

RFP EVALUATION PANEL REPORT

Project: Yahara Hills Maintenance Facility (for Golf Operations)
Location: 7051 Millpond Road, Madison, WI 53718
Aldermanic District: 16
RFP: 14049-0-2025-BP (Contract 9706)
Date: Nov. 05, 2025

This Evaluation has been reviewed and approved by a Principal Architect 2, Principal Engineer 2, Deputy City Engineer, Deputy Division Manager, or the City Engineer. ☒ Yes ☐ No

A. Project Details

1. Background Information

The current golf maintenance building, located on Brandt Rd. on the eastern side of the Yahara Golf Course, is located on property that was sold to Dane County for the new [Dane County Sustainability Campus + Future Landfill](#). The City of Madison Parks Golf Program will need to vacate the existing maintenance buildings by Oct. 31, 2028. The goal is to complete this project by March 31, 2028 in order to not interfere with the 2028 golf season.

This project consists of the design and construction of a golf maintenance building and cold storage to be located at the eastern side of the existing Yahara Hills clubhouse customer parking lot, at 7051 Millpond Road in Madison, WI. This facility will be utilized year-round by Parks Division Golf Operations to service all of the City's golf program vehicles and equipment. This facility will also be used as the golf course maintenance facility for the Yahara Hills Golf Course.

The preliminary design and construction budget for this project is approximately \$3.0M. Design is scheduled to start January of 2026 and the project is expected to go out for bid the first quarter of 2027. Construction is estimated to begin the second quarter of 2027 and be completed by the end of March 2028.

2. Role of Architecture and Engineering Services (A/E)

The A/E design services for this contract shall include plans and specifications for site planning, landscaping, architectural design of interior and exterior spaces, finishes, MEP/FP/T (mechanical, electrical, plumbing, fire protection, and technology) systems design, constructions specifications, and cost estimating. The design is required to achieve a LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) silver rating.

The A/E scope shall be for all design phases, preparation for bidding, construction administration and the warranty phase.

B. Purchasing Details

1. Purchasing guidelines for RFP evaluation

The City of Madison solicited proposals from qualified vendors through a Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP, addenda, tabulations, awards and related announcements were posted on two distribution networks – VendorNet and DemandStar. The RFP format, scoring and awarding was overseen by City of Madison, Finance-Purchasing.

2. RFP Response and Evaluation Timeline - 2025

Aug 07	RFP is issued
Aug 21	Optional A/E Site Visit of existing facilities
Aug 22	Questions Due
Aug 28	Addendum 1 posted
Sep 05	Proposals Due
Sep 11	Evaluation meeting #1. Distribute submissions to Evaluation Panelists
Sep 25	Scoring is due to City Purchasing
Sep 25	Evaluation meeting #2. Panel discussed technical scores, local preference scoring, and fee proposal scoring. The Panel selected the top 4 finalists pending the response from one finalist.
Sep 28	One finalist asked to withdraw

Sep 30	Questions and interview format sent to three finalists
Oct 14	Addendum 2 posted
Oct 22	Finalist interviews
Oct 28	Evaluation meeting #3, Panel discussed interviews
Nov 25	Referral/Recommendation at Common Council
Dec 01	Referral/Recommendation at Finance Committee
Dec 03	Referral/Recommendation at Board of Public Works
Dec 09	Action at Common Council

3. Original RFP Respondents (7)

1. Angus-Young Associates, Inc.
2. Aro Eberle Architects
3. Dimension IV Madison Design Group
4. Dorschner|Associates, Inc.
5. Sketchworks Architecture LLC
6. Strang, Inc.
7. Thrive Architects, LLC

4. Evaluation Panel

The evaluation panel was comprised of a total of four panelists. The panelists were tasked with scoring the technical requirements of the RFP proposal and included the following: 2 panelists from City Engineering-Facilities Management and 2 panelists from the Parks Division.

5. Evaluation Structure and Scoring

Evaluations were documented through a quantifiable scoring mechanism – see Section C of this document. The evaluation was conducted in a structured manner and administered by City Finance’s Purchasing Unit. See below for additional details.

ROUND - 1

Per instructions within the Request for Proposal, Respondents were asked to provide a series of deliverables, a portion of which were evaluated by the Panel. Evaluated deliverables included in the RFP in Section 5. Scope of Work and Required Information. Panelists followed Purchasing guidelines and predetermined grading scales for each evaluated deliverable as detailed in section 5.3 Required Information and Content of Proposals.

Panelists evaluated and scored the technical qualification and information section of each proposal and submitted their scoring evaluation to Purchasing where all the Panelist scores were averaged and weighted for evaluation for each of the Respondents. Purchasing scored the following deliverables based on City Purchasing guidelines: 5.4 Cost Proposal and 5.5 Local Vendor Preference. Results were then provided to the Panelists based on Section 5.6 Basis for Selection.

One firm’s proposal was over 50% lower in hours and price. The panel recommended Purchasing to reach out to the firm with the lowest proposal, offering them three business days to review their proposal hours and fee and provide an update.

After Purchasing reached out to the firm with the lowest proposal, they offered to remove themselves from the process. Purchasing clarified the City was not requesting the firm withdraw and informed the firm they had the option to make updates. Purchasing did not receive a response by the deadline, and subject firm was removed from consideration moving forward. The Panelists recommended the remaining next three highest scoring Finalists move on to Round 2 of the evaluation process.

ROUND - 2

The three Finalists were provided with five specific criteria that needed to be addressed during their interview presentation. The Panelists evaluated each Finalist team on how well they did or did not address the criteria, how well they responded to questions by the Panelists after their presentation, and how well the overall presentation went.

Panelists evaluated and scored each Finalists interview and submitted their scoring evaluation to Purchasing. Purchasing weighted and averaged all of the interview scores along with the original Round 1 scores.

Panelists then met to discuss the consolidated scoring and recommended one Finalist as noted in section C1 below.

C. Summary of Evaluation

1. Scoring Round 1

	Max Points	Angus-Young	Aro Eberle	Dimension IV	Dorschner	Sketch works	Strang	Thrive
Technical	65	57	42.13	60.69	49.75	57.63	49.69	45.63
Cost	30	30	14.65	13.64	16.22	9.31	10.92	17.82
Local Vendor	5	0	5	5	5	5	5	0
Total	100	87	61.77	79.33	70.97	71.94	65.6	63.44
Ranking		1	7	2	4	3	5	6

Notes:

1. The RFP proposal review is an opportunity to narrow the field of candidates via an initial round of scoring primarily based on response to the RFP guidelines. A smaller group of Finalists then moved on to an interview round.
2. A full description of requested material and grading weights can be found in the associated RFP documents.
3. Please review Section 4, below regarding Local Vendor Preference.

2. Scoring Round 2

	Max Points	Dimension IV	Dorschner	Sketch works
Technical (Round 1)	65	60.69	49.75	57.63
Presentation (Round 2)	65	56.03	57.63	52.38
Cost	60	50.44	60	34.43
Local Vendor	10	10	10	10
Total	100	177.16	177.38	154.43
Ranking		2	1	3

3. Fee Breakdown

Cost Evaluation	Dimension IV	Dorschner	Sketchworks
Basic Services of Scope	\$295,318	\$248,254	\$432,581
Total Hours	1829	1704	2986
Average Cost per Hour	\$161.46	\$145.69	\$ 144.87
Purchasing Cost Score	50.44	60	34.43

4. Local Preference

The City of Madison has adopted a Local Preference Purchasing Policy (RES-07-00421, FILE ID 05943) granting a scoring preference to local suppliers. Only suppliers who meet the criteria and are registered as of the bid's due date will receive preference.

Was the outcome of this bid changed by the local purchasing ordinance?

☐ Yes

☒ No

5. Recommendation

Based on the scoring and evaluation outlined above the selection Panel recommends that Dorschner | Associates, Inc. be approved as the consultant for the professional services required for the Yahara Hills Maintenance Facility project.