WEST FALLS CHURCH
CONCEPTUAL PROPOSAL EVALUATION PLAN

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The City of Falls Church has issued this Request for Conceptual Proposals ("RFP") to identify qualified teams ("Proposers") and solicit project concepts to redevelop and commercialize approximately 10.38 acres of real property adjacent to the replacement site of the existing George Mason High School. Successful Proposers will be invited to respond to a subsequent Request for Detailed Proposals.

PR OJECT GOALS

- Generate revenue for the City to offset capital costs of the new high school,
- Be a local and a regional destination with an authentic sense of place that grows more and more interesting, relevant, and attractive as it matures with time.
- Be a transit-oriented development that takes advantage of the proximity to the West Falls Church Metro Station
- Be environmentally sustainable and resilient, and designed to thoughtfully embrace emerging trends in technology and society.
- Naturally complement the educational community immediately adjacent on the campuses of George Mason High School, Mary Ellen Middle School, and the UVa & Virginia Tech Northern Virginia Center.
- Be a vibrant urban neighborhood where people will live, work, and shop, as well as learn, create, and play.

EVALUATION SCHEDULE

Milestone	**Date**
Conceptual Proposal submission deadline	May 1
Purchasing completeness check/ A&M compliance check	May 2-8
Kickoff with evaluation committee (proposals shared)	May 10
Committee reviews proposals	May 11-28
Evaluation work session	May 29
Present down-select recommendation to City Council	June 4
Announcement of Shortlist	June 2018 (date tbd)
Issue RFDP	June 2018 (date tbd)

EVALUATION COMMITTEE

Member	Title	Voting
	City Council Rep	*Yes*
Shields, Wyatt	City Manager	*Yes*
Wulff, Bob	Consultant	*Yes*
Snyder, Jim	CPEDS Director	*Yes*
Young, Bob	EDA Rep	*Yes*
Wodiska, Russ	PC Rep	*Yes*
Gill, Erin	School Board Rep	*Yes*
Noonan, Peter	Schools Superintendent	*Yes*
Goldstein, Lee	Project Manager	*Advisory*
McCoskrie, Carol	City Attorney	*Advisory*
Risher, Boss, Brown	Alvarez & Marsal	*Advisory*

Evaluator Duties

- Attend evaluation kickoff
- Review compliance check results
- Review proposals
- Document strengths and weaknesses per sub-factor
- Complete evaluation sheet prior to work session
- Attend evaluation work session to seek consensus

Alvarez & Marsal Duties

- Provide briefing on evaluation tool
- Evaluate financial capability
- Conduct financial approach analysis
- Complete baseline evaluation sheet
- Lead evaluation work session

EVALUATION TOOL

Every compliant proposal will be rated against the evaluation standards in the RFP to enable the City to rank Proposers and identify recommended Proposers for down-selection to City Council. Offers should not be evaluated in comparison to other offers.

Compliance Check – Beyond City Purchasing's completeness review, A&M will conduct a compliance check to ensure that proposals adhere to programmatic requirements. Results from this check will be included in the Evaluation worksheet.

Color Ratings – Evaluators are requested to color-rate each sub-factor on the Evaluation Worksheet as Exceptional, Acceptable, Marginal, or Unacceptable based on its associated rating criteria.

RATING	DEFINITION
Exceptional	Proposal addressed many elements in a manner greater than satisfactory and demonstrates added value.
Acceptable	Proposal addressed all elements in a satisfactory manner.
Marginal	Proposal failed to address or clearly address many of the elements in the criteria in a satisfactory manner, but failures can be corrected during discussions.
Unacceptable	Proposal failed to address most of the elements of the criteria in a satisfactory manner, and failures cannot be corrected during discussions.

Significant Strengths and Weaknesses – Significant Strengths underpin Exceptional and Acceptable ratings by offering qualitative features to justify the given rating. Significant Weaknesses underpin Marginal and Unacceptable ratings by describing the features or omissions that justify the given rating. This information is essential and will be included on the evaluation forms.

Risk Ratings – Evaluators are requested to offer risk ratings (high, moderate, or low) based on the likelihood

RISK RATING	DEFINITION
Low Risk	Any weaknesses have little potential to cause disruption to the planning and implementation of the project. Normal contractor/government communications will probably minimize any difficulties.
Moderate Risk	Any weaknesses have a greater potential to cause disruption to the planning and implementation phases. Enhanced contractor/government attention and close monitoring will probably minimize any difficulties.
High Risk	Weaknesses have the high potential to cause significant disruption to the planning and implementation phases even with enhanced contractor/government attention and close monitoring.

EVALUATION FACTORS

Factors in order of importance

Factors	1. Qualifications, and Experience	2. Financial Capability	3. Project Approach	4. Financial Approach
Compliance Sub-factors	Team contains all required components and professionals	Submission of financial documents	Project approach contains required narratives and designs	Financial approach contains required narratives and financial metrics
		Financial stability and liquidity		
		Performance and payment bonding capacity		
Evaluative Sub-factors	Key professionals' qualifications	Access to capital	Reasonableness of Project approach	Acceptance and ability to work with preferred transaction structure
	Master planning experience	Financial risks	Project concept's alignment with Project Requirements	Reasonableness of financing plan
	Mixed-use development experience		Inclusion of Desired Features	Additional opportunities for revenue generation for the City
	Placemaking experience (transit oriented development, civic space and programming)		Innovation of project concept	Ability to anticipate and mitigate risk and approach to potential schedule default
	Experience designing environmentally sustainable and resilient communities and energy efficient buildings		Entitlement Approach	
	Entity's experience working together		City and other public entity responsibilities	
	Experience working with Institutional Users		Community information and involvement	
			Team project management	