Provide Preliminary Site Plan and Environmental Work for a Replacement Fire Station in Garden Grove

RFP No. S-1177

Contract Administrator Project Mgr.	<u>Sandra Segawa</u> <u>Dave Barlag</u>
RATER'S NUMBER:	
NAME OF PROPOSER:	WLC Architects, Inc.
	RATING SCALE

Use one form to compile the rating for each proposer. Rate the proposer from 1 - 10 on each criterion as they and their proposal relate to the work. NOTE: The attached narrative section must also be completed to support the evaluator's scoring for each proposal. **PLEASE DO NOT RATE THE PRICING SECTION!**

Criteria	Weight	х	Rating	=	Score
1. Price	20	х	XXX	=	200
2. Project Plan	40	x	5		2-00
3. Qualifications of Proposer/Ability to Meet Proposal Requirements	40	x	5		200
Overall Score	100	х		=	600

3. I have rated the above Proposer's ability to perform the subject service according to the listed criteria and weights and calculated an overall score of $\bigcirc\bigcirc\bigcirc$, which is consistent with the rating scale.

Rater¹

1. PRICE	PRICE DID NOT DETAIL HOW HUCH FOR LEAD BECOME WATER
	DISTAND I POLICE LAND

2. PROJECT PLAN

REP NOT VERY CIEFLE OR CREATINGTON

TO CIVE THE CONTENT VEREL OF WHAT

3. QUALIFICATIONS OF PROPOSER/ABILITY TO MEET PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

PASED ON THIS REPY CRAPNICATION PROJECT

Provide Preliminary Site Plan and Environmental Work for a Replacement Fire Station in Garden Grove

RFP No. S-1177

Contract Administrator Project Mgr.	Sandra Segawa Dave Barlag
RATER'S NUMBER:	
NAME OF PROPOSER:	WD Westgroup Designs
	RATING SCALE

Use one form to compile the rating for each proposer. Rate the proposer from 1 - 10 on each criterion as they and their proposal relate to the work. NOTE: The attached narrative section must also be completed to support the evaluator's scoring for each proposal. **PLEASE DO NOT RATE THE PRICING SECTION!**

Criteria	Weight	х	Rating	=	Score
1. Price	20	x	XXX	=	80
2. Project Plan	40	х	8	=	320
3. Qualifications of				=	
Proposer/Ability to Meet Proposal	40	Х			320
Requirements			Carried Contraction of the Contr		<u> </u>
Overall Score	100	Х		=	720

3. I have rated the above Proposer's ability to perform the subject service according to the listed criteria and weights and calculated an overall score of $\frac{720}{}$, which is consistent with the rating scale.

er: _____

1. PRICE PRICE DETAILED COSTS.

2. PROJECT PLAN

3. QUALIFICATIONS OF PROPOSER/ABILITY TO MEET PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

DO UN WORLE TO - MOON PLONEYBY ISECONDEMENTS - MOON PLONEYBY

Provide Preliminary Site Plan and Environmental Work for a Replacement Fire Station in Garden Grove

RFP No. S-1177

Contract Administrator Project Mgr.	Sandra Segawa Dave Barlag
RATER'S NUMBER:	
NAME OF PROPOSER:	Rubio Medina DBA RM Architecture
	RATING SCALE

Use one form to compile the rating for each proposer. Rate the proposer from 1 - 10 on each criterion as they and their proposal relate to the work. NOTE: The attached narrative section must also be completed to support the evaluator's scoring for each proposal. **PLEASE DO NOT RATE THE PRICING SECTION!**

Criteria	Weight	х	Rating	=	Score
1. Price	20	х	XXX	=	41
2. Project Plan	40	х	9	=	360
3. Qualifications of Proposer/Ability to Meet Proposal Requirements	40	x	9	=	360
Overall Score	100	х		=	761

3. I have rated the above Proposer's ability to perform the subject service according to the listed criteria and weights and calculated an overall score of $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$, which is consistent with the rating scale.

1. PRICE

nent crear

2. PROJECT PLAN

VERY CIERT PROJECT FORMI.

3. QUALIFICATIONS OF PROPOSER/ABILITY TO MEET PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

PARES ON REP. FOR THE THE THE WORK TO THE MESON !

Provide Preliminary Site Plan and Environmental Work for a Replacement Fire Station in Garden Grove

RFP No. S-1177

Sandra Segawa

Project Mgr.

Dave Barlag

RATER'S NUMBER:

2

NAME OF PROPOSER:

WLC Architects, Inc.

RATING SCALE

Use one form to compile the rating for each proposer. Rate the proposer from 1 - 10 on each criterion as they and their proposal relate to the work. NOTE: The attached narrative section must also be completed to support the evaluator's scoring for each proposal. **PLEASE DO NOT RATE THE PRICING SECTION!**

Criteria	Weight	x	Rating	=	Score
1. Price	20	x	XXX	=	200
2. Project Plan	40	x	7	=	2-80
3. Qualifications of Proposer/Ability to Meet Proposal Requirements	40	x	9	11	360
Overall Score	100	х		=	840

3. I have rated the above Proposer's ability to perform the subject service according to the listed criteria and weights and calculated an overall score of $\frac{1}{2}$, which is consistent with the rating scale.

Rater:

1. PRICE

2. PROJECT PLAN

The WLC project plan exceeds the standards for this project and forwards a team structure that is in alignment with the goals of the City's proposal. In addition, the plan's key objectives reinforce the goals of the Fire Department and the critical concerns of the City.

3. QUALIFICATIONS OF PROPOSER/ABILITY TO MEET PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

The WLC work product is high quality and error free. In addition, the plan clearly outlines the qualifications of WLC staff and their ability to complete the work as required. The extensive list of similar public safety projects in Orange County provided by WLC is impressive. WLC also provided a lengthy reference list, which validated their ability to complete the project on time and on budget.

Provide Preliminary Site Plan and Environmental Work for a Replacement Fire Station in Garden Grove

RFP No. S-1177

Contract.	Administrator
-----------	---------------

Sandra Segawa

Project Mgr.

Dave Barlag

RATER'S NUMBER:

2

NAME OF PROPOSER:

WD Westgroup Designs

RATING SCALE

Use one form to compile the rating for each proposer. Rate the proposer from 1 - 10 on each criterion as they and their proposal relate to the work. NOTE: The attached narrative section must also be completed to support the evaluator's scoring for each proposal. **PLEASE DO NOT RATE THE PRICING SECTION!**

Criteria	Weight	x	Rating	=	Score
1. Price	20	x	XXX	. =	80
2. Project Plan	40	x	5	=	200
3. Qualifications of Proposer/Ability to Meet Proposal Requirements	40	х	5	11	200
Overall Score	100	х		=	480

3. I have rated the above Proposer's ability to perform the subject service according to the listed criteria and weights and calculated an overall score of _______, which is consistent with the rating scale.

Rater:

Signature/Date

9/29/16

1. PRICE

2. PROJECT PLAN

WESTGROUP Designs project plan meets the minimum requirements of the analytical work and efficient uses of resources. The plan lists examples of several projects within the Orange County area. An over emphasis was made on developing a plan that would be in alignment with the Orange County Fire Authority (OCFA) standards, and not enough emphasis on the direct special needs of the City of Garden Grove.

3. QUALIFICATIONS OF PROPOSER/ABILITY TO MEET PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

WESTGROUP Design proposal would meet the basic proposed requirements. References provided by WESTGROUP stated satisfactory work performance.

Provide Preliminary Site Plan and Environmental Work for a Replacement Fire Station in Garden Grove

RFP No. S-1177

Contract Administrator Project Mgr.	Sandra Segawa Dave Barlag
RATER'S NUMBER:	2
NAME OF PROPOSER:	Rubio Medina DBA RM Architecture

RATING SCALE

Use one form to compile the rating for each proposer. Rate the proposer from 1 - 10 on each criterion as they and their proposal relate to the work. NOTE: The attached narrative section must also be completed to support the evaluator's scoring for each proposal. **PLEASE DO NOT RATE THE PRICING SECTION!**

Criteria	Weight	х	Rating		Score
1. Price	20	х	XXX	=	41
2. Project Plan	40	х	5	=	200
3. Qualifications of Proposer/Ability to Meet Proposal Requirements	40	x	6-	11	240
Overall Score	100	х		=	481

3. I have rated the above Proposer's ability to perform the subject service according to the listed criteria and weights and calculated an overall score of ______, which is consistent with the rating scale.

Signature/Date

= 9/29/15

1. PRICE

2. PROJECT PLAN

RM Architectures (Project Plan) was competent in the terms of analytical work. The plan meets the minimum requirements and needs of the project.

3. QUALIFICATIONS OF PROPOSER/ABILITY TO MEET PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

RM Architecture "Qualifications" meets the minimum requirements. A large list of fire station projects was listed in their document, but only one specific fire department/station reference was listed.

Provide Preliminary Site Plan and Environmental Work for a Replacement Fire Station in Garden Grove

RFP No. S-1177

Contract	Administrator
----------	---------------

Project Mgr.

Sandra Segawa

Dave Barlag

RATER'S NUMBER:

3

NAME OF PROPOSER:

WLC Architects, Inc.

RATING SCALE

Use one form to compile the rating for each proposer. Rate the proposer from 1 - 10 on each criterion as they and their proposal relate to the work. NOTE: The attached narrative section must also be completed to support the evaluator's scoring for each proposal. **PLEASE DO NOT RATE THE PRICING SECTION!**

Criteria	Weight	х	Rating	=	Score
1. Price	20	х	XXX	=	200
2. Project Plan	40	x	9	=	360
3. Qualifications of Proposer/Ability to Meet Proposal Requirements	40	x	9	=	360
Overall Score	100	Х		=	920

3. I have rated the above Proposer's ability to perform the subject service according to the listed criteria and weights and calculated an overall score of $\frac{1}{2}$, which is consistent with the rating scale.

Rater:

1. PRICE	
	Price was lowest of all proposals.

2. PROJECT PLAN

Proposer project plan is exceptional and meets the specific needs of the City of Garden Grove

3. QUALIFICATIONS OF PROPOSER/ABILITY TO MEET PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

Contractor's proposal indicates exceptional response to stated requirements

Provide Preliminary Site Plan and Environmental Work for a Replacement Fire Station in Garden Grove

RFP No. S-1177

Contract Administrator Project Mgr.	<u>Sandra Segawa</u> Dave Barlag
RATER'S NUMBER:	3
NAME OF PROPOSER:	WD Westgroup Designs
	RATING SCALE

Use one form to compile the rating for each proposer. Rate the proposer from 1 - 10 on each criterion as they and their proposal relate to the work. NOTE: The attached narrative section must also be completed to support the evaluator's scoring for each proposal. **PLEASE DO NOT RATE THE PRICING SECTION!**

Criteria	Weight	х	Rating		Score
1. Price	20	х	XXX	=	80
2. Project Plan	40	х	8	=	320
3. Qualifications of Proposer/Ability to Meet Proposal Requirements	40	х	7	=	280
Overall Score	100	х		=	680

3. I have rated the above Proposer's ability to perform the subject service according to the listed criteria and weights and calculated an overall score of $\frac{600}{1000}$, which is consistent with the rating scale.

4		_	T	_	_
4	D.	_		ſ	<u>_</u>
.1	Г	г	1	u	L

Price was completive.

2. PROJECT PLAN

Project plan was good

3. QUALIFICATIONS OF PROPOSER/ABILITY TO MEET PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

Proposer has necessary qualifications to meet requirements. However, references were less than favorable.

Provide Preliminary Site Plan and Environmental Work for a Replacement Fire Station in Garden Grove

RFP No. S-1177

Contract Administrator Project Mgr.	<u>Sandra Segawa</u> <u>Dave Barlag</u>
RATER'S NUMBER:	3
NAME OF PROPOSER:	Rubio Medina DBA RM Architecture

Use one form to compile the rating for each proposer. Rate the proposer from 1 - 10 on each criterion as they and their proposal relate to the work. NOTE: The attached narrative section must also be completed to support the evaluator's scoring for each proposal. **PLEASE DO NOT RATE THE PRICING SECTION!**

RATING SCALE

Criteria	Weight	х	Rating	=	Score
1. Price	20	х	XXX	=	41
2. Project Plan	40	х	7	=	280
3. Qualifications of Proposer/Ability to Meet Proposal Requirements	40	×	8	=	320
Overall Score	100	х		=	641

3. I have rated the above Proposer's ability to perform the subject service according to the listed criteria and weights and calculated an overall score of _______, which is consistent with the rating scale.

1. PRICE

Price was the highest of all proposals

2. PROJECT PLAN

Proposers plan exceeded standards. However, on page 31 proposed listed several exclusions. My concern lies with bullet point two (2), Hazardous materials evaluation. They didn't address an action plan in the event of a hazardous materials discovery.

3. QUALIFICATIONS OF PROPOSER/ABILITY TO MEET PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

Proposer appears qualified. However, I have concerns that the size of his company could negatively impact our project.

Provide Preliminary Site Plan and Environmental Work for a Replacement Fire Station in Garden Grove

RFP No. S-1177

Cor	ntr	ac	t	Administrator
				-

Sandra Segawa

Project Mgr.

Dave Barlag

RATER'S NUMBER:

4

NAME OF PROPOSER:

WLC Architects, Inc.

RATING SCALE

Use one form to compile the rating for each proposer. Rate the proposer from 1 - 10 on each criterion as they and their proposal relate to the work. NOTE: The attached narrative section must also be completed to support the evaluator's scoring for each proposal. **PLEASE DO NOT RATE THE PRICING SECTION!**

Criteria .	Weight	x	Rating	=	Score
1. Price	20	х	XXX		200
2. Project Plan	40	х	Q		360
3. Qualifications of Proposer/Ability to Meet Proposal Requirements	40	x	6		240
Overall Score	100	x		=	800

3. I have rated the above Proposer's ability to perform the subject service according to the listed criteria and weights and calculated an overall score of ______, which is consistent with the rating scale.

Rater:

1. PRICE

2. PROJECT PLAN

Appears well qualified with good experience, but in my appropriate weakest of the 3 proposals (see below).

- 3. QUALIFICATIONS OF PROPOSER/ABILITY TO MEET PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS
- . Proposal Not TABBED AND organized as directed in the RFP
- · No evident manpower analysis included
- · Roject examples that include completion dates
- * Not a lot of specific about our 3 sites

Provide Preliminary Site Plan and Environmental Work for a Replacement Fire Station in Garden Grove

RFP No. S-1177

Contract Administrator

<u>Sandra Segawa</u>

Project Mgr.

Dave Barlag

RATER'S NUMBER:

4

NAME OF PROPOSER:

WD Westgroup Designs

RATING SCALE

Use one form to compile the rating for each proposer. Rate the proposer from 1 - 10 on each criterion as they and their proposal relate to the work. NOTE: The attached narrative section must also be completed to support the evaluator's scoring for each proposal. *PLEASE DO NOT RATE THE PRICING SECTION!*

Criteria	Weight	x	Rating		Score
1. Price	20	x	XXX	=	80
2. Project Plan	40	x	Processed		280
3. Qualifications of Proposer/Ability to Meet Proposal Requirements	40	×	9	galaga -	360
Overall Score	100	x		三	720

3. I have rated the above Proposer's ability to perform the subject service according to the listed criteria and weights and calculated an overall score of _______, which is consistent with the rating scale.

?ater

1. PRICE

2. PROJECT PLAN

Although projects with fewer Agencies, the firm has performed and has relevant expensioned

3. QUALIFICATIONS OF PROPOSER/ABILITY TO MEET PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

Best organized proposal.

Not the most varied experience (OCFA, hime Co. mainly)

Not sure if projects highlighted are withoutle last 5 yrs.

as stated in RFP.

Provide Preliminary Site Plan and Environmental Work for a Replacement Fire Station in Garden Grove

RFP No. S-1177

Contract Administrator	Sandra Segaw
Project Mgr.	<u>Dave Barlag</u>

RATER'S NUMBER:

NAME OF PROPOSER: Rubio Medina DBA RM Architecture

RATING SCALE

Use one form to compile the rating for each proposer. Rate the proposer from 1 - 10 on each criterion as they and their proposal relate to the work. NOTE: The attached narrative section must also be completed to support the evaluator's scoring for each proposal. **PLEASE DO NOT RATE THE PRICING SECTION!**

Criteria	Weight	x	Rating	=	Score
1. Price	20	х	XXX		41
2. Project Plan	40	х	8		320
3. Qualifications of Proposer/Ability to Meet Proposal Requirements	40	x	8		320
Overall Score	100	x		ا= ا	681

3. I have rated the above Proposer's ability to perform the subject service according to the listed criteria and weights and calculated an overall score of $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{2}}$, which is consistent with the rating scale.

1. PRICE

2. PROJECT PLAN

Appeners to be a mell qualified firm/team with relevent-

3. QUALIFICATIONS OF PROPOSER/ABILITY TO MEET PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

- n Description of issue and plan for existing FSG did not include perfermal of purchasing additional property to make the site larger and a more suitable size.
- · Not tabbed or organized asdirected in 121-12
- . Difficult to tell it recent projects occurred without last 5-years as started as RFP