EVALUATION FORM												
NAME OF OFFEROR:	SCORE											
(0=lowest; 5=higl	nest)										
EXPERIENCE OF FIRM IN OPERATING, MANAGING & MAINTAINING TENNIS CENTERS	0	25%	0									
Evaluator Comments:												
OPERATING PLAN, MAINTENANCE & MANAGEMENT APPROACH & PERFORMANCE GUARANTEES	0	30%	0									
Evaluator Comments:												
FINANCIAL PLAN & FINANCIAL RESOURCES OF THE OFFEROR	0	25%	0									
Evaluator Comments:												
PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS & EXPERIENCE OF INDIVIDUALS ASSIGNED TO THIS PROJECT	0	20%	0									
Evaluator Comments:		100%										
Highest Possible Final Score: 5	TOTAL S	CORE	0									
Evaluator Certification:		'										
By signing this completed form or by attaching to an electronic message transmitted under my name, I certify that the above point values reflect my best independent judgment of the merits of the noted offeror's proposal.	Signature											
	Pri	nted Name										
	D	epartment										

11-17RFP TENNIS CENTER MANAGEMENT SERVICES

	Weighting Factor		n Evaluator 2		_	Roberts-Rains Opt	Evaluator 1	ne Evalu	ator Evaluator	Off	Lano leunis eror	Evaluator	e revaluator 2 particular 2 particular 3		Matt Moreno	Evaluator 1	nlav		Of	Cliff Drysdale MGT	Evaluator	property Evaluator 2 property Evaluator 3	so Evaluator	Offer Cennis		ш Ev a	≟ luato		Offeror	. Evaluator 1	Evaluator Bulator		Offeron	Evaluator 1	Evaluator		Offeror		Evalua		eglo Soberts-Rains Opt 2	
EXPERIENCE OF FIRM IN OPERATING, MANAGING & MAINTAINING TENNIS CENTERS	25%		2 0	3 2.5	4	A 2.25	3.50	2 0 5			B 875		2 3 3		1.25	4.5	2 5			.375	-	2 35 4		4.37		1 2	•	4 2	1.75	1 1.00	_	3 4 3 2	G 1.5	4		3 4 3 5	Н 3	1	0 2	3 4 2.5 4	2.2	5
OPERATING PLAN, MAINTENANCE & MANAGEMENT APPROACH & PERFORMANCE GUARANTEES	30%	2	3	1	2	2.4	3.00	0 1	2 0	1	.8	1	1 0	1	0.9	4	3 3	3.5 4	4	4.35	4	5 4.	5 4	5.25	5 2	2 2	2.5	2	2.55	3.00	3 2	2.5 2	3.15	2	3	1.5 4	3.15	2	3	1 2	2.4	ţ
FINANCIAL PLAN & FINANCIAL RESOURCES OF THE OFFEROR	30%	1	1	1	1	1.2	3.00	0 1	1 0) 1	.5	2.00	2 0	1	1.5	4	3 3	3.5 4	4	4.35	3.50	3 4	1 4	4.35	5 0.	.5 2	1	1	1.35	3	3 2	2.5 1	2.85	1.5	2	1.5 4	2.7	1.5	0.5	1 1	1.2	2
PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS & EXPERIENCE OF INDIVIDUALS ASSIGNED TO THIS PROJECT	20%	4.00	2.5	2	3	2.3	4	4	3 3	3 2	2.8	2.5	1 1	1	1.1	4	5	3 4	. ;	3.2	3.5	5 4	3.5	3.2	: 3	3 2.	5 2.5	2	2	2	2.5	3 3	2.1	3.5	2	3.5 4	2.6	4	2.5	2 3	2.3	3
Highest Possible Score = 5					2	2.0375				2.4	938			<u>[</u>	1.1875				4.0	0688				4.293	38				1.9125				2.4			[2.8625				2.03	75

Evaluators are urged to use the following guidelines when assessing merits of each offer against each evaluation factor.

- 5 = Excellent (innovatively exceeds all needs)
- 4 = Above Average (meets all & exceeds some needs)
- 3 = Good (meets all needs)
- 2 = Fair (meets some needs)
- 1 = Merely Responsive (does not meet needs)
- 0 = Non-Responsive (fails to meet mandatory requirements)