

# VENDOR SCORECARD RFP 2024-04 TOWN OF RIDGELAND COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

## CRITERIA CHECKLIST

\*Prior to use, update criteria as needed to be consistent with RFP. Update basis for scoring to have qualitative scoring details.

Scores available from 1-5. Basis for scoring must be listed with specific examples.

1. Qualifications of the Respondent, specifically as they relate to this Project.	Vance LLC Conduit Planning	Goodwin Mills Cadwood	Insight Planning & Development	Benchmark	BASIS FOR SCORE
Overall Comprehension of Project Objectives	5	5	5	5	Arrived by deadline receives all points
Completeness	5	3	4	5	Completed sections in same order as RFP receives all points
Focus on implementation	4	5	2	5	
Overall Comprehension of Project Objectives	5	5	4	5	
Over all Timeline	5	4	3	5	
Price	5	4	2	5	Technically compliant and attractive receives all points
<b>Average Score</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	
2. Experience of the Respondent on similar projects and the individuals who would be assigned to this Project.	Vance LLC Conduit Planning	Goodwin Mills Cadwood	Insight Planning & Development	Benchmark	BASIS FOR SCORE
Organizational Structure	4	5	4	5	Explained structure and org chart
Experience with Similar Companies	4	4	4	5	
Aligns with Town Objectives	4	4	4	5	Demonstrated working with Towns of similar size and growth battles
Experience with in the State	5	3	3	5	has worked with comparable municipalities within the state
<b>Average Score</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	
3. Public participation strategies and past participation results from similar projects.	Vance LLC Conduit Planning	Goodwin Mills Cadwood	Insight Planning & Development	Benchmark	BASIS FOR SCORE
Overall Comprehension of Project Objectives	5	5	4	5	
explains different methods of public participation	5	4	5	5	
<b>Average Score</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	
4. Available resources to complete the project and overall cost effectiveness. This criterion would include any tools, personnel, resources, or methodologies commonly used by the Respondent that may be applicable to the project categories.	Vance LLC Conduit Planning	Goodwin Mills Cadwood	Insight Planning & Development	Benchmark	BASIS FOR SCORE
Completeness of Vendor Response	4	4	5	5	
Vendor Ability to Meet Requirements	4	5	4	4	Vendor details ability to meet requirements
<b>Average Score</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	
5. Responsiveness to the RFP	Vance LLC Conduit Planning	Goodwin Mills Cadwood	Insight Planning & Development	Benchmark	BASIS FOR SCORE
Timeliness	5	5	5	5	
Completeness	5	4	4	4	
Ability to Answer Questions	4	5	4	4	
<b>Average Score</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	
6. Professional References	Vance LLC Conduit Planning	Goodwin Mills Cadwood	Insight Planning & Development	Benchmark	BASIS FOR SCORE
Partnerships	5	5	3	5	Buyer duties favorable
Terms & Conditions Purchase Agreement Details	5	5	4	5	Terms & conditions favorable
References	3	3	3	5	Outlines purchase details
<b>Average Score</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	
7. Body of work, both completed and ongoing	Vance LLC Conduit Planning	Goodwin Mills Cadwood	Insight Planning & Development	Benchmark	BASIS FOR SCORE
Flexibility, Tailorability, Extensibility	5	4	3	5	
Ease of Use	4	4	5	5	
System Performance	2	3	2	5	
Flow & Simplicity	4	5	4	5	
<b>Average Score</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	

\*Change weights based on company requirements. Total score should = 5

## CRITERIA SCORES

	WEIGHT	Conduit Planning WEIGHTED SCORE	Goodwin Mills Cadwood WEIGHTED SCORE	Insight Planning & Development WEIGHTED SCORE	Benchmark WEIGHTED SCORE	NOTES
1. Qualifications of the Respondent, specifically as they relate to this Project.	0.20	0.97	0.87	0.67	1.00	
2. Experience of the Respondent on similar projects and the individuals who would be assigned to this Project	0.20	0.85	0.80	0.75	1.00	
3. Public participation strategies and past participation results from similar projects.	0.15	0.71	0.68	0.64	0.75	
4. Available resources to complete the project and overall cost effectiveness. This criterion would include any tools, personnel, resources, or methodologies commonly used by the Respondent that may be applicable to the project categories	0.20	0.80	0.90	0.00	0.90	
5. Responsiveness to the RFP	0.15	0.70	0.70	0.65	0.65	
6. Professional References.	0.05	0.22	0.22	0.17	0.25	
7. Body of work, both completed and ongoing.	0.05	0.19	0.20	0.18	0.25	
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>4.43</b>	<b>4.36</b>	<b>3.05</b>	<b>4.80</b>	

Note: This is a preliminary ranking only, and does not constitute an award. Any award is subject to majority vote and subsequent appropriation by the Ridgeland Town Council.