

Combined Evaluation Criteria for the Private Development Only	Base Score	Number of Evaluators	Maximum Score	Plenary Score	RBMC Score	Sares Regis Score	Sonnenblick Score	Strada Score
<b>Evaluation of the Proposal and Team</b>								
A Evaluation of the quality and completeness of information submitted in the SOQ.	5	7	35	0	14	0	27	28
B Evaluation of the project concept and its ability to create a high quality and prominent gateway to downtown	10	7	70	0	42	0	56	56
C Evaluation of the assembled development team.	15	7	105	0	45	0	84	84
D Evaluation of the team's past projects and performance.	15	7	105	0	45	0	84	84
E Evaluation of the team's past experience in conceiving and implementing projects within a downtown environment.	15	7	105	0	45	0	63	87
F Evaluation of the team's past experience in working with governmental entities or public-private partnerships.	5	7	35	0	15	0	27	29
G Evaluation of the team's experience in developing high quality projects of the nature proposed in the SOQ's.	5	7	35	0	20	0	27	28
H Evaluation of the team's experience in developing, desiging, and constructing projects of the nature proposed in the SOQ's in the state of California.	5	7	35	0	14	0	28	28
I Evaluation of the team's expericen in development sustainable projects.	5	7	35	0	14	0	21	29
J Evaluation of the team's expericen in operating high-end hotels projects or projects consistant with the nature proposed in the SOQ's.	5	7	35	0	14	0	27	21
K Evaluation of the team's experience in constructing parking facilities.	5	7	35	0	14	0	21	21
L Evaluation of the team's commitment ot inlcude local firms, sub-contracting opportunities, or local participation on the development team.	5	7	35	0	14	0	21	29
<b>Total Proposal and Team Score</b>	<b>95</b>		<b>665</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>296</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>486</b>	<b>524</b>
<b>Evaluation of the team's Financial Capabilities</b>								
A Evaluation of the team's financial information submitted.	10	7	70	0	28	0	56	58
B Evaluation of the team's ability to commit sufficient equity to the project to satisfy conventional lending requirements.	10	7	70	0	44	0	56	56
C Evaluation of the team's ability to secure financing for similar projects, including relationships with current lenders.	10	7	70	0	44	0	56	56
<b>Total Financial Capabilities Score</b>	<b>30</b>		<b>210</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>170</b>
<b>Evaluation of the Team's Personnel Experience and References</b>								
A Evaluation of the expertise of the proposed project personnel's ability to finance, manage, and operate the proposed project.								
1 Project Executive	10	7	70	0	42	0	56	56
2 Project Manager	10	7	70	0	42	0	56	56
3 Project Architect	10	7	70	0	42	0	56	58
4 Construction Manager	10	7	70	0	42	0	56	58
5 Other Key Personnel	10	7	70	0	42	0	56	56
B Evaluation of the reference checks supporting the assertions made in the team's SOQs.								
1 Project Executive	5	7	35	0	0	0	0	0
2 Project Manager	5	7	35	0	0	0	0	0
3 Project Architect	5	7	35	0	0	0	0	0
4 Construction Manager	5	7	35	0	0	0	0	0
5 Other Key Personnel	5	7	35	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total Personnel &amp; Reference Scores</b>	<b>75</b>		<b>525</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>284</b>
<b>Totals of Team's Score</b>	<b>200</b>		<b>1,400</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>622</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>934</b>	<b>978</b>
Did Team Propose as combined Civic Building & Private development Team			(Y/N)	n	y	n	y	y
Bonus Points for Propsing on both sites as single development team			10%	0	62.2	0	93.4	97.8
<b>Grand Totals of Team's Score</b>			<b>1,540</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>684</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,027</b>	<b>1,076</b>
			* Based upon 6 Raters			*		

Combined Evaluation Criteria for the Civic Building Only	Base Score	Number of Evaluators	Maximum Score	Plenary Score	RBMC Score	Sares Regis Score	Sonnenblick Score	Strada Score
<b>Evaluation of the Proposal and Team</b>								
A Evaluation of the quality and completeness of information submitted in the SOQ.	5	7	35	34	20	28	27	28
B Evaluation of the project concept.	10	7	70	56	42	54	54	56
C Evaluation of the assembled development team.	15	7	105	84	66	42	84	66
D Evaluation of the team's past projects and performance.	15	7	105	84	66	60	84	66
E Evaluation of the team's past experience in conceiving and implementing projects within a downtown environment.	15	7	105	81	66	42	84	87
F Evaluation of the team's past experience in working with governmental entities or public private partnerships	5	5	25	27	14	14	27	29
G Evaluation of the team's experience with projects that have utilized public financing, particularly in California	5	7	35	27	19	14	27	22
H Evaluation of the team's experience in constructing public projects such as civic buildings, city administration buildings, public safety buildings, or	5	7	35	28	14	20	28	22
I Evaluation of the team's experience in designing and implementing civic buildings which create a civic character, both internally and externally, with	5	7	35	28	14	20	28	21
J Evaluation of the team's experience in development sustainable projects	5	7	35	27	13	14	21	28
K Evaluation of the team's commitment to include local firms, sub-contracting opportunities, or local participation on the development team.	5	7	35	21	20	14	21	28
L Evaluation of the team's experience with prevailing wages.	5	7	35	21	21	21	21	29
<b>Total Proposal and Team Score</b>	<b>95</b>		<b>655</b>	<b>518</b>	<b>375</b>	<b>343</b>	<b>506</b>	<b>482</b>
<b>Evaluation of the team's Financial Capabilities</b>								
A Evaluation of the team's financial information submitted.	10	7	70	52	28	42	28	40
B Evaluation of the team's ability to commit sufficient equity to the project to satisfy conventional lending requirements.	10	7	70	56	42	42	54	56
C Evaluation of the team's ability to secure financing for similar projects, including relationships with current lenders.	10	7	70	56	42	42	56	56
<b>Total Financial Capabilities Score</b>	<b>30</b>		<b>210</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>152</b>
<b>Evaluation of the Team's Personnel Experience and References</b>								
A Evaluation of the expertise of the proposed project personnel's ability to finance, manage, and operate the proposed project.								
1 Project Executive	10	7	70	68	42	42	54	56
2 Project Manager	10	7	70	56	28	28	54	56
3 Project Architect	10	7	70	54	28	54	56	56
4 Construction Manager	10	7	70	56	56	56	56	58
5 Other Key Personnel	10	7	70	56	56	42	54	56
B Evaluation of the reference checks supporting the assertions made in the team's SOQs.								
1 Project Executive	5	7	35	0	0	0	0	0
2 Project Manager	5	7	35	0	0	0	0	0
3 Project Architect	5	7	35	0	0	0	0	0
4 Construction Manager	5	7	35	0	0	0	0	0
5 Other Key Personnel	5	7	35	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total Personnel &amp; Reference Scores</b>	<b>75</b>		<b>525</b>	<b>290</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>274</b>	<b>282</b>
<b>Totals of Team's Score</b>	<b>200</b>		<b>1,390</b>	<b>972</b>	<b>697</b>	<b>691</b>	<b>918</b>	<b>916</b>
Did Team Propose as combined Civic Building & Private development Team			(Y/N)	n	y	y	y	n
Bonus Points for Proposing on both sites as single development team			10%	0	69.7	69.1	91.8	0
<b>Grand Totals of Team's Score</b>			<b>1,529</b>	<b>972</b>	<b>767</b>	<b>760</b>	<b>1,010</b>	<b>916</b>
			* Based upon 6 Raters		*			