



Business Plan Consultant Selection
QUALIFICATIONS AND APPROACH REVIEW

Instructions:

PLEASE COMPLETE AND RETURN YOUR SCORES BY AUGUST 12. RESULTS WILL BE DISCUSSED AT THE SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING ON AUGUST 13.

That attached scoring sheet is for the Public Market Business Plan Proposals. The Local Food Committee's RFP Selection Subcommittee members are asked to fill out the following tables ranking the qualifications sections and approach sections of each proposal. Committee members are then asked for additional comments for each team and whether each team should be selected as a finalist and invited to interview.

| RATING GUIDELINE | | |
|------------------|--------------|---|
| Points | Description | Explanation |
| 10 - 9 | Excellent | Meets/exceeds requirements and expectations. |
| 8 - 7 | Very Good | Above average response. Few if any offsetting weaknesses |
| 6 - 5 | Good | Average response. Adequately addresses all criteria and meets all requirements. |
| 4 - 3 | Fair | Below average. Minimally addresses all requirements. |
| 2 - 1 | Poor | Mostly noncompliant. Serious doubts exist about ability to perform work. |
| 0 | Unacceptable | Fails to meet baseline requirements |

QUALIFICATIONS REVIEW

| | | ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS | GOOD FOOD PARTNERS | JC WILLIAMS | LINVILLE ARCHITECTS | MARKET VENTURES | MJB / FRIDAY | PROJECT FOR PUBLIC SPACES | VANDEWALLE & ASSOCIATES |
|-------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|---------------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| RFP SECTION | | RATING (1-10) | RATING (1-10) | RATING (1-10) | RATING (1-10) | RATING (1-10) | RATING (1-10) | RATING (1-10) | RATING (1-10) |
| 3A | Background and History | | | | | | | | |
| 3B | Project Team | | | | | | | | |
| 3C | Experience and References | | | | | | | | |
| 3D | Conflict of Interest | | | | | | | | |
| 3F | Contract Failures, Litigations | | | | | | | | |
| 3G | Financial Capability | | | | | | | | |

APPROACH REVIEW

| | | ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS | GOOD FOOD PARTNERS | JC WILLIAMS | LINVILLE ARCHITECTS | MARKET VENTURES | MJB / FRIDAY | PROJECT FOR PUBLIC SPACES | VANDEWALLE & ASSOCIATES |
|-------------|--|-------------------------------|--------------------|---------------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| RFP SECTION | | RATING (1-10) | RATING (1-10) | RATING (1-10) | RATING (1-10) | RATING (1-10) | RATING (1-10) | RATING (1-10) | RATING (1-10) |
| 4A | Technical Approach to Each Work Element | | | | | | | | |
| 4B | Clear Work Plan and Schedule | | | | | | | | |
| 4C | Reasonable Estimation of Total Work Hours by Task | | | | | | | | |
| 4D | Identification of Potential Road Blocks and Challenges | | | | | | | | |
| 4E | Identification of Information needed from the City | | | | | | | | |
| 4F | Any Other Information | | | | | | | | |

Use the space below to provide any additional comments on each of the proposals. In addition, for each proposal indicate whether you think it should move to an interview or be eliminated from consideration.

| ADDITIONAL COMMENTS |
|--|
| ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS Should this team be invited to interview? Y / N |
| GOOD FOOD PARTNERS Should this team be invited to interview? Y / N |
| JC WILLIAMS Should this team be invited to interview? Y / N |
| LINVILLE ARCHTITECTS Should this team be invited to interview? Y / N |

MARKET VENTURES

Should this team be invited to interview? Y / N

MJB / FRIDAY

Should this team be invited to interview? Y / N

PROJECT FOR PUBLIC SPACES

Should this team be invited to interview? Y / N

VANDEWALLE & ASSOCIATES

Should this team be invited to interview? Y / N