

Attachment B

**Robinson Park RFP - PROPOSAL Score by Evaluation Criteria
(With Six Raters)**

No.	Proposal Evaluation Criteria	Max Possible Points Per Criteria	Max Possible Score With Six Raters	Score by Proposal Evaluation Criteria							
				Short-listed			Other Proposers				
				GKK	Masbuild/ ONYX	Osborn	WLC	Albert Group	John Friedmann Alice Kimm	PBWS	TR Design Group
1	Qualification based on overall professional and practical experience	15	90	84	72	84	84	51	72	74	46
2	Specific experience in design and construction of community centers	20	120	112	76	103	109	83	54	83	22
3	Specific experience of firm and key personnel in community engagement processes	15	90	70	73	79	65	13	58	51.5	14
4	Project implementation/approach including ability to perform, ability to complete on time and within budget	25	150	129	131	142	137	65	62.5	117	49
5	Proposed schedule for performance of Scope of Services	10	60	53	43.5	47.5	54	39	44	46	27
6	Local Pasadena Business	5	30	30	30	9.99	12.3	8.4	6.36	30	7.656
7	Small & Micro Business	5	30	9.75	30	30	14.4	30	30	30	30
8	HUD Section 3 Business	5	30	0	30	30	30	0	0	0	0
	Total	100									
Average Proposal Score Overall				81.292	80.917	87.582	84.283	48.23	54.477	71.917	32.609

Attachment C

**Robinson Park RFP - INTERVIEW Score by Evaluation Criteria
(With Six Raters)**

				Score by Interview Evaluation Criteria			
No.	Interview Evaluation Criteria	Max Possible Points Per Criteria	Max Possible Score With Six Raters	GKK	Masbuild/ ONYX	Osborn	WLC
1	Completion of design and construction in an expedient fashion (on-time or ahead of schedule) thus minimizing impacts to the public.	10	60	55.6	53.7	54.6	54.7
2	Achievement of high quality standards for design and construction which meet the programming requirements of the conceptual plan and the intended uses.	10	60	54.6	49.5	54.7	51.7
3	Establishment and maintenance of good relationships with stakeholders through a community engagement process that emphasizes communication, open dialogue and cooperative decision making.	10	60	55.8	54.5	45.6	48.5
4	Completion of the Project within the City's budget.	10	60	52.8	52.8	51.6	48.8
5	To secure the services of the most qualified and experienced firm.	10	60	52.6	52.4	46.5	48.6
6	Proposer shall clearly describe its understanding of the technical issues and the scope of work to be addressed in the design and construction of the Project and explain the firm's proposed technical approach to develop and execute appropriate and efficient solutions.	10	60	53.8	50.6	46.6	48.7
7	Proposer shall clearly describe its design approach and address how it will enhance the Project's long-term performance, durability, maintainability and sensitivity to aesthetics and neighbor context.	10	60	52.8	50.8	52.6	46.6
8	Proposer shall clearly describe its Project approach, Project implementation, and Community Engagement and Community Outreach strategies and discuss how they will impact Project success.	10	60	55.7	52.7	51	49
9	Proposer shall clearly describe its understanding of the Project's key issues and how it has introduced innovation, approaches, structures, and procedures that the Proposer will employ to ensure successful attainment of the Project goals.	10	60	52.6	54.7	46.5	50.4
10	Panel questions regarding community concerns.	10	60	53	48	43.5	45
Total		100					
Average Interview Score Overall				89.88	86.62	82.20	82.00

Attachment D

**Consultant FINAL Ranking
(Total Average Score For Proposal and Interview)**

Consultant	Rank	Proposal Score - Average For All 6 Raters	Interview Score - Average For All 6 Raters	Total Score
GKK Works	1	81.29	89.88	171.18
Osborn Architects	2	87.58	82.20	169.78
Masbuild/ONYX	3	80.92	86.62	167.53
WLC Architects	4	84.28	82.00	166.28
PBWS	5	71.92	No Score	
John Friedman Alice Kimm	6	54.48	No Score	
Albert Group	7	48.23	No Score	
TR Design Group	8	32.61	No Score	
Max Possible Points		100	100	200