

RATING SHEET
SKATEPARK SPONSORSHIPS PROPOSALS

Attachment 3

Elements

- 1) Cover Letter to have authorized signature of an individual authorized to bind proposing entity
- 2) Company Data to include responses to 11 areas of inquiry
- 3) Resumes/Qualifications of personnel who will work on the project and Organizational Chart of assigned personnel
- 4) References – minimum 3 in the past five years
- 5) Overview & Approach
 - a. Understanding
 - b. Approach
 - c. Scope of Work NOT to be performed by proposer company (sub-contractor list)
 - d. Assistance or items expected of or to be provided by City of Costa Mesa
 - e. Additional Services
 - f. Compensation Schedule including man-hours, materials/supplies- guaranteed for term of contract or indicate adjustments; “not to exceed” budget
- 6) Validity of Proposal – minimum 90 days
- 7) Certificate of Insurance – offeror must demonstrate willingness and ability to submit proof of insurance within 10 days of execution of contract

Evaluation Criteria

- 1) Specific experience in developing corporate sponsorship packages for Municipal Skateparks
- 2) Demonstrated knowledge of public agencies, particularly municipalities
- 3) Understanding of needs and requirements of City of Costa Mesa
- 4) Quality of references
- 5) Proposed costs
- 6) Content and form of written proposal
- 7) Interview (if any), will be separately “graded” and score added to total to achieve overall rating

RATING SHEET – CORPORATE SPARTNERSHIPS AND PROGRAM SPONSORSHIPS PLAN

Rating Scale

(-) – Failed to Respond

(+) – Answer was sufficient

Proposer Name	Key Personnel Assigned: Resumes	Organizational Chart	References	
			3 or more	Related
Public Enterprise Group				
Waters & Faubel				

Proposer Name	Overview and Approach			
	Understanding	Approach	Sub-contracted services	Expect from City
Public Enterprise Group				
Waters & Faubel				

Proposer Name	Overview and Approach (cont)			
	Additional Services	Compensation Schedule	Rates Guaranteed (Term)	Insurance (-/+)
Public Enterprise Group				
Waters & Faubel				

RATER: _____

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Rating Scale:

0 – Failed to respond

1 – Response was negligible, did not convey understanding of requirement

2 – Response did not indicate sufficient understanding of or ability to perform requirement

3 – Response indicates understanding, but does not provide enough depth to indicate ability to perform

4 – Response indicates understanding and ability to perform requirement

5 – Response indicates understanding and demonstrates successful experience in element

Proposer Name	Experience/ Qualifications of Firm and Staff (general)	Experience/ Qualifications of Firm and Staff (specific)	Knowledge of Public Agencies/ Municipalities	Availability and Commitment of Staff to Program
Public Enterprise Group				
Waters & Faubel				

Proposer Name	Responsiveness to stated objectives and Scope of Work	Philosophy and Approach to Scope of Work	Understanding of the needs and requirements of City of Costa Mesa	Location of firm and availability of staff assigned to project
Public Enterprise Group				
Waters & Faubel				

Proposer Name	Quality of references	Proposed Costs	Content and Form of Written proposal	TOTAL
Public Enterprise Group				
Waters & Faubel				

RATER: _____

COMMENTS:

RATER: _____