

## Business Plan Consultant Selection QUALIFICATIONS REVIEW

Instructions:

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

That attached scoring sheet is for the *Qualifications Section* of the Public Market Business Plan Proposals (Chapter 3). The Local Food Committee's RFP Selection Subcommittee is asked to fill out the attached sheet for each submitted proposal.

As indicated on the scoring sheet, each section of Chapter 3 of the proposal is assigned a weight that will influence its overall affect on the total score for each consultant team. The Review Committee is asked to rank each section of each proposal on a scale of 1 to 10 with 10 being the highest (see chart below for guidelines).

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					

		ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS	GOOD FOOD PARTNERS	JC WILLIAMS	LINVILLE ARCHTITECTS	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								

Use the space below to provide any additional comments on each of the proposals. In addition, based on the totality of the qualifications sections, for each proposal indicate whether you think it should move on to the approach review or be eliminated from consideration.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS
Charled this consequence on to the HAmmarach Parisculla, V / N
Should this proposal move on to the "Approach Review"? Y/N
GOOD FOOD PARTNERS
Should this proposal move on to the "Approach Review"? Y/N
Should this proposal move on to the Approach Neview: 1714
JC WILLIAMS
Should this proposal move on to the "Approach Review"? Y/N
The state of the s
LINVILLE ARCHTITECTS
Should this proposal move on to the "Approach Review"? Y/N

