



City of Palm Desert
PW - Capital Improvement Projects
Jess Culpeper, Director of Capital Projects
73-510 Fred Waring Drive, Palm Desert, CA 92260

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

RESPONSE DEADLINE: February 13, 2024 at 2:00 pm

Report Generated: Thursday, February 22, 2024

PHASE 1

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Clarity and conformance of proposal to the RFP	0-5 Points	10 (10% of Total)

Description:

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Content of the proposal, including work plan	0-5 Points	25 (25% of Total)

Description:

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Firm experience and performance	0-5 Points	35 (35% of Total)

Description:

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Team members' experience and performance	0-5 Points	20 (20% of Total)

Description:

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Comments by References	0-5 Points	5 (5% of Total)

Description:

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Fee Proposal	0-5 Points	5 (5% of Total)

Description:

AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY

Vendor	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Evaluator 6	Evaluator 7	Evaluator 8	Total Score (Max Score 100)
Richard Kennedy Architects	-	-	93	99	-	97	95	95	95.8
Johnson Favaro	-	-	99	96	-	96	96	82	93.8
MSR Design	-	-	91	88	-	91	96	88	90.8
Gensler	-	-	97	89	-	91	89	76	88.4

EVALUATION TABULATION

Request For Proposal - Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

Vendor	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Evaluator 6	Evaluator 7	Evaluator 8	Total Score (Max Score 100)
LPA, Inc.	-	-	95	80	-	84	85	73	83.4
CannonDesign	-	-	93	92	-	93	66	55	79.8
Group 4 Architecture, Research + Planning, Inc.	-	-	67	75	-	86	73	63	72.8
The Miller Hull Partnership, LLP	-	-	67	74	-	83	51	60	67
KFA Architecture	-	-	68	75	-	70	56	64	66.6
Ferguson Pape Baldwin Architects	-	-	80	63	-	65	79	34	64.2
Stayner Architects	-	-	62	65	-	61	46	69	60.6
LEVER Architecture	-	-	58	58	-	53	50	60	55.8
RIOS Inc.	-	-	73	62	-	61	39	43	55.6
TSK Architects	-	-	67	50	-	55	35	44	50.2
Aaron Neubert Architects, Inc	-	-	72	50	-	53	38	36	49.8
STK Architecture, Inc.	-	-	56	28	-	29	27	25	33

EVALUATION TABULATION

Request For Proposal - Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA

Vendor	Clarity and conformance of proposal to the RFP 0-5 Points 10 Points (10%)	Content of the proposal, including work plan 0-5 Points 25 Points (25%)	Firm experience and performance 0-5 Points 35 Points (35%)	Team members' experience and performance 0-5 Points 20 Points (20%)	Comments by References 0-5 Points 5 Points (5%)	Fee Proposal 0-5 Points 5 Points (5%)	Total Score (Max Score 100)
Richard Kennedy Architects	5	4.8	5	4.6	4.8	3.6	95.8
Johnson Favaro	4.6	4.6	5	5	5	1.6	93.8
MSR Design	4.8	4.4	5	4.4	4.6	2	90.8
Gensler	4.2	4.4	4.6	4.8	4.8	1.8	88.4
LPA, Inc.	4.2	3.8	4.4	4.2	4.4	4	83.4
CannonDesign	4.2	3.8	4.2	4	4.2	2.8	79.8
Group 4 Architecture, Research + Planning, Inc.	3.6	2.8	4	3.8	4.8	3.6	72.8
The Miller Hull Partnership, LLP	3.6	2.8	3.6	3.4	4.2	2.8	67
KFA Architecture	3.8	3.6	3.4	2.4	4.2	3.4	66.6
Ferguson Pape Baldwin Architects	3.4	2.8	3.4	3.2	4.6	2.2	64.2
Stayner Architects	3.8	3.8	2.6	2	3.8	4	60.6
LEVER Architecture	4	2.4	2.6	2.6	4	3.2	55.8
RIOS Inc.	3.4	3	2.8	2.2	3.8	1.6	55.6

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

Vendor	Clarity and conformance of proposal to the RFP 0-5 Points 10 Points (10%)	Content of the proposal, including work plan 0-5 Points 25 Points (25%)	Firm experience and performance 0-5 Points 35 Points (35%)	Team members' experience and performance 0-5 Points 20 Points (20%)	Comments by References 0-5 Points 5 Points (5%)	Fee Proposal 0-5 Points 5 Points (5%)	Total Score (Max Score 100)
TSK Architects	3.2	2.6	2	2.4	3.8	3.4	50.2
Aaron Neubert Architects, Inc	2.8	2.6	2	2.4	3.8	3.8	49.8
STK Architecture, Inc.	2.6	1.4	1.4	1.4	3.4	2	33

INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES

Aaron Neubert Architects, Inc	
Clarity and conformance of proposal to the RFP 0-5 Points 10 Points (10%)	
Conformed to RFP Requirements	Evaluator 1: - Evaluator 2: - Evaluator 3: 3
See rating	Evaluator 4: 3 Evaluator 5: - Evaluator 6: 4
Joint Venture proposal. ANX + MKE.	Evaluator 7: 3

Very general

Evaluator 8: 1

Not clear

Content of the proposal, including work plan | 0-5 Points | 25 Points (25%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 3

6-7month work plan. Seemed to identify major milestones

Evaluator 4: 3

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 3

Missing SD scope of work. 8 months schedule

Evaluator 7: 3

Seemed very generic.

Evaluator 8: 1

Workplan not thorough

Firm experience and performance | 0-5 Points | 35 Points (35%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 4

Good experience in desert climate and on libraries

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

Evaluator 4: 2

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 2

Only 1 Library reference project, and it's in design

Evaluator 7: 1

Minimal relevant experience

Evaluator 8: 1

Little Library experience

Team members' experience and performance | 0-5 Points | 20 Points (20%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 4

Good subs

Evaluator 4: 2

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 2

Proposed Architect team members lack Library experience

Evaluator 7: 1

No clear experience for team members

Evaluator 8: 3

Little Library, Arch. Exp.

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

Comments by References | 0-5 Points | 5 Points (5%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 4

Good Reference

Evaluator 4: 4

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 5

Haven't spoken to references.

Evaluator 7: 1

Only had one library in the works.

Evaluator 8: 5

Acceptable

Fee Proposal | 0-5 Points | 5 Points (5%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 3

under \$300k but what about CDs?

Evaluator 4: 3

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 3

\$297,500 (incl. \$20,000 reimb.) Missing scope of work.

Evaluator 7: 5

Low cost.

Evaluator 8: 5

Low Fee

CannonDesign

Clarity and conformance of proposal to the RFP | 0-5 Points | 10 Points (10%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 5

Conformed to RFP requirements. 6 months schedule

Evaluator 4: 5

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 5

No comment.

Evaluator 7: 4

Addressed the RFP

Evaluator 8: 2

Not clear

Content of the proposal, including work plan | 0-5 Points | 25 Points (25%)

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 4

6 month schedule

Evaluator 4: 4

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 4

Lots of Library Experience. Some durations of activities in schedule appear to be too short.

Evaluator 7: 4

Complete

Evaluator 8: 3

Nat'l firm/But is that exp. present here

Firm experience and performance | 0-5 Points | 35 Points (35%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 5

Lots of CV and Library Exp.

Evaluator 4: 5

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 5

Lots of Library experience.

Evaluator 7: 3

Clearly capable, but not a lot of municipal library experience--mostly education.

Evaluator 8: 3

Riv. County Library, Little else

Team members' experience and performance | 0-5 Points | 20 Points (20%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 5

They identified a Library SME on the team. The subs, for landscape, are local

Evaluator 4: 5

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 5

Experienced team members, including Library Specialist

Evaluator 7: 3

Deep bench strength

Evaluator 8: 2

Some Lib Experience.

Comments by References | 0-5 Points | 5 Points (5%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 4

Provided

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

See rating

Evaluator 4: 4

Evaluator 5: -

Haven't spoken to references.

Evaluator 6: 5

Decent reference list.

Evaluator 7: 3

Acceptable

Evaluator 8: 5

Fee Proposal | 0-5 Points | 5 Points (5%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Add ons

Evaluator 3: 4

See rating

Evaluator 4: 3

Evaluator 5: -

\$604,099 (\$0 reimb.) 5th highest.

Evaluator 6: 3

Pricey

Evaluator 7: 2

Moderately high Fee

Evaluator 8: 2

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

Ferguson Pape Baldwin Architects

Clarity and conformance of proposal to the RFP | 0-5 Points | 10 Points (10%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 4

Conformed to RFP

Evaluator 4: 4

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 5

No comments

Evaluator 7: 3

Most elements addressed.

Evaluator 8: 1

Not clear

Content of the proposal, including work plan | 0-5 Points | 25 Points (25%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 3

9-month schedule

Evaluator 4: 3

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 3

Architecture of reference projects not exciting. 8 month schedule. Missing Programming scope, only confirmation of MSS' program.

Evaluator 7: 3

No programming included

Evaluator 8: 2

Pedestrian

Firm experience and performance | 0-5 Points | 35 Points (35%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 5

I love gabions. Good library experience examples seem to respect/source local materials

Evaluator 4: 3

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 3

Architecture of reference projects not exciting

Evaluator 7: 5

Several community libraries

Evaluator 8: 1

Exp. S.D. County Libs. Less exp. Firm

Team members' experience and performance | 0-5 Points | 20 Points (20%)

EVALUATION TABULATION

Request For Proposal - Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

	Evaluator 1: -
	Evaluator 2: -
	Evaluator 3: 4
Good staff/team, too many subs	
	Evaluator 4: 3
See rating	
	Evaluator 5: -
	Evaluator 6: 3
No Library-specific staff or consultant.	
	Evaluator 7: 4
Smaller firm	
	Evaluator 8: 2
Some exp. & with libs,	

Comments by References | 0-5 Points | 5 Points (5%)

	Evaluator 1: -
	Evaluator 2: -
	Evaluator 3: 4
El Centro Library too busy architecturally	
	Evaluator 4: 5
See rating	
	Evaluator 5: -
	Evaluator 6: 5
Haven't spoken to references.	

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

NA Evaluator 7: 4

Acceptable Evaluator 8: 5

Fee Proposal | 0-5 Points | 5 Points (5%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

over \$500k Evaluator 3: 2

See rating Evaluator 4: 2

Evaluator 5: -

587,000 (incl. \$10,300 reimb.) 6th highest. Missing scope of work Evaluator 6: 2

Upper-mid Evaluator 7: 3

Moderately high fee Evaluator 8: 2

Gensler

Clarity and conformance of proposal to the RFP | 0-5 Points | 10 Points (10%)

Evaluator 1: -

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

	Evaluator 2: -
	Evaluator 3: 4
Conforms	
	Evaluator 4: 4
See rating	
	Evaluator 5: -
	Evaluator 6: 5
No comments	
	Evaluator 7: 5
Experienced	
	Evaluator 8: 3
Reasonably clear	

Content of the proposal, including work plan | 0-5 Points | 25 Points (25%)

	Evaluator 1: -
	Evaluator 2: -
	Evaluator 3: 5
A proposal that includes taking us through permitting and construction start? - YES PLEASE!	
	Evaluator 4: 4
See rating	
	Evaluator 5: -
	Evaluator 6: 4
7 month schedule	
	Evaluator 7: 5

Comprehensive

Evaluator 8: 4

Seems thorough

Firm experience and performance | 0-5 Points | 35 Points (35%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 5

Deep bench

Evaluator 4: 5

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 5

Good Library experience.

Evaluator 7: 4

Interiors are sterile

Evaluator 8: 4

Library experience, MSS

Team members' experience and performance | 0-5 Points | 20 Points (20%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 5

Depth

See rating	Evaluator 4: 5
	Evaluator 5: -
Hiring MSS as Library consultant.	Evaluator 6: 5
Team members have library and public space experience	Evaluator 7: 5
Architect Exp. Some Librar	Evaluator 8: 4

Comments by References | 0-5 Points | 5 Points (5%)

	Evaluator 1: -
	Evaluator 2: -
fine	Evaluator 3: 5
See rating	Evaluator 4: 5
	Evaluator 5: -
Haven't spoken to references.	Evaluator 6: 5
Good reference list	Evaluator 7: 4
Acceptable	Evaluator 8: 5

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

Fee Proposal | 0-5 Points | 5 Points (5%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 4

over \$700k

Evaluator 4: 1

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 1

\$779,160 (incl. \$12,000 reimb.) 2nd highest

Evaluator 7: 2

Expensive

Evaluator 8: 1

High Fee

Group 4 Architecture, Research + Planning, Inc.

Clarity and conformance of proposal to the RFP | 0-5 Points | 10 Points (10%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 4

Conformed

Evaluator 4: 4

See rating

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 4

No budgets provided for reference projects

Evaluator 7: 3

Missing schematic design

Evaluator 8: 3

not too clear. Pulled from RFP

Content of the proposal, including work plan | 0-5 Points | 25 Points (25%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 3

Previously worked on PD library. Too many conceptual project references. 6-month schedule

Evaluator 4: 3

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 3

Missing SD scope of work. Includes community engagement scope which was removed via Addendum #01. 7 months schedule

Evaluator 7: 3

Missing schematic design

Evaluator 8: 2

Left out lots of the scope

Firm experience and performance | 0-5 Points | 35 Points (35%)

Evaluator 1: -

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

	Evaluator 2: -
	Evaluator 3: 3
Too many conceptual drawings/references	
	Evaluator 4: 4
See rating	
	Evaluator 5: -
	Evaluator 6: 5
Good experience.	
	Evaluator 7: 5
Lots of library experience	
	Evaluator 8: 3
Competent	

Team members' experience and performance | 0-5 Points | 20 Points (20%)

	Evaluator 1: -
	Evaluator 2: -
	Evaluator 3: 4
Fine	
	Evaluator 4: 4
See rating	
	Evaluator 5: -
	Evaluator 6: 5
Good experience	
	Evaluator 7: 2

Not clear for full team

Evaluator 8: 4

Competent. Done Libs.

Comments by References | 0-5 Points | 5 Points (5%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 4

Fine

Evaluator 4: 5

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 5

Haven't spoken to references.

Evaluator 7: 5

Lots of library experience

Evaluator 8: 5

Acceptable

Fee Proposal | 0-5 Points | 5 Points (5%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 3

\$340k+

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

See rating	Evaluator 4: 3
	Evaluator 5: -
	Evaluator 6: 3
\$342,196 (\$0 reimb.) Missing scope of work.	
	Evaluator 7: 4
Low price, but missing key components	
	Evaluator 8: 5
Low Fee	

Johnson Favaro

Clarity and conformance of proposal to the RFP | 0-5 Points | 10 Points (10%)

	Evaluator 1: -
	Evaluator 2: -
	Evaluator 3: 5
Conformed	
	Evaluator 4: 5
See rating	
	Evaluator 5: -
	Evaluator 6: 5
No comments	
	Evaluator 7: 5
Comprehensive	

Clear
Evaluator 8: 3

Content of the proposal, including work plan | 0-5 Points | 25 Points (25%)

Evaluator 1: -
Evaluator 2: -

Great approach
Evaluator 3: 5

See rating
Evaluator 4: 5

Connection to Civic Center is high priority.
Evaluator 5: -
Evaluator 6: 5

Impressive showcase of work
Evaluator 7: 5

A bit cookie cutter
Evaluator 8: 3

Firm experience and performance | 0-5 Points | 35 Points (35%)

Evaluator 1: -
Evaluator 2: -

Great experience. it's like all they do is libraries. 35+ years expereince.
Evaluator 3: 5

See rating
Evaluator 4: 5

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 5

Lots of Master Planning & Library experience.

Evaluator 7: 5

Clear outlook and approach

Evaluator 8: 5

Have the experience

Team members' experience and performance | 0-5 Points | 20 Points (20%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 5

Best

Evaluator 4: 5

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 5

Proposed staff has lots Master Plan experience and good Library experience.

Evaluator 7: 5

Balanced skills

Evaluator 8: 5

Know libraries, no librarian experience per se.

Comments by References | 0-5 Points | 5 Points (5%)

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 5

Higher end communities match PDs Brand.

Evaluator 4: 5

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 5

Haven't spoken to references.

Evaluator 7: 5

Plenty of relevant references

Evaluator 8: 5

Acceptable

Fee Proposal | 0-5 Points | 5 Points (5%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 4

\$291K for conceptual - another \$800 for schematic.

Evaluator 4: 1

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 1

\$813,800 (\$0 reimb.) Most expensive.

Very expensive

Evaluator 7: 1

Very high fee

Evaluator 8: 1

KFA Architecture

Clarity and conformance of proposal to the RFP | 0-5 Points | 10 Points (10%)

Conforms

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

See rating

Evaluator 3: 4

No comments

Evaluator 4: 4

Hard to read

Evaluator 5: -

Not too clear

Evaluator 6: 5

Hard to read

Evaluator 7: 3

Not too clear

Evaluator 8: 3

Content of the proposal, including work plan | 0-5 Points | 25 Points (25%)

Evaluator 1: -

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 4

Fine

Evaluator 4: 4

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 4

Work Plan was more about what they've done, not what they're going to do for our project.

Evaluator 7: 3

Seems light on effort.

Evaluator 8: 3

Better than most

Firm experience and performance | 0-5 Points | 35 Points (35%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 3

Didnt highlight a lot of library items

Evaluator 4: 4

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 4

Good Library experience

Evaluator 7: 3

EVALUATION TABULATION

Request For Proposal - Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

Lots of discussion about library experience, but most of the examples were of schools and housing

Evaluator 8: 3

Firm has done libs. but only 1 person

Team members' experience and performance | 0-5 Points | 20 Points (20%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 3

Lacking Library experience

Evaluator 4: 3

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 1

Proposed Architect team has barely any Library experience. Architect recommends keeping MSS under contract.

Evaluator 7: 2

Did not include team member project experience.

Evaluator 8: 3

One person was/is Tech advisor

Comments by References | 0-5 Points | 5 Points (5%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 4

Fine

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

See rating

Evaluator 4: 4

Evaluator 5: -

Haven't spoken to references.

Evaluator 6: 5

Evaluator 7: 3

Lots of discussion about library experience, but most of the examples were of schools and housing

Acceptable

Evaluator 8: 5

Fee Proposal | 0-5 Points | 5 Points (5%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

\$362k

Evaluator 3: 3

See rating

Evaluator 4: 3

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 3

\$362,562 (incl. \$5,000 reimb.) Recommend keeping MSS under contract

Evaluator 7: 3

Does not seem adequate to produce a quality result.

Low Fee

Evaluator 8: 5

LEVER Architecture

Clarity and conformance of proposal to the RFP | 0-5 Points | 10 Points (10%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 4

conforms

Evaluator 4: 4

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 4

No comments

Evaluator 7: 4

Response not as complete as others

Evaluator 8: 4

Somewhat clear

Content of the proposal, including work plan | 0-5 Points | 25 Points (25%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 2

Sub list is pretty weak.

Evaluator 4: 2

See rating

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 3

Missing Programming scope

Evaluator 7: 3

Outline is very generic

Evaluator 8: 2

NW Aesthetic, Didn't follow guideline

Firm experience and performance | 0-5 Points | 35 Points (35%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 3

PNW, respect for local material

Evaluator 4: 3

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 2

Very little Library experience

Evaluator 7: 2

Minimal library experience, no evidence of experience with desert climate. Seem to showcase innovative materials that are untested in this environment.

Evaluator 8: 3

Not a ton of lib exp.

Team members' experience and performance | 0-5 Points | 20 Points (20%)

EVALUATION TABULATION

Request For Proposal - Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

	Evaluator 1: -
	Evaluator 2: -
	Evaluator 3: 3
Team members seem fine. I havent heard of their subs.	
	Evaluator 4: 3
See rating	
	Evaluator 5: -
	Evaluator 6: 2
Very little Library experience	
	Evaluator 7: 2
Minimal public library experience	
	Evaluator 8: 3
No Desert exp.	

Comments by References | 0-5 Points | 5 Points (5%)

	Evaluator 1: -
	Evaluator 2: -
	Evaluator 3: 4
fine	
	Evaluator 4: 4
See rating	
	Evaluator 5: -
	Evaluator 6: 5
Haven't spoken to references.	

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

Minimal public library examples Evaluator 7: 2

Acceptable Evaluator 8: 5

Fee Proposal | 0-5 Points | 5 Points (5%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 3

\$409k

Evaluator 4: 3

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 3

\$409,000 (\$0 reimb.) Missing scope of work

Evaluator 7: 3

Lower end

Evaluator 8: 4

Relatively high fee

LPA, Inc.

Clarity and conformance of proposal to the RFP | 0-5 Points | 10 Points (10%)

Evaluator 1: -

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

	Evaluator 2: -
	Evaluator 3: 5
Conforms	
	Evaluator 4: 4
See rating	
	Evaluator 5: -
	Evaluator 6: 5
No comment	
	Evaluator 7: 4
Good examples.	
	Evaluator 8: 3
Not too clear	

Content of the proposal, including work plan | 0-5 Points | 25 Points (25%)

	Evaluator 1: -
	Evaluator 2: -
	Evaluator 3: 5
6=months and good approach	
	Evaluator 4: 4
See rating	
	Evaluator 5: -
	Evaluator 6: 3
Missing Programming scope of work. MEP, Structural & Civil appear to be in house.	
	Evaluator 7: 3

No programming in proposal

Evaluator 8: 4

Good

Firm experience and performance | 0-5 Points | 35 Points (35%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 5

Good and local examples

Evaluator 4: 4

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 5

Good Library experience

Evaluator 7: 5

Good experience in region

Evaluator 8: 3

Done Libraries - Concerns

Team members' experience and performance | 0-5 Points | 20 Points (20%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 4

I love gabions. COD library, moorpark looks great.

See rating	Evaluator 4: 4
	Evaluator 5: -
Good Library experience	Evaluator 6: 4
Good experience with libraries	Evaluator 7: 5
Handful of Libs. None notable	Evaluator 8: 4

Comments by References | 0-5 Points | 5 Points (5%)

	Evaluator 1: -
	Evaluator 2: -
fine	Evaluator 3: 4
See rating	Evaluator 4: 4
	Evaluator 5: -
Haven't spoken to references.	Evaluator 6: 5
Good relevant examples	Evaluator 7: 4
Acceptable	Evaluator 8: 5

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

Fee Proposal | 0-5 Points | 5 Points (5%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 5

\$295k, schematic design?

Evaluator 4: 4

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 3

\$295,000 (\$0 reimb.) Fee is based on an assumed construction budget of \$20M. Missing scope of work

Evaluator 7: 3

Low but missing components

Evaluator 8: 5

Low Fee

MSR Design

Clarity and conformance of proposal to the RFP | 0-5 Points | 10 Points (10%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 4

Conformed

Evaluator 4: 5

See rating

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 5

No comment

Evaluator 7: 5

Very comprehensive

Evaluator 8: 5

Clear

Content of the proposal, including work plan | 0-5 Points | 25 Points (25%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 5

Good approach 6-month schedule

Evaluator 4: 4

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 4

No consultant rate sheet.

Evaluator 7: 5

Very comprehensive

Evaluator 8: 4

Seems thorough, a bit cookie cut

Firm experience and performance | 0-5 Points | 35 Points (35%)

Evaluator 1: -

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 5

Good library experience

Evaluator 4: 5

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 5

Lots of Library experience.

Evaluator 7: 5

Demonstrated significant library design experience

Evaluator 8: 5

Have the experience

Team members' experience and performance | 0-5 Points | 20 Points (20%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 4

Good local subs, but the team is from upper midwest with limited desert climate experience

Evaluator 4: 4

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 5

Lots of Library experience.

Evaluator 7: 5

Complete and experienced.

	Evaluator 8: 4
Know libraries, no librarian consultant	

Comments by References | 0-5 Points | 5 Points (5%)

	Evaluator 1: -
	Evaluator 2: -
	Evaluator 3: 4
Fine	
	Evaluator 4: 5
See rating	
	Evaluator 5: -
	Evaluator 6: 5
Haven't spoken to references.	
	Evaluator 7: 4
Good reference list.	
	Evaluator 8: 5
Acceptable	

Fee Proposal | 0-5 Points | 5 Points (5%)

	Evaluator 1: -
	Evaluator 2: -
	Evaluator 3: 3
\$750k	

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

Evaluator 4: 2

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 1

Fee: \$747,900 (incl. \$30,000 reimb.) 3rd highest. Travel costs are reimbursable. Offices in Palm Springs & Minneapolis. Where is the team located?

Evaluator 7: 2

Expensive. No rates for consultant partners

Evaluator 8: 2

Relatively high fee

Richärd Kennedy Architects

Clarity and conformance of proposal to the RFP | 0-5 Points | 10 Points (10%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 5

Conformed

Evaluator 4: 5

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 5

No comments.

Evaluator 7: 5

Very clear

Evaluator 8: 5

Clear

Content of the proposal, including work plan | 0-5 Points | 25 Points (25%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 4

Pre-Design items are spot on. 9-month schedule

Evaluator 4: 5

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 5

Connection to Civic Center is high priority.

Evaluator 7: 5

Very comprehensive

Evaluator 8: 5

Exceptional

Firm experience and performance | 0-5 Points | 35 Points (35%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 5

Desert Climates, exciting design

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

See rating	Evaluator 4: 5
	Evaluator 5: -
Lots of Library experience	Evaluator 6: 5
Connected with campus & desert environment	Evaluator 7: 5
Appreciate Desert Experience	Evaluator 8: 5

Team members' experience and performance | 0-5 Points | 20 Points (20%)

	Evaluator 1: -
	Evaluator 2: -
Good experiecn and good subs.	Evaluator 3: 5
See rating	Evaluator 4: 5
	Evaluator 5: -
Lots of Library experience. Library Specialist on staff.	Evaluator 6: 5
Team seems limited compared to other firms	Evaluator 7: 4
Incred. Exp. No librarian consultant	Evaluator 8: 4

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

Comments by References | 0-5 Points | 5 Points (5%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 4

Fine.

Evaluator 4: 5

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 5

Haven't spoken to references.

Evaluator 7: 5

Great reference list for urban, desert libraries

Evaluator 8: 5

Acceptable

Fee Proposal | 0-5 Points | 5 Points (5%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 4

\$600k

Evaluator 4: 4

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 2

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

\$499,865 (\$0 reimb.)Travel costs are reimbursable. Office in Phoenix, AZ.

Evaluator 7: 4

Comparatively reasonable

Evaluator 8: 4

Modest Fee

RIOS Inc.

Clarity and conformance of proposal to the RFP | 0-5 Points | 10 Points (10%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 4

Conformed

Evaluator 4: 4

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 5

No comments.

Evaluator 7: 2

Difficult to read

Evaluator 8: 2

Not clear

Content of the proposal, including work plan | 0-5 Points | 25 Points (25%)

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 3

TMI and not applicable information

Evaluator 4: 3

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 4

No cost provided for reference projects. No rate sheets.

Evaluator 7: 3

Generic approach

Evaluator 8: 2

Did desert park Out of box

Firm experience and performance | 0-5 Points | 35 Points (35%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 4

Big Projects, major metro how will this thinking fit to local PD.

Evaluator 4: 3

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 3

Not much built work. Lots of planning.

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

Evaluator 7: 2

Not a lot of relevant completed projects

Evaluator 8: 2

Very little Lib Exp

Team members' experience and performance | 0-5 Points | 20 Points (20%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 4

Fine.

Evaluator 4: 3

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 1

Proposed team has almost no Library experience. The Library Consultant, AEA Consulting, also has almost no library experience.

Evaluator 7: 1

Didn't connect relevant experience of the individual team members.

Evaluator 8: 2

Their library expert is not a lib expert

Comments by References | 0-5 Points | 5 Points (5%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 4

fine, Joel Montalvo?

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

See rating

Evaluator 4: 4

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Haven't spoken to references.

Evaluator 6: 5

Haven't spoken to references.

Evaluator 7: 1

Too many examples of submissions for design competitions or other plans not completed.

Acceptable

Evaluator 8: 5

Acceptable

Fee Proposal | 0-5 Points | 5 Points (5%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

\$440K - Schematics another \$348k

Evaluator 3: 2

\$440K - Schematics another \$348k

Evaluator 4: 2

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

\$787,295.84 (\$0 reimb.) 2nd highest.

Evaluator 6: 1

\$787,295.84 (\$0 reimb.) 2nd highest.

Evaluator 7: 1

Expensive

Fairly high fee

Evaluator 8: 2

Fairly high fee

Stayner Architects

Clarity and conformance of proposal to the RFP | 0-5 Points | 10 Points (10%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 4

Conformed to RFP

Evaluator 4: 4

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 5

No comments.

Evaluator 7: 3

A little difficult to read with several examples that are not particularly relevant.

Evaluator 8: 3

Clear

Content of the proposal, including work plan | 0-5 Points | 25 Points (25%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 5

Great understanding of PD architecture. Interesting design concepts. 8-month timeline

Evaluator 4: 4

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 4

Small firm (8 ppl) with limited capacity. 8 month schedule. Reference project budgets incomplete.

Evaluator 7: 4

Comprehensive

Evaluator 8: 2

A bit cookie cutter. Design heavy. Architect Exp?

Firm experience and performance | 0-5 Points | 35 Points (35%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 2

They've only served as subs on these projects.

Evaluator 4: 3

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 2

No library experience other than what MSS brings to the table.

Evaluator 7: 1

Did not showcase relevant experience, especially in the unique desert environment.

Evaluator 8: 5

Library expert MSS

Team members' experience and performance | 0-5 Points | 20 Points (20%)

EVALUATION TABULATION

Request For Proposal - Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 2

See above - they subs

Evaluator 4: 2

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 2

Christian Stayner is Principal of Stayner Architects and B-arn-S Architects. Proposed Architect team has no library experience. Hiring MSS as Library Consultant. Small team.

Evaluator 7: 2

Hard to dig through bios to find relevant experience.

Evaluator 8: 2

Newer firm. Principal at 2 firms?

Comments by References | 0-5 Points | 5 Points (5%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 3

Limited

Evaluator 4: 4

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 5

EVALUATION TABULATION

Request For Proposal - Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

Haven't spoken to references.

Evaluator 7: 2

Reference projects did not showcase library imagining in the desert setting.

Evaluator 8: 5

Acceptable

Fee Proposal | 0-5 Points | 5 Points (5%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 4

\$275k+ \$10k reimbursements

Evaluator 4: 4

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 4

Fee: \$285,000 (incl. \$10,000 reimb.) High rates for add services. Concerned about the low proposal fee.

Evaluator 7: 3

Inexpensive, but incomplete.

Evaluator 8: 5

Low fee

STK Architecture, Inc.

Clarity and conformance of proposal to the RFP | 0-5 Points | 10 Points (10%)

	Evaluator 1: -
	Evaluator 2: -
Conforms	Evaluator 3: 4
See rating	Evaluator 4: 3
	Evaluator 5: -
Graphs and chart illegible.	Evaluator 6: 3
Didn't fully address the RFP	Evaluator 7: 2
Not clear	Evaluator 8: 1

Content of the proposal, including work plan | 0-5 Points | 25 Points (25%)

	Evaluator 1: -
	Evaluator 2: -
Not the most professional looking proposal and light on content	Evaluator 3: 2
See rating	Evaluator 4: 1
	Evaluator 5: -
	Evaluator 6: 1

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

Scope of services not in line with RFP. Multiple resumes missing. No rate sheets or schedule. One page references a 57 acre school project, instead of our Library. Work Plan unclear.

Evaluator 7: 2

Seemed incomplete.

Evaluator 8: 1

Could not make out

Firm experience and performance | 0-5 Points | 35 Points (35%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 3

Limited

Evaluator 4: 1

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 1

Only 1 Library reference project

Evaluator 7: 1

Only one library. Did not demonstrate understanding of the context of our City library.

Evaluator 8: 1

Limited.

Team members' experience and performance | 0-5 Points | 20 Points (20%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

Evaluator 3: 3

Camille has good experience not sure about the rest.

Evaluator 4: 1

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 1

Only the Principal has 1 library project for experience. No library experience by other team members.

Evaluator 7: 1

Limited relevant experience

Evaluator 8: 1

Their aesthetic does

Comments by References | 0-5 Points | 5 Points (5%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 2

DHS, Firestations?

Evaluator 4: 4

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 5

Haven't spoken to references.

Evaluator 7: 1

No library references

Evaluator 8: 5
Acceptable

Fee Proposal | 0-5 Points | 5 Points (5%)

Evaluator 1: -
Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 3
\$654k

Evaluator 4: 2
See rating

Evaluator 5: -
Evaluator 6: 2

Fee: \$419,440 (\$0 reimb.) Unclear if fee reflects required scope of services.

Evaluator 7: 1
Expensive for listed services.

Evaluator 8: 2
Relatively high fee

The Miller Hull Partnership, LLP

Clarity and conformance of proposal to the RFP | 0-5 Points | 10 Points (10%)

Evaluator 1: -
Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 4

conformed

Evaluator 4: 4

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 5

No comments.

Evaluator 7: 3

Very generic approach

Evaluator 8: 2

not too clear

Content of the proposal, including work plan | 0-5 Points | 25 Points (25%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 3

Limited detail on scope and timelines

Evaluator 4: 3

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 3

Missing Programming Scope of work

Evaluator 7: 2

Did not demonstrate significant creativity in reimagining library functions

Evaluator 8: 3

Lots of Wood. Cookie Cutter

Firm experience and performance | 0-5 Points | 35 Points (35%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 3

Great Library experience - mostly PNW

Evaluator 4: 4

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 5

Lots of Library experience.

Evaluator 7: 3

Appears to have significant experience, but none in low desert. Did not demonstrate understanding of our unique environment.

Evaluator 8: 3

NW Lib experience

Team members' experience and performance | 0-5 Points | 20 Points (20%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 4

Fine

Evaluator 4: 4

See rating

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 4

Good Library experience

Evaluator 7: 2

Not a lot of direct connections to relevant experience.

Evaluator 8: 3

No Desert exp.

Comments by References | 0-5 Points | 5 Points (5%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 4

Fine

Evaluator 4: 4

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 5

Haven't spoken to references.

Evaluator 7: 3

References were adequate

Evaluator 8: 5

Acceptable

Fee Proposal | 0-5 Points | 5 Points (5%)

Evaluator 1: -

EVALUATION TABULATION

Request For Proposal - Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 3

\$420k+

Evaluator 4: 3

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 2

Fee: \$427,770 (incl. \$19,400 reimb.) Missing scope of work. Travel is reimbursable expense. San Diego & Seattle offices.

Evaluator 7: 3

Reasonable, yet may be missing some requirements.

Evaluator 8: 3

Middle road fee

TSK Architects

Clarity and conformance of proposal to the RFP | 0-5 Points | 10 Points (10%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 4

Conformed

Evaluator 4: 3

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 5

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

No comments.

Evaluator 7: 3

Very generic submission

Evaluator 8: 1

Not clear

Content of the proposal, including work plan | 0-5 Points | 25 Points (25%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 3

short timeline - will we get what we need, plus no schematic proposal

Evaluator 4: 3

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 3

Missing SD scope of work.

Evaluator 7: 2

No strong examples

Evaluator 8: 2

Cookie Cutter

Firm experience and performance | 0-5 Points | 35 Points (35%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 3

ok

Evaluator 4: 2

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 2

Very little Library experience.

Evaluator 7: 1

Minimal municipal library experience.

Evaluator 8: 2

Limited. Subs have lib. Not principals

Team members' experience and performance | 0-5 Points | 20 Points (20%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 4

Good Experience

Evaluator 4: 2

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 2

Very little Library experience.

Evaluator 7: 2

Consultants show reasonable experience, but not the core team.

Evaluator 8: 2

Little lib. exp. No desert exp.

Comments by References | 0-5 Points | 5 Points (5%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 4

Fine.

Evaluator 4: 4

See rating

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 5

Haven't spoken to references.

Evaluator 7: 1

Minimal relevant examples.

Evaluator 8: 5

Acceptable

Fee Proposal | 0-5 Points | 5 Points (5%)

Evaluator 1: -

Evaluator 2: -

Evaluator 3: 3

\$210k schematic design missing?

Evaluator 4: 3

See rating

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2023-RFP-225

Architectural Design Services - Conceptual Design of Municipal Library

Evaluator 5: -

Evaluator 6: 3

Fee: \$210,000 (incl. \$10,000 reimb.) Missing scope of work. Travel is reimbursable expense. L.A. office.

Evaluator 7: 3

Seems to be missing elements.

Evaluator 8: 5

Low Fee