claims against professional liability insurance, whether the prime firm and members of the A/E team (when combined) have, during the past ten years:						
	a). During the past 10 years had claims filed (past, pending, or anticipated) against errors and omissions insurance (or other professional liability insurance); (0 points for 3 or more claims; 5 points for 2 claims; 10 points for 1 claim; and 15 points for 0 claims).	2.2	2.2	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.6
	b). During the past 10 years had lawsuits filed (past or anticipated) alleging professional negligence or other liability in any projects same scoring system as in 2a);	2.2	2.2	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.6
	c). During the past 10 years have filed lawsuits or formal claims against owners for which the firm or team members provided professional services (same scoring system as in 2a); and	3.3	2.2	3.3	3.3	-	2.4
	d). This criterion involves evaluation of the respondent's philosophy, skill, and experience in avoiding and dealing with disputes, claims, and litigation (discretion is afforded to the PRT in evaluating this element; a maximum of 10 points is allowed, the score for this element will be entered in the far-right column).	4.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	6.0	8.0
	Total Score for Item 2:	11.8	16.7	15.6	15.6	8.2	13.6
3	Performance regarding budget and schedule control on prior contracts. The maximum total score on this component is 10 points. The criteria are set out in a) and b):						
	a). 90% of the construction projects for which Architectural and Engineering Design Services have been provided have been completed within budget; and	5.0	5.0	3.4	3.4	1.7	3.7
	b). 90% of construction projects for which Architectural and Engineering Design Services have been provided have been completed on schedule.	5.0	5.0	3.3	3.3	1.7	3.7
	Total Score for Item 3:	10.0	10.0	6.7	6.7	3.3	7.4

EVALUATION CRITERIA - USE THE FOLLOWING POINT VALUES 0=Does not meet criterion, 5=Partially meets criterion, 10=Meets criterion, 15=Exceeds criterion RIM Architects		1	2	3	4	5	Average
4	Whether the respondent has the capacity to meet the Borough's goals set out in Section 1.2 and to complete the scope of work outlined in Section 3 of this RFP within the target dates specified. The maximum total score on this component is 20 points. The criteria will be judged whether the respondent:						
	a). has provided a persuasive explanation that the A/E team members have the capacity to provide Architectural and Engineering Design services for this project within the times specified;	4.0	4.0	2.7	2.7	2.1	3.1
	b). has offered a credible statement the firm will help the Borough achieve the project goals outlined in Section 1.2 of this RFP;	4.0	1.3	2.7	2.7	1.3	2.4
	c). provided a realistic plan and schedule to meet all elements of the project scope;	4.0	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.9
	d). has convincingly stated the capacity, availability and accessibility of A/E team to perform work for this Ketchikan Aquatic Center project; and	4.0	1.3	2.7	2.7	1.3	2.4
	e). has a level of contractual or other obligations for other projects such that there is a reasonable likelihood that the respondent would be able to properly perform A/E design services for the Aquatic Center project on time and within budget	4.0	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.1	2.8
	Total Score for Item 4:	20.0	12.0	13.3	13.3	9.6	13.6
5	Project approach to successfully design the project in accordance with project goals. The maximum total score on this component is 20 points. These criteria are measured in terms of whether the respondent has provided a plan to ensure that:						
	a). Approach to work plan so project is designed and delivered in accordance with project goals	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3
	b). Coordination with stakeholders and public during development of design for Aquatic Center;	5.0	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.7
	c). Cost and Schedule control	5.0	5.0	3.3	3.3	3.3	4.0
	d). Quality Control/Quality Assurance Procedures	5.0	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.7
	Total Score for Item 5:	18.3	15.0	13.3	13.3	13.3	14.7
6	Familiarity with the details of the project. The maximum total score on this component is 10 points.						
	a). This criterion is determined on the basis of the respondent's understanding the elements of the project	10.0	3.3	6.7	10.0	6.7	7.3
	Total Score for Item 6:	10.0	3.3	6.7	10.0	6.7	7.3
Total Weighted Score for All Categories:		84.8	69.8	66.7	72.2	54.5	69.6

EVALUATION CRITERIA - USE THE FOLLOWING POINT VALUES 0=Does not meet criterion, 5=Partially meets criterion, 10=Meets criterion, 15=Exceeds criterion Jensen Yorba Lott		1	2	3	4	5	Average
1	Experience of the "A/E Design Team" (i.e., architectural designers, engineering team and other professional staff members). The maximum total score on this component is 20 points. Proposals will be measured in terms of whether project team members have held roles similar to the one planned for the Aquatic Center project for projects that meet the criteria in a) through i) below. A/E experience with swimming pools is critical. Recognition of the particular challenges presented by the climate in Ketchikan are also crucial.						
	a). of similar scope (e.g., swimming pools, aquatic centers and expansion of existing facilities); similar cost (\$23.5 million), similar size (34,000 to 35,000 square feet)	5.0	5.0	3.3	3.3	3.3	4.0
	b). in Southeast Alaska or similar maritime environments	5.0	5.0	3.3	5.0	3.3	4.3
	c). other projects with the Borough or local or state government agencies;	1.4	1.4	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.1
	d). using CM/GC project delivery approach;	1.4	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
	e). involving value-engineering;	1.4	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
	f). using life-cycle cost estimating intended to promote value in terms of asset life; operations; and maintenance and repair;	1.4	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
	g). involving commissioning (a quality-oriented process for achieving, verifying, and documenting that the performance of facilities, systems, and assemblies meets defined objectives and criteria);	1.0	1.0	0.5	1.0	0.5	0.8
	h). including procurement of furnishings and moveable equipment; and	-	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.5	0.7
	i). involving stakeholders and/or a Building Committee in the design process	1.0	1.4	1.0	1.0	1.4	1.1
Total Score for Item 1:	17.6	17.6	12.8	15.0	12.8	15.2	

EVALUATION CRITERIA - USE THE FOLLOWING POINT VALUES 0=Does not meet criterion, 5 =Partially meets criterion, 10=Meets criterion, 15=Exceeds criterion Jensen Yorba Lott		1	2	3	4	5	Average
2	Character, integrity, reputation, and judgment of the firm and project team. The maximum total score on this component is 20 points. A maximum of 3.33 points is available for each of the criteria set out in a) through c). A maximum of 10 points is available for the element set out in d). The criteria in a) through d) will be measured in terms of litigation and claims against professional liability insurance, whether the prime firm and members of the A/E team (when combined) have, during the past ten years:						
	a). During the past 10 years had claims filed (past, pending, or anticipated) against errors and omissions insurance (or other professional liability insurance); (0 points for 3 or more claims; 5 points for 2 claims; 10 points for 1 claim; and 15 points for 0 claims).	3.3	1.1	3.3	2.2	3.3	2.7
	b). During the past 10 years had lawsuits filed (past or anticipated) alleging professional negligence or other liability in any projects same scoring system as in 2a);	1.1	2.2	2.2	2.2	1.1	1.8
	c). During the past 10 years have filed lawsuits or formal claims against owners for which the firm or team members provided professional services (same scoring system as in 2a); and	3.3	2.2	3.3	-	3.3	2.4
	d). This criterion involves evaluation of the respondent's philosophy, skill, and experience in avoiding and dealing with disputes, claims, and litigation (discretion is afforded to the PRT in evaluating this element; a maximum of 10 points is allowed, the score for this element will be entered in the far-right column).	9.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	8.8
	Total Score for Item 2:	16.8	10.6	18.9	14.4	17.8	15.7
3	Performance regarding budget and schedule control on prior contracts. The maximum total score on this component is 10 points. The criteria are set out in a) and b):						
	a). 90% of the construction projects for which Architectural and Engineering Design Services have been provided have been completed within budget; and	3.4	5.0	3.4	3.4	2.4	3.5
	b). 90% of construction projects for which Architectural and Engineering Design Services have been provided have been completed on schedule.	3.3	3.3	1.7	3.3	-	2.3
	Total Score for Item 3:	6.7	8.4	5.0	6.7	2.4	5.8

EVALUATION CRITERIA - USE THE FOLLOWING POINT VALUES 0=Does not meet criterion, 5=Partially meets criterion, 10=Meets criterion, 15=Exceeds criterion Jensen Yorba Lott		1	2	3	4	5	Average
4	Whether the respondent has the capacity to meet the Borough's goals set out in Section 1.2 and to complete the scope of work outlined in Section 3 of this RFP within the target dates specified. The maximum total score on this component is 20 points. The criteria will be judged whether the respondent:						
	a). has provided a persuasive explanation that the A/E team members have the capacity to provide Architectural and Engineering Design services for this project within the times specified;	2.7	4.0	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.9
	b). has offered a credible statement the firm will help the Borough achieve the project goals outlined in Section 1.2 of this RFP;	4.0	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.9
	c). provided a realistic plan and schedule to meet all elements of the project scope;	2.7	2.7	-	2.7	2.7	2.1
	d). has convincingly stated the capacity, availability and accessibility of A/E team to perform work for this Ketchikan Aquatic Center project; and	4.0	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.9
	e). has a level of contractual or other obligations for other projects such that there is a reasonable likelihood that the respondent would be able to properly perform A/E design services for the Aquatic Center project on time and within budget	4.0	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.9
	Total Score for Item 4:	17.3	14.6	10.7	13.3	13.3	13.8
5	Project approach to successfully design the project in accordance with project goals. The maximum total score on this component is 20 points. These criteria are measured in terms of whether the respondent has provided a plan to ensure that:						
	a). Approach to work plan so project is designed and delivered in accordance with project goals	5.0	5.0	1.7	3.3	3.3	3.7
	b). Coordination with stakeholders and public during development of design for Aquatic Center;	5.0	3.3	1.7	3.3	3.3	3.3
	c). Cost and Schedule control	5.0	3.3	1.7	3.3	3.3	3.3
	d). Quality Control/Quality Assurance Procedures	5.0	3.3	1.7	3.3	3.3	3.3
	Total Score for Item 5:	20.0	15.0	6.7	13.3	13.3	13.7
6	Familiarity with the details of the project. The maximum total score on this component is 10 points.						
	a). This criterion is determined on the basis of the respondent's understanding the elements of the project	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	6.7	9.3
	Total Score for Item 6:	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	6.7	9.3
Total Weighted Score for All Categories:		88.4	76.2	64.1	72.8	66.3	73.5

Architects Alaska

EVALUATION CRITERIA - USE THE FOLLOWING POINT VALUES 0=Does not meet criterion, 5=Partially meets criterion, 10=Meets criterion, 15=Exceeds criterion Architects Alaska		1	2	3	4	5	Average
1	<p>Experience of the "A/E Design Team" (i.e., architectural designers, engineering team and other professional staff members).</p> <p>The maximum total score on this component is 20 points.</p> <p>Proposals will be measured in terms of whether project team members have held roles similar to the one planned for the Aquatic Center project for projects that meet the criteria in a) through i) below.</p> <p>A/E experience with swimming pools is critical. Recognition of the particular challenges presented by the climate in Ketchikan are also crucial.</p>						
	a). of similar scope (e.g., swimming pools, aquatic centers and expansion of existing facilities); similar cost (\$23.5 million), similar size (34,000 to 35,000 square feet)	5.0	4.995	5.0	5.0	3.3	4.7
	b). in Southeast Alaska or similar maritime environments	5.0	4.995	5.0	5.0	3.3	4.7
	c). other projects with the Borough or local or state government agencies;	1.4	1.425	1.0	1.4	1.4	1.3
	d). using CM/GC project delivery approach;	1.4	1.425	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.1
	e). involving value-engineering;	1.4	1.425	1.4	1.0	1.4	1.3
	f). using life-cycle cost estimating intended to promote value in terms of asset life; operations; and maintenance and repair;	1.4	1.425	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.1
	g). involving commissioning (a quality-oriented process for achieving, verifying, and documenting that the performance of facilities, systems, and assemblies meets defined objectives and criteria);	1.0	0.950	1.4	1.0	1.4	1.1
	h). including procurement of furnishings and moveable equipment; and	0.5	0.950	0.5	1.4	1.0	0.9
	i). involving stakeholders and/or a Building Committee in the design process	1.0	0.950	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.2
Total Score for Item 1:	18.1	18.5	17.6	18.1	15.2	17.5	

Architects Alaska

EVALUATION CRITERIA - USE THE FOLLOWING POINT VALUES 0=Does not meet criterion, 5=Partially meets criterion, 10=Meets criterion, 15=Exceeds criterion Architects Alaska		1	2	3	4	5	Average
2	Character, integrity, reputation, and judgment of the firm and project team. The maximum total score on this component is 20 points. A maximum of 3.33 points is available for each of the criteria set out in a) through c). A maximum of 10 points is available for the element set out in d). The criteria in a) through d) will be measured in terms of litigation and claims against professional liability insurance, whether the prime firm and members of the						
	a). During the past 10 years had claims filed (past, pending, or anticipated) against errors and omissions insurance (or other professional liability insurance); (0 points for 3 or more claims; 5 points for 2 claims; 10 points for 1 claim; and 15 points for 0 claims).	2.2	3.330	2.2	2.2	1.1	2.2
	b). During the past 10 years had lawsuits filed (past or anticipated) alleging professional negligence or other liability in any projects same scoring system as in 2a);	2.2	3.330	1.1	2.2	3.3	2.4
	c). During the past 10 years have filed lawsuits or formal claims against owners for which the firm or team members provided professional services (same scoring system as in 2a); and	3.3	3.330	3.3	2.2	-	2.4
	d). This criterion involves evaluation of the respondent's philosophy, skill, and experience in avoiding and dealing with disputes, claims, and litigation (discretion is afforded to the PRT in evaluating this element; a maximum of 10 points is allowed, the score for this element will be entered in the far-right column).	9.0	10.000	10.0	10.0	10.0	9.8
	Total Score for Item 2:	16.8	20.0	16.7	16.7	14.4	16.9
3	Performance regarding budget and schedule control on prior contracts. The maximum total score on this component is 10 points. The criteria are set out in a) and b):						
	a). 90% of the construction projects for which Architectural and Engineering Design Services have been provided have been completed within budget; and	5.0	5.040	3.4	3.4	3.4	4.0
	b). 90% of construction projects for which Architectural and Engineering Design Services have been provided have been completed on schedule.	5.0	4.995	3.3	3.3	3.3	4.0
	Total Score for Item 3:	10.0	10.0	6.7	6.7	6.7	8.0

Architects Alaska

EVALUATION CRITERIA - USE THE FOLLOWING POINT VALUES 0=Does not meet criterion, 5=Partially meets criterion, 10=Meets criterion, 15=Exceeds criterion Architects Alaska		1	2	3	4	5	Average
4	Whether the respondent has the capacity to meet the Borough's goals set out in Section 1.2 and to complete the scope of work outlined in Section 3 of this RFP within the target dates specified. The maximum total score on this component is 20 points. The criteria will be judged whether the respondent:						
	a). has provided a persuasive explanation that the A/E team members have the capacity to provide Architectural and Engineering Design services for this project within the times specified;	4.0	4.005	4.0	2.7	4.0	3.7
	b). has offered a credible statement the firm will help the Borough achieve the project goals outlined in Section 1.2 of this RFP;	2.7	3.990	4.0	2.7	4.0	3.5
	c). provided a realistic plan and schedule to meet all elements of the project scope;	4.0	3.990	2.7	2.7	4.0	3.5
	d). has convincingly stated the capacity, availability and accessibility of A/E team to perform work for this Ketchikan Aquatic Center project; and	4.0	3.990	4.0	2.7	4.0	3.7
	e). has a level of contractual or other obligations for other projects such that there is a reasonable likelihood that the respondent would be able to properly perform A/E design services for the Aquatic Center project on time and within budget	4.0	2.660	2.7	2.7	4.0	3.2
	Total Score for Item 4:	18.6	18.6	17.3	13.3	20.0	17.6
5	Project approach to successfully design the project in accordance with project goals. The maximum total score on this component is 20 points. These criteria are measured in terms of whether the respondent has provided a plan to ensure that:						
	a). Approach to work plan so project is designed and delivered in accordance with project goals	5.0	5.010	3.3	5.0	5.0	4.7
	b). Coordination with stakeholders and public during development of design for Aquatic Center;	5.0	4.995	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
	c). Cost and Schedule control	5.0	3.330	3.3	5.0	5.0	4.3
	d). Quality Control/Quality Assurance Procedures	5.0	3.330	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.7
	Total Score for Item 5:	20.0	16.7	16.7	20.0	20.0	18.7
6	Familiarity with the details of the project. The maximum total score on this component is 10 points.						
	a). This criterion is determined on the basis of the respondent's understanding the elements of the project	10.0	10.005	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
	Total Score for Item 6:	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
Total Weighted Score for All Categories:		93.5	93.9	84.9	84.7	86.3	88.7

Kumin Associates

EVALUATION CRITERIA - USE THE FOLLOWING POINT VALUES 0=Does not meet criterion, 5 =Partially meets criterion, 10=Meets criterion, 15=Exceeds criterion Kumin Associates		1	2	3	4	5	Average
1	Experience of the "A/E Design Team" (i.e., architectural designers, engineering team and other professional staff members). The maximum total score on this component is 20 points. Proposals will be measured in terms of whether project team members have held roles similar to the one planned for the Aquatic Center project for projects that meet the criteria in a) through i) below. A/E experience with swimming pools is critical. Recognition of the particular challenges presented by the climate in Ketchikan are also crucial.						
	a). of similar scope (e.g., swimming pools, aquatic centers and expansion of existing facilities); similar cost (\$23.5 million), similar size (34,000 to 35,000 square feet)	5.0	1.665	1.7	5.0	5.0	3.7
	b). in Southeast Alaska or similar maritime environments	5.0	3.330	3.3	5.0	5.0	4.3
	c). other projects with the Borough or local or state government agencies;	1.4	1.425	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4
	d). using CM/GC project delivery approach;	1.4	0.950	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
	e). involving value-engineering;	1.4	0.950	1.4	1.0	1.4	1.2
	f). using life-cycle cost estimating intended to promote value in terms of asset life; operations; and maintenance and repair;	1.0	0.950	1.0	1.0	1.4	1.0
	g). involving commissioning (a quality-oriented process for achieving, verifying, and documenting that the performance of facilities, systems, and assemblies meets defined objectives and criteria);	1.4	0.950	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
	h). including procurement of furnishings and moveable equipment; and	1.4	0.950	1.0	1.0	1.4	1.1
	i). involving stakeholders and/or a Building Committee in the design process	1.4	0.950	1.0	1.4	1.0	1.1
Total Score for Item 1:	19.5	12.1	12.6	17.6	18.5	16.1	

EVALUATION CRITERIA - USE THE FOLLOWING POINT VALUES 0=Does not meet criterion, 5=Partially meets criterion, 10=Meets criterion, 15=Exceeds criterion Kumin Associates		1	2	3	4	5	Average
2	Character, integrity, reputation, and judgment of the firm and project team. The maximum total score on this component is 20 points. A maximum of 3.33 points is available for each of the criteria set out in a) through c). A maximum of 10 points is available for the element set out in d). The criteria in a) through d) will be measured in terms of litigation and claims against professional liability insurance, whether the prime firm and members of the A/E team (when combined) have, during the past ten years:						
	a). During the past 10 years had claims filed (past, pending, or anticipated) against errors and omissions insurance (or other professional liability insurance); (0 points for 3 or more claims; 5 points for 2 claims; 10 points for 1 claim; and 15 points for 0 claims).	1.1	3.330	1.1	-	-	1.1
	b). During the past 10 years had lawsuits filed (past or anticipated) alleging professional negligence or other liability in any projects same scoring system as in 2a);	3.3	3.330	1.1	3.3	3.3	2.9
	c). During the past 10 years have filed lawsuits or formal claims against owners for which the firm or team members provided professional services (same scoring system as in 2a); and	3.3	3.330	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3
	d). This criterion involves evaluation of the respondent's philosophy, skill, and experience in avoiding and dealing with disputes, claims, and litigation (discretion is afforded to the PRT in evaluating this element; a maximum of 10 points is allowed, the score for this element will be entered in the far-right column).	5.0	10.000	10.0	10.0	10.0	9.0
	Total Score for Item 2:	12.8	20.0	15.6	16.7	16.7	16.3
3	Performance regarding budget and schedule control on prior contracts. The maximum total score on this component is 10 points. The criteria are set out in a) and b):						
	a). 90% of the construction projects for which Architectural and Engineering Design Services have been provided have been completed within budget; and	5.0	3.360	3.4	3.4	5.0	4.0
	b). 90% of construction projects for which Architectural and Engineering Design Services have been provided have been completed on schedule.	5.0	3.330	3.3	3.3	5.0	4.0
	Total Score for Item 3:	10.0	6.7	6.7	6.7	10.0	8.0

EVALUATION CRITERIA - USE THE FOLLOWING POINT VALUES 0=Does not meet criterion, 5=Partially meets criterion, 10=Meets criterion, 15=Exceeds criterion Kumin Associates		1	2	3	4	5	Average
4	Whether the respondent has the capacity to meet the Borough's goals set out in Section 1.2 and to complete the scope of work outlined in Section 3 of this RFP within the target dates specified. The maximum total score on this component is 20 points. The criteria will be judged whether the respondent:						
	a). has provided a persuasive explanation that the A/E team members have the capacity to provide Architectural and Engineering Design services for this project within the times specified;	2.7	2.670	2.7	2.7	4.0	2.9
	b). has offered a credible statement the firm will help the Borough achieve the project goals outlined in Section 1.2 of this RFP;	2.7	2.660	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7
	c). provided a realistic plan and schedule to meet all elements of the project scope;	2.7	2.660	2.7	2.7	4.0	2.9
	d). has convincingly stated the capacity, availability and accessibility of A/E team to perform work for this Ketchikan Aquatic Center project; and	4.0	2.660	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.9
	e). has a level of contractual or other obligations for other projects such that there is a reasonable likelihood that the respondent would be able to properly perform A/E design services for the Aquatic Center project on time and within budget	2.7	2.660	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7
	Total Score for Item 4:	14.6	13.3	13.3	13.3	16.0	14.1
5	Project approach to successfully design the project in accordance with project goals. The maximum total score on this component is 20 points. These criteria are measured in terms of whether the respondent has provided a plan to ensure that:						
	a). Approach to work plan so project is designed and delivered in accordance with project goals	5.0	5.010	3.3	5.0	3.3	4.3
	b). Coordination with stakeholders and public during development of design for Aquatic Center;	3.3	3.330	3.3	5.0	3.3	3.7
	c). Cost and Schedule control	5.0	3.330	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.7
	d). Quality Control/Quality Assurance Procedures	5.0	3.330	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.7
	Total Score for Item 5:	18.3	15.0	13.3	16.7	13.3	15.3
6	Familiarity with the details of the project. The maximum total score on this component is 10 points.						
	a). This criterion is determined on the basis of the respondent's understanding the elements of the project	10.0	3.335	6.7	10.0	6.7	7.3
	Total Score for Item 6:	10.0	3.3	6.7	10.0	6.7	7.3
Total Weighted Score for All Categories:		85.3	70.4	68.1	80.9	81.2	77.2

BCRA Design

EVALUATION CRITERIA - USE THE FOLLOWING POINT VALUES 0=Does not meet criterion, 5 =Partially meets criterion, 10=Meets criterion, 15=Exceeds criterion BCRA Design		1	2	3	4	5	Average
1	Experience of the "A/E Design Team" (i.e., architectural designers, engineering team and other professional staff members). The maximum total score on this component is 20 points. Proposals will be measured in terms of whether project team members have held roles similar to the one planned for the Aquatic Center project for projects that meet the criteria in a) through i) below. A/E experience with swimming pools is critical. Recognition of the particular challenges presented by the climate in Ketchikan are also crucial.						
	a). of similar scope (e.g., swimming pools, aquatic centers and expansion of existing facilities); similar cost (\$23.5 million), similar size (34,000 to 35,000 square feet)	3.3	3.330	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3
	b). in Southeast Alaska or similar maritime environments	3.3	1.665	1.7	3.3	2.3	2.5
	c). other projects with the Borough or local or state government agencies;	1.4	0.950	1.0	0.5	1.0	1.0
	d). using CM/GC project delivery approach;	1.4	0.950	1.0	1.0	0.7	1.0
	e). involving value-engineering;	1.0	0.475	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.7
	f). using life-cycle cost estimating intended to promote value in terms of asset life; operations; and maintenance and repair;	1.4	0.950	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
	g). involving commissioning (a quality-oriented process for achieving, verifying, and documenting that the performance of facilities, systems, and assemblies meets defined objectives and criteria);	1.4	0.950	1.0	0.5	1.4	1.0
	h). including procurement of furnishings and moveable equipment; and	1.4	0.950	1.0	1.0	1.4	1.1
	i). involving stakeholders and/or a Building Committee in the design process	1.0	0.475	1.0	0.5	1.0	0.8
Total Score for Item 1:	15.7	10.7	11.6	11.4	12.5	12.4	

BCRA Design

EVALUATION CRITERIA - USE THE FOLLOWING POINT VALUES 0=Does not meet criterion, 5=Partially meets criterion, 10=Meets criterion, 15=Exceeds criterion BCRA Design		1	2	3	4	5	Average
2	Character, integrity, reputation, and judgment of the firm and project team. The maximum total score on this component is 20 points. A maximum of 3.33 points is available for each of the criteria set out in a) through c). A maximum of 10 points is available for the element set out in d). The criteria in a) through d) will be measured in terms of litigation and claims against professional liability insurance, whether the prime firm and members of the A/E team (when combined) have, during the past ten years:						
	a). During the past 10 years had claims filed (past, pending, or anticipated) against errors and omissions insurance (or other professional liability insurance); (0 points for 3 or more claims; 5 points for 2 claims; 10 points for 1 claim; and 15 points for 0 claims).	3.3	3.330	3.3	2.2	-	2.4
	b). During the past 10 years had lawsuits filed (past or anticipated) alleging professional negligence or other liability in any projects same scoring system as in 2a);	3.3	2.220	1.1	2.2	-	1.8
	c). During the past 10 years have filed lawsuits or formal claims against owners for which the firm or team members provided professional services (same scoring system as in 2a); and	3.3	2.220	3.3	2.2	-	2.2
	d). This criterion involves evaluation of the respondent's philosophy, skill, and experience in avoiding and dealing with disputes, claims, and litigation (discretion is afforded to the PRT in evaluating this element; a maximum of 10 points is allowed, the score for this element will be entered in the far-right column).	-	5.000	10.0	10.0	-	5.0
	Total Score for Item 2:	10.0	12.8	17.8	16.7	-	11.4
3	Performance regarding budget and schedule control on prior contracts. The maximum total score on this component is 10 points. The criteria are set out in a) and b):						
	a). 90% of the construction projects for which Architectural and Engineering Design Services have been provided have been completed within budget; and	3.4	3.360	3.4	1.7	5.0	3.4
	b). 90% of construction projects for which Architectural and Engineering Design Services have been provided have been completed on schedule.	3.3	3.330	3.3	1.7	5.0	3.3
	Total Score for Item 3:	6.7	6.7	6.7	3.3	10.0	6.7

BCRA Design

EVALUATION CRITERIA - USE THE FOLLOWING POINT VALUES 0=Does not meet criterion, 5=Partially meets criterion, 10=Meets criterion, 15=Exceeds criterion BCRA Design		1	2	3	4	5	Average
4	Whether the respondent has the capacity to meet the Borough's goals set out in Section 1.2 and to complete the scope of work outlined in Section 3 of this RFP within the target dates specified. The maximum total score on this component is 20 points. The criteria will be judged whether the respondent:						
	a). has provided a persuasive explanation that the A/E team members have the capacity to provide Architectural and Engineering Design services for this project within the times specified;	4.0	2.670	2.7	2.7	1.9	2.8
	b). has offered a credible statement the firm will help the Borough achieve the project goals outlined in Section 1.2 of this RFP;	4.0	2.660	2.7	2.7	1.3	2.7
	c). provided a realistic plan and schedule to meet all elements of the project scope;	4.0	2.660	1.3	1.3	1.3	2.1
	d). has convincingly stated the capacity, availability and accessibility of A/E team to perform work for this Ketchikan Aquatic Center project; and	4.0	2.660	2.7	1.3	1.3	2.4
	e). has a level of contractual or other obligations for other projects such that there is a reasonable likelihood that the respondent would be able to properly perform A/E design services for the Aquatic Center project on time and within budget	4.0	1.330	2.7	2.7	1.9	2.5
	Total Score for Item 4:	20.0	12.0	12.0	10.7	7.7	12.5
5	Project approach to successfully design the project in accordance with project goals. The maximum total score on this component is 20 points. These criteria are measured in terms of whether the respondent has provided a plan to ensure that:						
	a). Approach to work plan so project is designed and delivered in accordance with project goals	5.0	3.340	3.3	3.3	1.7	3.3
	b). Coordination with stakeholders and public during development of design for Aquatic Center;	5.0	3.330	3.3	1.7	1.7	3.0
	c). Cost and Schedule control	5.0	3.330	3.3	1.7	1.7	3.0
	d). Quality Control/Quality Assurance Procedures	5.0	3.330	3.3	1.7	3.3	3.3
	Total Score for Item 5:	20.0	13.3	13.3	8.3	8.3	12.7
6	Familiarity with the details of the project. The maximum total score on this component is 10 points.						
	a). This criterion is determined on the basis of the respondent's understanding the elements of the project	10.0	6.670	6.7	6.7	6.7	7.3
	Total Score for Item 6:	10.0	6.7	6.7	6.7	6.7	7.3
Total Weighted Score for All Categories:		82.3	62.1	68.1	57.1	45.3	63.0

ORB Architects

EVALUATION CRITERIA - USE THE FOLLOWING POINT VALUES 0=Does not meet criterion, 5 =Partially meets criterion, 10=Meets criterion, 15=Exceeds criterion ORB Architects		1	2	3	4	5	Average
1	<p>Experience of the "A/E Design Team" (i.e., architectural designers, engineering team and other professional staff members).</p> <p>The maximum total score on this component is 20 points.</p> <p>Proposals will be measured in terms of whether project team members have held roles similar to the one planned for the Aquatic Center project for projects that meet the criteria in a) through i) below.</p> <p>A/E experience with swimming pools is critical. Recognition of the particular challenges presented by the climate in Ketchikan are also crucial.</p>						
	a). of similar scope (e.g., swimming pools, aquatic centers and expansion of existing facilities); similar cost (\$23.5 million), similar size (34,000 to 35,000 square feet)	3.3	4.995	5.0	3.3	3.3	4.0
	b). in Southeast Alaska or similar maritime environments	3.3	4.995	1.7	3.3	2.3	3.1
	c). other projects with the Borough or local or state government agencies;	1.0	0.950	1.0	1.0	0.5	0.9
	d). using CM/GC project delivery approach;	1.4	0.950	1.0	0.5	-	0.8
	e). involving value-engineering;	-	0.950	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.8
	f). using life-cycle cost estimating intended to promote value in terms of asset life; operations; and maintenance and repair;	-	0.950	1.0	1.0	-	0.6
	g). involving commissioning (a quality-oriented process for achieving, verifying, and documenting that the performance of facilities, systems, and assemblies meets defined objectives and criteria);	-	0.950	1.0	0.5	0.2	0.5
	h). including procurement of furnishings and moveable equipment; and	-	0.475	0.5	0.5	-	0.3
	i). involving stakeholders and/or a Building Committee in the design process	1.0	0.950	1.0	0.5	1.0	0.9
Total Score for Item 1:	10.0	16.2	12.8	11.4	8.2	11.7	

ORB Architects

EVALUATION CRITERIA - USE THE FOLLOWING POINT VALUES 0=Does not meet criterion, 5=Partially meets criterion, 10=Meets criterion, 15=Exceeds criterion ORB Architects		1	2	3	4	5	Average
2	Character, integrity, reputation, and judgment of the firm and project team. The maximum total score on this component is 20 points. A maximum of 3.33 points is available for each of the criteria set out in a) through c). A maximum of 10 points is available for the element set out in d). The criteria in a) through d) will be measured in terms of litigation and claims against professional liability insurance, whether the prime firm and members of the A/E team (when combined) have, during the past ten years:						
	a). During the past 10 years had claims filed (past, pending, or anticipated) against errors and omissions insurance (or other professional liability insurance); (0 points for 3 or more claims; 5 points for 2 claims; 10 points for 1 claim; and 15 points for 0 claims).	3.3	3.330	1.1	3.3	3.3	2.9
	b). During the past 10 years had lawsuits filed (past or anticipated) alleging professional negligence or other liability in any projects same scoring system as in 2a);	3.3	3.330	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3
	c). During the past 10 years have filed lawsuits or formal claims against owners for which the firm or team members provided professional services (same scoring system as in 2a); and	3.3	3.330	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3
	d). This criterion involves evaluation of the respondent's philosophy, skill, and experience in avoiding and dealing with disputes, claims, and litigation (discretion is afforded to the PRT in evaluating this element; a maximum of 10 points is allowed, the score for this element will be entered in the far-right column).	8.0	10.000	10.0	10.0	10.0	9.6
	Total Score for Item 2:	18.0	20.0	17.8	20.0	20.0	19.1
3	Performance regarding budget and schedule control on prior contracts. The maximum total score on this component is 10 points. The criteria are set out in a) and b):						
	a). 90% of the construction projects for which Architectural and Engineering Design Services have been provided have been completed within budget; and	5.0	3.360	3.4	3.4	1.7	3.4
	b). 90% of construction projects for which Architectural and Engineering Design Services have been provided have been completed on schedule.	5.0	3.330	3.3	3.3	1.7	3.3
	Total Score for Item 3:	10.0	6.7	6.7	6.7	3.3	6.7

EVALUATION CRITERIA - USE THE FOLLOWING POINT VALUES 0=Does not meet criterion, 5=Partially meets criterion, 10=Meets criterion, 15=Exceeds criterion ORB Architects		1	2	3	4	5	Average
4	Whether the respondent has the capacity to meet the Borough's goals set out in Section 1.2 and to complete the scope of work outlined in Section 3 of this RFP within the target dates specified. The maximum total score on this component is 20 points. The criteria will be judged whether the respondent:						
	a). has provided a persuasive explanation that the A/E team members have the capacity to provide Architectural and Engineering Design services for this project within the times specified;	2.7	4.005	2.7	1.3	1.3	2.4
	b). has offered a credible statement the firm will help the Borough achieve the project goals outlined in Section 1.2 of this RFP;	4.0	3.990	2.7	1.3	-	2.4
	c). provided a realistic plan and schedule to meet all elements of the project scope;	4.0	2.660	1.3	2.7	-	2.1
	d). has convincingly stated the capacity, availability and accessibility of A/E team to perform work for this Ketchikan Aquatic Center project; and	2.7	2.660	1.3	1.3	-	1.6
	e). has a level of contractual or other obligations for other projects such that there is a reasonable likelihood that the respondent would be able to properly perform A/E design services for the Aquatic Center project on time and within budget	4.0	2.660	2.7	2.7	1.3	2.7
	Total Score for Item 4:	17.3	16.0	10.7	9.3	2.7	11.2
5	Project approach to successfully design the project in accordance with project goals. The maximum total score on this component is 20 points. These criteria are measured in terms of whether the respondent has provided a plan to ensure that:						
	a). Approach to work plan so project is designed and delivered in accordance with project goals	5.0	3.340	1.7	3.3	0.7	2.8
	b). Coordination with stakeholders and public during development of design for Aquatic Center;	5.0	3.330	1.7	1.7	3.3	3.0
	c). Cost and Schedule control	5.0	3.330	3.3	1.7	-	2.7
	d). Quality Control/Quality Assurance Procedures	5.0	3.330	3.3	3.3	-	3.0
	Total Score for Item 5:	20.0	13.3	10.0	10.0	4.0	11.5
6	Familiarity with the details of the project. The maximum total score on this component is 10 points.						
	a). This criterion is determined on the basis of the respondent's understanding the elements of the project	6.7	10.005	6.7	6.7	-	6.0
	Total Score for Item 6:	6.7	10.0	6.7	6.7	-	6.0
Total Weighted Score for All Categories:		82.0	82.2	64.6	64.1	38.2	66.2

MRV Architects

EVALUATION CRITERIA - USE THE FOLLOWING POINT VALUES 0=Does not meet criterion, 5 =Partially meets criterion, 10=Meets criterion, 15=Exceeds criterion MRV Architects		1	2	3	4	5	Average
1	Experience of the "A/E Design Team" (i.e., architectural designers, engineering team and other professional staff members). The maximum total score on this component is 20 points. Proposals will be measured in terms of whether project team members have held roles similar to the one planned for the Aquatic Center project for projects that meet the criteria in a) through i) below. A/E experience with swimming pools is critical. Recognition of the particular challenges presented by the climate in Ketchikan are also crucial.						
	a). of similar scope (e.g., swimming pools, aquatic centers and expansion of existing facilities); similar cost (\$23.5 million), similar size (34,000 to 35,000 square feet)	5.0	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.7
	b). in Southeast Alaska or similar maritime environments	5.0	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.7
	c). other projects with the Borough or local or state government agencies;	1.4	1.4	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.1
	d). using CM/GC project delivery approach;	1.4	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
	e). involving value-engineering;	1.4	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
	f). using life-cycle cost estimating intended to promote value in terms of asset life; operations; and maintenance and repair;	1.4	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
	g). involving commissioning (a quality-oriented process for achieving, verifying, and documenting that the performance of facilities, systems, and assemblies meets defined objectives and criteria);	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
	h). including procurement of furnishings and moveable equipment; and	1.4	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
	i). involving stakeholders and/or a Building Committee in the design process	1.4	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Total Score for Item 1:		19.5	13.8	13.3	13.3	13.3	14.6

MRV Architects

EVALUATION CRITERIA - USE THE FOLLOWING POINT VALUES 0=Does not meet criterion, 5=Partially meets criterion, 10=Meets criterion, 15=Exceeds criterion MRV Architects		1	2	3	4	5	Average
2	Character, integrity, reputation, and judgment of the firm and project team. The maximum total score on this component is 20 points. A maximum of 3.33 points is available for each of the criteria set out in a) through c). A maximum of 10 points is available for the element set out in d). The criteria in a) through d) will be measured in terms of litigation and claims against professional liability insurance, whether the prime firm and members of the A/E team (when combined) have, during the past ten years:						
	a). During the past 10 years had claims filed (past, pending, or anticipated) against errors and omissions insurance (or other professional liability insurance); (0 points for 3 or more claims; 5 points for 2 claims; 10 points for 1 claim; and 15 points for 0 claims).	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	2.2	3.1
	b). During the past 10 years had lawsuits filed (past or anticipated) alleging professional negligence or other liability in any projects same scoring system as in 2a);	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3
	c). During the past 10 years have filed lawsuits or formal claims against owners for which the firm or team members provided professional services (same scoring system as in 2a); and	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	2.2	3.1
	d). This criterion involves evaluation of the respondent's philosophy, skill, and experience in avoiding and dealing with disputes, claims, and litigation (discretion is afforded to the PRT in evaluating this element; a maximum of 10 points is allowed, the score for this element will be entered in the far-right column).	8.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	9.6
	Total Score for Item 2:	18.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	17.8	19.1
3	Performance regarding budget and schedule control on prior contracts. The maximum total score on this component is 10 points. The criteria are set out in a) and b):						
	a). 90% of the construction projects for which Architectural and Engineering Design Services have been provided have been completed within budget; and	5.0	3.4	3.4	5.0	3.4	4.0
	b). 90% of construction projects for which Architectural and Engineering Design Services have been provided have been completed on schedule.	3.3	3.3	3.3	5.0	3.3	3.7
	Total Score for Item 3:	8.4	6.7	6.7	10.0	6.7	7.7

MRV Architects

EVALUATION CRITERIA - USE THE FOLLOWING POINT VALUES 0=Does not meet criterion, 5 =Partially meets criterion, 10=Meets criterion, 15=Exceeds criterion MRV Architects		1	2	3	4	5	Average
4	Whether the respondent has the capacity to meet the Borough's goals set out in Section 1.2 and to complete the scope of work outlined in Section 3 of this RFP within the target dates specified. The maximum total score on this component is 20 points. The criteria will be judged whether the respondent:						
	a). has provided a persuasive explanation that the A/E team members have the capacity to provide Architectural and Engineering Design services for this project within the times specified;	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7
	b). has offered a credible statement the firm will help the Borough achieve the project goals outlined in Section 1.2 of this RFP;	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7
	c). provided a realistic plan and schedule to meet all elements of the project scope;	2.7	2.7	1.3	4.0	2.7	2.7
	d). has convincingly stated the capacity, availability and accessibility of A/E team to perform work for this Ketchikan Aquatic Center project; and	4.0	2.7	2.7	4.0	2.7	3.2
	e). has a level of contractual or other obligations for other projects such that there is a reasonable likelihood that the respondent would be able to properly perform A/E design services for the Aquatic Center project on time and within budget	4.0	2.7	2.7	2.7	1.9	2.8
	Total Score for Item 4:	16.0	13.3	12.0	16.0	12.5	13.9
5	Project approach to successfully design the project in accordance with project goals. The maximum total score on this component is 20 points. These criteria are measured in terms of whether the respondent has provided a plan to ensure that:						
	a). Approach to work plan so project is designed and delivered in accordance with project goals	5.0	5.0	3.3	3.3	3.3	4.0
	b). Coordination with stakeholders and public during development of design for Aquatic Center;	5.0	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.7
	c). Cost and Schedule control	5.0	3.3	3.3	3.3	1.7	3.3
	d). Quality Control/Quality Assurance Procedures	5.0	3.3	1.7	3.3	1.7	3.0
	Total Score for Item 5:	20.0	15.0	11.7	13.3	10.0	14.0
6	Familiarity with the details of the project. The maximum total score on this component is 10 points.						
	a). This criterion is determined on the basis of the respondent's understanding the elements of the project	10.0	6.7	6.7	10.0	6.7	8.0
	Total Score for Item 6:	10.0	6.7	6.7	10.0	6.7	8.0
Total Weighted Score for All Categories:		91.8	75.4	70.3	82.6	67.0	77.4