

FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

CONSULTANT SELECTION
COMBINED CONSENSUS SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description Military Readiness Center Design - Anacortes
Project Number 2022-066
Name of Selection Panel Chair Suzanne Gilbert

Phase 1 - SOQ Date: **8/17/2021** Number of Submitting Firms: **5**

Firms	Panelist Names					TOTAL PANEL RANKED SCORE	PHASE 1 RANK ORDER
	Suzanne Gilbert Rank Order	Yelena Semenova Rank Order	Sachin Saldanha Rank Order	Bradford Olson Rank Order	Linda Newcomb Rank Order		
1 Schreiber Starling Whitehead	1	2	1	1	2	7	1
2 Cortner Architectural	2	4	3	4	3	16	4
3 WJA Design Collaborative	4	1	4	2	1	12	2
4 Ankrom Moisan	5	5	5	5	5	25	5
5 KMB Architects	3	3	2	3	4	15	3
6							
7							
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							

Phase 2 Interview Date: **8/31/2021** Number of Firms Interviewed: **3**

Firms	RANK ORDER OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS					TOTAL ASSIGNED RANKS	FINAL RANK ORDER
	Suzanne Gilbert Rank Order	Yelena Semenova Rank Order	Sachin Saldanha Rank Order	Bradford Olson Rank Order	Linda Newcomb Rank Order		
1 WJA Design Collaborative	1	1	3	3	1	9	1
2 KMB Architects	2	2	2	2	3	11	3
3 Schreiber Starling Whitehead	3	3	1	1	2	10	2
4							
5							

Suzanne Gilbert
Suzanne Gilbert (Sep 2, 2021 08:30 PDT)
Suzanne Gilbert

Semenova
Yelena Semenova

Saldanha
Sachin Saldanha

BO
Brad Olson (Sep 2, 2021 07:33 PDT)
Bradford Olson

Linda Newcomb
Linda Newcomb



FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES
 CONSULTANT SELECTION
 PHASE I SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description Military Readiness Center Design - Anacortes	
Consensus Date 8/17/2021	Project Number 2022-066
Name of Selection Panel Member Suzanne Gilbert	

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	25%	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score				10%
1 Schreiber Starling Whitehead		85.0	21.3	98.0	29.4	95.0	23.8	98.0	9.8	90.0	9.0	466.0	93.2	1
2 Cortner Architectural		90.0	22.5	91.0	27.3	91.0	22.8	91.0	9.1	90.0	9.0	453.0	90.7	2
3 WJA Design Collaborative		81.0	20.3	79.0	23.7	90.0	22.5	91.0	9.1	90.0	9.0	431.0	84.6	4
4 Ankrom Moisan		81.0	20.3	75.0	22.5	75.0	18.8	75.0	7.5	91.0	9.1	397.0	78.1	5
5 KMB Architects		90.0	22.5	91.0	27.3	90.0	22.5	93.0	9.3	90.0	9.0	454.0	90.6	3
6														
7														
8														
9														
10														
11														
12														
13														
14														
15														
16														
17														
18														
19														
20														

COMMENTS:

Suzanne Gilbert
 Suzanne Gilbert (Sep 2, 2021 08:30 PDT)
 Suzanne Gilbert

8/17/2021
 Date

FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

**CONSULTANT SELECTION
PHASE I SCORING SHEET**

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description Military Readiness Center Design - Anacortes	
Consensus Date 8/17/2021	Project Number 2022-066
Name of Selection Panel Member Yelena Semenova	

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	25%	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score				10%
1 Schreiber Starling Whitehead		100.0	25.0	100.0	30.0	100.0	25.0	95.0	9.5	96.0	9.6	491.0	99.1	2
2 Cortner Architectural		98.0	24.5	97.0	29.1	95.0	23.8	91.0	9.1	90.0	9.0	471.0	95.5	4
3 WJA Design Collaborative		100.0	25.0	100.0	30.0	100.0	25.0	96.0	9.6	98.0	9.8	494.0	99.4	1
4 Ankrom Moisan		98.0	24.5	90.0	27.0	93.0	23.3	93.0	9.3	92.0	9.2	466.0	93.3	5
5 KMB Architects		100.0	25.0	100.0	30.0	100.0	25.0	94.0	9.4	95.0	9.5	489.0	98.9	3
6														
7														
8														
9														
10														
11														
12														
13														
14														
15														
16														
17														
18														
19														
20														

COMMENTS:

Semenova

Yelena Semenova

8/17/2021
Date

FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

CONSULTANT SELECTION
PHASE I SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description Military Readiness Center Design - Anacortes	
Consensus Date 8/17/2021	Project Number 2022-066
Name of Selection Panel Member Sachin Saldanha	

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	25%	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score				10%
1 Schreiber Starling Whitehead		22.0	5.5	28.0	8.4	23.0	5.8	6.0	0.6	8.0	0.8	87.0	21.1	1
2 Cortner Architectural		20.0	5.0	22.0	6.6	20.0	5.0	5.0	0.5	5.0	0.5	72.0	17.6	3
3 WJA Design Collaborative		18.0	4.5	17.0	5.1	18.0	4.5	3.0	0.3	6.0	0.6	62.0	15.0	4
4 Ankrom Moisan		18.0	4.5	15.0	4.5	16.0	4.0	6.0	0.6	6.0	0.6	61.0	14.2	5
5 KMB Architects		21.0	5.3	26.0	7.8	21.0	5.3	6.0	0.6	7.0	0.7	81.0	19.6	2
6														
7														
8														
9														
10														
11														
12														
13														
14														
15														
16														
17														
18														
19														
20														

COMMENTS:



Sachin Saldanha

8/17/2021

Date

FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

CONSULTANT SELECTION
PHASE I SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description Military Readiness Center Design - Anacortes	
Consensus Date 8/17/2021	Project Number 2022-066
Name of Selection Panel Member Bradford Olson	

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	25%	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score				10%
1 Schreiber Starling Whitehead		83.0	20.8	85.0	25.5	85.0	21.3	80.0	8.0	80.0	8.0	413.0	83.5	1
2 Cortner Architectural		80.0	20.0	80.0	24.0	80.0	20.0	75.0	7.5	77.0	7.7	392.0	79.2	4
3 WJA Design Collaborative		82.0	20.5	83.0	24.9	86.0	21.5	80.0	8.0	79.0	7.9	410.0	82.8	2
4 Ankrom Moisan		75.0	18.8	78.0	23.4	79.0	19.8	80.0	8.0	78.0	7.8	390.0	77.7	5
5 KMB Architects		78.0	19.5	82.0	24.6	84.0	21.0	80.0	8.0	80.0	8.0	404.0	81.1	3
6														
7														
8														
9														
10														
11														
12														
13														
14														
15														
16														
17														
18														
19														
20														

COMMENTS:

Brad Olson
 Brad Olson (Sep 2, 2021 07:33 PDT)
 Bradford Olson

8/17/2021
Date



FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES
 CONSULTANT SELECTION
 PHASE I SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description Military Readiness Center Design - Anacortes	
Consensus Date 8/17/2021	Project Number 2022-066
Name of Selection Panel Member Linda Newcomb	

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	25%	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score				10%
1 Schreiber Starling Whitehead		88.0	22.0	90.0	27.0	96.0	24.0	90.0	9.0	100.0	10.0	464.0	92.0	2
2 Cortner Architectural		80.0	20.0	83.0	24.9	92.0	23.0	70.0	7.0	70.0	7.0	395.0	81.9	3
3 WJA Design Collaborative		100.0	25.0	93.0	27.9	96.0	24.0	100.0	10.0	100.0	10.0	489.0	96.9	1
4 Ankrom Moisan		60.0	15.0	50.0	15.0	72.0	18.0	80.0	8.0	90.0	9.0	352.0	65.0	5
5 KMB Architects		72.0	18.0	77.0	23.1	80.0	20.0	70.0	7.0	80.0	8.0	379.0	76.1	4
6														
7														
8														
9														
10														
11														
12														
13														
14														
15														
16														
17														
18														
19														
20														

COMMENTS:

Linda Newcomb

Linda Newcomb

8/17/2021
Date

FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

CONSULTANT SELECTION
 PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description Military Readiness Center Design - Anacortes	
Date of Evaluation 8/31/2021	Project Number 2022-066
Name of Selection Panel Member Suzanne Gilbert	

CRITERIA	Weighting	WJA Design Collaborative		KMB Architects		Schreiber Starling Whitehead		Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score
		Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score				
ORGANIZATION	20%	95.0	19.0	88.0	17.6	85.0	17.0				
<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	25%	95.0	23.8	88.0	22.0	81.0	20.3				
<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	15%	95.0	14.3	81.0	12.2	81.0	12.2				
<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	20%	90.0	18.0	88.0	17.6	81.0	16.2				
<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	10%	93.0	9.3	90.0	9.0	81.0	8.1				
<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	10%	90.0	9.0	90.0	9.0	90.0	9.0				
<p>What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate for this project. How can the sustainability strategys mesh with the project budget.</p>											
DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN (indicate included or not included)	Not Scored	Included		Included		Included					
TOTAL Raw SCORE	100%	558.0		525.0		499.0					
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE			93.3		87.4		82.7				
FINAL RANK ORDER			1		2		3				
COMMENTS:											

Suzanne Gilbert
 Suzanne Gilbert (Sep 2, 2021 08:30 PDT)
 Suzanne Gilbert

Sep 2, 2021
 Date

FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

CONSULTANT SELECTION
PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description Military Readiness Center Design - Anacortes	
Date of Evaluation 8/31/2021	Project Number 2022-066
Name of Selection Panel Member Yelena Semenova	

CRITERIA	Weighting	WJA Design Collaborative		KMB Architects		Schreiber Starling Whitehead		Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score
		Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score				
ORGANIZATION	20%	100.0	20.0	95.0	19.0	90.0	18.0				
<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	25%	100.0	25.0	95.0	23.8	90.0	22.5				
<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	15%	100.0	95.0	95.0	90.0	90.0	13.5				
<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	20%	100.0	20.0	100.0	20.0	100.0	20.0				
<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	10%	95.0	9.5	96.0	9.6	90.0	9.0				
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	10%	90.0	9.0	90.0	9.0	95.0	9.5				
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	Included		Included		Included					
TOTAL Raw SCORE	100%	585.0		571.0		555.0					
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE			178.5		171.4		92.5				
FINAL RANK ORDER			1		2		3				
COMMENTS:											

Semenova

Yelena Semenova

Sep 2, 2021

Date

FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

CONSULTANT SELECTION
PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description Military Readiness Center Design - Anacortes	
Date of Evaluation 8/31/2021	Project Number 2022-066
Name of Selection Panel Member Sachin Saldanha	

CRITERIA	Weighting	WJA Design Collaborative		KMB Architects		Schreiber Stirling Whitehead		Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score
		Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score				
ORGANIZATION	20%	85.0	17.0	90.0	18.0	92.0	18.4				
<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	25%	85.0	21.3	90.0	22.5	95.0	23.8				
<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	15%	85.0	12.8	90.0	13.5	95.0	14.3				
<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	20%	88.0	17.6	90.0	18.0	95.0	19.0				
<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	10%	90.0	9.0	90.0	9.0	90.0	9.0				
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	10%	90.0	9.0	90.0	9.0	92.0	9.2				
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	Included		Included		Included					
TOTAL Raw SCORE	100%	523.0		540.0		559.0					
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE			86.6		90.0		93.6				
FINAL RANK ORDER			3		2		1				
COMMENTS:											



Sachin Saldanha

Sep 2, 2021

Date

FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

CONSULTANT SELECTION
PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description Military Readiness Center Design - Anacortes	
Date of Evaluation 8/31/2021	Project Number 2022-066
Name of Selection Panel Member Bradford Olson	

CRITERIA	Weighting	WJA Design Collaborative		KMB Architects		Schreiber Starling Whitehead		Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score
		Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score				
ORGANIZATION	20%	80.0	16.0	80.0	16.0	81.0	16.2				
<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	25%	82.0	20.5	81.0	20.3	82.0	20.5				
<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	15%	80.0	12.0	82.0	12.3	82.0	12.3				
<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	20%	81.0	16.2	81.0	16.2	83.0	16.6				
<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	10%	80.0	8.0	80.0	8.0	81.0	8.1				
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	10%	83.0	8.3	83.0	8.3	83.0	8.3				
What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate for this project. How can the sustainability strategys mesh with the project budget.											
DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN (indicate included or not included)	Not Scored	Included		Included		Included					
TOTAL Raw SCORE	100%	486.0		487.0		492.0					
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE			81.0		81.1		82.0				
FINAL RANK ORDER			3		2		1				
COMMENTS:											


Brad Olson (Sep 2, 2021 07:33 PDT)
Bradford Olson

Sep 2, 2021
Date

FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

CONSULTANT SELECTION
PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description Military Readiness Center Design - Anacortes	
Date of Evaluation 8/31/2021	Project Number 2022-066
Name of Selection Panel Member Linda Newcomb	

CRITERIA	Weighting	WJA Design Collaborative		KMB Architects		Schreiber Starling Whitehead		Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score
		Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score				
ORGANIZATION	20%	95.0	19.0	80.0	16.0	85.0	17.0				
<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	25%	88.0	22.0	92.0	23.0	84.0	21.0				
<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	15%	100.0	15.0	100.0	15.0	100.0	15.0				
<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	20%	90.0	18.0	85.0	17.0	95.0	19.0				
<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	10%	100.0	10.0	90.0	9.0	100.0	10.0				
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	10%	100.0	10.0	90.0	9.0	100.0	10.0				
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					
TOTAL Raw SCORE	100%	573.0		537.0		564.0					
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE			94.0		89.0		92.0				
FINAL RANK ORDER			1		3		2				
COMMENTS:											



Linda Newcomb

Sep 2, 2021

Date








22-066-ScoresheetSummary


Final Audit Report

2021-09-02

Created:	2021-09-02
By:	Angeline Ernst (angeline.ernst@des.wa.gov)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAAaeEqSjydvzTZWRRHaA7PBkJNshR1sYyO

"22-066-ScoresheetSummary" History


-  Document created by Angeline Ernst (angeline.ernst@des.wa.gov)
2021-09-02 - 0:05:54 AM GMT- IP address: 198.238.242.30
-  Document emailed to Suzanne Gilbert (suzanne.gilbert@des.wa.gov) for signature
2021-09-02 - 0:13:24 AM GMT
-  Document emailed to Yelena Semenova (yelena.semenova@des.wa.gov) for signature
2021-09-02 - 0:13:24 AM GMT
-  Document emailed to Linda Newcomb (newcomb@linarchitect.com) for signature
2021-09-02 - 0:13:25 AM GMT
-  Document emailed to Brad Olson (bradford.olson@mil.wa.gov) for signature
2021-09-02 - 0:13:25 AM GMT
-  Document emailed to Sachin Saldanha (sachin.saldanha@mil.wa.gov) for signature
2021-09-02 - 0:13:25 AM GMT
-  Email viewed by Yelena Semenova (yelena.semenova@des.wa.gov)
2021-09-02 - 0:21:19 AM GMT- IP address: 67.168.5.35
-  Email viewed by Sachin Saldanha (sachin.saldanha@mil.wa.gov)
2021-09-02 - 0:57:29 AM GMT- IP address: 172.58.46.146
-  Document e-signed by Sachin Saldanha (sachin.saldanha@mil.wa.gov)
Signature Date: 2021-09-02 - 2:30:47 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 172.56.42.30
-  Email viewed by Brad Olson (bradford.olson@mil.wa.gov)
2021-09-02 - 2:31:37 PM GMT- IP address: 174.246.52.148
-  Document e-signed by Brad Olson (bradford.olson@mil.wa.gov)
Signature Date: 2021-09-02 - 2:33:42 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 174.246.52.148

 Email viewed by Suzanne Gilbert (suzanne.gilbert@des.wa.gov)


2021-09-02 - 3:29:14 PM GMT- IP address: 104.47.65.254

 Document e-signed by Suzanne Gilbert (suzanne.gilbert@des.wa.gov)

Signature Date: 2021-09-02 - 3:30:22 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 73.169.232.32

 Document e-signed by Yelena Semenova (yelena.semenova@des.wa.gov)

Signature Date: 2021-09-02 - 4:26:43 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 198.238.242.30

 Email viewed by Linda Newcomb (newcomb@linarchitect.com)

2021-09-02 - 6:45:25 PM GMT- IP address: 66.249.84.89

 Document e-signed by Linda Newcomb (newcomb@linarchitect.com)

Signature Date: 2021-09-02 - 6:48:57 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 172.56.44.202

 Agreement completed.

2021-09-02 - 6:48:57 PM GMT