

Scoring Element	Weight	Weak	Below Average	Average	Above Average	Exceptional	Evaluator's Comments	Evaluator's Score
Section 1								
Company-Specific Information (contact person, diagram of management structure and descriptions of roles and responsibilities)	5	- Did not provide the requested information (0 POINTS)	N/A	- Presented most of the information requested in a manner that was understandable. Proposed individual is a "good" lead person for the GTH's interests. (3 POINTS)	N/A	- Presented all requested information in a clear, concise and understandable manner. Proposed individual is an "exceptional" lead person for the GTH's interests. (5 POINTS)		
Opportunity-Specific Information (how to leverage GTH value, support for intent, public rollout and how marketing would be approached)	10	- Did not provide information related to how to leverage the value of the GTH, unclear as to support for original intent and did not present a plan for how marketing would be approached (0 POINTS)	- Proponent demonstrated some of the following: understanding of GTH value, expressed support for vision and presented a proposal for being publicly involved in the marketing of the GTH (3 POINTS)	- Proponent demonstrated most of the following: understanding of GTH value, expressed support for vision and presented a proposal for being publicly involved in the marketing of the GTH (6 POINTS)	- Proponent demonstrated understanding of GTH value, expressed support for vision and presented a proposal for being publicly involved in the marketing of the GTH (8 POINTS)	- Proponent demonstrated in a clear, concise and compelling way, understanding of GTH value, expressed support for vision and presented a proposal for being publicly involved in the marketing of the GTH (10 POINTS)		
Major Deliverable Areas (detailed sales and marketing plan for first 18 months and by year, potential clients, appropriateness of size, pricing, permitted uses, approach, property management resources, approach, intent to use current provider, costing)	35	- Proponent did not respond to questions asked in a manner that provided confidence that they could be successful (i.e advancing marketing and sales while adequately maintaining the property) (0 POINTS)	- Proponent responded to some questions asked related to major deliverables incurring confidence that they might be successful (i.e advancing marketing and sales while adequately maintaining the property) (9 POINTS)	- Proponent responded to most questions asked related to major deliverables incurring confidence that they could be successful (i.e advancing marketing and sales while adequately maintaining the property) (18 POINTS)	- Proponent responded to all questions asked related to major deliverables incurring confidence that they would be successful (i.e advancing marketing and sales while adequately maintaining the property) (27 POINTS)	- Proponent responded to all questions asked related to major deliverables in a clear, concise and compelling manner incurring confidence that they would be successful (i.e advancing marketing and sales while adequately maintaining the property) (35 POINTS)		
TOTAL	50							0
Section 2								
Enter rating criteria specific to each individual proponent	50	- Does not provide responses to clarification questions (0 POINTS)	- Provided responses that sufficiently addressed some follow up questions and either clarified rationale for proposed approach or changed approach (13 POINTS)	- Provided adequate, clear responses that sufficiently addressed most follow up questions and either clarified rationale for proposed approach or changed approach (25 POINTS)	- Provided adequate, clear responses that sufficiently addressed all follow up questions and either clarified rationale for proposed approach or changed approach (37 POINTS)	- Provided comprehensive, clear responses that sufficiently addressed all follow up questions and either clarified rationale for proposed approach or changed approach (50 POINTS)		
TOTAL	50							0
Appendix 1: Financial Proposal Form								
Marketing & Sales	40	- Did not provide a marketing and sales plan in their response (0 POINTS)	- Presented a costing structure for marketing & sales however not fully explored or well defined (10 POINTS)	- Presented a costing structure for marketing & sales that was reasonable, cost effective and sustainable for both the GTH and Proponent (20 POINTS)	- Presented a comprehensive costing structure for marketing & sales that was reasonable, cost effective and sustainable for both the GTH and Proponent (30 POINTS)	- Presented a comprehensive costing structure for marketing & sales that was reasonable, cost effective and sustainable for both the GTH and Proponent that provided confidence that the Proponent would be effective (40 POINTS)		

Property Management	30	- Did not provide a costing structure for property management (0 POINTS)	- Presented a costing structure for property management however not fully explored or well defined (8 POINTS)	- Presented a costing structure for property management that was reasonable, cost effective and sustainable for both the GTH and Proponent (15 POINTS)	- Presented a comprehensive costing structure for property management that was reasonable, cost effective and sustainable for both the GTH and Proponent (23 POINTS)	- Presented a comprehensive costing structure for property management that was reasonable, cost effective and sustainable for both the GTH and Proponent that provided confidence that the Proponent would be effective (30 POINTS)		
Land Development	20	- Did not provide a costing structure for land development (0 POINT)	- Presented a costing structure for land development however not fully explored or well defined (5 POINTS)	- Presented a costing structure for land development that was reasonable, cost effective and sustainable for both the GTH and Proponent (10 POINTS)	- Presented a comprehensive costing structure for land development that was reasonable, cost effective and sustainable for both the GTH and Proponent (15 POINTS)	- Presented a comprehensive costing structure for land development that was reasonable, cost effective and sustainable for both the GTH and Proponent that provided confidence that the Proponent would be effective (20 POINTS)		
Overall Pricing Strategy	60	- Overall costing structure either was not provided or did not incorporate elements of innovation, cost effectiveness, public defendability or sustainability (0 POINT)	- Overall costing structure provided was somewhat innovative, cost effective, publicly defendable and sustainable (15 POINTS)	- Overall costing structure provided was mostly innovative, cost effective, publicly defendable and sustainable for both the proponent and the GTH (30 POINTS)	- Overall costing structure provided was innovative, cost effective, publicly defendable and sustainable for both the proponent, the GTH and represents best value for the GTH (45 POINTS)	- Overall costing structure provided was innovative, cost effective, publicly defendable and sustainable for both the proponent and the GTH, represents best value for the GTH and provided a high degree of confidence that overall objectives would be achieved (60 POINTS)		
TOTAL	150							0
Appendix 2: Success Matrix								
Land sales	20	- Did not provide an action plan with respect to land sales or the plan significantly lacked clarity and direction (0 POINTS)	- Communicates a vision and action plan for land sales that considered some innovation, public defendability and leveraging of available networks (5 POINTS)	- Communicates a vision and action plan for land sales that considered most of innovation, public defendability and leveraging of available networks (10 POINTS)	- Communicates a realistic vision and action plan for land sales that provided confidence that it would be achieved. The plan considered some innovation, public defendability and leveraging of available networks (15 POINTS)	- Communicates a compelling, realistic vision and action plan for land sales that provided confidence that it would be achieved. The plan considered innovation, public defendability and leveraging of available networks (20 POINTS)		
Development of sold acres	15	- Did not provide an action plan with respect to the development of sold acres or the plan significantly lacked clarity and direction (0 POINTS)	- Communicates a vision and action plan for the development of sold acres that is somewhat incomplete (4 POINTS)	- Communicates a realistic vision and action plan for the development of sold acres (8 POINTS)	Communicates a realistic vision and action plan for the development of sold acres that provided confidence that it would be achieved (12 POINTS)	- Communicates a compelling, realistic vision and action plan for the development of sold acres that provided confidence that it would be achieved (15 POINTS)		
Management of costs	15	- Did not provide an action plan with respect to the management of costs or the plan significantly lacked clarity and direction (0 POINTS)	- Communicates a vision and action plan for the management of costs that is somewhat incomplete (4 POINTS)	- Communicates a realistic vision and action plan for the management of costs (8 POINTS)	Communicates a realistic vision and action plan for the management of costs that provided confidence that it would be achieved (12 POINTS)	- Communicates a compelling, realistic vision and action plan for the management of costs that provided confidence that it would be achieved (15 POINTS)		

Improving the narrative of the GTH	15	- Did not provide an action plan with respect to improving the narrative of the GTH or the plan significantly lacked clarity and direction (0 POINTS)	- Communicates a vision and action plan for improving the narrative of the GTH that is somewhat incomplete (4 POINTS)	- Communicates a realistic vision and action plan for improving the narrative of the GTH (8 POINTS)	Communicates a realistic vision and action plan for improving the narrative of the GTH that provided confidence that it would be achieved (12 POINTS)	- Communicates a compelling, realistic vision and action plan for improving the narrative of the GTH that provided confidence that it would be achieved (15 POINTS)		
Ensure existing clients are well served	10	- Did not provide an action plan with respect to serving existing clients or the plan significantly lacked clarity and direction (0 POINTS)	- Communicates a vision and action plan for serving existing clients that is somewhat incomplete (3 POINTS)	- Communicates a realistic vision and action plan for serving existing clients (5 POINTS)	Communicates a realistic vision and action plan for serving existing clients that provided confidence that it would be achieved (8 POINTS)	- Communicates a compelling, realistic vision and action plan for serving existing clients that provided confidence that it would be achieved (10 POINTS)		
TOTAL	75							0
Presentation								
Communication of a compelling future vision of the GTH and related execution plan	20	- Does not communicate a compelling future vision of the GTH or related execution plan (0 POINTS)	Communicates an incomplete vision and action plan for the future of the GTH as a whole (5 POINTS)	- Communicates a vision and action plan for the future of the GTH as a whole that considered both innovation and public defensibility (10 POINTS)	- Communicates a realistic vision and action plan for the future of the GTH as a whole that provided confidence that it would be achieved. The plan considered both innovation and public defensibility (15 POINTS)	- Communicates a compelling, realistic vision and action plan for the future of the GTH as a whole that provided confidence that it would be achieved. The plan considered both innovation and public defensibility (20 POINTS)		
Project team instilled confidence in their ability to deliver if awarded the mandate	20	- Proposed team members did not instill confidence that they would be successful (0 POINTS)	- Proposed team member through their qualifications, references and presentation instilled little confidence that they would be able to successfully deliver on the proposed solution (5 POINTS)	- Proposed team member through their qualifications, references and presentation instilled some confidence that they would be able to successfully deliver on the proposed solution (10 POINTS)	Proposed team member through their qualifications, references and presentation instilled a moderate degree of confidence that they would be able to successfully deliver on the proposed solution (15 POINTS)	- Proposed team member through their qualifications, references and presentation instilled a high degree of confidence that they would be able to successfully deliver on the proposed solution (20 POINTS)		
Appropriately responded to questions asked related to presentation	15	- Team did not appropriately respond to questions asked (0 POINTS)	- Team responded to some questions posed in a knowledgeable, professional, and appropriate manner proposing appropriate solutions to presented problems. (4 POINTS)	- Team responded to most questions posed in a knowledgeable, professional, and appropriate manner proposing appropriate solutions to presented problems. (8 POINTS)	- Team responded to most questions posed in a knowledgeable, professional, and appropriate manner proposing appropriate solutions to presented problems. Team graciously acknowledged when knowledge areas were lacking and worked toward appropriate resolution. (12 POINTS)	- Team responded to all questions posed in a knowledgeable, professional, and appropriate manner proposing appropriate solutions to presented problems. (15 POINTS)		
Overall communication of best value for the GTH and Government	20	- Not deemed to provide good value for the GTH and Government (0 POINTS)	- When presentation reviewed as a whole it was determined that it provided less value overall than other proponents or the current operating model (5 POINTS)	- When presentation reviewed as a whole it was determined that it provided similar value overall than other proponents and current operating model (10 POINTS)	- When presentation reviewed as a whole it was determined that it provided better value overall than other proponents and current operating model (15 POINTS)	- When presentation reviewed as a whole it was determined that it provided exceptionally better value overall than other proponents and current operating model (20 POINTS)		
TOTAL	75							0
Best Overall Value to the GTH								

Marketing & Sales	15	- Not deemed to provide value related to marketing and sales (0 POINTS)	Presented compelling solutions related to marketing and sales that were deemed to provide less value than other proponents when considering cost, public defendability, innovation and sustainability (4 POINTS)	- Presented compelling solutions related to marketing and sales that were deemed to provide similar value to the GTH when considering cost, public defendability, innovation and sustainability (8 POINTS)	- Presented compelling solutions related to marketing and sales that were deemed to provide good value to the GTH when considering cost, public defendability, innovation and sustainability and instilled confidence that they would be successful (11 POINTS)	- Presented compelling solutions related to marketing and sales that were deemed to provide best value to the GTH when considering cost, public defendability, innovation and sustainability and instilled confidence that they would be successful (15 POINTS)		
Property Management	10	- Not deemed to provide value related to property management (0 POINTS)	Presented compelling solutions related to property management that were deemed to provide less value than other proponents when considering cost, public defendability, innovation and sustainability (3 POINTS)	- Presented compelling solutions related to property management that were deemed to provide similar value to the GTH when considering cost, public defendability, innovation and sustainability (5 POINTS)	- Presented compelling solutions related to property management that were deemed to provide good value to the GTH when considering cost, public defendability, innovation and sustainability and instilled confidence that they would be successful (8 POINTS)	- Presented compelling solutions related to property management that were deemed to provide best value to the GTH when considering cost, public defendability, innovation and sustainability and instilled confidence that they would be successful (10 POINTS)		
Land Development	5	- Not deemed to provide value related to land development (0 POINTS)	N/A	- Presented compelling solutions related to land development that were deemed to provide similar value to the GTH when considering cost, public defendability, innovation and sustainability (3 POINTS)	N/A	- Presented compelling solutions related to land development that were deemed to provide best value to the GTH when considering cost, public defendability, innovation and sustainability and instilled confidence that they would be successful (5 POINTS)		
Has effectively communicated a 6 to 18 month strategy for success	20	- Did not effectively communicate a 6 to 18 month plan for success (0 POINTS)	- Communicated a 6 to 18 month plan for success that provides less value for the GTH (5 POINTS)	- Communicated a realistic, achievable and defendable 6 to 18 month plan for success that provides good value for the GTH (10 POINTS)	- Communicated a realistic, achievable and defendable 6 to 18 month plan for success that provides best value for the GTH (15 POINTS)	- Communicated a compelling, realistic, achievable and defendable 6 to 18 month plan for success that provides best value for the GTH (20 POINTS)		
TOTAL	50							0
GRAND TOTAL	450							0