

## ELMCREST PARK PLAYGROUND PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM

All proposals will be reviewed for responsiveness and then evaluated using the criteria set out in this form.

### GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATORS

Each evaluation criterion has been assigned a specific number of points. The questions under each evaluated area help you measure the quality of the vendor's response. Do not assign points to individual questions; instead, award a total score for each evaluation criterion.

### RATING SCALE FOR ASSESSING VENDOR'S PROPOSAL

This rating scale is intended to establish guidelines within that category to ensure members of the RFP evaluation committee perform their evaluation with consistency. You may assign any value for a given criteria from 0 to the maximum number of points. A zero value typically constitutes no response or an inability of the vendor to meet the criterion. In contrast, the maximum value should constitute a high standard of meeting the criterion.

For Example: "Experience and Qualifications" an evaluation criterion receiving a weighting of 20% of the total possible points. Using a 100 point scale, a maximum of 20 points can be awarded. The rating scale would be:

Rating Scale (20 point maximum)	
Point Value	Explanation
<b>0</b>	None. Not addressed or response of no value
<b>1-5</b>	Fair. Limited applicability
<b>6-10</b>	Good. Some applicability
<b>11-15</b>	Very Good. Substantial applicability
<b>16-20</b>	Excellent. Total applicability

## EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING

Vendor Name \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Proposal Evaluation Committee Member \_\_\_\_\_

**Responsiveness:** *The following is a generalized, yes/no portion of the proposal evaluation. A 'No' evaluation would need to be qualified or justified in order for the vendor's proposal to proceed for consideration.*

[a] Was the proposal received on May 6<sup>th</sup>? Yes  No \_\_\_\_\_

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_

[b] Did the vendor specify an installation date? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_

[c] Did the vendor submit a 'complete and distinct' proposal? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_

[d] Is the proposal 'complimentary to the surrounding environment'? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_

**THE TOTAL NUMBER OF POINTS USED TO SCORE THIS PROPOSAL IS 100**

**1.01 Overall Understanding of Project** Score \_\_\_\_\_

Weight - **10 Percent** - Maximum Point Value for this evaluation  
 100 Points x **10 Percent** = **10 Points**

Rating Scale (10 POINT Maximum)	
Point Value	Explanation
0	None. Not addressed or response of no value
1-3	Fair. Limited applicability
4-6	Good. Some applicability
7-9	Very Good. Substantial applicability
10	Excellent. Total applicability

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below. Do not assign points to individual questions; instead, award a total score for each evaluation criterion.

[a] Has the vendor demonstrated a thorough understanding of the purpose and scope of the project (the entire initiative, including what is expected of the vendor)?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_

[b] How well has the vendor identified pertinent issues and potential problems or solutions related to the project?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_

[c] Has the vendor demonstrated an understanding of the deliverables the City expects it to provide?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_

**1.02 Meeting the Design Challenge**

**Score** \_\_\_\_\_

Weight - **20 Percent** - Maximum Point Value for this evaluation  
100 Points x **20 Percent** = **20 Points**

Rating Scale ( <b>20 point</b> maximum)	
Point Value	Explanation
<b>0</b>	None. Not addressed or response of no value
<b>1-5</b>	Fair. Limited applicability
<b>6-10</b>	Good. Some applicability
<b>11-15</b>	Very Good. Substantial applicability
<b>16-20</b>	Excellent. Total applicability

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below. Do not assign points to individual questions; instead, award a total score for each evaluation criterion.

[a] Has the vendor demonstrated an emphasis upon dynamic play events promoting challenge, agility and coordination for the 5-12 age group?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_

[b] Has the vendor provided events and activities encouraging cognitive and imaginative play for the 2-5 age group)? Are these two different age groups adequately separated?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_

**1.03 Meeting Specifications for Playground Equipment**      **Score** \_\_\_\_\_

Weight - **50 Percent** - Maximum Point Value for this evaluation  
100 Points x **50 Percent** = **50 Points**

Rating Scale (50 point maximum)	
Point Value	Explanation
<b>0</b>	None. Not addressed or response of no value
<b>1-12</b>	Fair. Limited applicability
<b>13-25</b>	Good. Some applicability
<b>26-49</b>	Very Good. Substantial applicability
<b>50</b>	Excellent. Total applicability

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below. Do not assign points to individual questions; instead, award a total score for each evaluation criterion.

[a] Has appropriate drainage of the resilient surfacing area addressed in some manner?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_

[b] Has warranty information for all proposed equipment been submitted, and does the equipment meet ASTM and CPSC standards and guidelines?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_

[c] Are all posts and all climbers, and static fabrications shall be powder coated metal and all decks vinyl coated steel? Posts a minimum of 5" diameter for 5-12 and minimum of 3.5" diameter for 2-5 age groups. Posts may be either aluminum or steel. All hand rails, loops and graspable rails powder coated steel?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_

[d] Does the playground appear to meet ADA standards??

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_

[e] Are the following standards met? If utilized, roofs provide practical shade and/or be integral to the farm theme. Materials proposed other than metal, must be suitable for and have demonstrated durability for use in commercial playgrounds.

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_

[f] Has the vendor specified the playground border/container, and shown the required dimensions and clearances for the proposed design? Did the proposal include a full size, scalable site plan showing all required dimensions?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_

[g] Has the vendor ***demonstrated: A number, variety and quality of events in the overall design which meet the design expectations for play value*** and best integrate any theme within the budget limit?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_

[h] Are there at least one bay of swings, 1 tot seat and one Accessible Molded Seat? Is there an additional bay of swings at a height of 8 feet with two strap seats?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_

**1.04 Landscape and Site Improvements**

**Score** \_\_\_\_\_

Weight - **20 Percent** - Maximum Point Value for this evaluation  
100 Points x **20 Percent** = **20 Points**

Rating Scale (20 point maximum)	
Point Value	Explanation
<b>0</b>	None. Not addressed or response of no value
<b>1-5</b>	Fair. Limited applicability
<b>6-10</b>	Good. Some applicability
<b>11-15</b>	Very Good. Substantial applicability
<b>16-20</b>	Excellent. Total applicability

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below. Do not assign points to individual questions; instead, award a total score for each evaluation criterion.

[a] Are there diagrammatic examples of flow or circulation paths within the playground, and around the playground? Do the older aged kids have no need to run through the younger aged kids play equipment, and vice versa?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_

[b] Is there seating around the playground for parents or guardians, in an area that is convenient, and allows for clear views of the playground?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_

[c] Does the landscape elements appear to be well-thought-out, and complement the playground?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_