

FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

ARCHITECT/ENGINEER SELECTION
COMBINED CONSENSUS SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description	Tri-Cities Military Readiness Center
Project Number	2018-586
Name of Selection Panel Chair	Dave Hickman

PHASE 1		Date 5/22/2020		Number of Submitting Firms			4	
Firms	Panelist Names						TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE	RANK ORDER
	Dave Hickman	Jeff Gonzalez	Ron Cross	Brad Olson	Garner Miller			
	total weighted	total weighted	total weighted	total weighted	total weighted			
1 Absher - WJA	96	95	88	90	93		461	1
2 Bouten - Mead & Hunt	77	80	64	71	84		375	4
3 Fowler - TVA	85	81	69	75	86		396	3
4 Garco - BWA	93	94	72	88	90		436	2
5 Jackson - Architects West	67	61	52	54	65		299	Withdrawn
6								
7								
8								
9								
10								
20								
PHASE 2		DATE: 8/8/2020		Number of Firms Interviewed			3	
Firms	RANK ORDER OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS						TOTAL ASSIGNED RANKS	FINAL RANK ORDER
	Dave Hickman	Jeff Gonzalez	Ron Cross	Brad Olson	Garner Miller			
1 Absher - WJA	80	80	69	75	73		376	1
2 Garco - BWA	81	82	70	75	78		386	2
3 Fowler - TVA	88	93	80	80	85		425	3
4								
FULL PROCUREMENT								
Firms	RANK ORDER OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS						TOTAL ASSIGNED RANKS	FINAL RANK ORDER
	Dave Hickman	Jeff Gonzalez	Ron Cross	Brad Olson	Garner Miller			
1 Absher - WJA	88.65	84	77	68	77		395	2
2 Garco - BWA	85.05	87	67	67	81		386	1
3 Fowler - TVA	92.7	93	78	73	83		419	3
4								

SELECTION PANEL REACHED CONSENSUS:

Dave Hickman 8/26/20
 Dave Hickman


Jeff Gonzalez
 Jeff Gonzalez
Brad Olson
 Brad Olson

Garner Miller 8/26/20
 Garner Miller



FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES
ARCHITECT/ENGINEER SELECTION
PHASE I SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description Tri-Cities Military Readiness Center	
Date of Evaluation	Project Number 2018-586
Name of Committee Member Dave Hickman	

CRITERIA	Proposed Team	Relevant Experience	Project Approach	Safety	Financial Capacity	TOTAL SCORE	RANK ORDER
	Maximum Score	35	35	25	5		
1 Absher - WJA	34	34	23	5	Pass X <i>D.H.H.</i>	96	1
2 Bouten - Mead & Hunt	25	28	20	4	Pass X <i>D.H.H.</i>	77	4
3 Fowler - TVA	29	30	22	4	Pass X <i>D.H.H.</i>	85	3
4 Garco - BWA	32	33	24	4	Pass X <i>D.H.H.</i>	93	2
5 Jackson - Architects West	22	25	16	4	Pass X <i>D.H.H.</i>	67	5
6					There was a misunderstanding in the interpretation of the information presented by the submitters.		
7							
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							

COMMENTS:

Dave Hickman
 Dave Hickman

5/22/2020
 Date

FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES
ARCHITECT/ENGINEER SELECTION
PHASE I SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description Tri-Cities Military Readiness Center	
Date of Evaluation	Project Number 2018-586
Name of Committee Member Jeff Gonzalez	

CRITERIA	Proposed Team	Relevant Experience	Project Approach	Safety	Financial Capacity		TOTAL SCORE	RANK ORDER
							Maximum Score	
	35	35	25	5	Pass/Fail		100	
1 Absher - WJA	33	34	23	5	Pass		95	1
2 Bouten - Mead & Hunt	27	27	21	5	Pass		80	4
3 Fowler - TVA	28	28	21	4	Pass		81	3
4 Garco - BWA	33	33	24	4	Pass		94	2
5 Jackson - Architects West	21	21	15	4	Pass		61	5
6								
7								
8								
9								
10								
11								
12								
13								
14								
15								
16								
17								
18								
19								
20								

COMMENTS:


Jeff Gonzalez

5/22/2020
Date

FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES
ARCHITECT/ENGINEER SELECTION
PHASE I SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description Tri-Cities Military Readiness Center	
Date of Evaluation	Project Number 2018-586
Name of Committee Member Brad Olson	

CRITERIA	Proposed Team	Relevant Experience	Project Approach	Safety	Financial Capacity	TOTAL SCORE	RANK ORDER
	Maximum Score	35	35	25	5		
1 Absher - WJA	32	32	22	4	Fail Pass 300	90	1
2 Bouten - Mead & Hunt	25	25	18	3	Fail Pass 700	71	4
3 Fowler - TVA	26	26	20	3	Fail Pass 250	75	3
4 Garco - BWA	30	32	22	4	Fail Pass 100	88	2
5 Jackson - Architects West	18	18	15	3	Fail Pass 200	54	5
6							
7							
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							

COMMENTS:


Brad Olson

5/22/2020
Date

FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES
ARCHITECT/ENGINEER SELECTION
PHASE I SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description Tri-Cities Military Readiness Center	
Date of Evaluation	Project Number 2018-586
Name of Committee Member Ron Cross	

CRITERIA	Proposed Team	Relevant Experience	Project Approach	Safety	Financial Capacity	TOTAL SCORE	RANK ORDER
Maximum Score	35	35	25	5	Pass/Fail	100	
1 Absher - WJA	30	30	23	5	RC F P	88	1
2 Bouten - Mead & Hunt	20	20	20	4	RC F P	64	4
3 Fowler - TVA	25	20	20	4	RC F P	69	3
4 Garco - BWA	25	25	18	4	RC F P	72	2
5 Jackson - Architects West	15	15	18	4	P F RC	52	5
6							
7							
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
COMMENTS:							

Ron Cross 

Date

FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES
ARCHITECT/ENGINEER SELECTION
PHASE I SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description Tri-Cities Military Readiness Center	
Date of Evaluation 5/21/2020	Project Number 2018-586
Name of Committee Member Garner Miller	

CRITERIA	Proposed Team	Relevant Experience	Project Approach	Safety	Financial Capacity	TOTAL SCORE	RANK ORDER
	Maximum Score	35	35	25	5		
1 Absher - WJA	33	33	22	5	P	93	1
2 Bouten - Mead & Hunt	25	33	22	4	P	84	4
3 Fowler - TVA	29	29	24	4	P	86	3
4 Garco - BWA	30	32	24	4	P	90	2
5 Jackson - Architects West	21	25	15	4	P	65	5
6							
7							
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							

COMMENTS:


Garner Miller

5-21-2020
Date

DESIGN BUILDER SELECTION
PHASE II SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description Tri-Cities Military Readiness Center	
Date of Evaluation 8/8/2020	Project Number 2018-586
Name of Selection Panel Member Dave Hickman	

PROPOSAL EVALUATION PROCESS

The Evaluation Committee 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 Proposed Design-Build Team's understanding of the delivery method;
- B. The degree to which the Proposed Design-Build Team understands the Owner's/DES' goals and objectives with respect to the Project; and
- C. The strength of the Proposed Design-Build Team's management plan for the Project, including not only the specific topics and specialized components outlined in the RFP or discussed in the Interactive Meeting but also any other component or element that the Proposed Design-Build Team deems essential to the based on each panelists raw scores of 0 to 100 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 submissions. The Selection Panel will then use the following guidelines to evaluate the submissions for each Selection Criterion. Weighting assigned in the RFQ and any addenda will calculate points based on each panelists raw scores of 0 to 100. 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

SCORING CRITERIA	Weighting	Absher - WJA		Garco - BWA		Fowler - TVA	
		RAW SCORE	Weighted Score	RAW SCORE	Weighted Score	RAW SCORE	Weighted Score
PROPOSAL AND DESIGN SOLUTION How well does the proposed design solution meet the program and technical approach to the design solution? How well does the design solution demonstrate long term value and low life cycle costs to the State of Washington, Washington Military Department, and the Department of Enterprise Services?	30%	55	17	65	20	80	28
OVERALL MANAGEMENT APPROACH How does the proposal show ability to meet time and budget requirements. Proposal identifies risks and challenges to the project and for each issue or challenge describe how to mitigate its potential negative impacts and any other unique approaches or strength to implement such mitigation strategies.	10%	70	7	90	9	95	10
OPERATIONS, MAINTENANCE, ENERGY PERFORMANCE, SUSTAINABILITY How well does the proposed design solution demonstrate innovative sustainable design strategies for energy efficiency in operations and maintenance	20%	90	18	75	15	85	17
ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL A. How well does the proposed team demonstrate the skill and competence in high performance design and construction and its understanding of the DES overall goals for the project? B. Provide table to confirm availability of proposed Design Build Team to perform the project.	20%	95	19	95	19	95	19
PAST PERFORMANCE ON SIMILAR PROJECTS	20%	95	19	90	18	90	18
FINANCIAL CAPACITY Provide one copy of bonding and insurance statements in a sealed envelope marked "Confidential Financial Materials in Response to RFQ"	PASS/FAIL	PASS		PASS		PASS	
DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN (indicate included or not included)	Not Scored	X		X		X	
TOTAL SCORE	100%	405	80	415	81	445	92
FINAL RANK ORDER			1		2		3
COMMENTS:							
FULL PROCUREMENT							
1. SOQ (Phase 1)	15%	96	14.4	93	13.95	85	12.75
2. PROPOSAL (Phase 2)	40%	80	32	81	32.4	92	36.8
3. PROPRIETARY MTG / INTERVIEW	35%	95	33.25	82	28.7	95	33.25
4. CONTRACT AMOUNT	10%	90	7	100	10	99	9.9
TOTAL SCORES	100%	361	86.65	356	85.05	371	92.7

Dave Hickman 8/21/2020

Committee Member's Signature

FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

DESIGN BUILDER SELECTION
PHASE II SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description Tri-Cities Military Readiness Center	
Date of Evaluation 8/21/2020	Project Number 2018-586
Name of Selection Panel Member Jeff Gonzalez	

PROPOSAL EVALUATION PROCESS

The Evaluation Committee 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 Proposed Design-Build Team's understanding of the delivery method;
- B. The degree to which the Proposed Design-Build Team understands the Owner's/DES' goals and objectives with respect to the Project; and
- C. The strength of the Proposed Design-Build Team's management plan for the Project, including not only the specific topics and specialized components outlined in the RFP or discussed in the Interactive Meeting but also any other component or element that the Proposed Design-Build Team deems essential to the based on each panelists raw scores of 0 to 100 success of the Project.

SCORING CRITERIA	Weighting	Absher - WJA		Garco - BWA		Fowler - TVA	
		RAW SCORE	Weighted Score	RAW SCORE	Weighted Score	RAW SCORE	Weighted Score
PROPOSAL AND DESIGN SOLUTION	30%	60	18	75	23	95	29
How well does the proposed design solution meet the program and technical approach to the design solution? How well does the design solution demonstrate long term value and low life cycle costs to the State of Washington, Washington Military Department, and the Department of Enterprise Services?							
OVERALL MANAGEMENT APPROACH	10%	60	6	75	8	90	9
How does the proposal show ability to meet time and budget requirements.							
Proposal identifies risks and challenges to the project and for each issue or challenge describe how to mitigate its potential negative impacts and any other unique approaches or strength to implement such mitigation strategies.							
OPERATIONS, MAINTENANCE, ENERGY PERFORMANCE, SUSTAINABILITY	20%	90	18	80	16	90	18
How well does the proposed design solution demonstrate innovative sustainable design strategies for energy efficiency in operations and maintenance							
ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL	20%	95	19	95	19	95	19
A. How well does the proposed team demonstrate the skill and competence in high performance design and construction and its understanding of the DES overall goals for the project? B. Provide table to confirm availability of proposed Design Build Team to perform the project.							
PAST PERFORMANCE ON SIMILAR PROJECTS	20%	95	19	85	17	90	18
FINANCIAL CAPACITY	PASS/FAIL	Pass		Pass		PASS	
Provide one copy of bonding and insurance statements in a sealed envelope marked "Confidential Financial Materials in Response to RFQ"							
DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN (indicate included or not included)	Not Scored	X		X		X	
TOTAL SCORE	100%	400	80	410	82	460	93
FINAL RANK ORDER			1		2		3
COMMENTS:							
FULL PROCUREMENT							
1. SOQ (Phase 1)	15%	95	14	94	14	81	12
2. PROPOSAL (Phase 2)	40%	80	32	82	33	93	37
3. PROPRIETARY MTG / INTERVIEW	35%	90	32	85	30	95	33
4. CONTRACT AMOUNT	10%	60	6	100	10	100	10
TOTAL SCORES	100%	325	84	361	87	369	93

SCORING GUIDELINES

In evaluating each of the criteria, the Selection Panel will identify significant and minor strengths and weaknesses from the submissions. The Selection Panel will then use the following guidelines to evaluate the submissions for each Selection Criterion. Weighting assigned in the RFQ and any addenda will calculate points based on each panelists raw scores of 0 to 100. 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.



Committee Member's Signature

DESIGN BUILDER SELECTION
PHASE II SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description Tri-Cities Military Readiness Center	
Date of Evaluation 8-21-20 8/21/2020	Project Number 2018-586
Name of Selection Panel Member Brad Olson	

PROPOSAL EVALUATION PROCESS

The Evaluation Committee 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 Proposed Design-Build Team's understanding of the delivery method;
- B. The degree to which the Proposed Design-Build Team understands the Owner's/DES' goals and objectives with respect to the Project; and
- C. The strength of the Proposed Design-Build Team's management plan for the Project, including not only the specific topics and specialized components outlined in the RFP or discussed in the Interactive Meeting but also any other component or element that the Proposed Design-Build Team deems essential to the based on each panelists raw scores of 0 to 100 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 submissions. The Selection Panel will then use the following guidelines to evaluate the submissions for each Selection Criterion. Weighting assigned in the RFQ and any addenda will calculate points based on each panelists raw scores of 0 to 100. 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.

 8/21/20

Committee Member's Signature

SCORING CRITERIA	Weighting	Absher - WJA		Garco - BWA		Fowler - TVA	
		RAW SCORE	Weighted Score	RAW SCORE	Weighted Score	RAW SCORE	Weighted Score
PROPOSAL AND DESIGN SOLUTION 70	30%	70	21	75	23	80	24
OVERALL MANAGEMENT APPROACH How does the proposal show ability to meet time and budget requirements. Proposal identifies risks and challenges to the project and for each issue or challenge describy how to mitigage tis potential negative impacts and any other unique approaches or strenght to implement such mitigation stratigies.	10%	75	8	75	8	80	8
OPERATIONS, MAINTENANCE, ENERGY PERFORMANCE, SUSTAINABILITY How well does the proposed design solution demonstrate innovative sustainable design strategies for energy effecienci in operations and maintenance	20%	65	13	70	14	75	15
ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL A. How well does the proposed team demonstrate the skill and competence in high performance design and constrution and its understanding of the DES overall goals for the project? B. Provide table to confirm availability of proposed Design Build Team to perform the project.	20%	80	16	75	15	80	16
PAST PERFORMANCE ON SIMILAR PROJECTS	20%	85	17	80	16	87	17
FINANCIAL CAPACITY Provide one copy of bonding and insurance statements in a sealed envelope marked "Confidential Financial Materials in Response to RFQ"	PASS/FAIL	Pass		PASS		PASS	
DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN (indicate included or not included)	Not Scored	X		X		X	
TOTAL SCORE	100%	375	75	375	75	402	80
FINAL RANK ORDER			1		2		3
COMMENTS:							
FULL PROCUREMENT							
1. SOQ (Phase 1)	15%	90	14	88	13	75	11
2. PROPOSAL (Phase 2)	40%	70	28	70	28	80	32
3. PROPRIETARY MTG / INTERVIEW	35%	75	26	70	25	80	28
4. CONTRACT AMOUNT	10%	7	1	10	1	8	1
TOTAL SCORES	100%	242	68	238	67	243	72

FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

DESIGN BUILDER SELECTION
PHASE II SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description Tri-Cities Military Readiness Center	
Date of Evaluation 8/8/2020	Project Number 2018-586
Name of Selection Panel Member Ron Cross	

SCORING CRITERIA	Weighting	Absher - WJA		Garco - BWA		Fowler - TVA	
		RAW SCORE	Weighted Score	RAW SCORE	Weighted Score	RAW SCORE	Weighted Score
PROPOSAL AND DESIGN SOLUTION How well does the proposed design solution meet the program and technical approach to the design solution? How well does the design solution demonstrate long term value and low life cycle costs to the State of Washington, Washington Military Department, and the Department of Enterprise Services?	30%	30	9	60	18	80	24
OVERALL MANAGEMENT APPROACH How does the proposal show ability to meet time and budget requirements. Proposal identifies risks and challenges to the project and for each issue or challenge describe how to mitigate its potential negative impacts and any other unique approaches or strength to implement such mitigation strategies.	10%	80	8	80	8	80	8
OPERATIONS, MAINTENANCE, ENERGY PERFORMANCE, SUSTAINABILITY How well does the proposed design solution demonstrate innovative sustainable design strategies for energy efficiency in operations and maintenance	20%	70	14	70	14	80	16
ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL A. How well does the proposed team demonstrate the skill and competence in high performance design and construction and its understanding of the DES overall goals for the project? B. Provide table to confirm availability of proposed Design Build Team to perform the project.	20%	90	18	80	16	80	16
PAST PERFORMANCE ON SIMILAR PROJECTS	20%	100	20	70	14	80	16
FINANCIAL CAPACITY Provide one copy of bonding and insurance statements in a sealed envelope marked "Confidential Financial Materials in Response to RFQ"	PASS/FAIL	Pass		FAIL		PASS	
DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN (indicate included or not included)	Not Scored	X		X		X	
TOTAL SCORE	100%	370	69	360	70	400	80
FINAL RANK ORDER			1		2		3
COMMENTS:							
FULL PROCUREMENT							
1. SOQ (Phase 1)	15%	88	13	72	11	69	10
2. PROPOSAL (Phase2)	40%	69	28	70	28	80	32
3. PROPRIETARY MTG / INTERVIEW	35%	80	28	60	21	80	28
4. CONTRACT AMOUNT	10%	80	8	70	7	80	8
TOTAL SCORES	100%	317	77	272	67	309	78

PROPOSAL EVALUATION PROCESS

The Evaluation Committee 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 Proposed Design-Build Team's understanding of the delivery method;
- B. The degree to which the Proposed Design-Build Team understands the Owner's/DES' goals and objectives with respect to the Project; and
- C. The strength of the Proposed Design-Build Team's management plan for the Project, including not only the specific topics and specialized components outlined in the RFP or discussed in the Interactive Meeting but also any other component or element that the Proposed Design-Build Team deems essential to the based on each panelists raw scores of 0 to 100 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 submissions. The Selection Panel will then use the following guidelines to evaluate the submissions for each Selection Criterion. Weighting assigned in the RFQ and any addenda will calculate points based on each panelists raw scores of 0 to 100. 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.



Committee Member's Signature

DESIGN BUILDER SELECTION
PHASE II SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description Tri-Cities Military Readiness Center	
Date of Evaluation 88/8/2020	Project Number 2018-586
Name of Selection Panel Member Garner Miller	

PROPOSAL EVALUATION PROCESS

The Evaluation Committee 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 Proposed Design-Build Team's understanding of the delivery method;
- B. The degree to which the Proposed Design-Build Team understands the Owner's/DES' goals and objectives with respect to the Project; and
- C. The strength of the Proposed Design-Build Team's management plan for the Project, including not only the specific topics and specialized components outlined in the RFP or discussed in the Interactive Meeting but also any other component or element that the Proposed Design-Build Team deems essential to the based on each panelists raw scores of 0 to 100 success of the Project.

SCORING CRITERIA	Weighting	Absher - WJA		Garco - BWA		Fowler - TVA	
		RAW SCORE	Weighted Score	RAW SCORE	Weighted Score	RAW SCORE	Weighted Score
PROPOSAL AND DESIGN SOLUTION How well does the proposed design solution meet the program and technical approach to the design solution? How well does the design solution demonstrate long term value and low life cycle costs to the State of Washington, Washington Military Department, and the Department of Enterprise Services?	30%	50	15	75	23	90	27
OVERALL MANAGEMENT APPROACH How does the proposal show ability to meet time and budget requirements. Proposal identifies risks and challenges to the project and for each issue or challenge describy how to mitigage tis potential negative impacts and any other unique approaches or strenght to implement such mitigation stratigies.	10%	60	6	75	8	80	8
OPERATIONS, MAINTENANCE, ENERGY PERFORMANCE, SUSTAINABILITY How well does the proposed design solution demonstrate innovative sustainable design strategies for energy effeciencis in operations and maintenance	20%	80	16	75	15	85	17
ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL A. How well does the proposed team demonstrate the skill and competence in high performance design and constrution and its understanding of the DES overall goals for the project? B. Provide table to confirm availability of proposed Design Build Team to perform the project.	20%	90	18	85	17	85	17
PAST PERFORMANCE ON SIMILAR PROJECTS	20%	90	18	80	16	80	16
FINANCIAL CAPACITY Provide one copy of bonding and insurance statements in a sealed envelope marked "Confidential Financial Materials in Response to RFQ"	PASS/FAIL	Pass		Pass		PASS	
DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN (indicate included or not included)	Not Scored	X		X		x	
TOTAL SCORE	100%	370	73	390	78	420	85
FINAL RANK ORDER			3		2		1
COMMENTS:							
FULL PROCUREMENT							
1. SOQ (Phase 1)	15%	93	14	90	14	86	13
2. PROPOSAL (Phase 2)	40%	73	29	78	31	85	34
3. PROPRIETARY MTG / INTERVIEW	35%	80	28	80	28	80	28
4. CONTRACT AMOUNT	10%	60	6	80	8	80	8
TOTAL SCORES	100%	306	77	328	81	331	83

SCORING GUIDELINES

In evaluating each of the criteria, the Selection Panel will identify significant and minor strengths and weaknesses from the submissions. The Selection Panel will then use the following guidelines to evaluate the submissions for each Selection Criterion. Weighting assigned in the RFQ and any addenda will calculate points based on each panelists raw scores of 0 to 100. 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.



Committee Member's Signature