

FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

CONSULTANT SELECTION
COMBINED CONSENSUS SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description STE(A)M Education Center - Shoreline Community College
Project Number 2021-103
Name of Selection Panel Chair Gary Wendleken

Phase 1 - SOQ

Date: 5/6/2021

Number of Submitting Firms: 16

Firms	Panelist Names					TOTAL PANEL RANKED SCORE	PHASE 1 RANK ORDER
	Gary Wendleken	Penny Koal	Cheryl Roberts	Dawn Beck	Garner Miller		
	Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order		
1 WRNS Studio	12	11	7	13	13	56	12
2 The Jones Payne Group	9	14	9	16	11	59	13
3 DLR Group	2	6	3	4	9	24	4
4 Integrus Architecture	3	9	2	1	4	19	3
5 StudioMengStrazzara-HastingsChivetta	6	12	10	15	7	50	9
6 Miller Hull Partnership	11	2	6	9	3	31	6
7 Architecture for Everyone-B+H	13	15	14	12	14	68	15
8 Gensler	5	16	13	7	12	53	11
9 Schreiber Starling Whitehead	4	3	4	3	2	16	1
10 NAC Architecture	7	5	11	14	5	42	8
11 LMN Architects	8	1	1	2	6	18	2
12 GGLO	15	7	12	8	10	52	10
13 McGranahan Architects	14	4	5	5	1	29	5
14 Mutuus Studio	16	13	15	11	16	71	16
15 Rolluda Architects	10	10	16	10	15	61	14
16 Perkins&Will	1	8	8	6	8	31	6
17							
18							
19							
20							

Phase 2 Interview

Date: 6/3/2021

Number of Firms Interviewed: 4

Firms	RANK ORDER OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS					TOTAL ASSIGNED RANKS	FINAL RANK ORDER
	Gary Wendleken	Penny Koal	Cheryl Roberts	Dawn Beck	Garner Miller		
	Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order		
1 Integrus Architecture	4	1	3	2	2	12	3
2 LMN Architects	1	2	2	3	3	11	2
3 Schreiber Starling Whitehead	3	3	1	1	1	9	1
4 DLR Group	2	4	4	4	4	18	4
5							

Gary Wendleken

Gary Wendleken

Cheryl Roberts

Cheryl Roberts (Jun 7, 2021 15:00 PDT)

Cheryl Roberts

Gm

Garner Miller (Jun 7, 2021 19:52 PDT)

Garner Miller

Penny Koal

Penny Koal

Dawn Beck

Dawn Beck (Jun 7, 2021 17:02 PDT)

Dawn Beck



**FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES
CONSULTANT SELECTION
PHASE I CONSENSUS SCORING SHEET**

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description STE(A)M Education Center - Shoreline Community College	
Consensus Date 5/6/2021	Project Number 2021-103
Name of Selection Panel Chair Gary Wendleken	

CRITERIA	Gary Wendleken	Penny Koal	Cheryl Roberts	Dawn Beck	Garner Miller	TOTAL PANEL RANK SCORES	RANK ORDER	
	RANK ORDER	RANK ORDER	RANK ORDER	RANK ORDER	RANK ORDER			
1	WRNS Studio	12	11	7	13	13	56	12
2	The Jones Payne Group	9	14	9	16	11	59	13
3	DLR Group	2	6	3	4	9	24	4
4	Integrus Architecture	3	9	2	1	4	19	3
5	StudioMengStrazzara-HastingsChivetta	6	12	10	15	7	50	9
6	Miller Hull Partnership	11	2	6	9	3	31	6
7	Architecture for Everyone-B+H	13	15	14	12	14	68	15
8	Gensler	5	16	13	7	12	53	11
9	Schreiber Starling Whitehead	4	3	4	3	2	16	1
10	NAC Architecture	7	5	11	14	5	42	8
11	LMN Architects	8	1	1	2	6	18	2
12	GGLO	15	7	12	8	10	52	10
13	McGranahan Architects	14	4	5	5	1	29	5
14	Mutuus Studio	16	13	15	11	16	71	16
15	Rolluda Architects	10	10	16	10	15	61	14
16	Perkins&Will	1	8	8	6	8	31	6
17								
18								
19								
20								

COMMENTS:

Gary Wendleken

Gary Wendleken

Cheryl Roberts

Cheryl Roberts (Jun 7, 2021 15:00 PDT)
Cheryl Roberts

Dawn Beck

Dawn Beck (Jun 7, 2021 17:02 PDT)
Dawn Beck

Penny Koal

Penny Koal

GM

Garner Miller (Jun 7, 2021 19:52 PDT)
Garner Miller

FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES
CONSULTANT SELECTION
PHASE I SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description STE(A)M Education Center - Shoreline Community College	
Consensus Date 5/6/2021	Project Number 2021-103
Name of Selection Panel Member Gary Wendleken	

CRITERIA	Qualification of Key Personnel		Relevant Experience		Past Performance		Life Cycle Cost Analysis Experience		Sustainable Design Experience		TOTAL RAW SCORE	TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE	RANK ORDER	
	Scores	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score				10%
1	WRNS Studio	70	21	74	19	76	19	76	8	76	8	372	73.7	12
2	The Jones Payne Group	70	21	82	21	74	19	72	7	73	7	371	74.5	9
3	DLR Group	84	25	82	21	86	22	82	8	86	9	420	84.0	2
4	Integrus Architecture	82	25	80	20	84	21	82	8	84	8	412	82.2	3
5	StudioMengStrazzara-HastingsChivetta	70	21	82	21	81	20	79	8	82	8	394	77.9	6
6	Miller Hull Partnership	66	20	82	21	74	19	75	8	80	8	377	74.3	11
7	Architecture for Everyone-B+H	73	22	74	19	62	16	77	8	83	8	369	71.9	13
8	Gensler	72	22	82	21	83	21	76	8	82	8	395	78.7	5
9	Schreiber Starling Whitehead	80	24	83	21	84	21	72	7	81	8	400	81.1	4
10	NAC Architecture	80	24	72	18	82	21	70	7	80	8	384	77.5	7
11	LMN Architects	74	22	80	20	72	18	82	8	75	8	383	75.9	8
12	GGLO	72	22	68	17	70	18	80	8	74	7	364	71.5	15
13	McGranahan Architects	70	21	68	17	75	19	75	8	75	8	363	71.8	14
14	Mutuus Studio	72	22	60	15	68	17	72	7	74	7	346	68.2	16
15	Rolluda Architects	78	23	68	17	74	19	78	8	77	8	375	74.4	10
16	Perkins&Will	82	25	92	23	83	21	78	8	81	8	416	84.3	1
17														
18														
19														
20														

COMMENTS:

Gary Wendleken

Gary Wendleken

Jun 7, 2021

Date

FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

**CONSULTANT SELECTION
PHASE I SCORING SHEET**

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description STE(A)M Education Center - Shoreline Community College	
Consensus Date 5/6/2021	Project Number 2021-103
Name of Selection Panel Member Penny Koal	

CRITERIA	Qualification of Key Personnel		Relevant Experience		Past Performance		Life Cycle Cost Analysis Experience		Sustainable Design Experience		TOTAL RAW SCORE	TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE	RANK ORDER
	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score	10%			
1 WRNS Studio	68	20	88	22	70	18	67	7	88	9	381	75.4	11
2 The Jones Payne Group	72	22	71	18	66	17	61	6	56	6	326	67.6	14
3 DLR Group	88	26	89	22	75	19	62	6	81	8	395	81.7	6
4 Integrus Architecture	70	21	80	20	88	22	78	8	88	9	404	79.6	9
5 StudioMengStrazzara-HastingsChivetta	66	20	70	18	80	20	65	7	70	7	351	70.8	12
6 Miller Hull Partnership	90	27	80	20	88	22	78	8	82	8	418	85.0	2
7 Architecture for Everyone-B+H	60	18	67	17	70	18	60	6	60	6	317	64.3	15
8 Gensler	60	18	62	16	68	17	66	7	66	7	322	63.7	16
9 Schreiber Starling Whitehead	92	28	80	20	82	21	80	8	83	8	417	84.4	3
10 NAC Architecture	85	26	81	20	85	21	77	8	85	9	413	83.2	5
11 LMN Architects	95	29	90	23	90	23	89	9	90	9	454	91.4	1
12 GGLO	77	23	81	20	88	22	80	8	77	8	403	81.1	7
13 McGranahan Architects	88	26	80	20	85	21	83	8	80	8	416	84.0	4
14 Mutuus Studio	69	21	69	17	70	18	72	7	72	7	352	69.9	13
15 Rolluda Architects	66	20	81	20	79	20	77	8	90	9	393	76.5	10
16 Perkins&Will	80	24	80	20	80	20	80	8	80	8	400	80.0	8
17													
18													
19													
20													

COMMENTS:

Penny Koal

Penny Koal

Jun 7, 2021

Date

FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

CONSULTANT SELECTION
PHASE I SCORING SHEET

Project description STE(A)M Education Center - Shoreline Community College	
Consensus Date 5/6/2021	Project Number 2021-103
Name of Selection Panel Member Cheryl Roberts	

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

CRITERIA	Qualification of Key Personnel		Relevant Experience		Past Performance		Life Cycle Cost Analysis Experience		Sustainable Design Experience		TOTAL RAW SCORE	TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE	RANK ORDER	
	Scores	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score				10%
1 WRNS Studio		80	24	75	19	75	19	75	8	80	8	385	77.0	7
2 The Jones Payne Group		75	23	80	20	75	19	75	8	70	7	375	75.8	9
3 DLR Group		90	27	85	21	80	20	75	8	70	7	400	82.8	3
4 Integrus Architecture		95	29	85	21	78	20	80	8	85	9	423	85.8	2
5 StudioMengStrazzara-HastingsChivetta		80	24	75	19	70	18	75	8	65	7	365	74.3	10
6 Miller Hull Partnership		75	23	85	21	80	20	75	8	68	7	383	78.1	6
7 Architecture for Everyone-B+H		80	24	75	19	65	16	60	6	60	6	340	71.0	14
8 Gensler		80	24	75	19	65	16	60	6	65	7	345	71.5	13
9 Schreiber Starling Whitehead		90	27	85	21	75	19	65	7	70	7	385	80.5	4
10 NAC Architecture		80	24	75	19	70	18	65	7	60	6	350	72.8	11
11 LMN Architects		95	29	95	24	80	20	75	8	80	8	425	87.8	1
12 GGLO		80	24	75	19	65	16	65	7	70	7	355	72.5	12
13 McGranahan Architects		90	27	85	21	70	18	65	7	70	7	380	79.3	5
14 Mutuus Studio		75	23	70	18	60	15	60	6	60	6	325	67.0	15
15 Rolluda Architects		70	21	60	15	50	13	60	6	60	6	300	60.5	16
16 Perkins&Will		85	26	75	19	75	19	70	7	60	6	365	76.0	8
17														
18														
19														
20														

COMMENTS:

Cheryl Roberts
Cheryl Roberts (Jun 7, 2021 15:00 PDT)
Cheryl Roberts

Jun 7, 2021

Date

FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

CONSULTANT SELECTION
PHASE I SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description STE(A)M Education Center - Shoreline Community College	
Consensus Date 5/6/2021	Project Number 2021-103
Name of Selection Panel Member Dawn Beck	

CRITERIA	Qualification of Key Personnel		Relevant Experience		Past Performance		Life Cycle Cost Analysis Experience		Sustainable Design Experience		TOTAL RAW SCORE	TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE	RANK ORDER	
	Scores	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score				10%
1 WRNS Studio		80	24	60	15	60	15	60	6	60	6	320	66.0	13
2 The Jones Payne Group		40	12	40	10	40	10	60	6	60	6	240	44.0	16
3 DLR Group		90	27	90	23	70	18	80	8	90	9	420	84.0	4
4 Integrus Architecture		98	29	90	23	90	23	90	9	90	9	458	92.4	1
5 StudioMengStrazzara-HastingsChivetta		60	18	60	15	40	10	50	5	50	5	260	53.0	15
6 Miller Hull Partnership		80	24	75	19	80	20	60	6	50	5	345	73.8	9
7 Architecture for Everyone-B+H		70	21	80	20	70	18	50	5	50	5	320	68.5	12
8 Gensler		80	24	80	20	70	18	80	8	80	8	390	77.5	7
9 Schreiber Starling Whitehead		95	29	85	21	80	20	80	8	80	8	420	85.8	3
10 NAC Architecture		70	21	50	13	50	13	60	6	70	7	300	59.0	14
11 LMN Architects		90	27	80	20	90	23	80	8	90	9	430	86.5	2
12 GGLO		70	21	80	20	70	18	80	8	80	8	380	74.5	8
13 McGranahan Architects		80	24	90	23	80	20	80	8	80	8	410	82.5	5
14 Mutuus Studio		70	21	70	18	70	18	70	7	60	6	340	69.0	11
15 Rolluda Architects		70	21	90	23	70	18	60	6	60	6	350	73.0	10
16 Perkins&Will		85	26	80	20	80	20	80	8	70	7	395	80.5	6
17														
18														
19														
20														
COMMENTS:														

Dawn Beck
Dawn Beck (Jun 7, 2021 17:02 PDT)

Jun 7, 2021

Dawn Beck

Date


FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

CONSULTANT SELECTION
PHASE I SCORING SHEET

Project description STE(A)M Education Center - Shoreline Community College	
Consensus Date 5/6/2021	Project Number 2021-103
Name of Selection Panel Member Garner Miller	

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

CRITERIA	Qualification of Key Personnel		Relevant Experience		Past Performance		Life Cycle Cost Analysis Experience		Sustainable Design Experience		TOTAL RAW SCORE	TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE	RANK ORDER	
	Scores	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score				10%
1	WRNS Studio	45	14	78	20	79	20	57	6	84	8	343	66.9	13
2	The Jones Payne Group	75	23	63	16	76	19	72	7	82	8	368	72.7	11
3	DLR Group	65	20	80	20	76	19	86	9	87	9	394	75.8	9
4	Integrus Architecture	89	27	91	23	78	20	83	8	85	9	426	85.8	4
5	StudioMengStrazzara-HastingsChivetta	77	23	82	21	81	20	75	8	74	7	389	78.8	7
6	Miller Hull Partnership	92	28	90	23	79	20	85	9	95	10	441	87.9	3
7	Architecture for Everyone-B+H	48	14	75	19	62	16	55	6	56	6	296	59.8	14
8	Gensler	62	19	74	19	77	19	79	8	78	8	370	72.1	12
9	Schreiber Starling Whitehead	91	27	92	23	84	21	88	9	87	9	442	88.8	2
10	NAC Architecture	87	26	89	22	77	19	78	8	89	9	420	84.3	5
11	LMN Architects	85	26	88	22	78	20	76	8	86	9	413	83.2	6
12	GGLO	78	23	70	18	68	17	76	8	83	8	375	73.8	10
13	McGranahan Architects	91	27	94	24	84	21	89	9	92	9	450	89.9	1
14	Mutuus Studio	44	13	55	14	55	14	56	6	61	6	271	52.4	16
15	Rolluda Architects	52	16	57	14	58	15	54	5	63	6	284	56.1	15
16	Perkins&Will	75	23	82	21	75	19	81	8	85	9	398	78.4	8
17														
18														
19														
20														
COMMENTS:														


Garner Miller (Jun 7, 2021 19:52 PDT)
Garner Miller

Jun 7, 2021

Date

FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; text-align: center;"> This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record </div>				Project description STE(A)M Education Center - Shoreline Community College					
				Date of Evaluation 6/3/2021			Project Number 2021-103		
				Name of Selection Panel Member Gary Wendleken					
CRITERIA	Weighting	Integrus Architecture		LMN Architects		Schreiber Starling Whitehead		DLR Group	
		Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score
ORGANIZATION	25%	80	20	84	21	82	21	80	20
<u>Management Plan:</u> How is the team set up to manage this project for the Client. What is their philosophy towards working collaboratively with clients and other outward looking issues.									
<u>Team Member Qualifications:</u> Are the relevant team members present and what role are they assuming in the discussion									
<u>Capacity/Production Capabilities:</u> Does the firm explain their workload for the duration of the project and how this project fits into the firm's overall planning									
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	20%	75	15	78	16	78	16	80	16
<u>Scope Management:</u> Based on the information provided and the Finalist's experience, how well has the team ascertained basic project requirements and how well have they managed development of project scope in the past.									
<u>Budgeting & Cost Control:</u> What strategies does the firm use to establish and manage project budgets. How successful have they been with past projects									
<u>Project Scheduling:</u> How does this finalist team develop schedules. How well do they listen to client schedule needs and then meet client schedule needs.									
PROJECT APPROACH	25%	84	21	86	22	83	21	84	21
<u>Understanding of this project:</u> Has the Finalist demonstrated that they have reviewed available project information, attended informational mtg, or done independent research to better understand the project and the project requirements									
<u>Challenges & Opportunities:</u> Has the Finalist attempted to define challenges and/or opportunities they see for the project?									
EXPERIENCE	15%	80	12	84	13	82	12	82	12
<u>Relevant Past Projects (firm):</u> Does the Finalist team discuss past work the firm has done and <i>how</i> that relates or provides guidance for this project?									
<u>Relevant Past Projects (key team members):</u> Do the individual team members have experience that relates to the project type or complexity?									
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	8%	75	6	72	6	70	6	74	6
Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive Life Cycle Cost exercise in decision making? Are they familiar with the OFM requirements? Are they differentiating between LCCA and ELCCA?									
SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE	7%	75	5	73	5	72	5	82	6
What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate for this project. How can the sustainability strategies mesh with the project budget.									
DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN (indicate included or not included)	Not Scored	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
TOTAL Raw SCORE	100%	469		477		467		482	81
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE			79		82		80		81
FINAL RANK ORDER			4		1		3		2
COMMENTS:									

Gary Wendleken

 Gary Wendleken

Jun 7, 2021

 Date

FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; text-align: center;"> This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record </div>				Project description STE(A)M Education Center - Shoreline Community College					
				Date of Evaluation 6/3/2021			Project Number 2021-103		
				Name of Selection Panel Member Penny Koal					
CRITERIA	Weighting	Integrus Architecture		LMN Architects		Schreiber Starling Whitehead		DLR Group	
		Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score
ORGANIZATION	25%	90	23	87	22	88	22	80	20
<u>Management Plan:</u> How is the team set up to manage this project for the Client. What is their philosophy towards working collaboratively with clients and other outward looking issues.									
<u>Team Member Qualifications:</u> Are the relevant team members present and what role are they assuming in the discussion									
<u>Capacity/Production Capabilities:</u> Does the firm explain their workload for the duration of the project and how this project fits into the firm's overall planning									
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	20%	88	18	90	18	80	16	87	17
<u>Scope Management:</u> Based on the information provided and the Finalist's experience, how well has the team ascertained basic project requirements and how well have they managed development of project scope in the past.									
<u>Budgeting & Cost Control:</u> What strategies does the firm use to establish and manage project budgets. How successful have they been with past projects									
<u>Project Scheduling:</u> How does this finalist team develop schedules. How well do they listen to client schedule needs and then meet client schedule needs.									
PROJECT APPROACH	25%	90	23	90	23	81	20	90	23
<u>Understanding of this project:</u> Has the Finalist demonstrated that they have reviewed available project information, attended informational mtg, or done independent research to better understand the project and the project requirements									
<u>Challenges & Opportunities:</u> Has the Finalist attempted to define challenges and/or opportunities they see for the project?									
EXPERIENCE	15%	85	13	80	12	88	13	80	12
<u>Relevant Past Projects (firm):</u> Does the Finalist team discuss past work the firm has done and <i>how</i> that relates or provides guidance for this project?									
<u>Relevant Past Projects (key team members):</u> Do the individual team members have experience that relates to the project type or complexity?									
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	8%	90	7	80	6	88	7	78	6
Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive Life Cycle Cost exercise in decision making? Are they familiar with the OFM requirements? Are they differentiating between LCCA and ELCCA?									
SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE	7%	90	6	82	6	90	6	89	6
What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate for this project. How can the sustainability strategies mesh with the project budget.									
DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN (indicate included or not included)	Not Scored	received		received		received		received	
TOTAL Raw SCORE	100%	533		509		515		504	84
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE			89		86		85		84
FINAL RANK ORDER			1		2		3		4
COMMENTS:									

Penny Koal

Penny Koal

Jun 7, 2021

Date

FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

CONSULTANT SELECTION
PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description STE(A)M Education Center - Shoreline Community College	
Date of Evaluation 6/3/2021	Project Number 2021-103
Name of Selection Panel Member Cheryl Roberts	

CRITERIA	Weighting	Integrus Architecture		LMN Architects		Schreiber Starling Whitehead		DLR Group	
		Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score
ORGANIZATION	25%	80	20	85	21	95	24	70	18
<p><u>Management Plan</u>: How is the team set up to manage this project for the Client. What is their philosophy towards working collaboratively with clients and other outward looking issues.</p> <p><u>Team Member Qualifications</u>: Are the relevant team members present and what role are they assuming in the discussion</p> <p><u>Capacity/Production Capabilities</u>: Does the firm explain their workload for the duration of the project and how this project fits into the firm's overall planning</p>									
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	20%	75	15	80	16	90	18	70	14
<p><u>Scope Management</u>: Based on the information provided and the Finalist's experience, how well has the team ascertained basic project requirements and how well have they managed development of project scope in the past.</p> <p><u>Budgeting & Cost Control</u>: What strategies does the firm use to establish and manage project budgets. How successful have they been with past projects</p> <p><u>Project Scheduling</u>: How does this finalist team develop schedules. How well do they listen to client schedule needs and then meet client schedule needs.</p>									
PROJECT APPROACH	25%	70	18	80	20	90	23	70	18
<p><u>Understanding of this project</u>: Has the Finalist demonstrated that they have reviewed available project information, attended informational mtg, or done independent research to better understand the project and the project requirements</p> <p><u>Challenges & Opportunities</u>: Has the Finalist attempted to define challenges and/or opportunities they see for the project?</p>									
EXPERIENCE	15%	75	11	80	12	85	13	70	11
<p><u>Relevant Past Projects (firm)</u>: Does the Finalist team discuss past work the firm has done and <i>how</i> that relates or provides guidance for this project?</p> <p><u>Relevant Past Projects (key team members)</u>: Do the individual team members have experience that relates to the project type or complexity?</p>									
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	8%	80	6	80	6	85	7	70	6
<p>Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive Life Cycle Cost exercise in decision making? Are they familiar with the OFM requirements? Are they differentiating between LCCA and ELCCA?</p>									
SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE	7%	90	6	80	6	80	6	80	6
<p>What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate for this project. How can the sustainability strategies mesh with the project budget.</p>									
DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN (indicate included or not included)	Not Scored	Received		Received		Received		Received	
TOTAL Raw SCORE	100%	470		485		525		430	71
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE			76		81		89		71
FINAL RANK ORDER			3		2		1		4
COMMENTS:									

Cheryl Roberts
Cheryl Roberts (Jun 7, 2021 15:00 PDT)
Cheryl Roberts

Jun 7, 2021
Date

FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

CONSULTANT SELECTION
PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record


Project description STE(A)M Education Center - Shoreline Community College	
Date of Evaluation 6/3/2021	Project Number 2021-103
Name of Selection Panel Member Dawn Beck	

CRITERIA	Weighting	Integrus Architecture		LMN Architects		Schreiber Starling Whitehead		DLR Group	
		Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score
ORGANIZATION	25%	90	23	80	20	100	25	50	13
<p><u>Management Plan</u>: How is the team set up to manage this project for the Client. What is their philosophy towards working collaboratively with clients and other outward looking issues.</p> <p><u>Team Member Qualifications</u>: Are the relevant team members present and what role are they assuming in the discussion</p> <p><u>Capacity/Production Capabilities</u>: Does the firm explain their workload for the duration of the project and how this project fits into the firm's overall planning</p>									
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	20%	90	18	80	16	100	20	70	14
<p><u>Scope Management</u>: Based on the information provided and the Finalist's experience, how well has the team ascertained basic project requirements and how well have they managed development of project scope in the past.</p> <p><u>Budgeting & Cost Control</u>: What strategies does the firm use to establish and manage project budgets. How successful have they been with past projects</p> <p><u>Project Scheduling</u>: How does this finalist team develop schedules. How well do they listen to client schedule needs and then meet client schedule needs.</p>									
PROJECT APPROACH	25%	80	20	70	18	90	23	70	18
<p><u>Understanding of this project</u>: Has the Finalist demonstrated that they have reviewed available project information, attended informational mtg, or done independent research to better understand the project and the project requirements</p> <p><u>Challenges & Opportunities</u>: Has the Finalist attempted to define challenges and/or opportunities they see for the project?</p>									
EXPERIENCE	15%	90	14	100	15	100	15	80	12
<p><u>Relevant Past Projects (firm)</u>: Does the Finalist team discuss past work the firm has done and <i>how</i> that relates or provides guidance for this project?</p> <p><u>Relevant Past Projects (key team members)</u>: Do the individual team members have experience that relates to the project type or complexity?</p>									
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	8%	90	7	90	7	100	8	80	6
<p>Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive Life Cycle Cost exercise in decision making? Are they familiar with the OFM requirements? Are they differentiating between LCCA and ELCCA?</p>									
SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE	7%	80	6	80	6	90	6	70	5
<p>What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate for this project. How can the sustainability strategies mesh with the project budget.</p>									
DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN (indicate included or not included)	Not Scored	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
TOTAL Raw SCORE	100%	520		500		580		420	67
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE			87		81		97		67
FINAL RANK ORDER			2		3		1		4
COMMENTS:									

Dawn Beck
Dawn Beck (Jun 7, 2021 17:02 PDT)
Dawn Beck

Jun 7, 2021
Date

FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; text-align: center;"> This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record </div>				Project description STE(A)M Education Center - Shoreline Community College					
				Date of Evaluation 6/3/2021			Project Number 2021-103		
				Name of Selection Panel Member Garner Miller					
CRITERIA	Weighting	Integrus Architecture		LMN Architects		Schreiber Starling Whitehead		DLR Group	
		Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score
ORGANIZATION	25%	78	20	78	20	76	19	74	19
<u>Management Plan:</u> How is the team set up to manage this project for the Client. What is their philosophy towards working collaboratively with clients and other outward looking issues.									
<u>Team Member Qualifications:</u> Are the relevant team members present and what role are they assuming in the discussion									
<u>Capacity/Production Capabilities:</u> Does the firm explain their workload for the duration of the project and how this project fits into the firm's overall planning									
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	20%	94	19	80	16	92	18	70	14
<u>Scope Management:</u> Based on the information provided and the Finalist's experience, how well has the team ascertained basic project requirements and how well have they managed development of project scope in the past.									
<u>Budgeting & Cost Control:</u> What strategies does the firm use to establish and manage project budgets. How successful have they been with past projects									
<u>Project Scheduling:</u> How does this finalist team develop schedules. How well do they listen to client schedule needs and then meet client schedule needs.									
PROJECT APPROACH	25%	88	22	86	22	92	23	74	19
<u>Understanding of this project:</u> Has the Finalist demonstrated that they have reviewed available project information, attended informational mtg, or done independent research to better understand the project and the project requirements									
<u>Challenges & Opportunities:</u> Has the Finalist attempted to define challenges and/or opportunities they see for the project?									
EXPERIENCE	15%	84	13	84	13	78	12	80	12
<u>Relevant Past Projects (firm):</u> Does the Finalist team discuss past work the firm has done and <i>how</i> that relates or provides guidance for this project?									
<u>Relevant Past Projects (key team members):</u> Do the individual team members have experience that relates to the project type or complexity?									
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	8%	60	5	60	5	82	7	78	6
Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive Life Cycle Cost exercise in decision making? Are they familiar with the OFM requirements? Are they differentiating between LCCA and ELCCA?									
SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE	7%	78	5	74	5	80	6	80	6
What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate for this project. How can the sustainability strategies mesh with the project budget.									
DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN (indicate included or not included)	Not Scored	Received		Received		Received		Received	
TOTAL Raw SCORE	100%	482		462		500		456	75
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE			83		80		84		75
FINAL RANK ORDER			2		3		1		4
COMMENTS:									


 Garner Miller (Jun 7, 2021 19:52 PDT)
 Garner Miller

Jun 7, 2021
 Date












2021-103-ScoreSheetSummary


Final Audit Report


2021-06-08


Created:	2021-06-07
By:	Angeline Ernst (angeline.ernst@des.wa.gov)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAAmrvh6Cpqh9YD-ZBoCzp6Apn4zjH6Epl5


"2021-103-ScoreSheetSummary" History


-  Document created by Angeline Ernst (angeline.ernst@des.wa.gov)
2021-06-07 - 9:35:13 PM GMT- IP address: 198.238.242.30
-  Document emailed to Gary Wendleken (gary.wendleken@des.wa.gov) for signature
2021-06-07 - 9:39:26 PM GMT
-  Document emailed to Penny Koal (penny.koal@des.wa.gov) for signature
2021-06-07 - 9:39:26 PM GMT
-  Document emailed to Cheryl Roberts (clroberts@shoreline.edu) for signature
2021-06-07 - 9:39:26 PM GMT
-  Document emailed to Dawn Beck (dbeck@shoreline.edu) for signature
2021-06-07 - 9:39:26 PM GMT
-  Document emailed to Garner Miller (garnerm@msgsrch.com) for signature
2021-06-07 - 9:39:27 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Gary Wendleken (gary.wendleken@des.wa.gov)
2021-06-07 - 9:40:01 PM GMT- IP address: 104.47.64.254
-  Document e-signed by Gary Wendleken (gary.wendleken@des.wa.gov)
Signature Date: 2021-06-07 - 9:40:47 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 198.238.242.30
-  Email viewed by Cheryl Roberts (clroberts@shoreline.edu)
2021-06-07 - 9:47:34 PM GMT- IP address: 24.18.228.154
-  Document e-signed by Cheryl Roberts (clroberts@shoreline.edu)
Signature Date: 2021-06-07 - 10:00:57 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 24.18.228.154
-  Email viewed by Penny Koal (penny.koal@des.wa.gov)
2021-06-07 - 10:10:46 PM GMT- IP address: 198.238.242.30


 Document e-signed by Penny Koal (penny.koal@des.wa.gov)
Signature Date: 2021-06-07 - 10:17:44 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 198.238.242.30

 Email viewed by Garner Miller (garnerm@msgsrch.com)
2021-06-07 - 10:32:10 PM GMT- IP address: 50.251.220.66

 Email viewed by Dawn Beck (dbeck@shoreline.edu)
2021-06-08 - 0:00:17 AM GMT- IP address: 172.242.243.147

 Document e-signed by Dawn Beck (dbeck@shoreline.edu)
Signature Date: 2021-06-08 - 0:02:34 AM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 172.242.243.147

 Document e-signed by Garner Miller (garnerm@msgsrch.com)
Signature Date: 2021-06-08 - 2:52:07 AM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 67.168.6.73

 Agreement completed.
2021-06-08 - 2:52:07 AM GMT