

**Selection Committee Evaluation Form**  
**RFQ No. 961 - Six Flags/Jazzland Site Redevelopment**  
**May 11, 2021**

**Committee Member Name: Courtney Stuckwisch Wong** \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Kiernan-West, LLC</b>			
In the Evaluation column, Committee Members shall score each proposal on the Technical criteria and weighting factors listed below and provide an assessment of that score. A proposal may receive the maximum percentage, a portion of this score, or no percentage at all. Thereafter, Committee Members shall provide an assessment of the Respondent's price proposals before providing a Final Score.			
<b>Criteria &amp; Weight</b>	<b>Criteria Description</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>	<b>Score</b>
Qualifications & Experience <u>25 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-25</b>	Qualifications, specialized experience, and track record of success on similar projects [e.g. examples of successful redevelopment projects];	<b>Assessment:</b> Respondent laid out a clear plan for the due diligence phase of master development planning as well as a long-term development timeline. The level of detail exhibits expertise in the type of development they are proposing, including consideration for the unique soils and conditions of the site.	____ <b>22</b> ____
Financial Capacity & Competence <u>25 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-25</b>	Financial capacity, and financial and technical competence [e.g. financial statements, balance sheets, other financial or technical competencies];	<b>Assessment:</b> Respondent able to self-fund equity required for project development and committed to covering costs in the due diligence phase, which they have already estimated and set aside. They have provided the most evidence of strong financial capacity of any of the respondents, including a confidential balance sheet and verification letter from a bank for due diligence.	____ <b>24</b> ____
Capacity & Demonstrated Ability <u>25 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-25</b>	Staff and organizational capacity, demonstrated ability including, without limitation, responsiveness to public and community goals, cost control, work quality and the ability to meet schedules and deadlines [e.g. staff and CV/resumes assigned to project, organizational charts, work samples, percentage of time dedicated to project];	<b>Assessment:</b> Primary respondent has 30 years of experience in real estate development, including master planning of sites with similar conditions and regulatory issues. Respondent has partnered with community members through new nonprofit S.H.I.E.L.D.1 with a commitment to social impact in New Orleans.	____ <b>22</b> ____
References <u>15 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-15</b>	References	<b>Assessment:</b> No change from first round. Provided a letter of reference from the former mayor of a city in New Jersey where respondent completed a project and from Withey Morris, explaining KW's ability to work through difficulties, build strong relationships.	____ <b>15</b> ____
DBE <u>10 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-10</b>	Past DBE Participation: Proposal submitted a quality DBE Participation Plan (DBE Form 3) that outlines past successful DBE participation on similar projects and includes innovative strategies and approaches to achieve and maintain DBE participation over the term of any formal agreements resulting from this solicitation	<b>Assessment:</b>  No change from first round. Completed DBE Form 3 and outlined plans to maximize DBE participation.	____ <b>10</b> ____
<b>Final Score</b>			____ <b>93</b> ____

Committee Member Signature  \_\_\_\_\_

**Selection Committee Evaluation Form**  
**RFQ No. 961 - Six Flags/Jazzland Site Redevelopment**  
**May 11, 2021**

**Committee Member Name: Courtney Stuckwisch Wong** \_\_\_\_\_

**Situs Development Collective LLC**

In the Evaluation column, Committee Members shall score each proposal on the Technical criteria and weighting factors listed below and provide an assessment of that score. A proposal may receive the maximum percentage, a portion of this score, or no percentage at all. Thereafter, Committee Members shall provide an assessment of the Respondent's price proposals before providing a Final Score.

<b>Criteria &amp; Weight</b>	<b>Criteria Description</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Qualifications &amp; Experience</b> <u>25 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-25</b>	Qualifications, specialized experience, and track record of success on similar projects [e.g. examples of successful redevelopment projects];	<b>Assessment:</b> Respondent's master development vision continues to be the most ambitious and contains a dozen potential uses. This prompts questions of feasibility and market demand, which are not fully addressed in the response.	<u>15</u>
<b>Financial Capacity &amp; Competence</b> <u>25 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-25</b>	Financial capacity, and financial and technical competence [e.g. financial statements, balance sheets, other financial or technical competencies];	<b>Assessment:</b> Respondent points to large transactions completed by various members of the team including while leveraging incentives, alludes to expressions of interest received for parts of the development, and states they have received an updated term sheet (confidential term sheet was provided in first round) from a financial institution. The financial institution requires a deep cash investment by respondent.	<u>12</u>
<b>Capacity &amp; Demonstrated Ability</b> <u>25 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-25</b>	Staff and organizational capacity, demonstrated ability including, without limitation, responsiveness to public and community goals, cost control, work quality and the ability to meet schedules and deadlines [e.g. staff and CV/resumes assigned to project, organizational charts, work samples, percentage of time dedicated to project];	<b>Assessment:</b> Although there is deep expertise among team members, the team has not completed projects individually or collectively at the scale that is being proposed.	<u>17</u>
<b>References</b> <u>15 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-15</b>	References	<b>Assessment:</b> No change from first round. No letters of reference were provided, but they did provide several references with contact info.	<u>10</u>
<b>DBE</b> <u>10 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-10</b>	Past DBE Participation: Proposal submitted a quality DBE Participation Plan (DBE Form 3) that outlines past successful DBE participation on similar projects and includes innovative strategies and approaches to achieve and maintain DBE participation over the term of any formal agreements resulting from this solicitation	<b>Assessment:</b>  No change from first round. Submitted a DBE Form 3. Team includes DBE firms. Proposed a thoughtful plan to achieve DBE goals.	<u>10</u>
<b>Final Score</b>			<u>64</u>

Committee Member Signature  \_\_\_\_\_

**Selection Committee Evaluation Form**  
**RFQ No. 961 - Six Flags/Jazzland Site Redevelopment**  
**May 11, 2021**

**Committee Member Name: Courtney Stuckwisch Wong** \_\_\_\_\_

**TKTMJ Incorporated/ Henry Consulting/ Bayou Phoenix**

In the Evaluation column, Committee Members shall score each proposal on the Technical criteria and weighting factors listed below and provide an assessment of that score. A proposal may receive the maximum percentage, a portion of this score, or no percentage at all. Thereafter, Committee Members shall provide an assessment of the Respondent's price proposals before providing a Final Score.

<b>Criteria &amp; Weight</b>	<b>Criteria Description</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Qualifications &amp; Experience</b> <u>25 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-25</b>	Qualifications, specialized experience, and track record of success on similar projects [e.g. examples of successful redevelopment projects];	<b>Assessment:</b> Since first round of RFQ, respondents have formalized partnership with Hillwood as a master developer, and they have experience in mixed use developments and logistics centers. The respondents and Hillwood have not yet completed a project together.	<u>20</u>
<b>Financial Capacity &amp; Competence</b> <u>25 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-25</b>	Financial capacity, and financial and technical competence [e.g. financial statements, balance sheets, other financial or technical competencies];	<b>Assessment:</b> Respondent attests to Hillwood's access to capital and network of private investors, and during the meeting Hillwood representative said they were excited by the opportunity. Respondent has experience leveraging incentives on local projects such as a home for the aged and a school, though their proposed vision is on a significantly larger scale.	<u>16</u>
<b>Capacity &amp; Demonstrated Ability</b> <u>25 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-25</b>	Staff and organizational capacity, demonstrated ability including, without limitation, responsiveness to public and community goals, cost control, work quality and the ability to meet schedules and deadlines [e.g. staff and CV/resumes assigned to project, organizational charts, work samples, percentage of time dedicated to project];	<b>Assessment:</b> The addition of Hillwood as a partner adds to the capacity of the respondent team. The local members of the respondent team have significant experience in local public engagement and have taken public desires into account.	<u>20</u>
<b>References</b> <u>15 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-15</b>	References	<b>Assessment:</b> No change from first round. Respondent provided three letters of reference and one letter of interest.	<u>15</u>
<b>DBE</b> <u>10 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-10</b>	Past DBE Participation: Proposal submitted a quality DBE Participation Plan (DBE Form 3) that outlines past successful DBE participation on similar projects and includes innovative strategies and approaches to achieve and maintain DBE participation over the term of any formal agreements resulting from this solicitation	<b>Assessment:</b>  No change from first round. Respondent submitted a DBE Form 3 and is a DBE itself and has DBEs on team. According to Office of Supplier Diversity, TKTMJ has a mixed history of meeting reporting requirements on City projects.	<u>9</u>
<b>Final Score</b>			<u>80</u>

Committee Member Signature \_\_\_\_\_



**TKTMJ Incorporated/ Henry Consulting/ Bayou Phoenix**

In the Evaluation column, Committee Members shall score each proposal on the Technical criteria and weighting factors listed below and provide an assessment of that score. A proposal may receive the maximum percentage, a portion of this score, or no percentage at all. Thereafter, Committee Members shall provide an assessment of the Respondent's price proposals before providing a Final Score.


Criteria & Weight	Criteria Description	Evaluation	Score
Qualifications & Experience <u>25 Points</u> Score 0-25	Qualifications, specialized experience, and track record of success on similar projects [e.g. examples of successful redevelopment projects];	Assessment: Strong focus on sport tourism & focus on big picture development	<u>22</u>
Financial Capacity & Competence <u>25 Points</u> Score 0-25	Financial capacity, and financial and technical competence [e.g. financial statements, balance sheets, other financial or technical competencies];	Assessment: Strong capital backing	<u>24</u>
Capacity & Demonstrated Ability <u>25 Points</u> Score 0-25	Staff and organizational capacity, demonstrated ability including, without limitation, responsiveness to public and community goals, cost control, work quality and the ability to meet schedules and deadlines [e.g. staff and CV/resumes assigned to project, organizational charts, work samples, percentage of time dedicated to project];	Assessment: Well thought out plan & capacity to deliver	<u>21</u>
References <u>15 Points</u> Score 0-15	References	Assessment: strong local	<u>15</u>
DBE <u>10 Points</u> Score 0-10	Past DBE Participation: Proposal submitted a quality DBE Participation Plan (DBE Form 3) that outlines past successful DBE participation on similar projects and includes innovative strategies and approaches to achieve and maintain DBE participation over the term of any formal agreements resulting from this solicitation	Assessment: Supportive.	<u>10</u>
<b>Final Score</b>			<u>92</u>



**Kiernan-West, LLC**

In the Evaluation column, Committee Members shall score each proposal on the Technical criteria and weighting factors listed below and provide an assessment of that score. A proposal may receive the maximum percentage, a portion of this score, or no percentage at all. Thereafter, Committee Members shall provide an assessment of the Respondent's price proposals before providing a Final Score.

Criteria & Weight	Criteria Description	Evaluation	Score
Qualifications & Experience <u>25 Points</u> Score 0-25	Qualifications, specialized experience, and track record of success on similar projects [e.g. examples of successful redevelopment projects];	Assessment: <i>Continued great project that focuses on Economic Development &amp; philanthropic initiatives</i>	<u>24</u>
Financial Capacity & Competence <u>25 Points</u> Score 0-25	Financial capacity, and financial and technical competence [e.g. financial statements, balance sheets, other financial or technical competencies];	Assessment: <i>Significant financing structure</i>	<u>24</u>
Capacity & Demonstrated Ability <u>25 Points</u> Score 0-25	Staff and organizational capacity, demonstrated ability including, without limitation, responsiveness to public and community goals, cost control, work quality and the ability to meet schedules and deadlines [e.g. staff and CV/resumes assigned to project, organizational charts, work samples, percentage of time dedicated to project];	Assessment: <i>Experienced. Qualified.</i>	<u>23</u>
References <u>15 Points</u> Score 0-15	References	Assessment: <i>Bank &amp; credit</i>	<u>15</u>
DBE <u>10 Points</u> Score 0-10	Past DBE Participation: Proposal submitted a quality DBE Participation Plan (DBE Form 3) that outlines past successful DBE participation on similar projects and includes innovative strategies and approaches to achieve and maintain DBE participation over the term of any formal agreements resulting from this solicitation	Assessment: <i>Supportive</i>	<u>10</u>
<b>Final Score</b>			<u>96</u>

Committee Member Signature 

**Situs Development Collective LLC**

In the Evaluation column, Committee Members shall score each proposal on the Technical criteria and weighting factors listed below and provide an assessment of that score. A proposal may receive the maximum percentage, a portion of this score, or no percentage at all. Thereafter, Committee Members shall provide an assessment of the Respondent's price proposals before providing a Final Score.


Criteria & Weight	Criteria Description	Evaluation	Score
Qualifications & Experience <u>25 Points</u> Score 0-25	Qualifications, specialized experience, and track record of success on similar projects [e.g. examples of successful redevelopment projects];	Assessment: <u>Qualified + professional Plan</u>	<u>20</u>
Financial Capacity & Competence <u>25 Points</u> Score 0-25	Financial capacity, and financial and technical competence [e.g. financial statements, balance sheets, other financial or technical competencies];	Assessment: <u>- unclear about public relationship for financing</u>	<u>21</u>
Capacity & Demonstrated Ability <u>25 Points</u> Score 0-25	Staff and organizational capacity, demonstrated ability including, without limitation, responsiveness to public and community goals, cost control, work quality and the ability to meet schedules and deadlines [e.g. staff and CV/resumes assigned to project, organizational charts, work samples, percentage of time dedicated to project];	Assessment: <u>Experienced.</u>	<u>19</u>
References <u>15 Points</u> Score 0-15	References	Assessment: <u>strong</u>	<u>12</u>
DBE <u>10 Points</u> Score 0-10	Past DBE Participation: Proposal submitted a quality DBE Participation Plan (DBE Form 3) that outlines past successful DBE participation on similar projects and includes innovative strategies and approaches to achieve and maintain DBE participation over the term of any formal agreements resulting from this solicitation	Assessment: <u>Supportive</u>	<u>10</u>
<b>Final Score</b>			<u>82</u>



**Selection Committee Evaluation Form**  
**RFQ No. 961 - Six Flags/Jazzland Site Redevelopment**  
**May 11, 2021**

**Committee Member Name:** Jeffrey Schwartz

<b>Kiernan-West, LLC</b>			
In the Evaluation column, Committee Members shall score each proposal on the Technical criteria and weighting factors listed below and provide an assessment of that score. A proposal may receive the maximum percentage, a portion of this score, or no percentage at all. Thereafter, Committee Members shall provide an assessment of the Respondent's price proposals before providing a Final Score.			
<b>Criteria &amp; Weight</b>	<b>Criteria Description</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>	<b>Score</b>
Qualifications & Experience <u>25 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-25</b>	Qualifications, specialized experience, and track record of success on similar projects [e.g. examples of successful redevelopment projects];	<b>Assessment:</b> Overall consistency with initial proposal; alignment with City economic development priority industries (food, STEAM, transportation and logistics); demonstrated capacity, qualifications, and experience building on similar sites, including wetlands	<u>24</u>
Financial Capacity & Competence <u>25 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-25</b>	Financial capacity, and financial and technical competence [e.g. financial statements, balance sheets, other financial or technical competencies];	<b>Assessment:</b> Significant and demonstrated financial capacity of respondents themselves, including already showing evidence of predevelopment funds in place at a local bank	<u>24</u>
Capacity & Demonstrated Ability <u>25 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-25</b>	Staff and organizational capacity, demonstrated ability including, without limitation, responsiveness to public and community goals, cost control, work quality and the ability to meet schedules and deadlines [e.g. staff and CV/resumes assigned to project, organizational charts, work samples, percentage of time dedicated to project];	<b>Assessment:</b> Direct, clear, and very specific plan for next steps; clearest business plan; provided a market study to demonstrate demand;	<u>23</u>
References <u>15 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-15</b>	References	<b>Assessment:</b> References continue to be germane, including building on wetlands site in New Jersey	<u>14</u>
DBE <u>10 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-10</b>	Past DBE Participation: Proposal submitted a quality DBE Participation Plan (DBE Form 3) that outlines past successful DBE participation on similar projects and includes innovative strategies and approaches to achieve and maintain DBE participation over the term of any formal agreements resulting from this solicitation	<b>Assessment:</b> Satisfied initial DBE requirements	<u>9</u>
<b>Final Score</b>			<u>94</u>

**Committee Member Signature** 

**Selection Committee Evaluation Form**  
**RFQ No. 961 - Six Flags/Jazzland Site Redevelopment**  
**May 11, 2021**

**Committee Member Name:** Jeffrey Schwartz

**Situs Development Collective LLC**

In the Evaluation column, Committee Members shall score each proposal on the Technical criteria and weighting factors listed below and provide an assessment of that score. A proposal may receive the maximum percentage, a portion of this score, or no percentage at all. Thereafter, Committee Members shall provide an assessment of the Respondent's price proposals before providing a Final Score.

<b>Criteria &amp; Weight</b>	<b>Criteria Description</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>	<b>Score</b>
Qualifications & Experience <u>25 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-25</b>	Qualifications, specialized experience, and track record of success on similar projects [e.g. examples of successful redevelopment projects];	<b>Assessment:</b> Questionnaire responses fleshed out a fuller vision of a compelling and aspirational project for a “city within a city;” principals continue to bring significant and diverse qualifications, including with blue and green sector	<u>20</u>
Financial Capacity & Competence <u>25 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-25</b>	Financial capacity, and financial and technical competence [e.g. financial statements, balance sheets, other financial or technical competencies];	<b>Assessment:</b> Details of financial commitments and capacity from primary financial partner for a large, multi-phase project are somewhat lacking; updated letter from financial partner; continued questions about carrying project through predevelopment	<u>18</u>
Capacity & Demonstrated Ability <u>25 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-25</b>	Staff and organizational capacity, demonstrated ability including, without limitation, responsiveness to public and community goals, cost control, work quality and the ability to meet schedules and deadlines [e.g. staff and CV/resumes assigned to project, organizational charts, work samples, percentage of time dedicated to project];	<b>Assessment:</b> Creative and robust thoughts on development process; demonstrated commitment to equity and an understanding of New Orleans (and New Orleans East) marketplace; assessment of market demand—especially for housing—was light on specifics; large range of contemplated uses (twelve uses) raise some questions	<u>20</u>
References <u>15 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-15</b>	References	<b>Assessment:</b> References provided	<u>12</u>
DBE <u>10 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-10</b>	Past DBE Participation: Proposal submitted a quality DBE Participation Plan (DBE Form 3) that outlines past successful DBE participation on similar projects and includes innovative strategies and approaches to achieve and maintain DBE participation over the term of any formal agreements resulting from this solicitation	<b>Assessment:</b> Satisfies initial DBE requirements	<u>10</u>
<b>Final Score</b>			<u>80</u>

**Committee Member Signature**  \_\_\_\_\_




**Selection Committee Evaluation Form**  
**RFQ No. 961 - Six Flags/Jazzland Site Redevelopment**  
**May 11, 2021**

**Committee Member Name:** Jeffrey Schwartz

**TKTMJ Incorporated/ Henry Consulting/ Bayou Phoenix**

In the Evaluation column, Committee Members shall score each proposal on the Technical criteria and weighting factors listed below and provide an assessment of that score. A proposal may receive the maximum percentage, a portion of this score, or no percentage at all. Thereafter, Committee Members shall provide an assessment of the Respondent's price proposals before providing a Final Score.

<b>Criteria &amp; Weight</b>	<b>Criteria Description</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>	<b>Score</b>
Qualifications & Experience <u>25 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-25</b>	Qualifications, specialized experience, and track record of success on similar projects [e.g. examples of successful redevelopment projects];	<b>Assessment:</b> Team brings exemplary big picture vision and aspirations, and principals have significant and diverse experience; Hillwood positioned as Master Development partner, which brings additional development experience, but specific relationship and commitment to the respondent team is somewhat unclear	<u>22</u>
Financial Capacity & Competence <u>25 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-25</b>	Financial capacity, and financial and technical competence [e.g. financial statements, balance sheets, other financial or technical competencies];	<b>Assessment:</b> Principals and Hillwood both bring significant financial and technical capacity and experience, though the level of Hillwood's commitment/involvement is unclear	<u>21</u>
Capacity & Demonstrated Ability <u>25 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-25</b>	Staff and organizational capacity, demonstrated ability including, without limitation, responsiveness to public and community goals, cost control, work quality and the ability to meet schedules and deadlines [e.g. staff and CV/resumes assigned to project, organizational charts, work samples, percentage of time dedicated to project];	<b>Assessment:</b> Clearest engagement with the community and ability to engage with stakeholders in the process; significant capacity among partners and principals; questionnaire response was somewhat unclear as to respondent's thoughts on project phasing, which raises questions for such a large and complex proposal, and leaves unanswered questions about priorities	<u>21</u>
References <u>15 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-15</b>	References	<b>Assessment:</b> References and examples continue to be compelling	<u>13</u>
DBE <u>10 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-10</b>	Past DBE Participation: Proposal submitted a quality DBE Participation Plan (DBE Form 3) that outlines past successful DBE participation on similar projects and includes innovative strategies and approaches to achieve and maintain DBE participation over the term of any formal agreements resulting from this solicitation	<b>Assessment:</b> Satisfies initial DBE requirements	<u>9</u>
<b>Final Score</b>			<u>86</u>

**Committee Member Signature** 

**Selection Committee Evaluation Form**  
**RFQ No. 961 - Six Flags/Jazzland Site Redevelopment**  
**May 11, 2021**

**Committee Member Name: Nicole Heyman**

<b>Kiernan-West, LLC</b>			
In the Evaluation column, Committee Members shall score each proposal on the Technical criteria and weighting factors listed below and provide an assessment of that score. A proposal may receive the maximum percentage, a portion of this score, or no percentage at all. Thereafter, Committee Members shall provide an assessment of the Respondent's price proposals before providing a Final Score.			
<b>Criteria &amp; Weight</b>	<b>Criteria Description</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>	<b>Score</b>
Qualifications & Experience <u>25 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-25</b>	Qualifications, specialized experience, and track record of success on similar projects [e.g. examples of successful redevelopment projects];	<b>Assessment:</b> Demonstrates experience and record of success	__25__
Financial Capacity & Competence <u>25 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-25</b>	Financial capacity, and financial and technical competence [e.g. financial statements, balance sheets, other financial or technical competencies];	<b>Assessment:</b> Demonstrates financial capacity and competence	__25__
Capacity & Demonstrated Ability <u>25 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-25</b>	Staff and organizational capacity, demonstrated ability including, without limitation, responsiveness to public and community goals, cost control, work quality and the ability to meet schedules and deadlines [e.g. staff and CV/resumes assigned to project, organizational charts, work samples, percentage of time dedicated to project];	<b>Assessment:</b> Demonstrates organization capacity	__20__
References <u>15 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-15</b>	References	<b>Assessment:</b> Meets requirements	__15__
DBE <u>10 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-10</b>	Past DBE Participation: Proposal submitted a quality DBE Participation Plan (DBE Form 3) that outlines past successful DBE participation on similar projects and includes innovative strategies and approaches to achieve and maintain DBE participation over the term of any formal agreements resulting from this solicitation	<b>Assessment:</b> Meets requirements	__10__
<b>Final Score</b>			__95__

Committee Member Signature  \_\_\_\_\_

**Selection Committee Evaluation Form**  
**RFQ No. 961 - Six Flags/Jazzland Site Redevelopment**  
**May 11, 2021**

**Committee Member Name: Nicole Heyman**

**Situs Development Collective LLC**

In the Evaluation column, Committee Members shall score each proposal on the Technical criteria and weighting factors listed below and provide an assessment of that score. A proposal may receive the maximum percentage, a portion of this score, or no percentage at all. Thereafter, Committee Members shall provide an assessment of the Respondent's price proposals before providing a Final Score.

<b>Criteria &amp; Weight</b>	<b>Criteria Description</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>	<b>Score</b>
Qualifications & Experience <u>25 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-25</b>	Qualifications, specialized experience, and track record of success on similar projects [e.g. examples of successful redevelopment projects];	<b>Assessment:</b> Demonstrates experience	<u>20</u>
Financial Capacity & Competence <u>25 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-25</b>	Financial capacity, and financial and technical competence [e.g. financial statements, balance sheets, other financial or technical competencies];	<b>Assessment:</b> Financial capacity not fully demonstrated	<u>20</u>
Capacity & Demonstrated Ability <u>25 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-25</b>	Staff and organizational capacity, demonstrated ability including, without limitation, responsiveness to public and community goals, cost control, work quality and the ability to meet schedules and deadlines [e.g. staff and CV/resumes assigned to project, organizational charts, work samples, percentage of time dedicated to project];	<b>Assessment:</b> Demonstrates staffing capacity	<u>20</u>
References <u>15 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-15</b>	References	<b>Assessment:</b> Meets requirements	<u>15</u>
DBE <u>10 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-10</b>	Past DBE Participation: Proposal submitted a quality DBE Participation Plan (DBE Form 3) that outlines past successful DBE participation on similar projects and includes innovative strategies and approaches to achieve and maintain DBE participation over the term of any formal agreements resulting from this solicitation	<b>Assessment:</b> Meets requirements	<u>10</u>
<b>Final Score</b>			<u>85</u>

Committee Member Signature 

**Selection Committee Evaluation Form**  
**RFQ No. 961 - Six Flags/Jazzland Site Redevelopment**  
**May 11, 2021**

**Committee Member Name: Nicole Heyman**

**TKTMJ Incorporated/ Henry Consulting/ Bayou Phoenix**

In the Evaluation column, Committee Members shall score each proposal on the Technical criteria and weighting factors listed below and provide an assessment of that score. A proposal may receive the maximum percentage, a portion of this score, or no percentage at all. Thereafter, Committee Members shall provide an assessment of the Respondent's price proposals before providing a Final Score.

<b>Criteria &amp; Weight</b>	<b>Criteria Description</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>	<b>Score</b>
Qualifications & Experience <u>25 Points</u> <b>Score 0-25</b>	Qualifications, specialized experience, and track record of success on similar projects [e.g. examples of successful redevelopment projects];	<b>Assessment:</b> Demonstrates capacity	<u>20</u>
Financial Capacity & Competence <u>25 Points</u> <b>Score 0-25</b>	Financial capacity, and financial and technical competence [e.g. financial statements, balance sheets, other financial or technical competencies];	<b>Assessment:</b> Financial capacity not fully demonstrated	<u>10</u>
Capacity & Demonstrated Ability <u>25 Points</u> <b>Score 0-25</b>	Staff and organizational capacity, demonstrated ability including, without limitation, responsiveness to public and community goals, cost control, work quality and the ability to meet schedules and deadlines [e.g. staff and CV/resumes assigned to project, organizational charts, work samples, percentage of time dedicated to project];	<b>Assessment:</b> Demonstrates staffing capacity	<u>25</u>
References <u>15 Points</u> <b>Score 0-15</b>	References	<b>Assessment:</b> Meets requirements	<u>15</u>
DBE <u>10 Points</u> <b>Score 0-10</b>	Past DBE Participation: Proposal submitted a quality DBE Participation Plan (DBE Form 3) that outlines past successful DBE participation on similar projects and includes innovative strategies and approaches to achieve and maintain DBE participation over the term of any formal agreements resulting from this solicitation	<b>Assessment:</b> Meets requirements	<u>10</u>
<b>Final Score</b>			<u>80</u>

Committee Member Signature  \_\_\_\_\_

**Selection Committee Evaluation Form**

RFQ No. 961 - Six Flags/Jazzland Site Redevelopment

May 11, 2021

Committee Member Name: Norman White

**Situs Development Collective LLC**

In the Evaluation column, Committee Members shall score each proposal on the Technical criteria and weighting factors listed below and provide an assessment of that score. A proposal may receive the maximum percentage, a portion of this score, or no percentage at all. Thereafter, Committee Members shall provide an assessment of the Respondent's price proposals before providing a Final Score.

Criteria & Weight	Criteria Description	Evaluation	Score
Qualifications & Experience <u>25 Points</u> <b>Score 0-25</b>	Qualifications, specialized experience, and track record of success on similar projects [e.g. examples of successful redevelopment projects];	<b>Assessment: Same as the initial submittal. Highly qualified.</b>	<u>20</u>
Financial Capacity & Competence <u>25 Points</u> <b>Score 0-25</b>	Financial capacity, and financial and technical competence [e.g. financial statements, balance sheets, other financial or technical competencies];	<b>Assessment: Included financial partners and identified a conduit approach to financing the project. This could present challenges when attempting to finance twelve (12) distinctively different options. The respondent's answer during the zoom call relied on the city revenue streams, whether future or existing (Non-General Obligation Bonds, like parking) that can be used for private placement instruments, gave me some concern. These initiatives may be necessary however I was hoping to hear more conversation as to how they would bring on additional investments.</b>	<u>14</u>
Capacity & Demonstrated Ability <u>25 Points</u> <b>Score 0-25</b>	Staff and organizational capacity, demonstrated ability including, without limitation, responsiveness to public and community goals, cost control, work quality and the ability to meet schedules and deadlines [e.g. staff and CV/resumes assigned to project, organizational charts, work samples, percentage of time dedicated to project];	<b>Assessment: The twelve (12) options will provide complexity in meeting the overall goal of the project. The comprehensive list did capture all the items in a previous study; however, it was up to the submitter to narrow the focus to match existing capacity and/or resources. I didn't hear this in today's presentation.</b>	<u>18</u>
References <u>15 Points</u> <b>Score 0-15</b>	References	<b>Assessment: References were attached in the previous submission</b>	<u>12</u>
DBE <u>10 Points</u> <b>Score 0-10</b>	Past DBE Participation: Proposal submitted a quality DBE Participation Plan (DBE Form 3) that outlines past successful DBE participation on similar projects and includes innovative strategies and approaches to achieve and maintain DBE participation over the term of any formal agreements resulting from this solicitation	<b>Assessment: Demonstrated compliance</b>	<u>10</u>
<b>Final Score</b>			<u>74</u>

Committee Member Signature Norman White

**Selection Committee Evaluation Form**  
**RFQ No. 961 - Six Flags/Jazzland Site Redevelopment**  
**May 11, 2021**

Committee Member Name: Norman White

**Kiernan-West, LLC**

In the Evaluation column, Committee Members shall score each proposal on the Technical criteria and weighting factors listed below and provide an assessment of that score. A proposal may receive the maximum percentage, a portion of this score, or no percentage at all. Thereafter, Committee Members shall provide an assessment of the Respondent's price proposals before providing a Final Score.

Criteria & Weight	Criteria Description	Evaluation	Score
Qualifications & Experience <u>25 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-25</b>	Qualifications, specialized experience, and track record of success on similar projects [e.g. examples of successful redevelopment projects];  Financial capacity, and financial and technical competence [e.g. financial statements, balance sheets, other financial or technical competencies];	<b>Assessment: Nothing changed from the initial proposal. They remain highly qualified.</b>	<u>20</u>
Capacity & Competence <u>25 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-25</b>	Staff and organizational capacity, demonstrated ability including, without limitation, responsiveness to public and community goals, cost control, work quality and the ability to meet schedules and deadlines [e.g. staff and CV/resumes assigned to project, organizational charts, work samples, percentage of time dedicated to project];	<b>Assessment: The financial proposal is like their initial submission, however the upfront investment in the due diligence area provide an enhancement.</b>	<u>20</u>
Capacity & Demonstrated Ability <u>25 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-25</b>	References	<b>Assessment: The overall experience remained unchanged in the second submittal. The overall focus of an agriculture hub, along with urban farming does provide a challenge for economic revitalization or driver when it's a newer concept. Looking for broader adjustments that would have been more community-based goals and activities opposed to concentration primarily on agricultural hub.</b>  <b>Assessment: References were included.</b>	<u>17</u>
References <u>15 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-15</b>	Past DBE Participation: Proposal submitted a quality DBE Participation Plan (DBE Form 3) that outlines past successful DBE participation on similar projects and includes innovative strategies and approaches to achieve and maintain DBE participation over the term of any formal agreements resulting from this solicitation	<b>Assessment: Demonstrated DBE participation.</b>	<u>10</u>
DBE <u>10 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-10</b>	<b>Final Score</b>		<u>77</u>

Committee Member Signature Norman White

<b>TKTMJ Incorporated/ Henry Consulting/ Bayou Phoenix</b>			
<p>In the Evaluation column, Committee Members shall score each proposal on the Technical criteria and weighting factors listed below and provide an assessment of that score. A proposal may receive the maximum percentage, a portion of this score, or no percentage at all. Thereafter, Committee Members shall provide an assessment of the Respondent's price proposals before providing a Final Score.</p>			
Criteria & Weight	Criteria Description	Evaluation	Score
<b>Qualifications &amp; Experience</b> <u>25 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-25</b>	Qualifications, specialized experience, and track record of success on similar projects [e.g. examples of successful redevelopment projects];	<b>Assessment: Nothing changed from the previous submission. Highly qualified.</b>	<u>20</u>
<b>Financial Capacity &amp; Competence</b> <u>25 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-25</b>	Financial capacity, and financial and technical competence [e.g. financial statements, balance sheets, other financial or technical competencies];	<b>Assessment: The financial submission was strengthened by adding four additional team members. Combined with other financial strategies, a Hillwood representative stated their willingness to financially support the project based on the attractiveness of the opportunity.</b>	<u>18</u>
<b>Capacity &amp; Demonstrated Ability</b> <u>25 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-25</b>	Staff and organizational capacity, demonstrated ability including, without limitation, responsiveness to public and community goals, cost control, work quality and the ability to meet schedules and deadlines [e.g. staff and CV/resumes assigned to project, organizational charts, work samples, percentage of time dedicated to project];	<b>Assessment: Staffing and organizational capacity was upgraded by adding major developers to include Hillwood, STEM NOLA, TransDEV and COX Business.</b>	<u>19</u>
<b>References</b> <u>15 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-15</b>	References	<b>Assessment:</b> <b>Reference were included in previous submission.</b>	<u>12</u>
<b>DBE</b> <u>10 Points</u>  <b>Score 0-10</b>	Past DBE Participation: Proposal submitted a quality DBE Participation Plan (DBE Form 3) that outlines past successful DBE participation on similar projects and includes innovative strategies and approaches to achieve and maintain DBE participation over the term of any formal agreements resulting from this solicitation	<b>Assessment:</b> <b>Met DBE goal</b>	<u>10</u>
<b>Final Score</b>			<u>79</u>