| Evaluation Criteria | Weight | | | | Prop | oser: Collin | s + Collins | LLP | | | | Score | Weighted |
|---|--------|----------|------|----------|------|--------------|-------------|----------|------|----------|-------|------------|----------|
| Written Criteria | 100% | Panel #1 | | Panel #2 | | Panel #3 | | Panel #4 | | Panel #5 | | Percentage | Score |
| Respondent's background, qualifications, reference letters and work experience | 25% | 5 | 25 | 4 | 20 | 4 | 20 | 5 | 25 | 5 | 25 | 23 | 23 |
| Respondent's Key/Assigned personnel, availability, accessibility, and professional experience and qualifications for each staff within their respective category. | 30% | 5 | 30 | 4 | 24 | 4 | 24 | 4 | 24 | 5 | 30 | 26 | 26 |
| Respondent's Litigation History | 15% | 5 | 15 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 12 | 5 | 15 | 13 | 13 |
| Respondent's Understanding of the RFP (including Scope of Work and Litigation Protocols) | 15% | 4 | 12 | 4 | 12 | 5 | 15 | 5 | 15 | 5 | 15 | 14 | 14 |
| Respondent's overall responsiveness, quality of proposal, ability to meet contract requirements and degree of compliance with Model Contract. | 15% | 4 | 12 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 12 | 5 | 15 | 5 | 15 | 13 | 13 |
| Written Proposal Evaluation - Must Equal 100% | 100% | 23.0 | 94.0 | 20.0 | 80.0 | 21.0 | 83.0 | 23.0 | 91.0 | 25.0 | 100.0 | 89.6 | 89.6 |

| Evaluation Criteria | Weight | | | Pı | roposer: Do | eclues, Burk | ett & Tho | mpson, APC | 3 | | | Score | Weighted |
|---|--------|----------|------|----------|-------------|--------------|-----------|------------|------|----------|------|------------|----------|
| Written Criteria | 100% | Panel #1 | | Panel #2 | | Panel #3 | | Panel #4 | | Panel #5 | | Percentage | Score |
| Respondent's background, qualifications, reference letters and work experience | 25% | 3 | 15 | 3 | 15 | 3 | 15 | 3 | 15 | 4 | 20 | 16 | 16 |
| Respondent's Key/Assigned personnel, availability, accessibility, and professional experience and qualifications for each staff within their respective category. | 30% | 4 | 24 | 3 | 18 | 4 | 24 | 4 | 24 | 4 | 24 | 23 | 23 |
| Respondent's Litigation History | 15% | 4 | 12 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 12 | 11 | 11 |
| Respondent's Understanding of the RFP (including Scope of Work and Litigation Protocols) | 15% | 4 | 12 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 12 | 11 | 11 |
| Respondent's overall responsiveness, quality of proposal, ability to meet contract requirements and degree of compliance with Model Contract. | 15% | 4 | 12 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 12 | 11 | 11 |
| Written Proposal Evaluation - Must Equal 100% | 100% | 19.0 | 75.0 | 15.0 | 60.0 | 16.0 | 66.0 | 19.0 | 75.0 | 20.0 | 80.0 | 71.2 | 71.2 |

| Evaluation Criteria | Weight | | | P | roposer: G | utierrez, Pi | reciado & l | House, LLP | | | | Score | Weighted |
|---|--------|----------|------|----------|------------|--------------|-------------|------------|------|----------|------|------------|----------|
| Written Criteria | 100% | Panel #1 | | Panel #2 | | Panel #3 | | Panel #4 | | Panel #5 | | Percentage | Score |
| Respondent's background, qualifications, reference letters and work experience | 25% | 3 | 15 | 4 | 20 | 4 | 20 | 4 | 20 | 4 | 20 | 19 | 19 |
| Respondent's Key/Assigned personnel, availability, accessibility, and professional experience and qualifications for each staff within their respective category. | 30% | 4 | 24 | 3 | 18 | 3 | 18 | 4 | 24 | 4 | 24 | 22 | 22 |
| Respondent's Litigation History | 15% | 4 | 12 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 12 | 11 | 11 |
| Respondent's Understanding of the RFP (including Scope of Work and Litigation Protocols) | 15% | 3 | 9 | 4 | 12 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 12 | 10 | 10 |
| Respondent's overall responsiveness, quality of proposal, ability to meet contract requirements and degree of compliance with Model Contract. | 15% | 3 | 9 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 12 | 10 | 10 |
| Written Proposal Evaluation - Must Equal 100% | 100% | 17.0 | 69.0 | 17.0 | 68.0 | 16.0 | 65.0 | 19.0 | 77.0 | 20.0 | 80.0 | 71.8 | 71.8 |

| Evaluation Criteria | Weight | | | Prop | oser: Koell | er, Nebekei | r, Carlson | & Haluck, I | LP | | | Score | Weighted |
|---|--------|----------|------|----------|-------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------|----------|------|------------|----------|
| Written Criteria | 100% | Panel #1 | | Panel #2 | | Panel #3 | | Panel #4 | | Panel #5 | | Percentage | Score |
| Respondent's background, qualifications, reference letters and work experience | 25% | 4 | 20 | 4 | 20 | 4 | 20 | 3 | 15 | 4 | 20 | 19 | 19 |
| Respondent's Key/Assigned personnel, availability, accessibility, and professional experience and qualifications for each staff within their respective category. | 30% | 5 | 30 | 4 | 24 | 4 | 24 | 4 | 24 | 5 | 30 | 26 | 26 |
| Respondent's Litigation History | 15% | 4 | 12 | 4 | 12 | 5 | 15 | 4 | 12 | 5 | 15 | 13 | 13 |
| Respondent's Understanding of the RFP (including Scope of Work and Litigation Protocols) | 15% | 5 | 15 | 4 | 12 | 5 | 15 | 5 | 15 | 5 | 15 | 14 | 14 |
| Respondent's overall responsiveness, quality of proposal, ability to meet contract requirements and degree of compliance with Model Contract. | 15% | 5 | 15 | 4 | 12 | 5 | 15 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 12 | 13 | 13 |
| Written Proposal Evaluation - Must Equal 100% | 100% | 23.0 | 92.0 | 20.0 | 80.0 | 23.0 | 89.0 | 20.0 | 78.0 | 23.0 | 92.0 | 86.2 | 86.2 |

| Evaluation Criteria | Weight | | | P | roposer: L | awrence Be | ach Allen | & Choi, PC | | | | Score | Weighted |
|---|--------|----------|------|----------|------------|------------|-----------|------------|------|----------|------|------------|----------|
| Written Criteria | 100% | Panel #1 | | Panel #2 | | Panel #3 | | Panel #4 | | Panel #5 | | Percentage | Score |
| Respondent's background, qualifications, reference letters and work experience | 25% | 4 | 20 | 3 | 15 | 4 | 20 | 3 | 15 | 4 | 20 | 18 | 18 |
| Respondent's Key/Assigned personnel, availability, accessibility, and professional experience and qualifications for each staff within their respective category. | 30% | 4 | 24 | 3 | 18 | 4 | 24 | 4 | 24 | 5 | 30 | 24 | 24 |
| Respondent's Litigation History | 15% | 5 | 15 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 12 | 5 | 15 | 5 | 15 | 14 | 14 |
| Respondent's Understanding of the RFP (including Scope of Work and Litigation Protocols) | 15% | 5 | 15 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 12 | 5 | 15 | 5 | 15 | 14 | 14 |
| Respondent's overall responsiveness, quality of proposal, ability to meet contract requirements and degree of compliance with Model Contract. | 15% | 5 | 15 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 12 | 5 | 15 | 13 | 13 |
| Written Proposal Evaluation - Must Equal 100% | 100% | 23.0 | 89.0 | 18.0 | 69.0 | 20.0 | 80.0 | 21.0 | 81.0 | 24.0 | 95.0 | 82.8 | 82.8 |

| Evaluation Criteria | Weight | | | Propose | r: Lynberg | & Watkins | s, A Profes | sional Corp | oration | | | Score | Weighted |
|---|--------|----------|-------|----------|------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|---------|----------|-------|------------|----------|
| Written Criteria | 100% | Panel #1 | | Panel #2 | | Panel #3 | | Panel #4 | | Panel #5 | | Percentage | Score |
| Respondent's background, qualifications, reference letters and work experience | 25% | 5 | 25 | 5 | 25 | 5 | 25 | 5 | 25 | 5 | 25 | 25 | 25 |
| Respondent's Key/Assigned personnel, availability, accessibility, and professional experience and qualifications for each staff within their respective category. | 30% | 5 | 30 | 5 | 30 | 5 | 30 | 5 | 30 | 5 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| Respondent's Litigation History | 15% | 5 | 15 | 5 | 15 | 5 | 15 | 4 | 12 | 5 | 15 | 14 | 14 |
| Respondent's Understanding of the RFP (including Scope of Work and Litigation Protocols) | 15% | 5 | 15 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 12 | 5 | 15 | 5 | 15 | 14 | 14 |
| Respondent's overall responsiveness, quality of proposal, ability to meet contract requirements and degree of compliance with Model Contract. | 15% | 5 | 15 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 12 | 5 | 15 | 5 | 15 | 14 | 14 |
| Written Proposal Evaluation - Must Equal 100% | 100% | 25.0 | 100.0 | 23.0 | 94.0 | 23.0 | 94.0 | 24.0 | 97.0 | 25.0 | 100.0 | 97.0 | 97.0 |

| Evaluation Criteria | Weight | | | | Propos | er: Mannin | g & Kass - | Ellrod | | | | Score | Weighted |
|---|--------|----------|------|----------|--------|------------|------------|----------|------|----------|------|------------|----------|
| Written Criteria | 100% | Panel #1 | | Panel #2 | | Panel #3 | | Panel #4 | | Panel #5 | | Percentage | Score |
| Respondent's background, qualifications, reference letters and work experience | 25% | 3 | 15 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 15 | 3 | 15 | 3 | 15 | 14 | 14 |
| Respondent's Key/Assigned personnel, availability, accessibility, and professional experience and qualifications for each staff within their respective category. | 30% | 3 | 18 | 3 | 18 | 2 | 12 | 3 | 18 | 3 | 18 | 17 | 17 |
| Respondent's Litigation History | 15% | 3 | 9 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 12 | 10 | 10 |
| Respondent's Understanding of the RFP (including Scope of Work and Litigation Protocols) | 15% | 2 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 9 | 7 | 7 |
| Respondent's overall responsiveness, quality of proposal, ability to meet contract requirements and degree of compliance with Model Contract. | 15% | 3 | 9 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 9 | 8 | 8 |
| Written Proposal Evaluation - Must Faual 100% | 100% | 14.0 | 57.0 | 12.0 | 49.0 | 12.0 | 48.0 | 14.0 | 57.0 | 16.0 | 63.0 | 54.8 | 54.8 |

| Evaluation Criteria | Weight | | | | Proposer: | Wagner-Ze | emming-Cl | hristensen | | | | Score | Weighted |
|---|--------|----------|------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------|----------|------|------------|----------|
| Written Criteria | 100% | Panel #1 | | Panel #2 | | Panel #3 | | Panel #4 | | Panel #5 | | Percentage | Score |
| Respondent's background, qualifications, reference letters and work experience | 25% | 4 | 20 | 3 | 15 | 3 | 15 | 3 | 15 | 4 | 20 | 17 | 17 |
| Respondent's Key/Assigned personnel, availability, accessibility, and professional experience and qualifications for each staff within their respective category. | 30% | 4 | 24 | 3 | 18 | 3 | 18 | 4 | 24 | 4 | 24 | 22 | 22 |
| Respondent's Litigation History | 15% | 3 | 9 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 12 | 10 | 10 |
| Respondent's Understanding of the RFP (including Scope of Work and Litigation Protocols) | 15% | 3 | 9 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 12 | 10 | 10 |
| Respondent's overall responsiveness, quality of proposal, ability to meet contract requirements and degree of compliance with Model Contract. | 15% | 4 | 12 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 12 | 11 | 11 |
| Written Proposal Evaluation - Must Equal 100% | 100% | 18.0 | 74.0 | 15.0 | 60.0 | 15.0 | 60.0 | 18.0 | 72.0 | 20.0 | 80.0 | 69.2 | 69.2 |

| Evaluation Criteria | Weight | | | | Propo | ser: Werve | & Keathle | y LLP | | | | Score | Weighted |
|---|--------|----------|------|----------|-------|------------|-----------|----------|------|----------|------|------------|----------|
| Written Criteria | 100% | Panel #1 | | Panel #2 | | Panel #3 | | Panel #4 | | Panel #5 | | Percentage | Score |
| Respondent's background, qualifications, reference letters and work experience | 25% | 4 | 20 | 3 | 15 | 3 | 15 | 3 | 15 | 4 | 20 | 17 | 17 |
| Respondent's Key/Assigned personnel, availability, accessibility, and professional experience and qualifications for each staff within their respective category. | 30% | 4 | 24 | 4 | 24 | 3 | 18 | 4 | 24 | 4 | 24 | 23 | 23 |
| Respondent's Litigation History | 15% | 4 | 12 | 4 | 12 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 12 | 11 | 11 |
| Respondent's Understanding of the RFP (including Scope of Work and Litigation Protocols) | 15% | 4 | 12 | 4 | 12 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 12 | 11 | 11 |
| Respondent's overall responsiveness, quality of proposal, ability to meet contract requirements and degree of compliance with Model Contract. | 15% | 4 | 12 | 4 | 12 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 12 | 11 | 11 |
| Written Proposal Evaluation - Must Faual 100% | 100% | 20.0 | 80.0 | 19.0 | 75.0 | 15.0 | 60.0 | 19.0 | 75.0 | 20.0 | 80.0 | 74.0 | 74.0 |

| Evaluation Criteria | Weight | | | | Propo | ser: Wesiers | ski & Zure | k LLP | | | | Score | Weighted |
|---|--------|----------|------|----------|-------|--------------|------------|----------|------|----------|------|------------|----------|
| Written Criteria | 100% | Panel #1 | | Panel #2 | | Panel #3 | | Panel #4 | | Panel #5 | | Percentage | Score |
| Respondent's background, qualifications, reference letters and work experience | 25% | 3 | 15 | 4 | 20 | 4 | 20 | 4 | 20 | 4 | 20 | 19 | 19 |
| Respondent's Key/Assigned personnel, availability, accessibility, and professional experience and qualifications for each staff within their respective category. | 30% | 4 | 24 | 4 | 24 | 5 | 30 | 4 | 24 | 4 | 24 | 25 | 25 |
| Respondent's Litigation History | 15% | 4 | 12 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 12 | 11 | 11 |
| Respondent's Understanding of the RFP (including Scope of Work and Litigation Protocols) | 15% | 4 | 12 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Respondent's overall responsiveness, quality of proposal, ability to meet contract requirements and degree of compliance with Model Contract. | 15% | 3 | 9 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 12 | 11 | 11 |
| Written Proposal Evaluation - Must Equal 100% | 100% | 18.0 | 72.0 | 19.0 | 77.0 | 20.0 | 83.0 | 20.0 | 80.0 | 20.0 | 80.0 | 78.4 | 78.4 |

| Evaluation Criteria | Weight | eight Proposer: Woodruff, Spradlin & Smart | | | | | | | | | | Score | Weighted |
|---|--------|--|-------|----------|-------|----------|-------|----------|-------|----------|-------|------------|----------|
| Written Criteria | 100% | Panel #1 | | Panel #2 | | Panel #3 | | Panel #4 | | Panel #5 | | Percentage | Score |
| Respondent's background, qualifications, reference letters and work experience | 25% | 5 | 25 | 5 | 25 | 5 | 25 | 5 | 25 | 5 | 25 | 25 | 25 |
| Respondent's Key/Assigned personnel, availability, accessibility, and professional experience and qualifications for each staff within their respective category. | 30% | 5 | 30 | 5 | 30 | 5 | 30 | 5 | 30 | 5 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| Respondent's Litigation History | 15% | 5 | 15 | 5 | 15 | 5 | 15 | 5 | 15 | 5 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Respondent's Understanding of the RFP (including Scope of Work and Litigation Protocols) | 15% | 5 | 15 | 5 | 15 | 5 | 15 | 5 | 15 | 5 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Respondent's overall responsiveness, quality of proposal, ability to meet contract requirements and degree of compliance with Model Contract. | 15% | 5 | 15 | 5 | 15 | 5 | 15 | 5 | 15 | 5 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Written Proposal Evaluation - Must Equal 100% | 100% | 25.0 | 100.0 | 25.0 | 100.0 | 25.0 | 100.0 | 25,0 | 100.0 | 25,0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |