

P22-07, Grounds Maintenance Core Services and Athletic Fields Final with Cost Max Points Available: 100		BrightView	ACS	Yellowstone	Trammell
Criteria / Points Available	Points	Points	Points	Points	Points
Total Core Services and Athletic Fields Non-Cost (See Non-Cost Core Services)	35.50	Score from Non-Cost Tab 35.00	Score from Non-Cost Tab 35.50	Score from Non-Cost Tab 40.00	Score from Non-Cost Tab 40.00
Total Cost for Core Services and Athletic Fields (See Cost Conversion Notes Below)	60.00	\$1,401,802.00 52.20	\$1,608,591.53 55.20	\$1,523,743.61 40.80	\$2,065,768.00 40.80
Total Score Points Available: 100	95.50	Highest Scoring Responsive and Responsible Offer Meeting FCS T&C 87.20	90.70	80.80	
Notes: Cost Evaluation Formula: (Lowest Price/R-where "R" represents the cost of proposal currently being ranked) x Points = Score)		Low Cost = 100% of eligible points	1401802/1608591.53=.87 AND 60X.87=52.20	1401802/1523743.61=.92 AND 60X.92= 55.20	1401802/2065768=.68 AND 60X.68=

P22-07, Grounds Maintenance Playground Final with Cost Max Points Available: 100		Trammell	ACS	Yellowstone
Criteria / Points Available	Points	Points	Points	Points
Total Playground Non-Cost	40.00	Score from Non-Cost Tab 37.00	Score from Non-Cost Tab 37.00	Score from Non-Cost Tab 37.00
Total Playground Cost (See Cost Conversion Notes Below)	60.00	\$244,540.00 52.80	\$278,140.44 53.40	\$276,120.00 53.40
Total Score Points Available: 100	100.00	Highest Scoring Responsive and Responsible Offer Meeting FCS T&C 89.80	90.40	90.40
Notes: Cost Evaluation Formula: (Lowest Price/R-where "R" represents the cost of proposal currently being ranked) x Points = Score)		Low Cost = 100% of eligible points	244540/278140.44=.88 AND 60X.88=52.8	244540/276120=.89 AND 60X.89=53.4

Criteria / Points Available	Points	BrightView	Points	ACS	Points	Yellowstone	Points	Trammell
P22-07, Grounds Maintenance Non-Cost Evaluation Core Services and Athletic Fields Max Points Available: 40								
This Non-Cost Evaluation is specific to scoring as is specifically and particularly relates to Core Services and Athletic Fields , which are defined as: all sections of the Contract not related to Athletic Fields (Mowing Services, Chemicals, and Irrigation) and Playground-both as defined on their specific Non-Cost Page. This Includes Special T&C Sections 2.03, 3.0, 5.0, all in accordance with applicable code, best practices and industry standards usual and customary with this type of work where not explicitly delineated or specified. This also includes note/clarifications as presented during the RFP evaluation/negotiation phase as documented and hereby included in the SOW								
Contractor Qualifications Section 5.1 30 Total								
Contractor Qualifications Sections 5.1.1-5.1.4 5/30 Available	5.00	Excellent=100%	5.00	Excellent=100%	5.00	Excellent=100%	5.00	Excellent=100%
Contractor Qualifications Section 5.1.5 Staffing Plan 5/30 Available	4.00	Good=80% Slight concerns over Account Manager not having direct K-12 Experience	4.00	Good=80% Slight concerns over Account Manager not having direct K-12 Experience	4.00	Good=80% Slight concerns over Account Manager not having direct K-12 Experience	5.00	Excellent=100%
Contractor Qualifications Section 5.1.7 References 10/30 Available	8.00	Good=80% References did not demonstrate as much large scale K-12 for core services type work with more emphasis on Athletic Fields and Higher Ed. K-12 Experience at Corp/Regional level, but not serviced directly from Branch assigned to this account. Offset by excellent references.	9.00	Very Good=90% Three K-12; positive references	8.00	Good=80% Other than Dekalb, references did not demonstrate as much large scale K-12 for core services. K-12 Experience at Corp/Regional level, but not serviced directly from Branch assigned to this account. Offset by very good references	10.00	Excellent=100% Demonstrated FCS and 7 other K-12 with longevity
Demonstrated Experience and Expertise in Core Services as evaluated by FCS through RFP process, reference checks, presentation/ interview etc 10/30 Available	9.00	Very Good=90% Definite confidence in knowledge/ability to perform Core Services-especially in Higher Ed and some K-12. However not as much demonstrated in large scale K-12 environment when rank comparison to this particular competitive solicitation	8.00	Good=80% Definite confidence in knowledge/ability to perform Core Services-withing govt and K-12. FCS has experienced slow responsiveness to requests in existing contract.	9.00	Very Good=90% Definite confidence in knowledge/ability to perform Core Services-withing govt and K-12. However not as much demonstrated in large scale K-12 environment when rank comparison to this particular competitive solicitation	10.00	Excellent=100% Demonstrated FCS and 7 other K-12 with longevity
Total Qualifications	26.00		26.00		26.00		30.00	
Scope of Work Section 5.2 10 Total								
Scope of Work Section 5.2.1-5.2.12 5/10 Available	4.50	Very Good=90% While all required topics were addressed, there is less detail (schedules, plans etc) when ranked comparatively	4.50	Very Good=90% While all required topics were addressed, there is less detail (schedules etc) when ranked comparatively	5.00	Excellent=100% In depth details of schedules and plans submitted in RFP	5.00	Excellent=100% In depth details of schedules and plans submitted in RFP
Scope of Work Section 5.2.14-5.2.16 AND 5.2.18 (all as applicable to core services); 5.3-5.4 5/10 Available	5.00	Excellent=100%	4.50	Very Good=90% While all required topics were addressed, there is some distinction in the amount of detail provided when comparatively ranked to other offers	4.50	Very Good=90% While all required topics were addressed, there is some distinction regarding processes and capabilities when ranked comparatively to other finalist	5.00	Excellent=100%
Total SOW Score	9.50		9.00		9.50		10.00	
Total Non-Cost Score Points Available: 40	35.50		35.00		35.50		40.00	
Notes: Non-Cost Determined Utilizing Scoring Matrix Relative to Points Available: Excellent=100%, Very Good= 90%, Good=80%, Adequate=70%, Marginal=50%, Poor=25%, Unacceptable=0%								
Comment on Evaluation Notes: Notes provided as justification for scoring are just summary statements. FCS evaluative process was more in depth, leading to distinct differentiating factors among all four proposals. Comments are not meant to be exhaustive but are reflective of the overall score per category based upon the Matrix describe adjacent to this note and demonstrate the best value as it relates to the non-cost portion of the RFP final score								

