APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B
PHASE 2 EVALUATION MANUAL

1. GENERAL

The purpose of this document is to establish a uniform evaluation procedure for Phase 2 of the solicitation based on contractually defined criteria. This process will be an extension of the Phase 1 evaluation process. The Evaluation Team will evaluate each proposal individually using the qualitative/quantitative procedures that follow. Each proposal will be reviewed and rated by each of the evaluators. During this process, discrepancies between evaluations will be discussed and resolved within the team. Following the completion of the individual evaluations, a consensus evaluation will be derived. The results of this consensus evaluation will determine which proposals proceed into Phase 2 of the solicitation process.

2. EVALUATION PROCEDURES.

a. Security. Each evaluator is responsible for maintaining security of offerors' proposals and Government evaluation documents. No material is permitted to be removed from the evaluation room during the evaluation or after completion of the evaluation. The evaluation room will be locked when not in use. Proposals are not to be discussed outside of the evaluation room.

b. Procurement Integrity and Non-disclosure. Evaluators must sign a non-disclosure statement as required by the procurement integrity regulations. This also applies to anyone who looks at the proposals, even if not actually involved in the evaluation process.

c. Written Comments. Written comments are required of each evaluator identifying the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal on the rating worksheets. These comments are essential to the Contract Specialist (CS) in preparing the Phase 1 Selection Memorandum, and debriefing of unsuccessful offerors.

d. Additional Information. Additional information may be needed to complete the evaluation process, or to assure that all proposals in the competitive range are conforming to the Request for Proposals (RFP). The Contracting Division will request the information or clarification be provided by the offeror in writing.

e. Prior to beginning the review or evaluation of any of the Offeror's proposals, the evaluators must familiarize themselves with the solicitation statement of work, proposal submission requirements (Section 00110) and the proposal evaluation criteria (Section 00120).

f. Evaluators shall review and evaluate all proposals independently. No discussions of proposals between the evaluators shall take place prior to the final consensus discussions.

g. Substitutions for evaluators will not be allowed once the evaluation process has begun. No consensus sessions may be held unless all evaluators are present as well as the non-rating board Chairperson.

h. Identify and Document Proposal Ambiguities and Inadequate Substantiation. Evaluators shall review the proposals to identify ambiguous language or areas where the Offeror has not provided sufficient information to allow a quality evaluation and rating to be accomplished. Instances shall immediately be discussed with the Chairperson for instructions on procedures.

i. Prior to beginning any review and evaluation, each evaluator shall ensure that he/she has a complete copy of the Engineering Minimum Technical check results as applicable. In many instances these engineering review comments can save time and effort and provide validation for the identified strengths and weaknesses.

3. PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

a. Section 00110, Proposal Submission requirements identifies all the necessary submittal information to be included in the Contractor proposals. Proposals that reach the evaluation stage have passed an initial Contracting Division review to assure that they are complete and responsive. All proposals that are provided to the evaluation team must be evaluated and rated.

4. INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL RATING WORKSHEETS

a. On the following pages individual worksheets are provided for use by the evaluators to review and rate the individual proposals. During the consensus evaluation, a single "consensus rating" worksheet shall be completed for each proposal and signed by all the evaluators. It is imperative that all comments and supporting rational for the rating assigned be included on this consensus sheet. Comments are required to support all ratings above or below "Satisfactory".

5. RATING METHODOLOGY

a. General. The proposals from the Offerors who reach Phase 2 will be evaluated to determine the quality of the proposed materials, methods, and procedures proposed. The acceptable Phase 2 ratings are as follows:

EXCELLENT: The offeror greatly exceeds the scope of the solicitation requirements in all aspects of the particular factor or sub-factor. The offeror also provides significant advantage(s) and exceeds the solicitation requirements in performance or capability in an advantageous way and has no apparent or significant weaknesses or omissions.

ABOVE AVERAGE: The offeror exceeds the scope of the solicitation in most aspects of the particular factor or sub-factor. The offeror provides an advantage in key areas or exceeds performance or capability requirements, but has some areas of improvement remaining.

AVERAGE: The offeror matches the scope of the solicitation in most aspects of the particular factor or sub-factor. The offeror meets the performance or capability requirements of the element but not in a way advantageous to the Government. There is room for improvement in this element.

POOR: The offeror does not meet the minimum scope of the solicitation for the particular factor or sub-factor. The offeror does not include any advantages and does not meet the minimal performance or capability requirements for this element. The offeror contains many apparent weaknesses and requires improvement.

UNACCEPTABLE: The offeror fails to meet the scope of the solicitation in all aspects of the factor or sub-factor or has not submitted any information to address this evaluated item. The offeror does not include any advantages in any areas of the element and does not meet the minimum performance or capability requirements of this factor or sub-factor. The proposal includes large apparent weaknesses and the proposal will require extensive modifications to come into compliance with the minimum requirements of the solicitation.

b. YES - NO Items. Where the specific evaluation sheets indicate a YES – NO Rating these items shall be treated as informational items. They are included in the evaluation worksheets to assure a similar focus among the evaluators and to ensure that individual evaluators do not overlook proposal information provided.

6. EVALUATION FACTORS

a. As indicated in Section 00120, PROPOSAL EVALUATION AND CONTRACT AWARD, the following factors will be evaluated and rated for each proposal:

FACTOR 2-1: HOUSING UNIT DESIGN: This factor is the most important factor in the technical evaluation of technical proposals.

FACTOR 2-2: HOUSING UNIT GROSS AREAS. This factor is slightly less important that Factor 1 in the evaluation of technical proposals.

FACTOR 2-3: HOUSING UNIT ENGINEERING: This factor is slightly less important than Factor 2.

FACTOR 2-4: SITE DESIGN: This factor is slightly less important than Factor 3.

FACTOR 2-5: SITE ENGINEERING: This factor is significantly less important than Factor 4.

FACTOR 2-6: OFFEROR MANAGEMENT PLANS AND SCHEDULES: This factor is equal in weight to Factor 2-5.

7. OVERALL PROPOSAL RATING

a. It is the intent of the evaluation worksheets that follow to focus the evaluators on the key issues and concerns with respect to construction, operation, and function of the facilities. These worksheets are meant to stimulate thought and analysis and provide a framework in which to document concerns, strengths, weaknesses, and omissions. Evaluators are encouraged to document all observations and analyses during the individual rating times and to share that analysis with the team during the consensus discussions.

b. It is the responsibility of the evaluation team to provide and document sufficient strengths, weaknesses, and omissions to suitably support the assigned rating in each Factor as well as the overall Phase 1 rating. Documentation/comments are required for all ratings other than “SATISFACTORY”.

c. The Chairperson shall distribute a copy of the Phase 1 ratings for each Offeror. The evaluation team, at this point, shall weigh the assigned ratings from Phase 1 and Phase 2, take into account the assembled strengths and weaknesses, and provide an overall proposal rating for each Offeror. This final combined rating shall be used for comparison and in the trade off process as applicable. For the purposes of this final proposal adjectival rating, the Phase 2 rating shall be more important than the Phase 1 rating.

d. Following the completion of the consensus discussions and rating assignments, the individual rating worksheets from each of the evaluators will be collected by the Chairperson and destroyed. Each evaluator shall sign the final consensus rating assignment sheet.

PROPOSAL RATING WORKSHEET

FACTOR 2-1

HOUSING UNIT DESIGN

Offeror: _____

Evaluator:_____

1. General: Housing unit design includes the function and appearance of housing unit materials, exclusive of the purely technical performance of internal engineering systems. The subfactors and elements considered herein deal with the planning and design of the housing units, as well as the durability and thermal performance of the materials. Consideration will be given to: the interaction of the individual housing unit to people; the degree to which the unit blends with those outdoor features of living normally associated with the family; the overall esthetics of the housing unit; and the amenities associated with livability. These latter elements include such items as separation of activities, convenience, logistics, leisure, bathing, food handling, and sleeping. Elements making up this factor are itemized below:

2. Each individual subfactor will be rated separately with a combined rating made for all of Factor 1 at the completion of the rating for each subfactor. The relative subfactor importance is as follows:

Subfactor a. is slightly less important than subfactor b
Subfactor b. is the most important subfactor
Subfactor c. is slightly less important than subfactor a
Subfactor d. is slightly less important than subfactor c
Subfactor e is slightly less important than subfactor d and is a GO – NO GO Subfactor.
Subfactor f is slightly less important than subfactor e
Subfactor g is slightly less important than subfactor f
Subfactor h is slightly less important than subfactor g
Subfactor i, j, k are each equal in importance to subfactor h
Subfactor l is slightly less important than subfactor k
Subfactor m is slightly less important than subfactor l
Subfactor n, o, p, q are each equal in importance to subfactor m

3. Subfactor Evaluations. *[Design District to edit subfactors as appropriate.]*

a. Housing Unit Type Proposed: Working within the allowable funding and the project scope, evaluate the proposed structures as follows: *[Design District may edit to account for funding and siting limitations.]*

Single Detached Units = Rated = Excellent
Duplex Units = Rated = Above Average
Townhouses = Rated = Average
Apartments = Rated = Average

b. Unit Functional Arrangement:

Considerations:

- Do the proposed floor plans provide convenient circulation between living, food handling, sleeping, and bathing areas?
- Does the relationship among the spaces enhance flexibility of usage?
- Consider amenities offered which enhance the overall interior functions, (living, sleeping, food handling, and bathing)
- Has an entrance foyer with a closet and visual separation from the living areas been included?
- Is access provided to the functional areas without passing through the living areas?
- Is there a balanced relationship in the sizing of the functional areas? (Consider impacts of family size)
- Are logistics of home operation considered? (furniture movement, furnishability, circulation of expendable supplies and disposal)
- Do the floor plans enhance indoor and outdoor living in relation to patios, screened porches, vistas, yard areas, and climate?
- What design considerations are included to enhance the overall livability and amenity of the housing units?

/__ / Excellent /__ / Above Average /__ / Average /__ / Poor /__ / Unacceptable

- Proposal Strengths. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal strengths in the area of Unit Functional Arrangement. Comments are required for all ratings above “AVERAGE”.

- Proposal Weaknesses. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal weaknesses in the area of Unit Functional Arrangement. Comments are required for all ratings above “AVERAGE”.

- Other Comments. Include any other comments with respect to Unit Functional Arrangement here.

c. Exterior Appearance:

Considerations:

- Variety in facades and roof lines, entrances
- Staggering of housing units or other variations to reduce redundancy
- Proportions of fenestration in relation to elevations
- Visual effects of garages on the housing units
- Shadow effects, materials, and textures
- Proportion and scale of the structures
- Other aesthetic considerations

/__ / Excellent /__ / Above Average /__ / Average /__ / Poor /__ / Unacceptable

- Proposal Strengths. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal strengths in the area of Exterior Appearance. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

- Proposal Weaknesses. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal weaknesses in the area of Exterior Appearance. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

- Other Comments. Include any other comments with respect to Exterior Appearance here.

d. Living, Dining, and Family Areas:

Considerations:

- Interior design elements which enhance the individual and family group aspects of recreation, leisure, and entertainment, such as:
  - Possibility of joint use for concurrent activities
  - Location of convenience electrical outlets
  - Location of telephone and TV outlets
  - Light switching locations
  - Built-In amenities (bookcases, window seats, fireplaces, etc.)
- Consider each space (living, dining, family room) individually and provide narrative assessments of each space in relation to the criteria established and amenities provided.

/__ / Excellent /__ / Above Average /__ / Average /__ / Poor /__ / Unacceptable

- Proposal Strengths. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal strengths in the area of Living, Dining, and Family Areas. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

- Proposal Weaknesses. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal weaknesses in the area of Living, Dining, and Family Areas. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

- Other Comments. Include any other comments with respect to Living, Dining, and Family Areas here.

e. Minimum Space Sizes. Does the proposal include all the spaces required by the statement of work and do those spaces comply with the minimum size or dimension requirements of the statement of work? Insufficient or incomplete information in the proposal for any of the unit types will be scored as a "NO GO". A single NO GO for any unit type will require an overall NO GO Rating for this subfactor.

/__ / GO	/__ / NO GO	2 Bedroom Units
/__ / GO	/__ / NO GO	3 Bedroom Units
/__ / GO	/__ / NO GO	4 Bedroom Units
/__ / GO	/__ / NO GO	5 Bedroom Units

f. Occupant Storage Areas:

Considerations:

- Closet design and location for linen, coats, and clothing.
- Exterior bulk storage area, location, shelving, ease of access
- Interior bulk storage area, location, shelving, ease of access
- Compliance with minimum areas required for each and congregate area

/__ / Excellent /__ / Above Average /__ / Average /__ / Poor /__ / Unacceptable

- Proposal Strengths. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal strengths in the area of Occupant Storage Areas. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

- Proposal Weaknesses. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal weaknesses in the area of Occupant Storage Areas. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

- Other Comments. Include any other comments with respect to Occupant Storage Areas here.

g. Vehicle Storage.

Considerations:

- Attachment to Structure
- Proximity to Housing Unit, covered walkways as appropriate
- Circulation space around the vehicle
- Proximity of garage to functional areas of the housing units

/__ / Excellent /__ / Above Average /__ / Average /__ / Poor /__ / Unacceptable

- Proposal Strengths. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal strengths in the area of Vehicle Storage. Comments are required for all ratings above “AVERAGE”.

- Proposal Weaknesses. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal weaknesses in the area of Vehicle Storage. Comments are required for all ratings above “AVERAGE”.

- Other Comments. Include any other comments with respect to Vehicle Storage here.

h. Sleeping Areas.

Considerations:

- Size and proportions of bedrooms
- Location of doors and windows with respect to furniture placement
- Closet location and access
- Visual privacy
- Acoustic privacy

/__ / Excellent /__ / Above Average /__ / Average /__ / Poor /__ / Unacceptable

- Proposal Strengths. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal strengths in the area of Sleeping Areas. Comments are required for all ratings above “AVERAGE”.

- Proposal Weaknesses. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal weaknesses in the area of Sleeping Areas. Comments are required for all ratings above “AVERAGE”.

- Other Comments. Include any other comments with respect to Sleeping Areas here.

i. Kitchen and Food Handling.

Considerations:

- Efficiency of food preparation triangle including circulation of materials and people.
- Size and layout of cabinetry and counter areas
- Electrical outlets, location and number
- Provision of space for occupant owned freezer
- Visual privacy/separation
- Innovative approaches and amenities

/__ / Excellent /__ / Above Average /__ / Average /__ / Poor /__ / Unacceptable

- Proposal Strengths. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal strengths in the area of Kitchen and Food Handling. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

- Proposal Weaknesses. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal weaknesses in the area of Kitchen and Food Handling. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

- Other Comments. Include any other comments with respect to Kitchen and Food Handling here.

j. Exterior Finishes.

Considerations:

- Aesthetics of proposed designs
- Maintainability of materials proposed
- Quality of doors, windows, siding, roofing, trim
- Sustainable Design considerations – does the proposal address and incorporate sustainable design considerations in the unit designs?
- Particular attention should be paid to required recurring maintenance of finishes

/__ / Excellent /__ / Above Average /__ / Average /__ / Poor /__ / Unacceptable

- Proposal Strengths. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal strengths in the area of Exterior Finishes. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

- Proposal Weaknesses. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal weaknesses in the area of Exterior Finishes. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

- Other Comments. Include any other comments with respect to Exterior Finishes here.

k. Thermal Envelope.

Considerations:

- Wall, roof, window, and doors thermal performance
- Infiltration reduction strategies
- Compliance with Energy Star Homes criteria as outlined in the SOW
- Overall thermal resistance to heat gain/loss of structure proposed

/__ / Excellent /__ / Above Average /__ / Average /__ / Poor /__ / Unacceptable

- Proposal Strengths. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal strengths in the area of Unit Thermal Envelope. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

- Proposal Weaknesses. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal weaknesses in the area of Unit Thermal Envelope. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

- Other Comments. Include any other comments with respect to Unit Thermal Envelope here.

I. Interior Finishes.

Considerations:

- Consider the Quality, Durability, Maintainability, and Aesthetics of the following:
  - Walls and ceilings
  - Flooring
  - Stairs
  - Shelving, wainscots, and moldings
  - Kitchen and Bath countertops
  - Kitchen cabinet materials

/__ / Excellent /__ / Above Average /__ / Average /__ / Poor /__ / Unacceptable

- Proposal Strengths. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal strengths in the area of Unit Interior Finishes. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

- Proposal Weaknesses. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal weaknesses in the area of Unit Interior Finishes. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

- Other Comments. Include any other comments with respect to Unit Interior Finishes here.

m. Bathroom Areas.

Considerations:

- Number and size of spaces provided
- Furnishing (heat lamps, vanity cabinets, storage)
- Visual privacy
- Acoustic privacy

/__ / Excellent /__ / Above Average /__ / Average /__ / Poor /__ / Unacceptable

- Proposal Strengths. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal strengths in the area of Unit Bathroom Areas. Comments are required for all ratings above “AVERAGE”.

- Proposal Weaknesses. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal weaknesses in the area of Unit Bathroom Areas. Comments are required for all ratings above “AVERAGE”.

- Other Comments. Include any other comments with respect to Unit Bathroom Areas here.

n. Utility and Work Areas.

Considerations:

- Does this area provide an efficient work flow without infringing on the other functions?
- Is this area suitable for ironing and/or light hobby work?
- Does the mechanical space provide for adequate space for maintenance of equipment?
- Provision of lighting, storage shelving, and convenience outlets
- Location of mechanical equipment with respect to noise control
- Provision of separate utility room?

/__ / Excellent /__ / Above Average /__ / Average /__ / Poor /__ / Unacceptable

- Proposal Strengths. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal strengths in the area of Unit Utility and Work Areas. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

- Proposal Weaknesses. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal weaknesses in the area of Unit Utility and Work Areas. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

- Other Comments. Include any other comments with respect to Unit Utility and Work Areas here.

o. Color Schemes.

Considerations:

- Aesthetics and coordination of exterior color selections
- Aesthetics and coordination of interior color selections

/__ / Excellent /__ / Above Average /__ / Average /__ / Poor /__ / Unacceptable

- Proposal Strengths. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal strengths in the area of Unit Color Schemes. Comments are required for all ratings above “AVERAGE”.

- Proposal Weaknesses. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal weaknesses in the area of Unit Color Schemes. Comments are required for all ratings above “AVERAGE”.

- Other Comments. Include any other comments with respect to Unit Color Schemes here.

p. Patios, Service Yards, Fencing.

Considerations:

- Size, location, and quality of proposed materials
- Patio visual privacy
- Access for service

/__ / Excellent /__ / Above Average /__ / Average /__ / Poor /__ / Unacceptable

- Proposal Strengths. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal strengths in the area of Unit Patios, Service Yards, and Fencing. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

- Proposal Weaknesses. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal weaknesses in the area of Unit Patios, Service Yards, and Fencing. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

- Other Comments. Include any other comments with respect to Unit Patios, Service Yards, and Fencing here.

q. Amenities.

Considerations:

- Items which are proposed in excess of solicitation requirements:
  - Patio Roofs
  - Screened Porches
  - Built-in Interior Features
  - Other items.

NOTE: If the proposer includes no amenities which qualify in this subfactor, the proposal shall be rated as "AVERAGE". Ratings below "AVERAGE" are only possible where an offered amenity is actually an undesirable feature. These negative items should likely be addressed during discussions with the proposers.

/__ / Excellent /__ / Above Average /__ / Average /__ / Poor /__ / Unacceptable

- Proposal Strengths. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal strengths in the area of Unit Amenities. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

- Proposal Weaknesses. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal weaknesses in the area of Unit Amenities. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

- Other Comments. Include any other comments with respect to Unit Amenities here.

FACTOR 2-1 Summary Rating

FACTOR 2-1 SUMMARY RATING CHART			
Item No.	**Description**	**Rating***	**Comments**
1.	Subfactor a Housing Unit Type		This subfactor is slightly less important than subfactor b.
2.	subfactor b Functional Arrangement		This is the most important subfactor.
3.	Subfactor c Exterior Appearance		This subfactor is slightly less important than subfactor a.
4.	Subfactor d Living, Dining, and Family Areas		This subfactor is equal in importance to subfactor c.
5.	Subfactor e *** Minimum Space Sizes		This subfactor is slightly less important than subfactor d.
6.	Subfactor f Occupant Storage Areas		This subfactor is slightly less important than subfactor e.
7.	Subfactor g Vehicle Storage		This subfactor is slightly less important than subfactor f.
8.	Subfactor h Sleeping Areas		This subfactor is slightly less important than subfactor g.
9.	Subfactor i Kitchen and Food Handling		This subfactor is equal in importance to subfactor h.
10.	Subfactor j Exterior Finishes		This subfactor is equal in importance to subfactor h.
11.	Subfactor k Thermal Envelope		This subfactor is slightly less important than subfactor h.
12.	Subfactor l Interior Finishes		This subfactor is slightly less important than subfactor k.
13.	Subfactor m Bathroom Areas		This subfactor is slightly less important than subfactor l.
14.	Subfactor n Utility and Work Areas		This subfactor is equal in importance to subfactor m
15.	Subfactor o Color Schemes		This subfactor is equal in importance to subfactor m
16.	Subfactor p Patios, Service Yards, and Fencing		This subfactor is equal in importance to subfactor m
17.	Subfactor q Amenities		This subfactor is equal in importance to subfactor m
FACTOR 2-1 RATING**			

* Ratings may be either:
Excellent – Above Average – Average – Poor - Unacceptable

** Evaluators shall consider the ratings in the various items shown to determine a suitable overall rating. The overall rating cannot be an average, mode, or median of the ratings of the subfactors. A final rating must be reached based on discussions and a consensus among the evaluators

*** Subfactor is a GO NO-GO subfactor.

PROPOSAL RATING WORKSHEET

FACTOR 2-2

HOUSING UNIT GROSS AREAS

Offeror: _____

Evaluator:_____

1. General: Evaluators shall review the area calculations submitted by the offerors with respect to the gross areas provided in the proposal. Proposals which meet the minimum gross area limitations set forth in the solicitation shall be evaluated as “Average”. Evaluations which exceed “Average” for this Factor must be supported by sufficient documentation as to the inherent benefits included in the proposal and it’s positive impacts on family life and well being. The provision of additional square footage does not require the awarding of additional consideration in this factor.

/__ / Excellent /__ / Above Average /__ / Average /__ / Poor /__ / Unacceptable

Notes:

PROPOSAL RATING WORKSHEET

FACTOR 2-3

BUILDING SYSTEMS

Offeror: _____

Evaluator:_____

1. General: In addition to system design, each subfactor evaluates the choice of materials for the systems in terms of life cycle cost effectiveness. Since these new housing units will be "Energy Star" Homes, proposals must include information required to allow the evaluators to determine compliance with the minimum requirements of the solicitation with respect to Energy Conservation. Proposers are encouraged to adopt and/or develop additional means and methods to enhance the performance of the submitted units. Factors such as durability, corrosion resistance, pest and termite resistance, ease of maintenance, life cycle cost of maintenance, and energy efficiency should be considered with respect to the following:

Subfactor a This is the most important subfactor
Subfactor b This subfactor is less important than subfactor a.
Subfactor c This subfactor is slightly less important than subfactor b
Subfactor d This subfactor is less important than subfactor c
Subfactor e This subfactor is a GO NO GO subfactor.

2. Subfactor Evaluations.

a. Energy Star Program Considerations. This subfactor considers the quality of the energy conservation investments which the proposer has included in the unit design. While the solicitation will set minimum standards for compliance, this element considers the overall quality of the housing unit systems and can provide additional consideration for systems that exceed the stated minimums.

Considerations:

- Residential appliances (Energy Star labels, etc)
- Sealing and location of ductwork systems
- Infiltration reduction systems

/__ / Excellent /__ / Above Average /__ / Average /__ / Poor /__ / Unacceptable

- Proposal Strengths. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal strengths in the area of Energy Star Program Considerations. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

- Proposal Weaknesses. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal weaknesses in the area of Energy Star Program Considerations. Comments are required for all ratings above “AVERAGE”.

- Other Comments. Include any other comments with respect to Energy Star Program Considerations here.

b. Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC) Systems. This element considers the quality of heating, ventilating, air conditioning, control systems, and associated equipment design to provide personal comfort in a life cycle cost effective manner. All central HVAC equipment shall be Energy Star labeled.

Considerations:

- Supply Air Distribution System Design
- Return Air Distribution System Design
- Kitchen/Bath Exhaust Systems
- Air Handling/Furnace Equipment
- Condensing Unit or other outdoor equipment

/__ / Excellent /__ / Above Average /__ / Average /__ / Poor /__ / Unacceptable

- Proposal Strengths. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal strengths in the area of HVAC Systems. Comments are required for all ratings above “AVERAGE”.

- Proposal Weaknesses. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal weaknesses in the area of HVAC Systems. Comments are required for all ratings above “AVERAGE”.

- Other Comments. Include any other comments with respect to HVAC Systems here.

c. Interior Electrical Systems.

Considerations:

- Overall system design
- Outlet and switch quantity and placement
- Fixture Quality (Aesthetics and Energy Conservation)
- Electrical Equipment Quality
- Cable Television Systems
- Telephone outlets and system

/__ / Excellent /__ / Above Average /__ / Average /__ / Poor /__ / Unacceptable

- Proposal Strengths. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal strengths in the area of Interior Electrical Systems. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

- Proposal Weaknesses. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal weaknesses in the area of Interior Electrical Systems. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

- Other Comments. Include any other comments with respect to Interior Electrical Systems here.

d. Plumbing Systems.

Considerations:

- Piping Zoning, Layout, Isolation
- Pipe sizing and materials
- Fixtures and Accessories provided
- Water Heater

/__ / Excellent /__ / Above Average /__ / Average /__ / Poor /__ / Unacceptable

- Proposal Strengths. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal strengths in the area of Plumbing Systems. Comments are required for all ratings above “AVERAGE”.

- Proposal Weaknesses. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal weaknesses in the area of Plumbing Systems. Comments are required for all ratings above “AVERAGE”.

- Other Comments. Include any other comments with respect to Plumbing Systems here.

e. Building Structural Systems. This subfactor is considered a GO – NO GO element. Evaluators are still encouraged to provide comments to document significant strengths or weaknesses.

/__/ GO /__/ NO GO

- Proposal Strengths. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal strengths in the area of Building Structural Systems.

- Proposal Weaknesses. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal weaknesses in the area of Building Structural Systems.

FACTOR 2-3 Summary Rating

FACTOR 2-3 SUMMARY RATING CHART			
Item No.	**Description**	**Rating***	**Comments**
1.	Subfactor a Energy Star Program Considerations		This subfactor is the most important subfactor.
2.	Subfactor b Heating, Ventilating, and Air Conditioning		This subfactor is less important than subfactor a.
3.	Subfactor c Interior Electrical Systems		This subfactor is slightly less important than subfactor b.
4.	Subfactor d Interior Plumbing Systems		This subfactor is less important than subfactor c.
5.	Subfactor e Structural Systems		This is GO-NO GO Subfactor.***
FACTOR 2-3 RATING**			

* Ratings may be either:
Excellent – Above Average – Average – Poor - Unacceptable

** Evaluators shall consider the ratings in the various items shown to determine a suitable overall rating. The overall rating cannot be an average, mode, or median of the ratings of the subfactors. A final rating must be reached based on discussions and a consensus among the evaluators

*** A NO GO rating for the Structural Systems Subfactor will require an overall rating of “Unacceptable” for this factor.

PROPOSAL RATING WORKSHEET

FACTOR 2-4

SITE DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

Offeror: _____

Evaluator:_____

1. General: Site design includes overall planning, layout, design and development of the housing site(s), exclusive of utility systems. It embraces consideration of community appearance, compatibility of grounds and buildings, functionality, dignity, and livability. Generally excluded are considerations relative to the quality of materials, which are evaluated elsewhere.

Subfactor a. This is the most important subfactor
Subfactor b. This subfactor is slightly less important than sufactor a.
Subfactor c. This subfactor is less important than sufactor b.
Subfactor d. This subfactor is equal in importance to sufactor c.
Subfactor e. This subfactor is equal in importance to sufactor d.
Subfactor f. This subfactor is equal in importance to sufactor d.
Subfactor g. This subfactor is equal in importance to sufactor d.

2. Subfactor Evaluations.

a. Site Utilization and Area Development Plan. The project density in housing units per hectare [acre] is pre-established by the project scope and the composition (number of units and number of bedrooms) in relation to total area prescribed for development.

Considerations:

- Community Development Plan/Concept
- Clustering (Grouping of structures to provide good accessibility to and from the local streets, parking areas, and usable attractive areas.)
- Variation of Structure Setback and Appearance
- Buffering of Housing Units (Separation of structures from heavy traffic and surrounding land uses not compatible with residential development. Evaluate adequacy of site plan to provide some level of sound and visual privacy for the residents. To be considered here, the space shall not be the required recreation areas.)

/__ / Excellent /__ / Above Average /__ / Average /__ / Poor /__ / Unacceptable

- Proposal Strengths. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal strengths in the area of Site Utilization and Area Development Plan. Comments are required for all ratings above “AVERAGE”.

- Proposal Weaknesses. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal weaknesses in the area of Site Utilization and Area Development Plan. Comments are required for all ratings above “AVERAGE”.

- Other Comments. Include any other comments with respect to Site Utilization and Area Development Plans here.

b. Force Protection Considerations. This subfactor evaluates the inclusion of force protection constraints on the site design. The requirements for this factor are prescriptive in nature. Proposals which have significant omissions or inconsistencies with respect to force protection issues will be rated "UNACCEPTABLE".

Other Considerations: Placement of parking areas, placement of pedestrian parkways, orientation of the facilities,

[Design District shall edit this subfactor as applicable for each project]

/__ / Excellent /__ / Above Average /__ / Average /__ / Poor /__ / Unacceptable

- Proposal Strengths. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal strengths in the area of site Force Protection. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

- Proposal Weaknesses. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal weaknesses in the area of site Force Protection. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

- Other Comments. Include any other comments with respect to site Force Protection here.

c. Landscaping. This factor evaluates the design, quality, quantity, and location of trees, shrubs, plantings, ground covers, and grass used to screen and enhance individual living units and recreation areas.

Considerations:

- Screening and Shading Plant Selections
  - Are plant materials hardy to this climate?
  - Have plantings been provided to provide screening between units, structures, and clusters?
  - Do the plantings enhance a sense of privacy for the residents?
  - Consider actual number, size, and type of plants proposed.
  - Do the plantings discretely hide the service and utility equipment?
  - Have trees been included to provide shading on the east, west, and south exposures?
  - Are foundation plantings appropriate and do they require minimal maintenance?
- Street Tree Selections
  - Do street trees proposed comply with the hierarchy of streets in the area?
  - Are the street trees hardy to the local clmat?
  - Consider size, type, and quality of trees proposed.

/__ / Excellent /__ / Above Average /__ / Average /__ / Poor /__ / Unacceptable

- Proposal Strengths. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal strengths in the area of Landscaping. Comments are required for all ratings above “AVERAGE”.

- Proposal Weaknesses. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal weaknesses in the area of Landscaping. Comments are required for all ratings above “AVERAGE”.

- Other Comments. Include any other comments with respect to Landscaping here.

d. Vehicular Circulation. This subfactor evaluates the capability of primary, secondary, and feeder streets to provide access to the units, community facilities, and service access to the units. The subfactor also evaluates vehicular and pedestrian safety.

Considerations:

- Convenient and direct access to/from each structure and/or cluster?
- Convenient and direct access to/from community facilities?
- Is the proposed roadway system a logical extension of the existing system?
- Does the street design minimize choke points and traffic conflicts?
- Does the street design allow for service vehicle access (trash, fire, police, etc)
- Does the street design allow for moving van and delivery truck access?

/__ / Excellent /__ / Above Average /__ / Average /__ / Poor /__ / Unacceptable

- Proposal Strengths. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal strengths in the area of Vehicular Circulation. Comments are required for all ratings above “AVERAGE”.

- Proposal Weaknesses. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal weaknesses in the area of Vehicular Circulation. Comments are required for all ratings above “AVERAGE”.

- Other Comments. Include any other comments with respect to Vehicular Circulation here.

e. Children's Outdoor Play Areas. .

Considerations:

- Has a neighborhood park been provided in accordance with requirements of the SOW?
- Have appropriate play events been included in the neighborhood park?
- Have play lots been sized and located in accordance with SOW requirements?
- Have age appropriate play events been included in the play lots?
- Are the fall zones and use zones identified on the plan?
- Has a suitable base material been included in the play areas?
- Have poisonous plants and thorns been kept away from the play areas?

/__ / Excellent /__ / Above Average /__ / Average /__ / Poor /__ / Unacceptable

- Proposal Strengths. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal strengths in the area of Children's Outdoor Play Areas. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

- Proposal Weaknesses. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal weaknesses in the area of Children's Outdoor Plan Areas. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

- Other Comments. Include any other comments with respect to Children's Outdoor Play Areas here.

f. Pedestrian Circulation. This subfactor evaluates the way in which the walkway system supports the movement of pedestrians from one location to another. If the overall street pattern does not make sidewalks functionally compatible with the sub-elements of a good pedestrian circulation system listed below, then the ratings assigned must reflect this functional inadequacy.

Considerations:

- For Individual Units
  - Does walkway system provide short direct access routes to the fronts of all units?
  - Are parking areas connected by walkways to the structures they serve?
  - Can all parts of the parking areas be reached without leaving the walkway?
  - Does the walkway design minimize pedestrian movement through the parking areas?
  - Are walkways provided to facilitate curbside automated trash collection?
- To Recreation Areas, Bus Stops, Community Facilities
  - Do walkways provide convenient access?
  - Can play lots be reached without crossing secondary streets?
  - Does the walkway system provide a natural and convenient routing to school or the nearest bus stop shelter?

/__ / Excellent /__ / Above Average /__ / Average /__ / Poor /__ / Unacceptable

- Proposal Strengths. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal strengths in the area of Pedestrian Circulation. Comments are required for all ratings above “AVERAGE”.

- Proposal Weaknesses. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal weaknesses in the area of Pedestrian Circulation. Comments are required for all ratings above “AVERAGE”.

- Other Comments. Include any other comments with respect to Pedestrian Circulation here.

g. Parking Areas. This subfactor considers the provision of parking areas within the site development. The actual design of the pavement surfaces proposed is evaluated elsewhere, this subfactor considers more the functional and organizational layout of the parking areas.

Considerations:

- For Individual Units
  - Proximity to the housing units?
  - Provision of two spaces per unit?
  - Parking areas within 15200 mm [50 ft] of units?
- Layout of Parking Areas
  - Minimize conflict between entering/leaving vehicles?
  - No backing into primary streets
  - Separation of parking exits/entrances from street intersections.

/__ / Excellent /__ / Above Average /__ / Average /__ / Poor /__ / Unacceptable

- Proposal Strengths. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal strengths in the area of Parking Area Development. Comments are required for all ratings above “AVERAGE”.

- Proposal Weaknesses. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal weaknesses in the area of Parking Area Development. Comments are required for all ratings above “AVERAGE”.

- Other Comments. Include any other comments with respect to Parking Area Development here.

FACTOR 2-4 Summary Rating

FACTOR 2-4 SUMMARY RATING CHART			
Item No.	**Description**	**Rating***	**Comments**
1.	Subfactor a Site Utilization and Area Development Plan		This is the most important subfactor.
2.	subfactor b Force Protection Considerations		This subfactor is slightly less important than subfactor a.
3.	Subfactor c Landscaping		This subfactor is less important than subfactor b.
4.	Subfactor d Vehicular Circulation		This subfactor is slightly less important than subfactor c.
5.	Subfactor e Children's Outdoor Play Areas		This subfactor is equal in importance to subfactor d
6.	Subfactor f Pedestrian Circulation		This subfactor is equal in importance to subfactor d
7.	Subfactor g Parking		This subfactor is equal in importance to subfactor d
FACTOR 2-4 RATING**			

* Ratings may be either:
Excellent – Above Average – Average – Poor - Unacceptable

** Evaluators shall consider the ratings in the various items shown to determine a suitable overall rating. The overall rating cannot be an average, mode, or median of the ratings of the subfactors. A final rating must be reached based on discussions and a consensus among the evaluators

PROPOSAL RATING WORKSHEET

FACTOR 2-5

SITE ENGINEERING

Offeror: _____

Evaluator:_____

1. General: Site engineering includes the technical performance of site design and exterior utility systems. The quality of the proposed construction materials is also evaluated in each element. Particular emphasis is placed on durability, corrosion resistance, pest and termite resistance, ease of maintenance, and life cycle cost of maintenance requirements. Consideration will be given to the suitability of the chosen material to the environment in which it is to be placed. Evaluation includes consideration of engineering aspects of operation and maintenance. Utility systems are to be evaluated beyond the 1500-m [5-ft] line from the housing units.

Subfactor a. This is the most important subfactor.
Subfactor b. This subfactor is less important than subfactor a.
Subfactor c. This subfactor is equal in importance to subfactor b.
Subfactor d. This subfactor is equal in importance to subfactor b.
Subfactor e. This subfactor is equal in importance to subfactor b.

2. Subfactor Evaluations.

a. Site Integration. This subfactor considers the grading and drainage and its integration with the natural features, and the proposals overall integration with the surrounding areas.

Considerations:

- Drainage Design. Quality and effectiveness of the drainage system proposed to adequately handle the surface runoff.
- Preservation of Natural Features. This includes the preservation of trees, natural drainage swales, streams, and any other natural or historic feature of the site.
- Integration with Surrounding Area. Integration of new development with the physical flows and relationship with the surrounding areas.
- Grading Design
    - Aesthetic effects on the site of the proposed grading.
    - Enhance and/or blend with the natural contours of the site?
    - Blend into the overall off-site topographic character?

/__ / Excellent /__ / Above Average /__ / Average /__ / Poor /__ / Unacceptable

- Proposal Strengths. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal strengths in the area of Site Integration. Comments are required for all ratings above “AVERAGE”.

- Proposal Weaknesses. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal weaknesses in the area of Site Integration. Comments are required for all ratings above “AVERAGE”.

- Other Comments. Include any other comments with respect to Site Integration here.

b. Water System. This subfactor considers the design and materials proposed for use with the domestic water. Careful consideration should be given to reviewing the proposed site main sizes and materials proposed.

Other Considerations: None.

/__ / Excellent /__ / Above Average /__ / Average /__ / Poor /__ / Unacceptable

- Proposal Strengths. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal strengths in the area of Water System design. Comments are required for all ratings above “AVERAGE”.

- Proposal Weaknesses. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal weaknesses in the area of Water System design. Comments are required for all ratings above “AVERAGE”.

- Other Comments. Include any other comments with respect to Water System design here.

c. Fuel Piping and Storage Systems. This subfactor considers the fuel piping systems proposed for the facility. These systems include natural gas, fuel oil, propane, or other fuel type systems. Evaluators shall consider the narrative information with respect to installation location and material selection. To the greatest extent possible, evaluate the provisions for containment of leaks and the accessibility of the piping for replacement and repair.

Other Considerations: If fuel oil or propane storage tanks are proposed for use they must comply explicitly with the statement of work requirements.

/__ / Excellent /__ / Above Average /__ / Average /__ / Poor /__ / Unacceptable

- Proposal Strengths. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal strengths in the area of Fuel Piping and Storage System design. Comments are required for all ratings above “AVERAGE”.

- Proposal Weaknesses. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal weaknesses in the area of Fuel Piping and Storage System design. Comments are required for all ratings above “AVERAGE”.

- Other Comments. Include any other comments with respect to Fuel Piping and Storage System design here.

d. Electrical Distribution System. This subfactor considers the design of the site electrical distribution system. It covers the system from the point of connection to the existing base infrastructure to the main power panel inside each new housing unit or structure. Evaluators shall review and consider proposed material quality, access for repair/replacement, sizing/loading of transformers and other electrical issues. Coordination with the base-wide power distribution system is a requirement. Cable television and telephone distribution are included in this subfactor.

Other Considerations: None.

/__ / Excellent /__ / Above Average /__ / Average /__ / Poor /__ / Unacceptable

- Proposal Strengths. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal strengths in the area of Electrical Distribution System design. Comments are required for all ratings above “AVERAGE”.

- Proposal Weaknesses. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal weaknesses in the area of Electrical Distribution design. Comments are required for all ratings above “AVERAGE”.

- Other Comments. Include any other comments with respect to Electrical Distribution design here.

e. Sanitary Sewer System. This subfactor is considered the most important subfactor due to the desire to maintain a gravity sanitary sewer system. Consideration shall be given to the placement of sanitary sewer mains, provisions for cleaning, and to the inclusion of a pumping station/force main if required by the site development. Included in this subfactor is the evaluation of actual materials proposed for installation.

Other Considerations: None.

/__ / Excellent /__ / Above Average /__ / Average /__ / Poor /__ / Unacceptable

- Proposal Strengths. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal strengths in the area of Sanitary Sewer System design. Comments are required for all ratings above “AVERAGE”.

- Proposal Weaknesses. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal weaknesses in the area of Sanitary Sewer design. Comments are required for all ratings above “AVERAGE”.

- Other Comments. Include any other comments with respect to Sanitary Sewer design here.

FACTOR 2-5 Summary Rating

FACTOR 2-5 SUMMARY RATING CHART			
Item No.	**Description**	**Rating***	**Comments**
1.	Subfactor a Site Integration		This is the most important subfactor.
2.	subfactor b Water System		This subfactor is less important than subfactor a.
3.	Subfactor c Fuel Piping and Storage System		This subfactor is equal to subfactor b.
4.	Subfactor d Fuel Piping and Storage System		This subfactor is equal to subfactor b.
5.	Subfactor e Sanitary Sewer System		This subfactor is equal to subfactor b.
FACTOR 2-5 RATING**			

* Ratings may be either:
Excellent – Above Average – Average – Poor - Unacceptable

** Evaluators shall consider the ratings in the various items shown to determine a suitable overall rating. The overall rating cannot be an average, mode, or median of the ratings of the subfactors. A final rating must be reached based on discussions and a consensus among the evaluators

PROPOSAL RATING WORKSHEET

FACTOR 2-6

OFFEROR MANAGEMENT PLANS AND SCHEDULES

Offeror: _____

Evaluator:_____

1. General: This factor is equal in importance to Factor 2-5. The information provided in response to this factor completes the Offeror Performance Information which was received, reviewed, and evaluated in Phase 1 of this solicitation. Through this factor the evaluators will review and evaluate the Offeror's demonstrated understanding of the design/build process as required in this solicitation. Each of the four subfactors are approximately equal in importance.

2. Subfactor Evaluations.

a. Quality Control Plan. Evaluators shall review and evaluate the Offeror's quality control procedures planned for application to this project. The quality control plan and procedures must address design as well as construction phases of the project. The proposed quality control program must include and address the Corps three phase quality control system and acknowledge experience and familiarity with the Corps Quality Assurance program. If personnel identified by the Offeror have changed, the alternate personnel shall be reviewed to assure a similar level of quality.

Other Considerations: None.

/__ / Excellent /__ / Above Average /__ / Average /__ / Poor /__ / Unacceptable

- Proposal Strengths. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal strengths in the Offeror's Quality Control Program. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

- Proposal Weaknesses. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal weaknesses of the Offeror's Quality Control Program. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

b. Schedule Information. Evaluators shall review and evaluate the Offeror's proposed schedule information to determine the extent of "fast tracking" included. The schedule must reflect a single task oriented structure for both design and construction operations. Evaluators shall review and assess completeness, inclusion of required milestones, and realism. Proposed schedules which indicate project completion prior to the Government indicated maximum duration may receive favorable consideration.

Other Considerations: None.

/__ / Excellent /__ / Above Average /__ / Average /__ / Poor /__ / Unacceptable

- Proposal Strengths. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal strengths in the Offeror's proposed Project Schedule. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

- Proposal Weaknesses. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal weaknesses of the Offeror's proposed Project Schedule. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

c. Closeout Plan. Evaluators shall review and evaluate the Offeror's proposed closeout plan. Particular emphasis shall be placed on the preparation of Operations & Maintenance Manuals and the training of the base personnel on the installed systems and materials.

Other Considerations: None.

/__ / Excellent /__ / Above Average /__ / Average /__ / Poor /__ / Unacceptable

- Proposal Strengths. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal strengths in the Offeror's proposed Closeout Plan. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

- Proposal Weaknesses. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal weaknesses of the Offeror's proposed Closeout Plan. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

d. Sub-Contracting Plan. Evaluators shall review and evaluate the Offeror's proposed subcontracting plan in terms of achieving the required special emphasis group participations and the completeness and rational for the plan proposed. Offerors who are not required to submit a subcontracting plan (ie Small Business concerns) will be assigned a rating equal to the highest evaluation of any subcontracting plan submitted in response to this solicitation.

Other Considerations: None.

/__ / Excellent /__ / Above Average /__ / Average /__ / Poor /__ / Unacceptable

- Proposal Strengths. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal strengths in the Offeror's proposed Sub-Contracting Plan. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

- Proposal Weaknesses. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal weaknesses of the Offeror's proposed Sub-Contracting Plan. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

FACTOR 2-6 Summary Rating

FACTOR 2-6 SUMMARY RATING CHART			
Item No.	**Description**	**Rating***	**Comments**
1.	Subfactor a Quality Control Plan		All subfactors are equal.
2.	subfactor b Schedule Information		All subfactors are equal.
3.	Subfactor c Closeout Plan		All subfactors are equal.
4.	Subfactor d Sub-Contracting Plan		All subfactors are equal.
FACTOR 2-6 RATING**			

* Ratings may be either:
Excellent – Above Average – Average – Poor - Unacceptable

** Evaluators shall consider the ratings in the various items shown to determine a suitable overall rating. The overall rating cannot be an average, mode, or median of the ratings of the subfactors. A final rating must be reached based on discussions and a consensus among the evaluators

Offeror:_____

Phase 2 Summary and Overall Rating

PHASE 2 SUMMARY RATING CHART			
Item No.	**Description**	**Rating***	**Comments**
1.	Factor 2-1 Housing Unit Design		The most important Factor.
2.	Factor 2-2 Housing Unit Gross Areas		This Factor is slightly less important than Factor 2-1
3.	Factor 2-3 Housing Unit Engineering		This Factor is slightly less important than Factor 2-2
4.	Factor 2-4 Site Design		This Factor is significantly less important than Factor 2-3
5.	Factor 2-5 Site Engineering		This Factor is approximately equal in importance to Factor 2-4.
6.	Factor 2-6 Offeror Management Plans and Schedules		This Factor is approximately equal in importance to Factor 2-5.
OVERALL PHASE 2 RATING**			

* Ratings may be either:
Excellent – Above Average – Average – Poor - Unacceptable

** Evaluators shall consider the ratings in the various items shown to determine a suitable overall rating. The overall rating cannot be an average, mode, or median of the ratings of the four factors. A final rating must be reached based on discussions and a consensus among the evaluators

Attach additional sheets to this rating summary to provide supporting rational for assignment of ratings.

_____
Board Member 1

_____
Board Member 2

_____
Board Member 3

_____
Board Member 4

_____
Board Chairperson

APPENDIX C

SUMMARY EVALUATION MATRIX

PROPOSAL SUMMARY SCORING MATRIX				
Offeror	Phase I Rating*	Phase II Rating**	Final Overall Proposal Rating**	Comments

* Ratings may be either:
Neutral – Outstanding – Above Average – Satisfactory – Marginal – Unsatisfactory

** Ratings may be either:
Excellent – Above Average – Average – Poor - Unacceptable

Note:
Excellent = Outstanding
Average = Satisfactory
Poor = Marginal
Unacceptable = Unsatisfactory

_____
Board Member 1

_____
Board Member 2

_____
Board Member 3

_____
Board Member 4

_____
Board Chairperson