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Mr. Raymond L. Grant  
Materials Management Officer  
Office of General Services  
1201 Main Street, Suite 600  
Columbia, South Carolina 29201  

Dear Ray:

We have examined the procurement policies and procedures of the Horry County School District for the period April 1, 1992 through June 30, 1995. As part of our examination, we studied and evaluated the system of internal control over procurement transactions to the extent we considered necessary.

The evaluation was to establish a basis for reliance upon the system of internal control to assure adherence to Section 11-35-70 of the South Carolina Consolidated Procurement Code and the District’s procurement policy. Additionally, the evaluation was used in determining the nature, timing and extent of other auditing procedures necessary for developing an opinion on the adequacy, efficiency and effectiveness of the procurement system.

The administration of the Horry County School District is responsible for establishing and maintaining a system of internal control over procurement transactions. In fulfilling this responsibility, estimates and judgments by management are required to assess the expected benefits and related costs of control procedures. The objectives of a system are to provide management with reasonable, but not absolute, assurance of the integrity of the
procurement process, that affected assets are safeguarded against loss from unauthorized use or disposition and that transactions are executed in accordance with management's authorization and are recorded properly.

Because of inherent limitations in any system of internal control, errors or irregularities may occur and not be detected. Also, projection of any evaluation of the system to future periods is subject to the risk that procedures may become inadequate because of changes in conditions or that the degree of compliance with the procedures may deteriorate.

Our study and evaluation of the system of internal control over procurement transactions, as well as our overall examination of procurement policies and procedures, were conducted with professional care. However, because of the nature of audit testing, they would not necessarily disclose all weaknesses in the system.

The examination did, however, disclose conditions enumerated in this report which we believe need correction or improvement.

Corrective action based on the recommendations described in these findings will in all material respects place the Horry County School District in compliance with Section 11-35-70 of the South Carolina Consolidated Procurement Code and the District’s Code and ensuing regulations.

Larry G. Sorrell, Manager
Audit and Certification
INTRODUCTION

We conducted an examination of the internal procurement operating policies and procedures of the Horry County School District. Our on-site review was conducted November 6, 1995, through January 5, 1996, and was made under the authority of Section 11-35-70 of the South Carolina Consolidated Procurement Code.

The examination was directed principally to determine whether, in all material respects, the procurement system's internal controls were adequate and the procurement procedures, as outlined in the Horry County School District Procurement Code and Internal Procurement Operating Procedures Manual, were in compliance with existing laws and regulations and with accepted public procurement standards.

Additionally our work was directed toward assisting the District in promoting the underlying purposes and policies of the Code, which we believe to be appropriate for all governmental bodies, as outlined in Section 11-35-20, which include:

(1) to ensure the fair and equitable treatment of all persons who deal with the procurement system of this State

(2) to provide increased economy in State procurement activities and to maximize to the fullest extent practicable the purchasing values of funds of the State

(3) to provide safeguards for the maintenance of a procurement system of quality and integrity with clearly defined rules for ethical behavior on the part of all persons engaged in the public procurement process
SCOPE

We conducted our examination in accordance with Generally Accepted Auditing Standards as they apply to compliance audits. Our examination encompassed a detailed analysis of the internal procurement operating procedures of the Horry County School District and its related policies and procedures manual to the extent we deemed necessary to formulate an opinion on the adequacy of the system to properly handle procurement transactions.

We selected judgmental samples for the period July 1, 1992, through June 30, 1995, of procurement transactions for compliance testing and performed other audit procedures that we considered necessary to formulate this opinion. Specifically, the scope of our audit included, but was not limited to, a review of the following:

1. All sole source and emergency procurements for the period July 1, 1992, through June 30, 1995

2. Procurement transactions for the period July 1, 1992, through June 30, 1995 as follows:
   a) Two hundred twenty one judgmentally selected payments
   b) A block sample of 500 sequentially numbered purchase orders

3. The selection and approval of eleven architect and engineering service contracts

4. Nine major construction contracts for approval and compliance with the South Carolina School Facilities Planning and Construction Guide and District’s Procurement Code

5. Minority Business Enterprise Plan and quarterly reports submitted to the Assistant Superintendent for Finance

6. Internal guidelines for procurement and the District’s Procurement Code and Regulations

7. Economy and efficiency of the procurement system with adequate audit trails
SUMMARY OF AUDIT FINDINGS

Our audit of the procurement system of the Horry County School District, hereinafter referred to as the District, produced findings and recommendations as follows.

I. Construction and Related Professional Services

A. Contract Worth $1.3 Million Awarded to Late Respondent

1. A vendor who responded six minutes late to an opening for response to invitation was allowed to participate in the architectural short listing process and was awarded a contract worth $1.3 million.

2. The same vendor failed to respond in writing to a question used in determining the ranking order. The vendor was allowed to respond after the opening which is contrary to the District’s Code.

3. One of the five committee members failed to score sixteen out of twenty five proposals.

B. Program Management Services Contract

1. The score sheets used to objectively rate vendors for a program management contract were not scored.

2. The program management firm was given procurement responsibility on behalf of the District for a $98.4 million dollar building program it is managing except for procurements of major construction contracts. The firm must adhere to the District’s Procurement Code, Regulations and Procurement Procedures Manual.

C. Architect/Engineer Plans Not Approved by the Department of Education

The Department of Education requires that A/E plans be approved prior to construction contract documents being prepared. In seven instances the approval was not obtained by the District yet the construction contracts were bid.

D. Inappropriate Selection Method

One contract for A/E services in the amount of $32,385 was selected using the small A/E services selection procedure. This procedure only applies for A/E contracts up to $18,000.
E. Land Purchase

The Department of Education requires that all land purchases for schools be approved by them on a form F-2 prior to purchase. A form F-2 submitted to the Department of Education by the District did not have the appropriate signatures.

F. Notice of Intent to Award Not Issued

Four construction contracts were awarded without the required 16 day Notice of Intent to Award being sent to all respondents of the bids informing them of the apparent low bidder and of their protest rights.

G. Board Approval of Three Construction Contracts Not Obtained.

The District requires that all construction contracts be approved by the School Board prior to award. Three contracts were not approved.

II. General Procurement Exceptions

A. Notice of Intent to Award Not Prepared

The District did not prepare the notice of intent to award for five contracts.

B. Notice of Intent to Award Inappropriately Waived

In four instances the District waived the requirement for the 16 day Notice of Intent to Award being sent to all respondents to bids informing them of the apparent low bidder and of their protest rights. The District's Code does not allow for an option to waive this requirement.

C. Inappropriate Sole Sources

Seven procurements made as sole sources we believe were inappropriate as such and should have been competed.

D. Insufficient Solicitations of Competition

Four procurements were noted where sufficient levels of competition were not made.
E. Attorney Services Not Approved By The Board

One contract for attorney services was not approved by the Board as required by the District's Code.

F. Improper Payments

Three payments were improperly made. Two vendors were overpaid and one vendor was underpaid.

G. One Consultant Should Have Been Classified as an Employee

An individual was hired as a consultant but by definition based on job duties should have been considered an employee.
RESULTS OF EXAMINATION

I. Construction and Related Professional Services

Our review of construction procurements involved procurements of goods and services related to construction, construction related professional service contracts and major construction contracts. This review was made to determine compliance with the South Carolina School Facilities Planning and Construction Guide issued by the Department of Education, compliance with the District’s Procurement Code, Regulations and Procurement Procedures Manual. Our findings are as follows.

A. Contract Worth $1.3 Million Awarded to Late Respondent

The District conducted an opening for a response to invitation for architectural/engineering proposals on April 22, 1994, at 3:00 p.m. for a $98.4 million building program. According to District personnel, time was called at 3:00 p.m. and the response period was closed. At 3:06 p.m. a representative from a firm arrived and requested that his proposal be considered. The person conducting the opening properly refused the proposal. However, through a written request made by the firm in question, the District elected to accept the proposal. Acceptance of this proposal allowed the vendor to participate in the short listing process, ultimately resulting in an award to the vendor at 5.25 percent of a $24,626,000 construction budget or $1,292,865.

The District’s Regulation 30(b)(2)(c) states in part:

"... On the basis of the above, over a three year period the South Carolina Department of Education, Office of School Planning and Building developed a thorough set of regulations governing the planning and construction of educational facilities. These regulations were approved by the State Board of Education on December 10, 1982, and then submitted to the South Carolina General Assembly for review and approval. These regulations became effective on May 27, 1983, after having been published in the State Register (Vol. 7, Issue No. 5). These regulations were combined with guidelines developed and reviewed by a host of individuals that included representatives from the Department of Education, various state agencies, outside educational and technical consultants, and a number of school superintendents,
planners, architects, engineers and school maintenance personnel. The final product was the *South Carolina School Facilities Planning Construction Guide*, 1983 edition hereinafter referred to as the *Guide*. This *Guide* along with these regulations shall be used in lieu of Article 9 of the *South Carolina Consolidated Procurement Code* and shall be substituted for the *Manual for Planning and Execution of State Permanent Improvements, Part II: Execution of Permanent Improvements, State Budget and Control Board*.

The District's Regulation 30(b)(2)(d) states:

"The *Guide* plus the following sections shall encompass the execution procedure from the date of the project's funding by the School Board to the project close out when the purpose for the project's inception has been fulfilled."

The District's Regulation 30(c) states in part:

"Professional Services. Architects, engineers, landscape architects and land surveying services. The requirement for and qualifications of these services is established in section 1.06 of the *Guide*. The procedure for acquiring these services is set forth below.

(1) Invitation. The school district will announce its requirements for these services through Dodge-McGraw Hill or newspaper advertisements and will mail invitations for proposals to firms on school district's bid list and/or firms listed in the records of the Office of School Facilities Planning.

(2) Response to Invitation. The date for submission of information from interested persons or firms in response to an invitation shall be not less than fifteen (15) days after publication of the invitation. Interested architect-engineer, construction management and land surveying persons or firms shall be required to respond to the invitation with the submission of a current and accurate Federal Standard Form 254, Architect-Engineer and Related Services Questionnaire, and Federal Standard Form 255, Architect-Engineer and Related Services Questionnaire for Specific Project, or such similar information as the Board may prescribe by policy, and any other information which the particular invitation may require.

(3) Interview with Interested Firms. Following receipt of information from all interested persons and firms, the Board appointed architectural selection committee shall hold interviews with at least five persons or firms who have responded to the advertisement and who are deemed most qualified on the basis of information available prior to the interviews... The Board selection committee's determination as to which will be interviewed shall be in writing and shall be based upon
its review and evaluation of all submitted materials. The written report of the committee shall specifically list the name of all persons and firms that responded to the advertisement and enumerate the reasons of the committee for selecting those to be interviewed. The purpose of the interviews shall be to provide such further information as may be required by the selection committee to fully acquaint itself with the relative qualification of the several interested firms.

(4) Selection and Ranking of the Five Most Qualified. The selection committee shall evaluate each of the persons or firms interviewed in view of their:

(a) past performance,
(b) ability of professional personnel,
(c) willingness to meet time and budget requirements,
(d) location,
(e) recent, current and projected work load of the firms,
(f) creativity and insight related to the project, and
(g) related experience on similar projects.

Based upon these evaluations, the Board selection committee shall select the five which, in its judgment, are the most qualified, ranking the five in priority order. The selection committee's report ranking the five chosen persons or firms shall be in writing and shall include data substantiating its determinations. When the ranking report is final, written notification of the election and order of preference shall be immediately sent to all of those who responded to the Board selection committee's invitation to submit information."

As noted in Regulation 30(c)(2), the response to the invitation included the date for submission the invitation. The advertisement for the A&E services appeared in four newspapers. The advertisements included the following statement, "All application forms will be due by 3:00 p.m., April 22, 1994."

We recommend the District adhere to Regulation 30. One of the underlying purposes of the District's Code and Regulations is to provide safeguards for the maintenance of a procurement system of quality and integrity with clearly defined rules for ethical behavior on the part of all persons engaged in the public procurement process. Acceptance of a late response to an invitation undermines this purpose.

Further, once the District elected to accept the late vendor's proposal and later proceeded with the evaluations, it was noted by the District that a response to one of the questions used in scoring the proposals had been omitted by the vendor. The vendor was
allowed to submit the response to the question. This action is contrary to the District’s Regulation. Two of the five committee members actually scored the response. The District’s Regulation 30(c), as noted above, required the vendors to respond to the invitation with current and accurate information. Since the question was used in determining the best qualified offerors for architectural/engineering services, the correction of this mistake was inappropriate because the vendor did not respond, in total, to the invitation.

We recommend the District adhere to Regulation 30(c). Another one of the underlying purposes of the District’s Code and Regulations is to ensure the fair and equitable treatment of all persons who deal with the procurement system of the District. It is the District’s practice not to allow respondents to submit information after an opening. This practice should always be consistently applied.

Finally, once the District’s selection committee had completed its evaluations of all of the proposals submitted by firms and prepared the score sheets to support a short list of vendors, a ranking report of vendors to be interviewed was issued. However, one of the committee members did not score sixteen out of twenty five of the proposals resulting in a score of zero for those sixteen firms from that committee member. Each of the five committee members’ score sheets were totaled and then a cumulative total of all sheets was derived. This cumulative total was used to determine the ranking order in the ranking report. Failure to score sixteen proposals was undoubtedly unfair to those vendors.

The District’s Regulation 30(c)(3) and 30(c)(4), as previously stated, described the evaluation process that included rating each response to the invitation. The evaluation format had seven criteria. Each criteria had the maximum points allowable per criteria with the
maximum cumulative total of 100.

We recommend the District adhere to the requirements of their Regulations and the evaluation criteria as established.

B. Program Management Services Contract

Another professional service contract related to the $98.4 million building program for the management services of that building program was awarded at $2,957,000. The score sheets which contained the evaluation criteria used to determine the ranking order were not scored. The selection committee simply rated each of the responding five firms as one through five. All of the ratings from the members were tallied and the lowest tally was awarded the contract. We saw only one evaluation sheet out of the five from one committee member where any consideration was placed on the evaluation criteria set forth on the evaluation sheets. By not scoring the sheets, objectivity of the selection process was removed.

The District’s Regulation 30(c)(4) states:

“Selection and Ranking of the Five Most Qualified. The selection committee shall evaluate each of the persons or firms interviewed in view of their:

(a) past performance,
(b) ability of professional personnel,
(c) willingness to meet time and budget requirements,
(d) location,
(e) recent, current and projected work load of the firms,
(f) creativity and insight related to the project, and
(g) related experience on similar projects.

Based upon these evaluations, the Board selection committee shall select the five which, in its judgment, are the most qualified, ranking the five in priority order. The selection committee’s report ranking the five chosen persons or firms shall be in writing and shall include data substantiating its determinations. When the ranking report is final, written notification of the election and order of preference shall be immediately sent to all of who that responded to the Board selection committee’s invitation to submit information.”
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We recommend that score sheets be scored based on the criteria indicated above on all such contracts in the future. Sufficient data should be documented to support the selection committee’s ranking order.

Finally, the District has given procurement responsibility to the management firm for the $98.4 million building program for bulk purchases of equipment such as HVAC systems, kitchen equipment, and furniture. The District has placed a great deal of confidence in this management firm. We wish to point out to the District that the delegation of procurement authority to the management firm does not negate the District’s Procurement Code, Regulations, or Procurement Procedures Manual. Since we expect the procurement activity by the management firm in terms of dollars to be material, the procurement files will be audited.

C. Architect/Engineer Plans Not Approved by the Department of Education

Seven projects which required plans prepared by architectural/engineering firms did not have approved plans from the Department of Education’s Office of District Facilities Management, yet, these jobs were bid anyway contrary to law. These plans were as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Plan Submittal Date</th>
<th>Bid Opening Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aynor Elementary Site</td>
<td>No Plans</td>
<td>08/15/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aynor Elementary Building</td>
<td>09/22/95</td>
<td>01/18/96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Attendance High/ Middle Site</td>
<td>04/18/95</td>
<td>05/30/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Attendance High/ Middle Building</td>
<td>08/24/95</td>
<td>11/29/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forrestbrook Middle Building</td>
<td>07/21/95</td>
<td>10/31/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrtle Beach Middle Site</td>
<td>04/24/95</td>
<td>06/20/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrtle Beach Middle Building</td>
<td>06/19/95</td>
<td>10/10/95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 59-23-40 of the South Carolina Code of Laws requires that drawings and specifications for all public school buildings be submitted to and approved by the State Superintendent of Education or her agent prior to being constructed. As of January 1996, the approvals of the cited plans had not been obtained from the Office of District Facilities
Management of the Department of Education. According to that Office, the plans submitted contained building code violations as well as violations of the South Carolina School Facilities Planning and Construction Guide issued by the Department of Education. A letter issued by the Department of Education shown to us by the District gave the District authority to proceed with the advertising of construction jobs. The letter did not give the District authority to accept bids prior to plans being approved.

We recommend the District seek to resolve any deficiencies in these plans by working closely with the Department of Education and the architectural/engineering firms until these plans are approved. This practice could needlessly result in costly change orders to construction contracts to bring the buildings into Code compliance.

D. Inappropriate Selection Method

One contract for architectural/engineering services in the amount of $32,385 v. as made using the small architectural and engineering services selection method. This method of selection only applies to contracts up to $18,000. Contracts $18,000 and under do not require advertising and the use of a selection committee whereas contracts exceeding $18,000 do.

We recommend the District use the appropriate selection method when procuring architectural and engineering services.

E. Land Purchase

We reviewed a document referred to as F-2 called the Application For Approval of Property Acquisition prepared by the District and submitted to the Department of Education requesting approval for the purchase of property. Form F-2 did not have the Superintendent’s or the Chairman of the Board’s signatures as required. Instead a District employee signed their names and placed his initials under each signature. This purchase was in the amount of $550,000 for the site off of Highway 501 on tract 1 of International Paper adjacent to Myrtle Beach National.

Section 2.03 (3) of the South Carolina School Facilities Planning and Construction Guide requires that form F-2 be submitted by the Superintendent. The Guide does not allow
for delegation of authority of the required signatures. Approval was granted by the Department of Education of the form F-2 in question. However, the Department stated that they were unaware that the signatures were not from the appropriate people.

We recommend the District adhere to Section 2.03 (3) of the Guide and obtain the appropriate signatures on form F-2.

F. Notice of Intent to Award Not Issued

Four construction contracts were awarded without the required 16 day notice of intent to award being issued to the respondents of those construction bids informing the bidders of the low bidder and the protest rights of all bidders. These contracts were as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aynor High and Middle Schools</td>
<td>$3,148,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Byrnes Retrofits</td>
<td>$1,040,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition/ Alteration - North Myrtle Beach High and Middle Schools</td>
<td>$580,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs to Loris, Green Sea Floyds &amp; North Myrtle Beach High Schools</td>
<td>$342,846</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section V. I. of the District’s Procurement Code states in part, “When a contract has a total or potential value in excess of fifty thousand dollars, notice must be given to all bidders responding to the solicitation as to the agency’s determination that a certain bidder is the lowest responsible and responsive bidder whose bid meets the requirements and criteria set forth in the invitation for bids .... Sixteen days after notice of intent to award a contract ...., the agency may enter a contract ....” Section V.b. identifies Section V of the District’s Code to apply to “all District Contracts.”

We recommend on all District contracts which have a total or potential value in excess of fifty thousand dollars that a 16 day notice of intent to award be issued to all bidders responding to the solicitations. The notice of intent to award must contain the information pertaining to a bidder’s right to protest should a bidder feel aggrieved in the award of a contract.
G. Board Approval of Three Construction Contracts Not Obtained

Three contracts solicited under the construction procedures were not approved by the Board. These were as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking lot addition &amp; resurfacing at Homewood Elementary School</td>
<td>$49,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking lot addition and resurfacing at Conway Elementary School</td>
<td>64,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking lot addition and resurfacing at North Myrtle Beach High</td>
<td>172,774</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

District Regulation 30 (b). which pertains to construction states in part, "The approval process includes the Assistant Superintendent for Finance, the Superintendent, and ultimately the Board of Education ...." As it is written, the Board must approve all construction and construction related contracts.

We recommend the District obtain approval on each construction contract. The District should consider establishing a dollar limit for Board approval on construction contracts as well as professional services contracts related to construction.

II. General Procurement Exceptions

We performed tests of general procurement activity to include but not limited to samples of goods and services, information technology and consultant services as well as sole source and emergency procurements. Our testing revealed the following exceptions.

A. Notice of Intent to Award Not Prepared

The District did not prepare the notice of intent to award on the following five contracts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bid Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9394-95</td>
<td>Duplicating Machines</td>
<td>$ 92,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9192-162</td>
<td>Security Systems</td>
<td>51,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9394-57</td>
<td>Printer</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 16 day notice of intent to award is required on all contracts which exceed fifty thousand dollars in total or potential value. The determination of the requirement is based on each contract award. Multiple lot awards to different vendors should not be combined in determining the notice of intent requirement. Only the total awarded to each vendor applies. The intent to award must contain the bidder’s right to protest should a bidder feel aggrieved in the award of a contract.

B. Notice of Intent to Award Inappropriately Waived

In four instances the District elected to waive the requirement for the 16 day notice of intent to award.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bid Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9394-110</td>
<td>Intercoms</td>
<td>$114,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9495-6</td>
<td>Multi media and computer software</td>
<td>53,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9495-89</td>
<td>Network Routers</td>
<td>89,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9293-111</td>
<td>Extermination Services</td>
<td>111,338</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the most part the notice of intent to award was waived to save time in obtaining the necessary items. However, the District’s Procurement Code does not allow for an option to waive this 16 day requirement and such an option would not be consistent with the State’s Code.

The District must end the practice of waiving the intent to award criteria. The emergency source selection could be used when time does not permit the utilization of the intent to award.
C. Inappropriate Sole Sources

Most of the sole source transactions we reviewed were appropriately classified and reported. However, seven procurements made as sole sources we believe were inappropriate as such and should have been competed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purchase Order</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17853</td>
<td>Software and site license</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13125</td>
<td>Software development</td>
<td>31,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4723</td>
<td>Installation of ropes course</td>
<td>4,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5810</td>
<td>Promotional items</td>
<td>4,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16822</td>
<td>Architectural services</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10812568</td>
<td>Sets, costumes, make up, sound and lighting</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14638</td>
<td>Used floor mats</td>
<td>1,925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The software and site license fee procured were decided upon by a committee as being the best. This method of selection lends itself to a request for proposal selection procedure where the District establishes criteria and selects the best source based on rating that criteria from responding vendors. Further, the District failed to include this procurement on its annual report of sole source activity to the Board. The software development contract should have been solicited under the request for proposal procedure as well. Other vendors were available to provide the ropes course and the promotional items. Competition should have been solicited. The architectural services could have been obtained through the small A&E selection procedure. Under this procedure the District may directly contract an A&E firm up to $18,000. The District justified the vendor selected to provide the sets and costumes, etc. on the basis that his price cannot be duplicated. Best price is not a justification for sole source. Finally, other vendors could provide floor mats. The District should have attempted to solicit vendors for used mats.
We recommend that these procurements be competed in the future. Also, the District may wish to file an amended report adding the sole source not reported to the Board.

D. **Insufficient Solicitations of Competition**

Four procurements were noted where sufficient levels of competition were not made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bid 9293-119</td>
<td>Printers</td>
<td>$15,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bid 9293-97</td>
<td>T-shirts</td>
<td>29,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bid 9394-91</td>
<td>Lap top computers</td>
<td>19,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO 200805</td>
<td>Cosmetology teaching service</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bid 9293-119 for the printers was set up as a 90 day term contract. The solicitation indicated that a significant purchase would be made. However, the District only solicited nine vendors. For the T-shirts seven vendors were solicited. At that time procurements over $10,000 required a minimum of ten solicitations from qualified sources of supply. On bid 9394-91 a 90 day term contract was made by soliciting three vendors for an initial purchase of $5,436. The competition threshold was determined from the initial purchase. On June 29, 1994 a purchase in the amount of $13,653 was made from this contract. At this level of procurement activity, the District’s Code required that a minimum of five written solicitations be made. During the last audit we cited the District for this practice and recommended that for such contracts when the total potential purchase against a term contract is not known, the District should solicit the maximum required level of competition. We reiterate this point to ensure that sufficient levels of competition are solicited that the maximum level of competition should be solicited. The last procurement cited above was not supported by any solicitations of competition.

We recommend the District adhere to the minimum solicitation requirements outlined in the Procurement Code and Regulations.
E. Attorney Services Not Approved by the Board

One contract for attorney services to serve as a hearing officer was paid on voucher 132557 in the amount of $4,758 was not approved by the Board. District Regulation 4.c. states in part, "Prior to any award of any contract for the services of attorneys, approval for such services shall be obtained from the Board or its designee." The Board has not delegated this authority. We recommend the District request Board approval on all attorney related contracts. Since the authority to hire attorneys rests with the Board, ratification of this contract should be requested in accordance to Regulation 3.a.

F. Improper Payments

Three payments were improperly made where two vendors were over paid and one was under paid.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voucher Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Voucher Amount</th>
<th>Over&lt;Under&gt; Payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>153645</td>
<td>Network routers</td>
<td>$62,535</td>
<td>$504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104103</td>
<td>T-shirts</td>
<td>2,771</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149859</td>
<td>Beauty school supplies</td>
<td>13,597</td>
<td>&lt;988&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the network routers the bid was prepared with freight included in the price. No freight terms were recorded on the purchase order meaning no freight was due. However, $472 in shipping charges were invoiced and paid. Also, one line item was over charged by one dollar for each of 32 units or $32 over charged. The total over paid on this invoice was $472 plus $32 which equals $504.

For the T-shirts the District bid a contract and awarded x-large T-shirts at $3.30 each. However, an invoice billed 168 of those T-shirts at $4.20 or $.90 over bid price. The District did not catch the error and as a result paid $151 over bid price.
The invoice for the beauty school supplies contained a credit due the District of $988. The invoice included the credit, however, the District deducted the credit from the amount on the invoice. By reducing the invoice by the credit of $988, the District took the credit twice.

G. One Consultant Should Have Been Classified as an Employee

The District hired an individual as an artist residency and classified the person as a consultant. This occurred on voucher 122397 in the amount of $3,000. Additionally, another $2,500 was budgeted for services rendered during the summer months. In our opinion based on the scope of the contract, we believe the District should have classified the individual as an employee and made payroll payments through the payroll system.

We recommend the District consider the relationship between the District and employees or consultants when determining proper classification. If employees are misclassified as consultants, the District would be liable for all withholding taxes.
CONCLUSION

As enumerated in our transmittal letter, corrective action based on the recommendations described in this report, we believe, will in all material respects place Horry County School District in compliance with the District’s Procurement Code and ensuing regulations.

Subject to this corrective action, we recommend that Horry County School District be allowed to continue procuring all goods and services, information technology, consultants and construction and related professional services in accordance with Section 11-35-70 of the South Carolina Consolidated Procurement Code.

Robert J. Aycock, IV
Audit Manager

Larry G. Sorrell, Manager
Audit and Certification
Mr. Raymond L. Grant
Materials Management Officer
Materials Management Office
1201 Main Street, Suite 600
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Dear Ray:

We have reviewed the response from the Horry County School District to our audit report April 1, 1992 - June 30, 1995. Also, we have followed the District's corrective action during and subsequent to our field work. We are satisfied that the District has made substantial progress toward implementing the recommendations in our audit report and strengthening the internal controls in the procurement system.

We, therefore, recommend that the District be allowed to continue operation under its own procurement code as authorized by Section 11-35-70 of the South Carolina Consolidated Procurement Code.

Sincerely,

Larry G. Sorrell, Manager
Audit and Certification

Total Printed - 28
Unit Cost - 8.22
Total Cost - 230.16
APPENDIX A

HORRY COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT RESPONSE TO PROCUREMENT AUDIT
APRIL 1, 1992 - JUNE 30, 1995

I. LETTER OF APRIL 30, 1996

II. LETTER OF APRIL 8, 1996 WITH EXHIBITS A AND B

III. LETTERS OF FEBRUARY 26, 1996 AND FEBRUARY 22, 1996 WITH EXHIBITS A TO Z
April 30, 1996

VIA FACSIMILE AND U.S. MAIL

Mr Larry G Sorrell
Audit & Certification
State Budget and Control Board
1201 Main Street Suite 600
Columbia SC 29201

RE: Horry County School District's response to draft Procurement Audit Report

Dear Mr Sorrell:

This will acknowledge receipt of your updated draft audit report.

The only additional response which we would like to make is as follows:

1. We request that the District's response be incorporated into the report, and that our response include this letter, our letter of April 8, 1996, with two (2) exhibits, and our response dated February 26, 1996, and the exhibits incorporated with it.

2. Page 13 of the draft report, Item "C" refers to jobs which were bid without final approval from the Department of Education's Office of District Facilities Management. Included in the listing is Aynor Elementary Building. This project has not been bid, nor will it be bid prior to written approval.

3. As to the issue of the architect/engineer plans not approved, it should be noted that as of the date of this writing all projects which have been bid, or put out for bid have now received final approval from the ODFM Office.

4. We would request that at the time that the final report is issued, that your staff meet with us and the Office of the Solicitor to review and discuss the final report and its implications, rather than your office simply mailing out the report to the interested parties.

We wish to again affirm that the District is committed to take appropriate corrective action so that those issues referred to in your report will not arise again in the future.

ITEM I
With kind regards.

Yours very truly,

SINGLETONE & BURROUGHS, P.A.

Joseph F. Singleton

JFS/mhs
cc: Greg Long
   Solicitor Ralph Wilson
   Delbert H. Singleton Esq
April 8, 1996

Mr Larry Sorrell
Mr Jimmy Aycock
Audit & Certification
State Budget and Control Board
1201 Main Street Suite 600
Columbia SC 29201

RE: Horry County School District's response to draft
Procurement Audit Report

Dear Gentlemen:

The Horry County School District has asked me to transmit to
you our response to the revised draft as referred to in your
letter to Harold Hardwick of March 22, 1996.

We would request that the District's response be
incorporated into the report, and that our response include, not
only this letter and the two exhibits, but also the previous
response to you dated February 26, 1996, and the exhibits
enclosed with it.

Exhibit A discusses each item identified in your draft audit
report, which disclosed conditions which you believed needed
correction or improvement, and emphasizes the District's
intention to take appropriate corrective action so that those
issues will not arise again in the future.

Exhibit B institutes a request from the District that
certain language changes be made to your draft audit report.
Although we do not disagree that the recommendations made by you
in your report would help improve the procurement process, I
respectfully take issue with legal conclusions contained therein,
which leave the impression that, at some instances, District
action was in direct contravention of the District's Procurement
Code and State Law. A crux of the problem arises out of the fact
that the Horry County School District has its own Procurement
Code, which has been approved by the appropriate State Agencies,
and, although similar to, is not identical to the South Carolina
Procurement Code. Additionally, our Procurement
Code requires that in dealing with major construction the District use the South Carolina School Facilities Planning and Construction Guide (the Guide). This Guide along with appropriate regulations are by law to be used in lieu of Article 9 of the South Carolina Consolidated Procurement Code.

Our School District's personnel intended to follow our own District Procurement Code and the Guide, but it appears to me that in some instances your audit report interpretation requires compliance, not only with these Codes, but with the State Procurement Code as well. The applicability of two or three different guidelines does in some circumstances create ambiguity. It would be respectfully submitted that if your office expects the District to adhere to all three guidelines, we need to be officially notified and need to consider amending our Code to be in accordance with what we are to be held accountable for in future audits.

In connection with the failure to issue notice of intent to award (F.), it should be noted that the District's Procurement Code specifically provides that the Construction Guide be utilized in connection with major construction projects as opposed to other procurement. The Guide does not have any provision for the requirement of the giving of any notice of intent to award.

Another problem area relates to the issue of the receipt of a response to invitation for architectural/engineering proposals being accepted "6 minutes late." Although the District's Procurement Code does have a regulation (12.8) dealing with rejecting late bids, there is no regulation or provision in the District's Procurement Code relating to time limit beyond which a response to invitation could no longer be accepted.

Another instance not provided for in the District's Procurement Code involves the question whether the response to invitation could have properly been supplemented to allow a question which the responding architect failed to answer to be later answered and considered. Although our Code would not allow any change in a bid, the response to invitation is clearly not a "bid." A District is specifically prohibited by State Law from accepting bids from architects.

In conclusion, the District needs, not only to conscientiously comply with its Procurement Code, but also to be vigilant as to any areas of its Code which may need supplementation or clarification.
Please accept this letter, Exhibits A and B, and our previous response and exhibits as responses to and additions to your audit report.

Please also note a request in Exhibit B for a meeting to discuss these issues.

Yours very truly,

SINGLETON & BURROUGHS, P.A.

Joseph F. Singleton

JFS/mhs
cc: Greg Long, Coordinator of Purchasing
    Solicitor Ralph Wilson
    Delbert Singleton, Legal Counselor (w/out attachments)
    William F. Halligan, Esquire (w/out attachments)
EXHIBIT A

April 1, 1996

TO: Mr. Larry Sorrell
    Mr. Jimmy Aycock

The District would like for each of you to know that we sincerely appreciate the many hours that have been spent reviewing records and working with district staff in an effort to improve the procurement function. The District has made many improvements as a result of the 1993 audit and will certainly implement necessary corrective actions relative to recommendations made in the 1996 audit so that the District will be in compliance with §11-35-70 of the South Carolina Consolidated Procurement Code and the District’s Code.

As we discussed during our February 26, 1996, exit conference, there are actions we intend to take to assure that your recommendations are implemented. Our District’s appeals process has been strengthened such that only District Procurement Officials and the appropriate Staff Officials will be involved in rendering opinions on appeals submitted by vendors and others.

VENDOR APPEALS/PROCUREMENT RELATED ISSUES

If there are questions related to procurement issues or vendor appeals, we are committed to the following appeals process:

The first level of resolution will be by the District Procurement Office. The Procurement Office’s decision will be provided in writing. If an individual would like to appeal that Procurement Officer’s decision, a written request should be submitted to the Assistant Superintendent for Finance within ten working days of receipt of the Procurement Officer’s decision. In an individual or vendor is not satisfied with the opinion rendered by the Assistant Superintendent for Finance, they may submit their appeal to the District’s Procurement Review Panel for disposition. This appeal should be submitted within ten working days of the Assistant Superintendent of Finance’s decision and be accompanied by the responses from the District’s Procurement Office and Assistant Superintendent for Finance. The State Budget and Control’s Office of General Services can be consulted for an opinion at any stage of the appeal process.

If further appeal is necessary, legal action and/or board approval would be required.

I. CONSTRUCTION PROCUREMENT
Section A

Presently there are no written guidelines that align the District’s practice as it pertains to accepting a response to invitations with the District’s Procurement Code as it pertains to accepting bids. The District supports the Office of General Services’ recommendations that Regulations 12.h. be adhered to when accepting a response to invitation. Therefore, at an early date, the District will insert language into the Procurement Code that will clearly state regulation 12.h. will be adhered to when accepting a response to invitation. In the future, if any respondent to a response to invitation does not submit the required documents prior to established deadlines, their proposal will not be considered.

The District supports the Office of General Services’ recommendations that Regulation 15.b. should be adhered to when a request is made by a vendor to submit a response to a question that has been omitted from the original response to invitation. Therefore, at an early date, the District will insert language into the Procurement Code that will clearly state that regulation 15.b. will be adhered to when considering a vendor’s request to submit a response after the established deadline. In the future, if any request to consider a question that has been omitted is submitted, regulation 15.b. will be adhered to.

The District supports the Office of General Services’ recommendation that §11-35-3220 of the State Procurement code be followed when scoring proposals. In the future, §11-35-3220 will be followed and all proposals will be scored.

Section B. Program Management Services

The District supports the Office of General Services’ recommendation that all score sheets be scored and data be provided to support the committee’s selection. In the future, §11-35-3220(5) of the State Procurement Code will be adhered to and all score sheets will be scored.

AS of January 19, 1996, the District implemented a procedure to assure compliance to the District’s Procurement Code by Southern Management Group. (See Attachment). Furthermore, as recommended by the Office of the General Services, on March 26, 1996, representative from Horry County Schools and Southern Management visited Richland School District I. The group met with Mr. Gregg Jones. Mr. Jones shared Richland I’s process as they pertain to architectural and construction related issues. Mr. Jones also shared Richland I’s record keeping procedures.

Section C. Architect/Engineer Plans Not Approved by Department of Education

The District supports the office of General Services’ recommendation that all deficiencies be resolved with the Department of Education and that in the future no projects should be bid until written approval is obtained from the Department of Education. Presently all plans have received approval except Eighth Attendance High/Middle Building, Forestbrook Middle Building, and Myrtle Beach Middle Building. Final plans for these projects are in the Office of the District Facilities Management awaiting written approval. It should be noted that Aynor Elementary has not been bid and will be not bid until written approval is obtained.
Section D. Inappropriate Selection Method

See Attachment A

The district supports the recommendation of the Office of General Services. In the future, the appropriate selection method will be used when procuring architectural and engineering services that exceed $18,000.00.

Section E. Land Purchase for School

The District supports the Office of General Services' recommendations that section 2.03(3) of the Guide be adhered to. In the future, only original signatures will be used.

Section F. Notice of Intent to Award Not Issued

The District supports the Office of General Services' recommendation that procedures listed in the District's Code as they relate to award of contracts of $50,000.00 or above be followed on all major construction projects. As soon as practicable, the District's Code will be amended to reflect same.

Section G. Board of Approval of Three Construction Contracts Not Obtained

The District supports the Office of General Services' recommendation that all construction and construction-related contracts received Board approval after bidding. In the future, all construction and construction-related contracts will be sent to the Board for approval after the bidding phase.

II. GENERAL PROCUREMENT EXCEPTIONS

Section A. Notice of Intent to Award Not Prepared

9394-95 Duplicating Machines

We did not anticipate the dollar potential of this contract to be over $50,000 but now realize a 16-day intent to award should have been done.

9394-162 Security Systems

Only one bid was received and there was no other contending vendor to notify of the award intent.

9394-57 Printer Contract

We realize a 16-day intent to award should have been done.

Section A. Proposed Corrective Action

The District acknowledges it should have prepared the notice of intent to award.

Section B. Notice of Intent to Award Inappropriately Waived

The District did waive the requirement for the 16-day notice of intent to award. It was waived to save time in obtaining the necessary items. The District thought that it was appropriate to waive the 16-day notice of intent to award when equipment, supplies, or services were deemed crucial.

Section B. Proposed Corrective Action

The District will end the practice of waiving the intent to award.

Section C. Inappropriate Sole Sources

PO#17853 Software & Site License
PO#13125 Software Development

District agrees these should have been solicited as a Request for Proposal (RFP).

PO#4723 Installation of Ropes Course

At the time the purchase was made, this was the only company we were aware of. Since that time, we have learned of another vendor and both companies will be contacted in the future.

PO#5810 Promotional Items

This should not have been a sole source because at least four companies were solicited for quotes.

PO#16822 Architectural Services

The District agrees that this service could have been obtained through the small A&E selection process.

PO#10812568 Sets, Costumes, Make-up, Sound and Lighting

District agrees with Office of General Services
PO#14638   Used Floor Mats

These used mats were purchased from Servicemaster when their contract expired. The mats were already at the schools being used. We had received one quote for new mats and realized the used mats were what we needed. Also, we felt nobody else had that number of used mats available. It made more sense to keep these mats rather than spending the time, effort, and disruption to get other used mats.

Section C. Proposed Corrective Action

The District will obtain the maximum level of competition as is possible.

Section D. Insufficient Solicitation of Competition

Bid#9293-119  Printers
Bid #9293-97  T-Shirts

All known sources at that time were solicited.

Bid#9394-91  Lap-top Computers

The District agrees and is determining the total potential purchase. In doing so, we will solicit the maximum required level of competition.

PO#200805   Cosmetology Teaching Services

All known sources were contacted and asked to send proposals if they were interested in providing a training program at Finklea Career Center. Only one responded.

PO#9411181   VHS Camcorder

Procurement worked with Socastee High on this matter. Procurement gave the school permission to order the camcorder from the W.H. Platt Company at $1,800. Procurement believes that attempts were made to get price quotes from several companies. Those companies are Magnavox Outlet in Myrtle Beach, McDuff Video Concepts in Murrells Inlet and AVAC of Myrtle Beach, South Carolina.

Section D. Proposal Corrective Action

One of the primary goals of procurement is to solicit as many vendors as possible in all transactions. This is something that procurement strives for on a daily basis.

Section E. Attorney Services not Approved by the Board

The Board will approve all services provided by an attorney.

ITEM II EXHIBIT A
Section F. Improper Payments

PO#153645  Network Printer

After the purchase order was mailed to the company, the Technology Department called Procurement and asked if there was any way we could get routers faster than the two weeks quoted. Procurement called the company and they said they could overnight them to us for an extra charge. Technology Department approved the extra charge for overnighting the routers. He determined that the delivery of the routers was crucial because of the cost of the manpower we had standing by to complete the job. Procurement agreed and approved this action. Also, router #CISO2501 was no longer on the market at the time the order was placed, we authorized to pay $1.00 more for the upgraded version because of the crucial delivery.

PO#104103  T-Shirts

School personnel changed the order for XX Large shirts after the order was placed, instead of them being X Large. The price on the invoice is right and the description is wrong. The description should have been XX Large.

PO#149859  Beauty School Supplies

First check for $14,752.64 was lost (void). Total on second invoice with discount should have been $14,584.61. The company gave us a second discount of $1,555.70. We owe the company $987.67, however, we have never been billed for it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Invoice total wrong</th>
<th>Total should have been</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$13,955.10 with discount</td>
<td>$13,890.10 with discount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>757.54 tax</td>
<td>694.51 tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$14,752.64</td>
<td>$14,584.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$14,752.64  1,155.70 company gave 2nd discount  13,596.94  $ 987.67

Section G. One Consultant Should Have Been Classified as an Employee

District agrees with this conclusion.
EXHIBIT “B”

April 8, 1996

TO: Mr. Larry Sorrell
    Mr. Jimmy Aycock

    During the exit conference between Horry County School and the Office of General Services, officials from the Office of General Services stated that they would entertain recommendations from the district as it pertains to language changes in the audit report.

    The district would like to suggest the following modifications.

I. Page 5, lines 5, 6

   The draft audit states “1. A vendor who responded six minutes late to an opening for response to invitation was awarded a contract worth $1.3 million.”

   Proposed Modification
   A vendor who responded six minutes late to an opening for response to invitation was allowed to participate in the architectural short listing process.

II. Page 5, lines 8, 9

   The draft audit states “The vendor was allowed to respond after the opening which is contrary to the District’s Code.”

   Proposed Modification
   The vendor was allowed to respond to after the opening.

III. Page 8, lines 13, 14, 15, 16

   The draft audit states “However, through a written request made by the firm in question, the District elected to accept the proposal ultimately resulting in an award to the vendor at 5.25 percent of a $24,626,000 construction budget or $1,292,865.”

   Proposed Modification
   However, through a written request made by the firm in question, the District elected to accept the proposal. Acceptance of this proposal allowed the vendor to participate in the short listing
IV. Page 8, lines 22, 23

The draft audit states "Under the District’s Procurement Regulations, the late response of the firm should not have been accepted since it was not in the possession of any District employees."

**Proposed Modification**

Under this regulation, the late response of the firm would not have been accepted since it was not in the possession of any District employees.

V. Page 9, lines 1, 2, 3, 4

The draft audit states "One of the underlying policies of the District’s Procurement Code is to provide safeguards for the maintenance of a procurement system of quality and integrity with clearly defined rules for ethical behavior on the part of all persons engaged in the public procurement process."

**Proposed Modification**

One of underlying purposes of the District’s Procurement Code is to provide safeguards for the maintenance of a procurement system of quality and integrity with clearly defined rules of ethical behavior on the part of all persons engaged in the public procurement process.

VI. Page 9, lines 4, 5

The draft audit states "Acceptance of late bids undermines this policy."

**Proposed Modification**

Acceptance of a late response to invitation undermines this purpose.

VII. Page 9, line 9

The draft audit states "This action is contrary to the District’s Code."

**Proposed Modification**

Delete this sentence.

VIII. Page 9, line 10

The draft audit states "Two of the five committee members actually scored the response. Regulation 15.b. states:"

**Proposed Modification**


Two of the five committee members actually scored the response. Even though scoring of this response did not affect the ten firms to be interviewed, we recommend that in the future the district adhere to regulation 15.b. which states:

IX. Page 9, lines 17, 18

The draft audit states “Since the question was used in determining the best qualified offerors for architectural/engineering services, the correction of this mistake was inappropriate.”

Proposed Modification
If regulation 15.b. had been followed when considering the vendor’s request, this response would not have been accepted.

X. Page 10, lines 18, 19

The draft audit states “By not scoring the sheets, objectivity of the selection process was removed.”

Proposed Modification
Without the scored sheets, objectivity of the selection process is more difficult to justify.

XI. Page 11, line 25

The draft audit states “Aynor Elementary Building, Plan Submittal Date 09/22/95, Project Bid Date 01/18/96.”

Proposed Modification
Delete line 25.

XII. Page 12, lines 10, 11

The draft audit states “We fail to understand why the District would proceed with bidding construction jobs that did not have the plans approved as mandated by Law.”

Proposed Modification
Delete above statement included in lines 10 and 11.

XIII. Page 13, lines 11, 12

The draft audit states “However, the Department stated that they were unaware that the signatures were not from the appropriate people.”

Proposed Modification
The Office of General Services has provided Mr. William F. Halligan of Childs and Duff, P.A. with copies of the latest draft audit. The District realizes that no one in the Office of General Services has been notified of a change in Attorneys; however, Mr. Joey Singleton of Cross, Singleton and Burroughs in Conway, South Carolina, will be handling all legal issues as they pertain to the District’s Procurement Audit Report. Mr. Singleton’s fax number is 802-248-7182, his telephone number is 803-248-4229, and his mailing address is P. O. Box 1244, Conway, South Carolina 29526. Please forward all future correspondence to Mr. Singleton.

Finally, the District would like to meet with officials from the Office of General Services to discuss our responses and suggested modifications to the latest draft audit. Additionally, we would like to get an opinion from the Office of General Services on the District’s proposed corrective actions. The District wants to assure that proposed corrective action is appropriate and will in all material respects, place the Horry County School District in compliance with Section 11-35-70 of the South Carolina Consolidated Procurement Code and the District’s Code and insuring regulations. If in the opinion of the Office of General Services, additional corrective action is necessary, the District will incorporate required language to reflect same.
Mr. Larry Sorrell, Manager  
Audit and Certification  
State Budget and Control Board  
1201 Main Street, Suite 600  
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Dear Larry:

In response to the preliminary audit report, the following is offered:

I. Construction and Related Professional Services

Section D.

See Attachment "A"

II. General Procurement Exceptions

Section A. Notice of Intent to Award Not Prepared

9394-95 Duplicating Machines
9394-162 Security Systems
9394-57 Printer
9293-93 Computer Maintenance

Section A. Proposed Correction Action

The District acknowledges it should have prepared the notice of intend to awards.

Section B.

The District did waive the requirement for the 16 day notice of intent to award. It was waived to save time in obtaining the necessary items. The District thought that it was appropriate to waive the 16 day notice of intent to award. The District's feeling is that it is better to waive the 16 day notice of intent rather than use the emergency source selection. The emergency source selection does not
allow for the formal sealed bid conditions to be utilized and the maximum number of vendors may not be solicited if the emergency source is used.

Section B. Proposed Corrective Action

The District will end the practice of waiving the intent to award criteria.

Section C. Inappropriate Sole Sources

PO #17853 Software & Site License
PO #13125 Software Development

District agrees this should have been better to handle as an RFP.

PO #4723 Installation of Ropes Course

At the time the purchase was made, this was the only company we were aware of. Since that time, we have learned of another vendor and both companies will be contacted in the future.

PO #16822 Architectural Services

The architectural services for writing of specifications and bidding for a contractor to repair a floor at Myrtle Beach Middle School were begun in 1988. This was done as a part of a major addition to the school. The architect has already accomplished the majority of the legwork necessary. Funds were unavailable in 1988 and have been unavailable until this fiscal year. This project has presented a hazard to the students and must, if at all possible, be accomplished during the Christmas holidays. This architect must be utilized since a majority of the preliminary work has been accomplished and was obligated prior to funds becoming available. The cost for the architectural services will be $3,500.00 plus reimbursable expenses for advertising and printing not to exceed $1,000.00.

PO #10812568 Sets, Costumes, Makeup

This should not have been a sole source because at least four companies were solicited for quotes.
PO #14638  Used Floor Mats.

These used mats were purchased from Servicemaster at a good price. The mats were already at the schools being used. We had received one quote for new mats and realized the used mats were what we needed. Also, we felt nobody else had that number of used mats available. It made more sense to keep these mats rather than spending the time, effort, and disruption to get other used mats.

Section C. Proposed Corrective Action

The District will obtain competition as is possible.

Section D. Insufficient Solicitation of Competition

Bid #9293-119 Printers
Bid #9293-97 T-Shirts

All known sources at that time were solicited.

Bid #9394-91 Lap Top Computers

The District agrees and is determining the total potential purchase. In doing so, we will solicit the maximum required level of competition.

PO #200805 Cosmetology Teaching Services

All known sources were contacted and asked to send proposals if they were interested in providing a training program at Finklea Career Center. Only one responded.

PO #190134 Performance

This is the school district's annual contribution to the residency program of the Coastal Concert Association.

PO #9411181 VHS Camcorder

Procurement worked with Dick Roth from Socastee High on this matter. Procurement gave the school permission to order the camcorder from the W. H. Platt Company at $1,800.00. Procurement believes that attempts were made to get price quotes from several companies. Those companies are Magnavox Outlet in Myrtle Beach, McDuff Video Concepts in Murrells Inlet and AVAC of Myrtle Beach, S. C.
Section D. Proposal Corrective Action

One of the primary goals of procurement is to solicit as many vendors as possible in all transactions. This is something that procurement strives for on a daily basis.

Section E. Attorney services not approved by the Board. The Board will approve all services provided by any attorney.

Section F. Improper Payments

PO #153645 Network Router

After the purchase order was mailed to the company, Richard Nadeau, head of our Technology Department, called me and asked me if there was any way we could get the routers faster than the two weeks quoted. I called the company and they said they could overnight them to us for an extra charge. Richard approved the extra charge for overnighting the routers. He determined that the delivery of the routers was crucial because of the cost of the manpower we had standing by to complete the job. Also, router #CISCO2501 was no longer on the market at the time the order was placed, we authorized to pay a $1.00 more for the upgraded version because of the crucial delivery.

PO #104103 T-Shirts

Wanda Siler changed the order for XX Large shirts after the order was placed, instead of them being X Large. The price on the invoice is right and the description is wrong. The description should have been XX Large.

PO #149859 Beauty School Supplies

First check for $14,752.64 was lost (void). Total on second invoice with discount should have been $14,584.61. The company gave us a second discount of $1,155.70. We owe the company $987.67, however we have never been billed for it.
Invoice Total Wrong
$13,995.10 with discount
- 757.54 tax
$14,752.64

$14,752.64
- 1,155.70 company gave 2nd discount
$13,596.94 2nd check

Total should have been
$13,890.10 with discount
- 987.67 tax
$14,584.61

Section G. One consultant should have been classified as an employee. District agrees with this conclusion.

Section H. Missing Documentation

If you have any questions, please feel free to call me anytime. Thank you.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Gregg S. Long
Coordinator of Procurement

c: Harrell W Hardwick
Mr. Larry Sorrell, Manager  
Audit and Certification  
State Budget and Control Board  
1201 Main Street, Suite 600  
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Dear Larry:

In response to the preliminary audit report, I offer the following:

Section A

Mr. Gregg Long, chief procurement officer, was asked to advertise for qualification statements from architectural firms. The statements were due by 3:00 p.m. on April 22, 1994. Later in the afternoon after the statements were due, Mr. Long came to me and explained the situation with Mr. Derrick Mozingo. Mr. Long's accounts of events were similar to those submitted by Mr. Mozingo in his letter of April 25, 1994. (Exhibit A) Mr. Long made the decision not to accept Mr. Mozingo's application. Mr. Mozingo, by his letter of April 25, appealed the decision to another level.

To make my recommendation, I referred to the District's Procurement Code. Section 30-C of the district's procurement code prescribes procedures that are to be followed when selecting A&E firms. Paragraph 2 outlines certain steps that the district is required to follow when receiving a response to invitation. The District regulation at no point refers to a response to invitation as a bid, nor does it refer a reader to any other section in the code. No where in this paragraph is there a requirement stipulating that the district must establish an acceptance deadline, nor does it provide any guidelines as it pertains to rejecting proposals. Furthermore, Architectural Registration Law, Title 40, Chapter 3, Section 40-3-165 Code of Laws of South Carolina 1976 as amended through March 1, 1994, states that "Architects shall not enter into a contract for professional services on any basis other than direct negotiation thereby precluding participation in any system requiring a comparison of compensation. Provided, however, an architect may state compensation to a prospective client in direct negotiation where architectural services necessary to protect the public health, safety, and welfare have been defined." (Exhibit B) This issue was never considered as a bid. My interpretation of section 30-C led me to believe that there could be leeway in the process. I found no information that indicated this was inappropriate. Following my review of the district's code, and consultation with Mr. Tom Baldwin of the Southern Management Group, I advised Dr. Gary Smith that I could not find...
anything stating that someone could not consider a late application if extenuating circumstances existed. It was reasonable to allow Mozingo to submit his application. Mr. Mozingo thought he arrived before 3:00 p.m., the traffic situation on Highway 501 is terrible, and it seemed unfair to prevent consideration of his application based on what was, at most, being late by six minutes at the very first stage of the process of architectural selection. I was asked and agreed to communicate this to Mr. Long. I have always believed that actions taken did not violate any section of the code. It should also be noted that acceptance of the response to invitation in no way assured any firm, nor eliminated any firm, from obtaining a contract to perform A&E services.

On April 27, 1994, each of the five members of the Architectural Selection Committee was given twenty-five (25) proposals and twenty-five (25) rating sheets. Twenty-five (25) firms submitted proposals. The committee rated the firms according to criteria listed in section 30-C paragraph 4. On May 9, 1995, the committee met again. Each member brought their rating sheets with them. The rating sheets were collected and scores recorded. Each of the five raters’ point totals was added for each of the twenty-five (25) firms. The ten firms with the highest point totals were interviewed. One committee member did not score sixteen (16) of the proposals. It was understood that the member not scoring intended for a score of zero to be assigned. The score of zero was awarded and points totaled. It is important to note that four firms receiving the zero rating did make the short list, and one ultimately received a contract. (Exhibit D and Exhibit E)

On May 9, 1994, Mr. Derrick Mozingo submitted a letter indicating that his answer to question #45 of the proposal had been omitted. He requested that the information be incorporated in his proposal. I have no knowledge of any of the prescribed procedures listed in section 30-C that would prohibit granting of this request. There is no prohibition in the District’s Procurement Code or the Guide against considering an incomplete application, and question 45 is a very minor issue. Therefore, I submitted Mr. Mozingo’s letter to the committee members for consideration. (Exhibit C) Three of the committee members rated the firms without considering Mozingo’s letter. Two of the members did award points. The two members’ cumulative number of points awarded on question 45 was 15, eight from one member and seven from the other. If these points were deducted from Mr. Mozingo’s score, it would not alter the ten firms that were selected to be interviewed. (Exhibit D and Exhibit E)

Section A - Proposed Corrective Action

If it is recommended by the Office of General Services that the district is to follow bidding procedures when accepting a response to invitation, the procurement code could be changed to clearly state same. At the present time there is no such definition. Appropriate changes in this section should be approved by the Horry County Board of Education and the Office of General Services.

ITEM III
Section B

The score sheets used to rate vendors for a program management contract were scored. (Exhibit F) Section 30-C paragraph 4 stipulates procedures that will be followed when ranking firms interviewing for the purpose of providing professional services. This section requires that committee members will rank firms in priority order using prescribed criteria. Each committee member used criteria as outlined in section 30-C paragraph 4 and ranked the five firms accordingly. I prepared the original rating form and assigned the suggested points within each category. The Committee asked me whether they needed to go through the point system. I advised them that they simply could score the firms one through five. Since the Procurement Code specifies the factors but not the point or weighting system, I thought that this was appropriate. A scoring system of 1-5 was used with one being the highest and five being the lowest. Each rater’s score was added and the firm receiving the lowest point total on the 1-5 scale was selected. (Exhibit G)

Section B - Corrective Action

The district’s procurement code does not prescribe a particular form, weighting system, or rating system as it pertains to selecting A/E firms or construction managers. In order to remove any questions surrounding this issue, a standard form and a weighting/rating system could be developed and included in the code.

An accountability plan has been implemented as it pertains to Southern Management’s role in the procurement activity. These procedures have been forwarded to Mr. Larry Sorrell and Mr. Jimmy Aycock in the Office of General Services for review. (Exhibit H)

Section C

It is important to understand, while there is some misunderstanding on approvals received or not received, verbal or written, from ODFM, all projects, whether referenced in this report or not, have been advertised, bid, and contract awarded to the lowest bidder in accordance with the bid procurement procedures as outlined in Section 8 of the South Carolina School and Facilities Planning Guide. In addition, all issues that ODFM had previously cited have been incorporated into documents prior to bid or contract award.

Further, as documented in this report, all non-compliance issues in the audit are either in compliance or an agreement has been reached with ODFM in regard to bringing projects into compliance.

ITEM III
While ODFM approval is the ultimate responsibility of the Architects and Engineers, Southern Management Group has implemented the following to resolve outstanding issues and implement steps to avoid future misunderstanding or non-compliance.

1. Since the district's receipt of Mr. John Kent's letter of February 2, 1996, Southern Management Group has held two meetings in Columbia with ODFM in regards to resolving issues raised in Mr. Kent's letter in addition to daily phone conversations with ODFM staff.
2. As a Consultant to the Owner, Southern Management Group has assumed the lead role in working with ODFM and architects to assure the District's compliance on all projects.
3. As the District's Consultant, Southern Management Group will attend future meetings between ODFM and architects to insure proper approval is received on all aspects of the program prior to proceeding.
4. Beginning Monday, February 19, 1996, Southern Management Group is adding an additional individual who has extensive experience in school building programs. One of his main focuses will be to work with Mr. Gregg Long on all Owner Purchased items as it relates to the Building Program to assure compliance with the Procurement Code.
5. We recommend that Mr. John Kent, the Director of ODFM, be contacted on the role Southern Management Group has taken on behalf of the District in resolving these issues since February 2, 1996.

A very ambitious schedule was developed, centered around the District's needs to relieve the extreme overcrowding in the various schools. Around December 1994, Southern Management Group advised the District that the approval process could get lengthy and delay start and completion of the projects. A memo was send out on December 11, 1994, advising all Architects of their responsibility to insure that they obtain proper approval from ODFM and other agencies so as not to delay projects. (Exhibit I) Architects and Engineers were routinely encouraged to finish their design on time to allow for ample review and approval time by ODFM.

On February 2, 1996, I received a fax from Mr. John Kent advising of the status of the District's on-going construction projects. I was surprised as to the status of several of these projects. Southern Management Group spent the entire weekend on the phone with the District's Architects and Engineers going back through the files and pulling together the information necessary to meet with ODFM on Monday, February 5, 1996, at 11:00 a.m. Mr. Tom Baldwin personally called Mr. Kent on Sunday afternoon at his home requesting an opportunity to meet with him to review the status of each project so that he could have a clear understanding of what approvals had not been received. Since that meeting on the 5th, Southern Management Group has had a follow up meeting with Mr. Robert Mitchell and continuous dialogue with ODFM to expedite the approval process. Each issue cited in the audit report is listed below.
Mr. Larry Sorrell  
February 26, 1996  
Page 5

1. **Amor Elementary Site Package**  
The Architect stated he submitted the plans on July 6, 1995. (Exhibit J) However, ODFM states they never received the package. As a result of letters written February 7 and February 9, 1996, (Exhibit K and Exhibit L) we have since received approval from ODFM. (Exhibit M)

2. **Amor Elementary Building**  
Plans were submitted on September 22, 1995. The bid of this project has been delayed because of spacing between other projects. This project will not be bid until all comments are incorporated and approval to bid obtained. (Exhibit K and Exhibit N)

3. **8th Attendance Zone High/Middle School Site**  
ODFM has withheld approval of site pending resolution of final easements at accesses to the site. This has yet to be resolved. A status report was provided to all parties including ODFM on October 12, 1995. We are currently working to resolve the easement issues as expeditiously as possible. At this time all parties have agreed in principle to these easements. Formal agreements will be finalized very soon. The Architect had incorporated all previous comments in regards to site issues raised by ODFM and SCDOT prior to bid. The District requested a temporary approval of the sitework to the property line. (Exhibit O) This approval should be obtained by the end of the week. (Exhibit P)

4. **8th Attendance Zone High/Middle School Building**  
According to Ms. Susan Baker of LS3P Architects, ODFM gave verbal approval to the Architect. (Exhibit Q) All changes and issues required by ODFM were incorporated into the documents in a timely fashion. (Exhibit R) The bid period was actually moved from October 26, 1995, to November 29, 1995, to allow for incorporation of ODFM comments and ample time for contract review as per ODFM’s request. (Exhibit S)

5. **Forestbrook Middle School Building**  
All of ODFM requirements were incorporated into the bidding documents and/or contract prior to award. Mr. Robert Mitchell in a meeting on February 5th indicated that they would rather just see all of the modifications at once. It was the Architect’s intentions to follow the same procedure agreed to in Item No. 4 above. The Architect is committed to resubmitting these plans within three weeks. (Exhibit T) The bid period on this project was extended from September 12, 1995, to October 3, 1995, to allow for incorporation of ODFM comments and ample time for contract review as per ODFM’s request.

ITEM III
6. **Myrtle Beach Middle School Site**
   This middle school site was approved verbally, contingent on SCDOT approval and receiving OCRM permit. Both of these were obtained prior to proceeding. (Exhibit U) ODFM received a copy of SCDOT approval, however, they did not receive a copy of the OCRM permit prior to February 9, 1996. This approval has now been obtained. (Exhibit V)

7. **Myrtle Beach Middle School Building**
   Again, it is the same as Forestbrook Middle School (see No. 5 above). The Architects have assured us they have incorporated all building code issues, as well as South Carolina School Facilities Planning and Construction Guide issues, into the contract documents in a timely fashion. (Exhibit T)

   Proceeding forward without final written approval because of time constraints is not uncommon. ODFM has from time to time allowed projects to proceed. Previously it has not been untypical for projects to be advertised while final review and comments from ODFM were being received, with final comments from ODFM issued in the addenda and plans resubmitted after the bid.

   The Architects have assured us that all of ODFM’s previous comments have been incorporated into the drawings at no additional costs thus allowing us to maintain a very ambitious schedule.

**Section C - Corrective Action**

The district is in the process of correcting all inconsistencies with ODFM. All regulations will be followed. If waivers should be granted, proper documentation will be maintained.

**Section E**

The Building Committee on June 20, 1994, voted 4 to 1 to purchase the site off of Highway 501. (Exhibit W) At this meeting Mr. Richard Heath, chairman of the board and Dr. Gary Smith, Superintendent, were both present. Mr. Heath voted in favor of purchasing the property and Dr. Smith supported the land acquisition. On June 23, 1994, while participating in a site observation meeting with Mr. Robert Mitchell, I signed the F2 form for Mr. Heath and Dr. Smith. (Exhibit X) My placing of these signatures was noted by my initials being placed below each of their names. This was done simply as an administrative act.

**Section E - Corrective Action**

In the future only original signatures will be used.
Section F

Under the regulations Section of the district’s procurement code, it states:

“Section 59-23-190, Code of Laws of South Carolina, 1976, requires that all public school buildings be inspected and approved by the State Superintendent of Education or his agent, before first being occupied.

On the basis of the above, over a three year period the South Carolina Department of Education, Office of School Planning and Building developed a thorough set of regulations governing the planning and construction of educational faculties. These regulations were approved by the State Board of Education on December 10, 1982, and then submitted to the South Carolina General Assembly for review and approval. These regulations became effective on May 27, 1983, after having been published in the State Register (Vol. 7, Issue No. 5). These regulations were combined with guidelines developed and reviewed by a host of individuals that included representatives from the Department of Education, various state agencies, outside educational and technical consultants, and a number of school superintendents, planners, architects, engineers and school maintenance personnel. The final product was the South Carolina School Facilities Planning Construction Guide, 1983 edition hereinafter referred to as the Guide. This Guide along with these regulations shall be used in lieu of Article 9 of the South Carolina Consolidated Procurement Code and shall also be substituted for the Manual for Planning and Execution of State Permanent Improvement. Part II: Execution of Permanent Improvements, State Budget and control Board.”

Additionally, on page 27 of 40 in the general provision section, section 10 refers to major construction.

The provision states that the district on all major construction projects will use the South Carolina School Facilities Planning and Construction Guide which will be administered by the Office of School Facilities Planning.

The Guide does not require that a notice of intent to award be issued.

Section F - Corrective Action

None required if only the Guide is followed. However, if it is recommended that the large contract section of the district’s code be followed in major construction, the code could be changed to reflect the same. Currently this is not the case.
Section G

The parking lot addition and resurfacing projects at Homewood Elementary, Conway Elementary, and North Myrtle Beach High were approved by the Board as part of the District’s capital improvement projects. The North Myrtle Beach High project and Conway Elementary project were approved as part of the 1993-1994 Capital Improvement program. (Exhibit Y) The Homewood project was approved as part of the 1994-1995 program. (Exhibit Z) All projects were properly bid. However, before final contracts were awarded, they were not taken back to the Board for ratification.

Section G - Corrective Action

In the future, all construction contracts will be taken to the Board for final approval.

Sincerely,

Eddie Rodelsperger
Executive Director

ER:jsc

02269601.DOC
Eddie Rodelsperger  
Horry County School District  
1600 9th Avenue  
Conway, SC 29526  

RE: Architectural/Engineering Proposal  

Dear Eddie:  

This letter is in reference to our submittal package dropped off on Friday afternoon and received by Greg Long. Greg stated that, according to his time, the package was received at 3:06 p.m., six minutes past the 3:00 p.m. submittal deadline and he could not officially accept the package. I asked him as I am asking you and the proper authorities to consider the following:  

1. My watch indicated 2:58 p.m. We left our office in Myrtle Beach at 2:15 p.m. and did not anticipate to be held up due to traffic and delays because of work on Hwy. 501. What is normally a 20 minute trip turned into a 40 minute trip. My secretary did phone ahead to the school's operations department around 2:30 p.m. to let them know we were on our way and, again, at 2:50 p.m., designating we were stuck in traffic but still were determined to make the deadline.  

2. Our intent was for our package to be in before 3:00 p.m. and, if indeed it was six minutes late, it in no way gives us an unfair advantage over our competition. This is a qualification submittal, not a bid submittal, and in no way gives us an advantage over the competition.  

3. Our past commitment to the district in on time job performance and work quality.  

4. Our time given through voluntary efforts to help benefit the district.  

5. The amount of time and money invested in the preparation of this submittal.  

6. The package submittal questionnaire on our firm has been on file with the district for over a year and could be used if for some legal reason the recent submittal cannot be admitted.  

ITEM III EXHIBIT A
I apologize for putting myself and you in this position and am simply asking for consideration of our team credentials. I accept full responsibility for the last minute delay of this submittal and did so only because of prior commitments made due to current clients and current job conditions.

Obviously our firm has long been interested in this work and feels that we have put together a team that will benefit the district. I am only asking to be included for consideration and think that it would be greatly unfair if we were denied because of a six minute discrepancy.

I can only ask for your understanding and thoughtful consideration. I am, Sincerely,

S. DERRICK MOZINGO ASSOCIATES

S. Derrick Mozingo Jr., AIA

cc: Dr. Gary Smith

SDM/pm
and issue an injunction, including mandatory injunction upon finding the truth and sufficiency of the allegations of the petition. The South Carolina Administrative Law Judge Division as provided under Article 5 of Chapter 23 of Title 1 may enforce the injunction by punishment for contempt and by any other process permitted to circuit courts, and make other orders in its discretion. The injunction may be limited in time, perpetual or conditional, as may be necessary and proper to the enforcement of this chapter, or the regulations or orders of the board, or the law of this State relating to architecture.

40-3-150. Penalties. Any person violating the provisions of this chapter is guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction, must be fined not less than five hundred dollars nor more than five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned for not less than thirty days nor more than six months, or both, within the discretion of the court.

40-3-160. Activities and practices not prohibited by chapter. (1) Nothing in this chapter prohibits a general contractor or a home builder from the preparation and use of details and shop drawings, assembly or erection drawings, or graphic descriptions used to detail or illustrate a portion of the work required to construct the project in accordance with the plans and specifications prepared or to be prepared under the requirements of this chapter.

(2) Nothing in this chapter prevents or affects the practice of any other legally recognized profession.

(3) If the drawings and specifications are signed by the authors with the true title of their occupations, this chapter does not apply to the preparations of plans and specifications for:

(a) a building which is to be used for farm purposes only;

(b) a building less than three stories high and containing less than five thousand square feet of total floor area except buildings of assembly, institutional, educational, and hazardous occupancies as defined by the Standard Building Code, regardless of area;

(c) a detached single-family or two-family dwelling, as defined in Group R3 of the Standard Building Code, regardless of size, with each unit having a grade level exit and any sheds, storage buildings, and garages incidental thereto;

(d) alterations to any buildings to which this chapter does not apply, if the alterations do not increase the areas and capacities beyond the limits of this chapter or affect the structural safety of the building.

(4) Nothing in this chapter prevents or affects the practice of engineering, as defined in Chapter 21 of Title 40, nor architectural work incidental to the practice of engineering.

40-3-165. Contract Negotiation. Architects shall not enter into a contract for professional services on any basis other than direct negotiation thereby precluding participation in any system requiring a comparison of compensation. Provided, however, an architect may state compensation to a prospective client in direct negotiation where architectural services necessary to protect the public health, safety, and welfare have been defined.

40-3-170. Service of Notice. Service of any notice provided by law upon any nonresident architect who has been admitted to the practice of architecture or upon any resident architect who, having been admitted, subsequently becomes a

ITEM III EXHIBIT B
Eddie Rodelsperger
1600 9th Avenue
Conway, SC 29526

RE: Horry County School District
1994 Building Program

Dear Eddie:

Please find attached our response to question #45 of the proposal request for the above referenced project. In transposing the questions into our word processing system, this question was entered but was erased due to a hard drive filing error. We are sorry for this inconvenience but we were not aware of the problem at the time and did not discover it until today.

We would appreciate it if you would incorporate this page into our proposal package. Thank you for your consideration of this matter. I am.

Sincerely,

S. DERRICK MOZINGO ASSOCIATES

S. Derrick Mozingo, Jr. AIA

SDM/pm
44. What impact, if any, will the use of a Program Manager or Construction Manager have on your fees?

Our fees would not be affected unless the directive was given to bid the projects under a multiple bid package for the various disciplines. Depending upon the extent and breakout of this process, some adjustment in fee could be anticipated due to the additional time required for the coordination, printing and issuing of the work.

45. Teaching methods will change drastically over the next decade, what steps will you take in the design phase to assure that buildings will have the flexibility to change as instructional needs change?

As a team we will plan for structural flexibility to allow for future movement of core spaces as needs and sizes of instructional spaces change. We design for cabling flexibility for future technology where spaces are planned to accommodate and provide for various networking and technology systems, i.e., voice, video and data.

We also study sites in-depth, planning and allowing for multiple future additions or varying campus configurations. Hayes Larges Architects recently completed a new elementary school which was designed to accommodate the district’s needs for a future middle school by selectively oversizing and designing core areas to accept changes (multi-purpose rooms, media centers, administration, laboratories, etc.).

(Signed) S. Derrick Mozingo, Jr., Principal

Firm: S. Derrick Mozingo Associates
Address: 618 Chestnut Road, Suite 205
Myrtle Beach, SC 29572
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT
1600 9th. Avenue
CONWAY, SOUTH CAROLINA 29526
April 27, 1994

MEMO TO: Bruce Rush, Ferrell Lee, Helen Smith, Irvin Anderson, Gary Smith and Richard Heath, Members of the Architect Selection Committee for the Phase I Building Program - $98.4 Projects

FROM: Eddie Rodelsperger

SUBJECT: Architect Selection

Enclosed herewith please find one copy of the proposal from each firm submitting a response to our request for proposal for the Phase I Building Program. I am also enclosing a rating sheet for each firm. Please review and rate the proposals prior to the Architect Selection Committee meeting which is scheduled for Monday, May 9, 1994 at 5:00 p.m. The meeting will be held in the District Office Conference Room on 9th Avenue. Please bring the Proposals and the rating sheets with you to this meeting.

Should you have any questions, please let me know.

rgs
Enclosures
Horry County Schools
Architect Selection - 98.4 Projects

Short List Criteria

Firm Name: Boney Architects

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   Total Points Awarded: 15

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   Total Points Awarded: 0

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   Total Points Awarded: 8

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   Total Points Awarded: 8

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   Total Points Awarded: 5

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   Total Points Awarded: 14

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   Total Points Awarded: 14

Grand Total Items 1-7 (Maximum 100 Points)

Total Points Awarded: 64

Item III Exhibit D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: CNGH/Tych - Associated Architects

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 15

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 6

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
FIRM NAME: Carter Architecture, Inc.

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.  
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 4

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).  
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

5. Firm’s response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget  
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.  
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7  
(Maximum 100 Points) 19

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Dynamic Design Engineering, Inc.  

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.  
(Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)  

TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.  
(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)  

TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.  
(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)  

TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 2

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).  
Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded  

TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).  
(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)  

TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:  
   a) Understanding of Program  
   b) Willingness to meet schedule  
   c) Commitment to budget  
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)  

TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.  
(Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)  

TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7  
(Maximum 100 Points)  
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ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Cummings & McCrady, Inc.

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 2

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 4

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 2

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 2

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 2

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
(Maximum 100 Points)

12

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: The FWA Group

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 16

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 6

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
a) Understanding of Program
b) Willingness to meet schedule
c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 12

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 14

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Fuller, Ward & Associates, AIA, pa

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 15

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 12
   GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7
   (Maximum 100 Points)
   61

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
FIRM NAME: GMK Associates, Inc.

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years. (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 18

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases. (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel. (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42). (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 6

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45). (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 4

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 12

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal. (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 12

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7
(Maximum 100 Points)

60
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Glick/Boehm & Associates, Inc.

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 2

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 2

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 2

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Steven Goggans & Associates

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 4

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 2

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 2

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 2

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7
(Maximum 100 Points)

10

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
FIRM NAME: Goff-D'Antonio Associates

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 2

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 2

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 2

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 2

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Jenkins, Hancock & Sides

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 18

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 6

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 6

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7
(Maximum 100 Points)

58

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Hayes, Seay, Mattern & Mattern, Inc.

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 18

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 6

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 16

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 16

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
**FIRM NAME:** LS3P Architects

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   **TOTAL POINTS AWARDED** 18

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   **TOTAL POINTS AWARDED** 6

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   **TOTAL POINTS AWARDED** 8

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   **TOTAL POINTS AWARDED** 8

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   **TOTAL POINTS AWARDED** 8

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   **TOTAL POINTS AWARDED** 16

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   **TOTAL POINTS AWARDED** 18

**GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7**
(Maximum 100 Points)

82

**ITEM III EXHIBIT D**
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

**FIRM NAME:** Jumper Stewart Carter Sease Architects, PA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years. (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases. (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Education, training and experience of project personnel. (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42). Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45). (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Proposal demonstrates the following: a) Understanding of Program b) Willingness to meet schedule c) Commitment to budget (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Professionalism and completeness of Proposal. (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7** (Maximum 100 Points) 16
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: MJA, Inc. Architects

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 6

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 4

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 4

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Martin Boal Anthony & Johnson, Architects

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.  
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED: 18

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED: 6

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED: 6

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).  
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED: 4

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED: 4

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:  
   a) Understanding of Program  
   b) Willingness to meet schedule  
   c) Commitment to budget  
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED: 8

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.  
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED: 12

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7  
(Maximum 100 Points)  

58

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Pegram Associates, Inc. Architects in association w/
Cooper Carry & Associates, Inc.

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
(Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 6

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
(Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
(Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 12

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
(Maximum 100 Points)

59

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME:  S. Derrick Mozingo Associates

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.  
(Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  18

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.  
(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  0

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.  
(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  10

4. Firm’s response to prototype design (Question #42).  
(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  8

5. Firm’s response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).  
(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  8

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:  
a) Understanding of Program  
b) Willingness to meet schedule  
c) Commitment to budget  
(Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  12

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.  
(Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  15

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7  
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS  
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS  

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Stevens & Wilkinson, Inc.

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.  
(Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  8

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.  
(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  0

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.  
(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  6

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).  
Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  4

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).  
(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  6

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program  
   b) Willingness to meet schedule  
   c) Commitment to budget  
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  10

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.  
(Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  12

   GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7  
   (Maximum 100 Points)

   46

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Rosenblum & Associates Architects, Inc.

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years. (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 2

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases. (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel. (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 2

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42). Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 2

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45). (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 2

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal. (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 2

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7 (Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Usty Wolfe Koll Architecture

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
(Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 12

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 6

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 15

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 14

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
(Maximum 100 Points)

71

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Thomas & Denzinger, Architects

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 4

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 4

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 2

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 2

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 4

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SHORT LIST CRITERIA</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FIRM NAME: Williams &amp; Associates, Architects-Engineers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years. (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases. (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Education, training and experience of project personnel. (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42). (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45). (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Proposal demonstrates the following: a) Understanding of Program b) Willingness to meet schedule c) Commitment to budget (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Professionalism and completeness of Proposal. (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7 (Maximum 100 Points)</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
FIRM NAME: Wilkins Wood Goforth Pike Associates, Ltd.

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years. (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 14

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases. (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel. (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42). (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45). (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 18

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal. (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 16

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7 (Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Carter Architecture, Inc.

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED
   
2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED
   
3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED
   
4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED
   
5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED
   
6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED
   
7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED
   
GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRy COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Boney Architects

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  10

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  0

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  6

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  10

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  5

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program  
   b) Willingness to meet schedule  
   c) Commitment to budget  
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  12

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  10

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
(Maximum 100 Points)  
52

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: CNGH/Tych - Associated Architects

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 15

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 7

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 7

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 15

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Cummings & McCrady, Inc.

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 4

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

4. Firm’s response to prototype design (Question #42).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 1

5. Firm’s response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 1

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
Horry County Schools
Architect Selection - 98.4 Projects

Short List Criteria

Firm Name: Dynamic Design Engineering, Inc.

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   Total Points Awarded

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up to Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   Total Points Awarded

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up to Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   Total Points Awarded

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   (Up to Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   Total Points Awarded

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up to Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   Total Points Awarded

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   Total Points Awarded

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   Total Points Awarded

   Grand Total Items 1-7
   (Maximum 100 Points)

Item III Exhibit D
SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Fuller, Ward & Associates, AIA.

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED: 14

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED: 0

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED: 4

4. Firm’s response to prototype design (Question #42).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED: 5

5. Firm’s response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED: 5

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED: 14

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED: 14

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7
(Maximum 100 Points)

TOTAL POINTS AWARDED: 56

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: The FWA Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years. (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases. (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Education, training and experience of project personnel. (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42). (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45). (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6    | Proposal demonstrates the following:  
  a) Understanding of Program  
  b) Willingness to meet schedule  
  c) Commitment to budget. (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded) | 15             |
| 7    | Professionalism and completeness of Proposal. (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded) | 57             |

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7 (Maximum 100 Points) 82

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Education, training and experience of project personnel.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Proposal demonstrates the following:</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a)    Understanding of Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b)    Willingness to meet schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c)    Commitment to budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total Items 1-7**

(Maximum 100 Points)

**Total Points Awarded:** 74
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: GMK Associates, Inc.

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 15

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 6

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

4. Firm’s response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

5. Firm’s response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 7

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 14

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 17

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7
(Maximum 100 Points)

77

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Goff-D'Antonio Associates

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Steven Goggans & Associates

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 2

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 7

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 2

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 11

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 12

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Hayes, Seay, Mattern & Mattern, Inc.

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded) TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded) TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 1

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded) TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 6

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded) TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded) TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 11

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded) TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 12

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
(Maximum 100 Points) 50

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
## SHORT LIST CRITERIA

**FIRM NAME:** Jenkins, Hancock & Sides

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Education, training and experience of project personnel.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Proposal demonstrates the following:</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Understanding of Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Willingness to meet schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Commitment to budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7**

(Maximum 100 Points)
FIRM NAME: Jumper Stewart Carter Sease Architects, PA

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: LS3P Architects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Education, training and experience of project personnel.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Proposal demonstrates the following:</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Understanding of Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Willingness to meet schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Commitment to budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7 (Maximum 100 Points) 93

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
FIRM NAME: Martin Boal Anthony & Johnson, Architects

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years. (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 14

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases. (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel. (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42). (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 9

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45). (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 16

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal. (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 16

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7 (Maximum 100 Points)
TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 76

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: MJA, Inc. Architects

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 12

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 3

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 6

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 6

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 3

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 12

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 12

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORR Y COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: S. Derrick Mozingo Associates

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 2.0

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 9

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 19

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 18

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA


1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 15

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 3

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 6

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 9

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 15

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 17

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7 (Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Rosenblum & Associates Architects, Inc.

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 2

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 6

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 9

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 11

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Stevens & Wilkinson, Inc.

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
(Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

4. Firm’s response to prototype design (Question #42).
(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

5. Firm’s response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
(Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
(Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Thomas & Denzinger, Architects

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 4

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 2

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 7

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 4

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 11

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 12

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Usry Wolfe Koll Architecture

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 12

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 7

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 6

4. Firm’s response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 9

5. Firm’s response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 17

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 17

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Wilkins Wood Goforth Pike Associates, Ltd.

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 16

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 6

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 7

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 6

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 13

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 12

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Williams & Associates, Architects-Engineers

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 3

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 7

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 2

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 2

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 9

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 9

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
(Maximum 100 Points)

37

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
FIRM NAME: Boney Architects

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years. (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 16

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases. (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel. (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 2

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42). (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45). (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 6

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 14

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal. (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 14

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7 (Maximum 100 Points) 67

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
**HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS**  
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS  

**SHORT LIST CRITERIA**

**FIRM NAME:** Carter Architecture, Inc.

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.  
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)  
   
   **TOTAL POINTS AWARDED**  
   
2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)  
   
   **TOTAL POINTS AWARDED**  
   
3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)  
   
   **TOTAL POINTS AWARDED**  
   
4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).  
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded  
   
   **TOTAL POINTS AWARDED**  
   
5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)  
   
   **TOTAL POINTS AWARDED**  
   
6. Proposal demonstrates the following:  
   a) Understanding of Program  
   b) Willingness to meet schedule  
   c) Commitment to budget  
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)  
   
   **TOTAL POINTS AWARDED**  
   
7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.  
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)  
   
   **TOTAL POINTS AWARDED**  
   
**GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7**  
(Maximum 100 Points)  

**ITEM III EXHIBIT D**
## SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: CNGH/Tych - Associated Architects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years. (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases. (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Education, training and experience of project personnel. (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42). Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45). (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Proposal demonstrates the following: a) Understanding of Program b) Willingness to meet schedule c) Commitment to budget (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Professionalism and completeness of Proposal. (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7 (Maximum 100 Points) | 63 |

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Cummings & McCrady, Inc.

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  10

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  3

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  7

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  8

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  3

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  15

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  13

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7
(Maximum 100 Points)  62

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Dynamic Design Engineering, Inc.

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.  
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).  
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget  
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.  
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

   GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7  
   (Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Fuller, Ward & Associates, AIA, pa

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 17

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 4

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 7

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 3

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 15

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 15

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: The FWA Group

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years. (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 12

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases. (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 6

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel. (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

4. Firm’s response to prototype design (Question #42). Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

5. Firm’s response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45). (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 6

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:  
   a) Understanding of Program  
   b) Willingness to meet schedule  
   c) Commitment to budget (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 14

7. Professionalism-and completeness of Proposal. (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 15

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7 (Maximum 100 Points) 68

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Glick/Boehm & Associates, Inc.

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 15

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 4

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 6

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 12

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 12

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7 (Maximum 100 Points) 59

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
SHORT LIST CRITERIA

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.  
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 17

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 7

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 6

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:  
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget  
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 15

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.  
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 15

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7  
(Maximum 100 Points)

76

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Goff-D’Antonio Associates

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years. (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases. (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel. (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42). Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45). (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal. (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7 (Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Steven Goggans & Associates

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 17

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 6

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 18

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 4

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 15

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
## SHORT LIST CRITERIA

**FIRM NAME:** Hayes, Seay, Mattern & Mattern, Inc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years. (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases. (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Education, training and experience of project personnel. (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42). (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45). (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6.   | Proposal demonstrates the following:  
   a) Understanding of Program  
   b) Willingness to meet schedule  
   c) Commitment to budget (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded) | 14 |
| 7.   | Professionalism and completeness of Proposal. (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded) | 12 |

**GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7** (Maximum 100 Points)  

**ITEM III EXHIBIT D**
FIRM NAME: Jenkins, Hancock & Sides

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.  
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 6

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 6

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).  
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 7

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 6

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:  
   a) Understanding of Program  
   b) Willingness to meet schedule  
   c) Commitment to budget  
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 12

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.  
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 17

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7  
(Maximum 100 Points)  

59

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Jumper Stewart Carter Sease Architects, PA

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 15

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 4

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
(Maximum 100 Points)

54

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
**SHORT LIST CRITERIA**

**FIRM NAME:** LS3P Architects

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.  
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   
   **TOTAL POINTS AWARDED**

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   
   **TOTAL POINTS AWARDED**

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   
   **TOTAL POINTS AWARDED**

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).  
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   
   **TOTAL POINTS AWARDED**

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   
   **TOTAL POINTS AWARDED**

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:  
   a) Understanding of Program  
   b) Willingness to meet schedule  
   c) Commitment to budget  
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   
   **TOTAL POINTS AWARDED**

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.  
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   
   **TOTAL POINTS AWARDED**

**GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7**  
(Maximum 100 Points)

**ITEM III EXHIBIT D**
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Martin Boal Anthony & Johnson, Architects

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 15

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 4

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 7

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 6

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 7

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7
(Maximum 100 Points)
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ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: MJA, Inc. Architects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#45).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Proposal demonstrates the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Understanding of Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Willingness to meet schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Commitment to budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

16 + 5 + 6 + 2 + 7 + 17 = 67

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
FIRM NAME: S. Derrick Mozingo Associates

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.  
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 15

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 7

4. Firm’s response to prototype design (Question #42).  
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 6

5. Firm’s response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:  
   a) Understanding of Program  
   b) Willingness to meet schedule  
   c) Commitment to budget  
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 17

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.  
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 17

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7  
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
SHORT LIST CRITERIA


1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years. (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 16

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases. (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel. (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 7

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42). (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45). (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 7

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 17

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal. (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 17

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: _Rosenblum & Associates Architects, Inc._

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 4

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 4

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 6

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 6

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 15

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 14

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
(Maximum 100 Points)
TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 57

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Stevens & Wilkinson, Inc.

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 15

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 7

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Thomas & Denzinger, Architects

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years. (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases. (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel. (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 6

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42). Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 7

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45). (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 12

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal. (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

   GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7 (Maximum 100 Points)
   35

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Usry Wolfe Koll Architecture

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 7

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 7

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
      (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
      TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 20

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 13

   GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7
   (Maximum 100 Points)

   ITEM III EXHIBIT D
SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Wilkins Wood Goforth Pike Associates, Ltd.

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.  
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 20

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 9

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:  
   a) Understanding of Program  
   b) Willingness to meet schedule  
   c) Commitment to budget  
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 20

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.  
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 19

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7  
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Williams & Associates, Architects-Engineers

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 12

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 3

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 4

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
(Maximum 100 Points)
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FIRM NAME: Carter Architecture, Inc.

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.  
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 3

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).  
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:  
   a) Understanding of Program  
   b) Willingness to meet schedule  
   c) Commitment to budget  
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 15

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.  
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7  
(Maximum 100 Points) 46

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
FIRM NAME: Boney Architects

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
(Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 20

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED ? 3

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 7

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
(Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 18

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
(Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 20

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
(Maximum 100 Points)

88

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: LS3P Architects

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 20

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 20

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 20

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Jumper Stewart Carter Sease Architects, PA

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED __________

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED __________

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED __________

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED __________

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED __________

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED __________

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED __________

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Jenkins, Hancock & Sides

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED __________

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED __________

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED __________

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED __________

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED __________

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED __________

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED __________

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: ____________ Hayes, Seay, Mattern & Mattern, Inc. ____________

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED ____________

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED ____________

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED ____________

4. Firm’s response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED ____________

5. Firm’s response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED ____________

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED ____________

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED ____________

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS  
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS  

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Steven Goggans & Associates

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.  
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  10

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  10

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).  
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  5

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  5

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:  
   a) Understanding of Program  
   b) Willingness to meet schedule  
   c) Commitment to budget  
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  20

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.  
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  15

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7  
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Goff-D'Antonio Associates

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: GMK Associates, Inc.

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Glick/Boehm & Associates, Inc.

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRy COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: The FWA Group

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Fuller, Ward & Associates, AIA, pa

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Dynamic Design Engineering, Inc.

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Cummings & McCrady, Inc.

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED __________

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED __________

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED __________

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED __________

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED __________

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED __________

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED __________

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: CNGH/Tych - Associated Architects

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

4. Firm’s response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

5. Firm’s response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Carter Architecture, Inc.

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Boney Architects

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.</td>
<td>(Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td>TOTAL POINTS AWARDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.</td>
<td>(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td>TOTAL POINTS AWARDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Education, training and experience of project personnel.</td>
<td>(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td>TOTAL POINTS AWARDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).</td>
<td>Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded</td>
<td>TOTAL POINTS AWARDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes</td>
<td>(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td>TOTAL POINTS AWARDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Question #45).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Proposal demonstrates the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Understanding of Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Willingness to meet schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Commitment to budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td>TOTAL POINTS AWARDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.</td>
<td>(Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)</td>
<td>TOTAL POINTS AWARDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7</td>
<td>(Maximum 100 Points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ITEM III EXHIBIT D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Williams & Associates, Architects-Engineers

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

4. Firm’s response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

5. Firm’s response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
a) Understanding of Program
b) Willingness to meet schedule
c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7
(Maximum 100 Points)

46

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
FIRM NAME: Wilkins Wood Goforth Pike Associates, Ltd.

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
a) Understanding of Program
b) Willingness to meet schedule
c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
(Maximum 100 Points)  

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Usry Wolfe Koll Architecture

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  18

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  2

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  10

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  8

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  5

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  18

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  20

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
FIRM NAME: Thomas & Denzinger, Architects

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.  
(Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 15

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.  
(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.  
(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).  
Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).  
(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a)  Understanding of Program
   b)  Willingness to meet schedule
   c)  Commitment to budget  
(Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 18

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.  
(Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 15

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7  
(Maximum 100 Points) 68

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS  
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS  

SHORT LIST CRITERIA  

FIRM NAME: Stevens & Wilkinson, Inc.  

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.  
(Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)  

TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  17  

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.  
(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)  

TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  3  

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.  
(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)  

TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  10  

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).  
(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)  

TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  10  

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).  
(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)  

TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  5  

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:  
a) Understanding of Program  
b) Willingness to meet schedule  
c) Commitment to budget  
(Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)  

TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  17  

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.  
(Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)  

TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  20  

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7  
(Maximum 100 Points)  

82  

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Rosenblum & Associates Architects, Inc.

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
(Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 2

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 15

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
(Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 15

   GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7
   (Maximum 100 Points)

   ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA


1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years. (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 19

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases. (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 3

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel. (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42). Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45). (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 20

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal. (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 20

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7 (Maximum 100 Points) 92

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: S. Derrick Mozingo Associates

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 17

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 20

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 20

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
FIRM NAME: MJA, Inc. Architects

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 20

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 7

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 3

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 75

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 15

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
(Maximum 100 Points)

75
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Martin Boal Anthony & Johnson, Architects

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 17

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 20

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 20

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: LS3P Architects

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years. (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 20

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases. (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel. (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42). (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45). (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 20

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal. (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 20

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7 (Maximum 100 Points)
   TOTAL POINTS 96

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Jumper Stewart Carter Sease Architects, PA

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 12

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 2

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 7

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 15

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 15

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7
(Maximum 100 Points)

66

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Jenkins, Hancock & Sides

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years. (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 20

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases. (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 40

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel. (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42). Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 4

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45). (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 6

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 20

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal. (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 20

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7 (Maximum 100 Points)

84

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Hayes, Seay, Mattern & Mattern, Inc.

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 17

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 20

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 20

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Steven Goggans & Associates

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 15

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 7

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 7

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 20

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 20

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Goff-D'Antonio Associates

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 9

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 15

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 15

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
(Maximum 100 Points)
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ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: GMK Associates, Inc.

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 20

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 2

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

4. Firm’s response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

5. Firm’s response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 5

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 16

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 20

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Education, training and experience of project personnel.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Proposal demonstrates the following:</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Understanding of Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Willingness to meet schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Commitment to budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Professionalism and completeness of Proposal</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total Items 1-7**  
(Maximum 100 Points)

**Total Points Awarded**: 39

---

**FIRM NAME**: Glick/Boehm & Associates, Inc.
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: The FWA Group

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.  
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 18

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

4. Firm’s response to prototype design (Question #42).  
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

5. Firm’s response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 9

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:  
   a) Understanding of Program  
   b) Willingness to meet schedule  
   c) Commitment to budget  
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 20

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.  
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)  
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 20

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7  
(Maximum 100 Points)  
93

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Fuller, Ward & Associates, AIA, pa

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 17

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 3

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 7

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 7

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 20

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7 (Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Dynamic Design Engineering, Inc.

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
**HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS**  
**ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS**  

**SHORT LIST CRITERIA**

**FIRM NAME:** Cummings & McCrady, Inc.

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.  
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   **TOTAL POINTS AWARDED** 12

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   **TOTAL POINTS AWARDED** 0

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   **TOTAL POINTS AWARDED** 9

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).  
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded

   **TOTAL POINTS AWARDED** 3

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).  
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   **TOTAL POINTS AWARDED** 2

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:  
   a) Understanding of Program  
   b) Willingness to meet schedule  
   c) Commitment to budget  
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   **TOTAL POINTS AWARDED** 15

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.  
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   **TOTAL POINTS AWARDED** 15

**GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7**  
(Maximum 100 Points)
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HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: CNGH/Tych - Associated Architects

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 20

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 8

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 20

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 20

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
## Horry County Schools
### Architect Selection - 98.4 Projects

#### Short List Criteria

**Firm Name:** Martin Boal Anthony & Johnson, Architects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Description</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, training and experience of project personnel.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal demonstrates the following:</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Understanding of Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Willingness to meet schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Commitment to budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total Items 1 - 7**

(Maximum 100 Points)
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: MIA, Inc. Architects

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
(Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  10

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  0

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
(Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  1

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  6

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  0

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED  15

   GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
   (Maximum 100 Points)

   ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: S. Derrick Mozingo Associates

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 17

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 6

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

4. Firm’s response to prototype design (Question #42).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

5. Firm’s response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 0

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 20

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 20

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years. (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases. (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel. (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42). Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45). (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal. (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7 (Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Rosenblum & Associates Architects, Inc.

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

4. Firm’s response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

5. Firm’s response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
FIRM NAME: Stevens & Wilkinson, Inc.

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years. (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases. (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 6

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel. (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42). Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45). (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal. (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7 (Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Thomas & Denzinger, Architects

| 1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years. | TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 15 |
| (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded) |

| 2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases. | TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 2 |
| (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded) |

| 3. Education, training and experience of project personnel. | TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10 |
| (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded) |

| 4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42). | TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 6 |
| Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded |

| 5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45). | TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10 |
| (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded) |

| 6. Proposal demonstrates the following: |
| a) Understanding of Program |
| b) Willingness to meet schedule |
| c) Commitment to budget |
| (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded) | TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 20 |

| 7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal. | TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 18 |
| (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded) |

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1 - 7 (Maximum 100 Points) 88

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Usry Wolfe Koll Architecture

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Wilkins Wood Goforth Pike Associates, Ltd.

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 20

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 6

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 10

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 6

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 20

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)

   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED 20

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
ARCHITECT SELECTION - 98.4 PROJECTS

SHORT LIST CRITERIA

FIRM NAME: Williams & Associates, Architects-Engineers

1. Previous experience on K-12 Schools within the last five years.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

2. Previous experience with Bond Referendum phases.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

3. Education, training and experience of project personnel.
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

4. Firm's response to prototype design (Question #42).
   Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded
   
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

5. Firm's response to flexibility in design for future changes (Question #45).
   (Up To Ten (10) Points May Be Awarded)
   
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

6. Proposal demonstrates the following:
   a) Understanding of Program
   b) Willingness to meet schedule
   c) Commitment to budget
   (Up to Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

7. Professionalism and completeness of Proposal.
   (Up To Twenty (20) Points May Be Awarded)
   
   TOTAL POINTS AWARDED

GRAND TOTAL ITEMS 1-7
(Maximum 100 Points)

ITEM III EXHIBIT D
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LS3P Architects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkins, Wood, Goforth, Pike</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegram Associates</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derrick Mozingo Assoc</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Boal, Anthony</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usry, Wolfe, Koll</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWA Group</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMK Associates</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNGH/Tych</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens &amp; Wilkinson</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MJA, Inc. Architects</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas &amp; Denzinger</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boney Architects</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Goggans Assoc.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenkins, Hancock, Sides</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes, Sea, Mattern</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuller, Ward &amp; Assoc.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimper, Stewart, Carter</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenblum &amp; Assoc</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goff-D'Antonio</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cummings &amp; McCrady</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams &amp; Assoc</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter Architecture</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glick/Boehm &amp; Assoc</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic Design</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### A. PAST PERFORMANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Maximum: 15 Points</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's overall track record</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reference checks by Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Maximum: 25 Points</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Key individual to program</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Commitment of key individual(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chemistry of key individual(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. WILLINGNESS TO MEET TIME AND BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Maximum: 5 Points</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's approach to maintaining schedule and budget</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Past performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. LOCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Maximum: 10 Points</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's knowledge of Horry County</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How will firm implement program locally?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E. RECENT, CURRENT AND PROJECTED WORK LOADS OF THE FIRM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Maximum: 5 Points</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Work load of key individual</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Resources to staff program adequately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### F. CREATIVITY AND INSIGHT RELATED TO PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Maximum: 25 Points</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Key individual's understanding of all aspects of the program</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unique approaches or ideas in maintaining budgets and schedules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cost savings ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### G. RELATED EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Maximum: 15 Points</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Experience working for a school district as an agent, not a general contractor</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Experience in South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL

Total score: 75 points

---

**ITEM III EXHIBIT F**
### A. PAST PERFORMANCE

1. Firm's overall track record
2. Reference checks by Administration

### B. ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL

1. Key individual to program
2. Commitment of key individual(s)
3. Chemistry of key individual(s)

### C. WILLINGNESS TO MEET TIME AND BUDGET

1. Firm's approach to maintaining schedule and budget
2. Past performance

### D. LOCATION

1. Firm's knowledge of Horry County
2. How will firm implement program locally?

### E. RECENT, CURRENT AND PROJECTED WORK LOADS OF THE FIRM

1. Work load of key individual
2. Resources to staff program adequately

### F. CREATIVITY AND INSIGHT RELATED TO PROJECT

1. Key individual's understanding of all aspects of the program
2. Unique approaches or ideas in maintaining budgets and schedules
3. Cost savings ideas

### G. RELATED EXPERIENCE

1. Experience working for a school district as an agent, not a general contractor
2. Experience in South Carolina

### TOTAL

---

**ITEM III EXHIBIT F**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>A. PAST PERFORMANCE</strong></th>
<th>Maximum: 15 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's overall track record</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reference checks by Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>B. ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL</strong></th>
<th>Maximum: 25 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Key individual to program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Commitment of key individual(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chemistry of key individual(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>C. WILLINGNESS TO MEET TIME AND BUDGET</strong></th>
<th>Maximum: 5 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm’s approach to maintaining schedule and budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Past performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>D. LOCATION</strong></th>
<th>Maximum: 10 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm’s knowledge of Horry County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How will firm implement program locally?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>E. RECENT, CURRENT AND PROJECTED WORK LOADS OF THE FIRM</strong></th>
<th>Maximum: 5 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Work load of key individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Resources to staff program adequately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>F. CREATIVITY AND INSIGHT RELATED TO PROJECT</strong></th>
<th>Maximum: 25 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Key individual’s understanding of all aspects of the program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unique approaches or ideas in maintaining budgets and schedules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cost savings ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>G. RELATED EXPERIENCE</strong></th>
<th>Maximum: 15 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Experience working for a school district as an agent, not a general contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Experience in South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TOTAL</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**ITEM III EXHIBIT F**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Maximum Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. PAST PERFORMANCE</td>
<td>1. Firm's overall track record 2. Reference checks by Administration</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL</td>
<td>1. Key individual to program 2. Commitment of key individual(s) 3. Chemistry of key individual(s)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. WILLINGNESS TO MEET TIME AND BUDGET</td>
<td>1. Firm's approach to maintaining schedule and budget 2. Past performance</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. LOCATION</td>
<td>1. Firm's knowledge of Horry County 2. How will firm implement program locally?</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. RECENT, CURRENT AND PROJECTED WORK LOADS OF THE FIRM</td>
<td>1. Work load of key individual 2. Resources to staff program adequately</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. CREATIVITY AND INSIGHT RELATED TO PROJECT</td>
<td>1. Key individual's understanding of all aspects of the program 2. Unique approaches or ideas in maintaining budgets and schedules 3. Cost savings ideas</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. RELATED EXPERIENCE</td>
<td>1. Experience working for a school district as an agent, not a general contractor 2. Experience in South Carolina</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. PAST PERFORMANCE</strong></td>
<td><strong>Maximum: 15 Points</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's overall track record</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reference checks by Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>B. ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL</strong></th>
<th><strong>Maximum: 25 Points</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Key individual to program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Commitment of key individual(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chemistry of key individual(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>C. WILLINGNESS TO MEET TIME AND BUDGET</strong></th>
<th><strong>Maximum: 5 Points</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's approach to maintaining schedule and budget</td>
<td><strong>Process book</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Past performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>D. LOCATION</strong></th>
<th><strong>Maximum: 10 Points</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's knowledge of Horry County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How will firm implement program locally?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>E. RECENT, CURRENT AND PROJECTED WORK LOADS OF THE FIRM</strong></th>
<th><strong>Maximum: 5 Points</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Work load of key individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Resources to staff program adequately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>F. CREATIVITY AND INSIGHT RELATED TO PROJECT</strong></th>
<th><strong>Maximum: 25 Points</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Key individual's understanding of all aspects of the program</td>
<td><strong>Responsibility index</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unique approaches or ideas in maintaining budgets and schedules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cost savings ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>G. RELATED EXPERIENCE</strong></th>
<th><strong>Maximum: 15 Points</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Experience working for a school district as an agent, not a general contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Experience in South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| <strong>TOTAL</strong>                                                                              |                        |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. PAST PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>Maximum: 15 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's overall track record</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reference checks by Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL</th>
<th>Maximum: 25 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Key individual to program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Commitment of key individual(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chemistry of key individual(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. WILLINGNESS TO MEET TIME AND BUDGET</th>
<th>Maximum: 5 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's approach to maintaining schedule and budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Past performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. LOCATION</th>
<th>Maximum: 10 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's knowledge of Horry County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How will firm implement program locally?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. RECENT, CURRENT AND PROJECTED WORK LOADS OF THE FIRM</th>
<th>Maximum: 5 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Work load of key individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Resources to staff program adequately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F. CREATIVITY AND INSIGHT RELATED TO PROJECT</th>
<th>Maximum: 25 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Key individual's understanding of all aspects of the program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unique approaches or ideas in maintaining budgets and schedules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cost savings ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G. RELATED EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>Maximum: 15 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Experience working for a school district as an agent, not a general contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Experience in South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ITEM III EXHIBIT F
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. PAST PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>Maximum: 15 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's overall track record</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reference checks by Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL</th>
<th>Maximum: 25 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Key individual to program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Commitment of key individual(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chemistry of key individual(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. WILLINGNESS TO MEET TIME AND BUDGET</th>
<th>Maximum: 5 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's approach to maintaining schedule and budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Past performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. LOCATION</th>
<th>Maximum: 10 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's knowledge of Horry County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How will firm implement program locally?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. RECENT, CURRENT AND PROJECTED WORK LOADS OF THE FIRM</th>
<th>Maximum: 5 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Work load of key individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Resources to staff program adequately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F. CREATIVITY AND INSIGHT RELATED TO PROJECT</th>
<th>Maximum: 25 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Key individual's understanding of all aspects of the program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unique approaches or ideas in maintaining budgets and schedules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cost savings ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G. RELATED EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>Maximum: 15 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Experience working for a school district as an agent, not a general contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Experience in South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| TOTAL |  |
|-------|  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Maximum Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. PAST PERFORMANCE</td>
<td>1. Firm’s overall track record</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Reference checks by Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL</td>
<td>1. Key individual to program</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Commitment of key individual(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Chemistry of key individual(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. WILLINGNESS TO MEET TIME AND BUDGET</td>
<td>1. Firm’s approach to maintaining schedule and budget</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Past performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. LOCATION</td>
<td>1. Firm’s knowledge of Horry County</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. How will firm implement program locally?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. RECENT, CURRENT AND PROJECTED WORK LOADS OF THE FIRM</td>
<td>1. Work load of key individual</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Resources to staff program adequately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. CREATIVITY AND INSIGHT RELATED TO PROJECT</td>
<td>1. Key individual’s understanding of all aspects of the program</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Unique approaches or ideas in maintaining budgets and schedules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Cost savings ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. RELATED EXPERIENCE</td>
<td>1. Experience working for a school district as an agent, not a general contractor</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Experience in South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**
### A. PAST PERFORMANCE
1. Firm’s overall track record
2. Reference checks by Administration

### B. ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL
1. Key individual to program
2. Commitment of key individual(s)
3. Chemistry of key individual(s)

### C. WILLINGNESS TO MEET TIME AND BUDGET
1. Firm’s approach to maintaining schedule and budget
2. Past performance

### D. LOCATION
1. Firm’s knowledge of Horry County
2. How will firm implement program locally?

### E. RECENT, CURRENT AND PROJECTED WORK LOADS OF THE FIRM
1. Work load of key individual
2. Resources to staff program adequately

### F. CREATIVITY AND INSIGHT RELATED TO PROJECT
1. Key individual’s understanding of all aspects of the program
2. Unique approaches or ideas in maintaining budgets and schedules
3. Cost savings ideas

### G. RELATED EXPERIENCE
1. Experience working for a school district as an agent, not a general contractor
2. Experience in South Carolina

### TOTAL

---

**ITEM III EXHIBIT F**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>A. PAST PERFORMANCE</strong></th>
<th>Maximum: 15 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's overall track record</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reference checks by Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>B. ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL</strong></th>
<th>Maximum: 25 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Key individual to program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Commitment of key individual(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chemistry of key individual(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>C. WILLINGNESS TO MEET TIME AND BUDGET</strong></th>
<th>Maximum: 5 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's approach to maintaining schedule and budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Past performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>D. LOCATION</strong></th>
<th>Maximum: 10 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's knowledge of Horry County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How will firm implement program locally?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>E. RECENT, CURRENT AND PROJECTED WORK LOADS OF THE FIRM</strong></th>
<th>Maximum: 5 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Work load of key individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Resources to staff program adequately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>F. CREATIVITY AND INSIGHT RELATED TO PROJECT</strong></th>
<th>Maximum: 25 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Key individual's understanding of all aspects of the program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unique approaches or ideas in maintaining budgets and schedules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cost savings ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>G. RELATED EXPERIENCE</strong></th>
<th>Maximum: 15 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Experience working for a school district as an agent, not a general contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Experience in South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **TOTAL** | |
|-----------| |

*ITEM III EXHIBIT F*
### A. PAST PERFORMANCE
- Firm's overall track record
- Reference checks by Administration

| Maximum: 15 Points |

### B. ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL
- Key individual to program
- Commitment of key individual(s)
- Chemistry of key individual(s)

| Maximum: 25 Points |

### C. WILLINGNESS TO MEET TIME AND BUDGET
- Firm’s approach to maintaining schedule and budget
- Past performance

| Maximum: 5 Points |

### D. LOCATION
- Firm’s knowledge of Horry County
- How will firm implement program locally?

| Maximum: 10 Points |

### E. RECENT, CURRENT AND PROJECTED WORK LOADS OF THE FIRM
- Work load of key individual
- Resources to staff program adequately

| Maximum: 5 Points |

### F. CREATIVITY AND INSIGHT RELATED TO PROJECT
- Key individual’s understanding of all aspects of the program
- Unique approaches or ideas in maintaining budgets and schedules
- Cost savings ideas

| Maximum: 25 Points |

### G. RELATED EXPERIENCE
- Experience working for a school district as an agent, not a general contractor
- Experience in South Carolina

| Maximum: 15 Points |

### TOTAL

**ITEM III EXHIBIT F**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. PAST PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>Maximum: 15 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's overall track record</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reference checks by Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL</th>
<th>Maximum: 25 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Key individual to program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Commitment of key individual(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chemistry of key individual(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. WILLINGNESS TO MEET TIME AND BUDGET</th>
<th>Maximum: 5 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's approach to maintaining schedule and budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Past performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. LOCATION</th>
<th>Maximum: 10 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. RECENT, CURRENT AND PROJECTED WORK LOADS OF THE FIRM</th>
<th>Maximum: 5 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Work load of key individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Resources to staff program adequately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F. CREATIVITY AND INSIGHT RELATED TO PROJECT</th>
<th>Maximum: 25 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Key individual's understanding of all aspects of the program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unique approaches or ideas in maintaining budgets and schedules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cost savings ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G. RELATED EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>Maximum: 15 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Experience working for a school district as an agent, not a general contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Experience in South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**
### Firm: MB Kahn

### Scorer: RSH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>A. PAST PERFORMANCE</strong></th>
<th>Maximum: 15 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's overall track record</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reference checks by Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>B. ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL</strong></th>
<th>Maximum: 25 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Key individual to program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Commitment of key individual(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chemistry of key individual(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>C. WILLINGNESS TO MEET TIME AND BUDGET</strong></th>
<th>Maximum: 5 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's approach to maintaining schedule and budget</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Past performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>D. LOCATION</strong></th>
<th>Maximum: 10 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's knowledge of Horry County</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How will firm implement program locally?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>E. RECENT, CURRENT AND PROJECTED WORK LOADS OF THE FIRM</strong></th>
<th>Maximum: 5 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Work load of key individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Resources to staff program adequately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>F. CREATIVITY AND INSIGHT RELATED TO PROJECT</strong></th>
<th>Maximum: 25 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Key individual’s understanding of all aspects of the program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unique approaches or ideas in maintaining budgets and schedules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cost savings ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>G. RELATED EXPERIENCE</strong></th>
<th>Maximum: 15 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Experience working for a school district as an agent, not a general contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Experience in South Carolina</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL

3

**ITEM III EXHIBIT F**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. PAST PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>Maximum: 15 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's overall track record</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reference checks by Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL</th>
<th>Maximum: 25 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Key individual to program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Commitment of key individual(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chemistry of key individual(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. WILLINGNESS TO MEET TIME AND BUDGET</th>
<th>Maximum: 5 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's approach to maintaining schedule and budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Past performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. LOCATION</th>
<th>Maximum: 10 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's knowledge of Horry County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How will firm implement program locally?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. RECENT, CURRENT AND PROJECTED WORK LOADS OF THE FIRM</th>
<th>Maximum: 5 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Work load of key individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Resources to staff program adequately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F. CREATIVITY AND INSIGHT RELATED TO PROJECT</th>
<th>Maximum: 25 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Key individual's understanding of all aspects of the program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unique approaches or ideas in maintaining budgets and schedules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cost savings ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G. RELATED EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>Maximum: 15 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Experience working for a school district as an agent, not a general contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Experience in South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL

ITEM III EXHIBIT F
### A. PAST PERFORMANCE
1. Firm's overall track record
2. Reference checks by Administration

### Maximum: 15 Points

### B. ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL
1. Key individual to program
2. Commitment of key individual(s)
3. Chemistry of key individual(s)

### Maximum: 25 Points

### C. WILLINGNESS TO MEET TIME AND BUDGET
1. Firm's approach to maintaining schedule and budget
2. Past performance

### Maximum: 5 Points

### D. LOCATION
1. Firm's knowledge of Horry County
2. How will firm implement program locally?

### Maximum: 10 Points

### E. RECENT, CURRENT AND PROJECTED WORK LOADS OF THE FIRM
1. Work load of key individual
2. Resources to staff program adequately

### Maximum: 5 Points

### F. CREATIVITY AND INSIGHT RELATED TO PROJECT
1. Key individual's understanding of all aspects of the program
2. Unique approaches or ideas in maintaining budgets and schedules
3. Cost savings ideas

### Maximum: 25 Points

### G. RELATED EXPERIENCE
1. Experience working for a school district as an agent, not a general contractor
2. Experience in South Carolina

### Maximum: 15 Points

### TOTAL

---

**ITEM III EXHIBIT F**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. PAST PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>Maximum: 15 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's overall track record</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reference checks by Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL</td>
<td>Maximum: 25 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Key individual to program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Commitment of key individual(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chemistry of key individual(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. WILLINGNESS TO MEET TIME AND BUDGET</td>
<td>Maximum: 5 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's approach to maintaining schedule and budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Past performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. LOCATION</td>
<td>Maximum: 10 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's knowledge of Horry County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How will firm implement program locally?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. RECENT, CURRENT AND PROJECTED WORK LOADS OF THE FIRM</td>
<td>Maximum: 5 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Work load of key individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Resources to staff program adequately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. CREATIVITY AND INSIGHT RELATED TO PROJECT</td>
<td>Maximum: 25 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Key individual's understanding of all aspects of the program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unique approaches or ideas in maintaining budgets and schedules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cost savings ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. RELATED EXPERIENCE</td>
<td>Maximum: 15 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Experience working for a school district as an agent, not a general contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Experience in South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. PAST PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>Maximum: 15 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's overall track record</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reference checks by Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL</th>
<th>Maximum: 25 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Key individual to program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Commitment of key individual(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chemistry of key individual(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. WILLINGNESS TO MEET TIME AND BUDGET</th>
<th>Maximum: 5 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's approach to maintaining schedule and budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Past performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. LOCATION</th>
<th>Maximum: 10 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's knowledge of Horry County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How will firm implement program locally?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. RECENT, CURRENT AND PROJECTED WORK LOADS OF THE FIRM</th>
<th>Maximum: 5 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Work load of key individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Resources to staff program adequately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F. CREATIVITY AND INSIGHT RELATED TO PROJECT</th>
<th>Maximum: 25 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Key individual's understanding of all aspects of the program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unique approaches or ideas in maintaining budgets and schedules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cost savings ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G. RELATED EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>Maximum: 15 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Experience working for a school district as an agent, not a general contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Experience in South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**
### A. PAST PERFORMANCE
- 1. Firm's overall track record
- 2. Reference checks by Administration

### B. ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL
- 1. Key individual to program
- 2. Commitment of key individual(s)
- 3. Chemistry of key individual(s)

### C. WILLINGNESS TO MEET TIME AND BUDGET
- 1. Firm's approach to maintaining schedule and budget
- 2. Past performance

### D. LOCATION
- 1. Firm's knowledge of Horry County
- 2. How will firm implement program locally?

### E. RECENT, CURRENT AND PROJECTED WORK LOADS OF THE FIRM
- 1. Work load of key individual
- 2. Resources to staff program adequately

### F. CREATIVITY AND INSIGHT RELATED TO PROJECT
- 1. Key individual's understanding of all aspects of the program
- 2. Unique approaches or ideas in maintaining budgets and schedules
- 3. Cost savings ideas

### G. RELATED EXPERIENCE
- 1. Experience working for a school district as an agent, not a general contractor
- 2. Experience in South Carolina

### TOTAL

---

**ITEM III EXHIBIT F**
**Firm:** Heery Int'l

**Scorer:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Maximum Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A. PAST PERFORMANCE | Firm's overall track record  
Reference checks by Administration | 15 |
| B. ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL | 1. Key individual to program  
2. Commitment of key individual(s)  
3. Chemistry of key individual(s) | 25 |
| C. WILLINGNESS TO MEET TIME AND BUDGET | 1. Firm's approach to maintaining schedule and budget  
2. Past performance | 5 |
| D. LOCATION | 1. Firm's knowledge of Horry County  
2. How will firm implement program locally? | 10 |
| E. RECENT, CURRENT AND PROJECTED WORK LOADS OF THE FIRM | 1. Work load of key individual  
2. Resources to staff program adequately | 5 |
| F. CREATIVITY AND INSIGHT RELATED TO PROJECT | 1. Key individual's understanding of all aspects of the program  
2. Unique approaches or ideas in maintaining budgets and schedules  
3. Cost savings ideas | 25 |
| G. RELATED EXPERIENCE | 1. Experience working for a school district as an agent, not a general contractor  
2. Experience in South Carolina | 15 |
| TOTAL | | |
**Firm:** 3D, Inc.

**Scorer:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. PAST PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>Maximum: 15 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm’s overall track record</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reference checks by Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL</th>
<th>Maximum: 25 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Key individual to program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Commitment of key individual(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chemistry of key individual(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. WILLINGNESS TO MEET TIME AND BUDGET</th>
<th>Maximum: 5 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm’s approach to maintaining schedule and budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Past performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. LOCATION</th>
<th>Maximum: 10 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm’s knowledge of Horry County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How will firm implement program locally?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. RECENT, CURRENT AND PROJECTED WORK LOADS OF THE FIRM</th>
<th>Maximum: 5 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Work load of key individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Resources to staff program adequately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F. CREATIVITY AND INSIGHT RELATED TO PROJECT</th>
<th>Maximum: 25 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Key individual’s understanding of all aspects of the program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unique approaches or ideas in maintaining budgets and schedules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cost savings ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G. RELATED EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>Maximum: 15 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Experience working for a school district as an agent, not a general contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Experience in South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL | |
|-------| |
### A. PAST PERFORMANCE
- 1. Firm's overall track record
- 2. Reference checks by Administration

### B. ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL
- 1. Key individual to program
- 2. Commitment of key individual(s)
- 3. Chemistry of key individual(s)

### C. WILLINGNESS TO MEET TIME AND BUDGET
- 1. Firm's approach to maintaining schedule and budget
- 2. Past performance

### D. LOCATION
- 1. Firm's knowledge of Horry County
- 2. How will firm implement program locally?

### E. RECENT, CURRENT AND PROJECTED WORK LOADS OF THE FIRM
- 1. Work load of key individual
- 2. Resources to staff program adequately

### F. CREATIVITY AND INSIGHT RELATED TO PROJECT
- 1. Key individual's understanding of all aspects of the program
- 2. Unique approaches or ideas in maintaining budgets and schedules
- 3. Cost savings ideas

### G. RELATED EXPERIENCE
- 1. Experience working for a school district as an agent, not a general contractor
- 2. Experience in South Carolina

### TOTAL

**ITEM III EXHIBIT F**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Maximum Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. PAST PERFORMANCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's overall track record</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reference checks by Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Key individual to program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Commitment of key individual(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chemistry of key individual(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. WILLINGNESS TO MEET TIME AND BUDGET</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's approach to maintaining schedule and budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Past performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. LOCATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's knowledge of Horry County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How will firm implement program locally?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. RECENT, CURRENT AND PROJECTED WORK LOADS OF THE FIRM</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Work load of key individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Resources to staff program adequately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. CREATIVITY AND INSIGHT RELATED TO PROJECT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Key individual's understanding of all aspects of the program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unique approaches or ideas in maintaining budgets and schedules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cost savings ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G. RELATED EXPERIENCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Experience working for a school district as an agent, not a general contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Experience in South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. PAST PERFORMANCE  
1. Firm's overall track record  
2. Reference checks by Administration  

B. ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL  
1. Key individual to program  
2. Commitment of key individual(s)  
3. Chemistry of key individual(s)  

C. WILLINGNESS TO MEET TIME AND BUDGET  
1. Firm's approach to maintaining schedule and budget  
2. Past performance  

D. LOCATION  
1. Firm's knowledge of Horry County  
2. How will firm implement program locally?  

E. RECENT, CURRENT AND PROJECTED WORK LOADS OF THE FIRM  
1. Work load of key individual  
2. Resources to staff program adequately  

F. CREATIVITY AND INSIGHT RELATED TO PROJECT  
1. Key individual's understanding of all aspects of the program  
2. Unique approaches or ideas in maintaining budgets and schedules  
3. Cost savings ideas  

G. RELATED EXPERIENCE  
1. Experience working for a school district as an agent, not a general contractor  
2. Experience in South Carolina  

TOTAL  

Maximum: 15 Points  
Maximum: 25 Points  
Maximum: 5 Points  
Maximum: 10 Points  
Maximum: 5 Points  
Maximum: 25 Points  
Maximum: 15 Points  

ITEM III EXHIBIT F
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Maximum Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A. PAST PERFORMANCE | 1. Firm's overall track record  
2. Reference checks by Administration | 15 |
| B. ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL | 1. Key individual to program  
2. Commitment of key individual(s)  
3. Chemistry of key individual(s) | 25 |
| C. WILLINGNESS TO MEET TIME AND BUDGET | 1. Firm's approach to maintaining schedule and budget  
2. Past performance | 5 |
| D. LOCATION | 1. Firm's knowledge of Horry County  
2. How will firm implement program locally? | 10 |
| E. RECENT, CURRENT AND PROJECTED WORK LOADS OF THE FIRM | 1. Work load of key individual  
2. Resources to staff program adequately | 5 |
| F. CREATIVITY AND INSIGHT RELATED TO PROJECT | 1. Key individual's understanding of all aspects of the program  
2. Unique approaches or ideas in maintaining budgets and schedules  
3. Cost savings ideas | 25 |
| G. RELATED EXPERIENCE | 1. Experience working for a school district as an agent, not a general contractor  
2. Experience in South Carolina | 15 |
| TOTAL | | |

ITEM III EXHIBIT F
A. PAST PERFORMANCE

1. Firm's overall track record
2. Reference checks by Administration

B. ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL

1. Key individual to program
2. Commitment of key individual(s)
3. Chemistry of key individual(s)

C. WILLINGNESS TO MEET TIME AND BUDGET

1. Firm's approach to maintaining schedule and budget
2. Past performance

D. LOCATION

1. Firm's knowledge of Horry County
2. How will firm implement program locally?

E. RECENT, CURRENT AND PROJECTED WORK LOADS OF THE FIRM

1. Work load of key individual
2. Resources to staff program adequately

F. CREATIVITY AND INSIGHT RELATED TO PROJECT

1. Key individual's understanding of all aspects of the program
2. Unique approaches or ideas in maintaining budgets and schedules
3. Cost savings ideas

G. RELATED EXPERIENCE

1. Experience working for a school district as an agent, not a general contractor
2. Experience in South Carolina

TOTAL

ITEM III EXHIBIT F
**Firm:** Southern Management Group  
**Scorer:** Helen Smith

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. PAST PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>Maximum: 15 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's overall track record</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reference checks by Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL</th>
<th>Maximum: 25 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Key individual to program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Commitment of key individual(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chemistry of key individual(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. WILLINGNESS TO MEET TIME AND BUDGET</th>
<th>Maximum: 5 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's approach to maintaining schedule and budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Past performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. LOCATION</th>
<th>Maximum: 10 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's knowledge of Horry County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How will firm implement program locally?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. RECENT, CURRENT AND PROJECTED WORK LOADS OF THE FIRM</th>
<th>Maximum: 5 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Work load of key individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Resources to staff program adequately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F. CREATIVITY AND INSIGHT RELATED TO PROJECT</th>
<th>Maximum: 25 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Key individual's understanding of all aspects of the program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unique approaches or ideas in maintaining budgets and schedules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cost savings ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G. RELATED EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>Maximum: 15 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Experience working for a school district as an agent, not a general contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Experience in South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. PAST PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>Maximum: 15 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's overall track record</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reference checks by Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL</th>
<th>Maximum: 25 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Key individual to program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Commitment of key individual(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chemistry of key individual(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. WILLINGNESS TO MEET TIME AND BUDGET</th>
<th>Maximum: 5 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's approach to maintaining schedule and budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Past performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. LOCATION</th>
<th>Maximum: 10 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's knowledge of Horry County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How will firm implement program locally?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. RECENT, CURRENT AND PROJECTED WORK LOADS OF THE FIRM</th>
<th>Maximum: 5 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Work load of key individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Resources to staff program adequately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F. CREATIVITY AND INSIGHT RELATED TO PROJECT</th>
<th>Maximum: 25 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Key individual's understanding of all aspects of the program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unique approaches or ideas in maintaining budgets and schedules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cost savings ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G. RELATED EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>Maximum: 15 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Experience working for a school district as an agent, not a general contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Experience in South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL                                                                                 |                     |

ITEM III EXHIBIT F
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. PAST PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>Maximum: 15 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's overall track record</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reference checks by Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL</th>
<th>Maximum: 25 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Key individual to program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Commitment of key individual(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chemistry of key individual(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. WILLINGNESS TO MEET TIME AND BUDGET</th>
<th>Maximum: 5 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's approach to maintaining schedule and budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Past performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. LOCATION</th>
<th>Maximum: 10 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's knowledge of Horry County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How will firm implement program locally?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. RECENT, CURRENT AND PROJECTED WORK LOADS OF THE FIRM</th>
<th>Maximum: 5 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Work load of key individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Resources to staff program adequately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F. CREATIVITY AND INSIGHT RELATED TO PROJECT</th>
<th>Maximum: 25 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Key individual's understanding of all aspects of the program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unique approaches or ideas in maintaining budgets and schedules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cost savings ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G. RELATED EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>Maximum: 15 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Experience working for a school district as an agent, not a general contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Experience in South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL
Firm: Heery Int'l  
Scorer: Helen Smith

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. PAST PERFORMANCE</strong></td>
<td>15 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm’s overall track record</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reference checks by Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL</strong></td>
<td>25 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Key individual to program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Commitment of key individual(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chemistry of key individual(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. WILLINGNESS TO MEET TIME AND BUDGET</strong></td>
<td>5 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm’s approach to maintaining schedule and budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Past performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. LOCATION</strong></td>
<td>10 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm’s knowledge of Horry County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How will firm implement program locally?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. RECENT, CURRENT AND PROJECTED WORK LOADS OF THE FIRM</strong></td>
<td>5 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Work load of key individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Resources to staff program adequately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. CREATIVITY AND INSIGHT RELATED TO PROJECT</strong></td>
<td>25 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Key individual’s understanding of all aspects of the program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unique approaches or ideas in maintaining budgets and schedules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cost savings ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G. RELATED EXPERIENCE</strong></td>
<td>15 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Experience working for a school district as an agent, not a general contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Experience in South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ITEM III EXHIBIT F
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. PAST PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>Maximum: 15 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's overall track record</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reference checks by Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL</th>
<th>Maximum: 25 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Key individual to program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Commitment of key individual(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chemistry of key individual(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. WILLINGNESS TO MEET TIME AND BUDGET</th>
<th>Maximum: 5 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's approach to maintaining schedule and budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Past performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. LOCATION</th>
<th>Maximum: 10 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm's knowledge of Horry County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How will firm implement program locally?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. RECENT, CURRENT AND PROJECTED WORK LOADS OF THE FIRM</th>
<th>Maximum: 5 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Work load of key individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Resources to staff program adequately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F. CREATIVITY AND INSIGHT RELATED TO PROJECT</th>
<th>Maximum: 25 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Key individual's understanding of all aspects of the program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unique approaches or ideas in maintaining budgets and schedules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cost savings ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G. RELATED EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>Maximum: 15 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Experience working for a school district as an agent, not a general contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Experience in South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL | |

ITEM III EXHIBIT F
(6) Heery

(2) MB Kuhn

(3) Construction Control

(5) 3D, Inc.

(1) Southern Mgnt Group

ITEM III EXHIBIT G
January 19, 1996

MEMO TO: Tom Baldwin

FROM: Eddie Rodelsperger

SUBJECT: Preparation for Future Procurement Audits

On Wednesday, January 17, 1996, I had the opportunity to meet with Mr. Larry Sorrell and Mr. Jimmy Aycock of the office of Audit and Certification. This was a very informative meeting. Mr. Sorrell and Mr. Aycock were most helpful. After several hours of discussion, they were able to clarify all questions I had relative to processes and documentation as they pertain to school construction. Mr. Sorrell and Mr. Aycock stressed the importance of having complete and accurate files on each construction project. Since Southern Management is responsible for all procurement activities as they pertain to the district’s $98.3 million building program and ultimately responsible for maintaining accurate records, I am providing a copy of the Horry County Schools Procurement Code and the following matrixes that, if adhered to, will result in a clear audit when Mr. Sorrell and Mr. Aycock return.

1) A & E Related Professional Services Matrix
2) Major Construction Matrix
3) Standard Procurement Matrix

A complete file must be maintained on the selection of architects, engineers, and consultants to include surveyors, appraisers, roof consultants, and any other professional services acquired. A complete file must be maintained on all new construction projects, site work, renovations, re-roofing projects, and HVAC projects. A complete file must be maintained on any items that SMG may bulk purchase for the district. These should include but are not limited to HVAC equipment, kitchen equipment, and furniture. In short, all items purchased by SMG that are not included in the General Contractor’s contract.
Mr. Tom Baldwin
Page 2
January 19, 1996

After you have reviewed the district procurement code, if you should have questions or need clarification on any issue, please submit same to Mr. Gregg Long in writing. Mr. Long, I am certain, will provide a prompt and accurate response. However, should you not agree with Mr. Long’s interpretation, please direct your questions to Mr. Harrell Hardwick, Assistant Superintendent for Finance. If further clarification is necessary, please contact Mr. Larry Sorrell or Mr. Jimmy Aycock of the office of Audit and Certification (803-737-0647).

Finally, please be advised that I am requesting Mr. Gregg Long to audit your files every six months. The first audit will be requested in March. After the audit is complete, I will request a written report. If there are problems, I will work with you personally to ensure compliance. I am certain that you will appreciate Mr. Long’s help in maintaining complete files.

Tom, please know that Horry County Schools has placed a tremendous amount of confidence in you. In essence the district has entrusted you with $98.3 million of taxpayers’ money. Not only do we expect you to deliver the quality schools that we promised our citizens, we expect all district policies and regulations to be followed. I have utmost confidence in you and your staff’s ability to do just that.

ER:jsc

Enclosures

c. Gerrita Postlewait
   Dallas Johnson
   Harrell Hardwick
   Gregg Long
   Larry Sorrell
   Jimmy Aycock
   01199601.DOC

ITEM III EXHIBIT H
HCSD
A&E AND RELATED PROFESSIONAL SERVICES MATRIX
4/1/92-6/30/95

Grid Steps
A. Affidavit of Advertisement with clipping
   Response date must be at least 15 days

B. Respondents must use proper form in response
   A&E Service Questionnaires, Federal Standard Forms #254 and #255.

C. Agency must interview at least 5 firms responding
   1. Selection committee's determination must be in writing as to ranking.
   2. Written notification of order of ranking must be sent to responding vendor

D. Board approval of A&E Selection
   Copy of executed agreement for A&E services.

E. A&E Approval Request - Small Contracts
   1. Procurement must be under $18,000 (Steps A-D do not apply).
   2. Copy of executed agreement for A&E services.

F. Letter of Approval from the Office of School Planning and Building of the
   Plans prepared by the A&E

G. Sole Source of A&E
   Executed agreement must accompany (Steps A-E do not apply).

H. Emergency Procurement of A&E
   Executed agreement must accompany (Steps A-E do not apply).
HCSD
MAJOR CONSTRUCTION MATRIX
4/1/92-6/30/95

GRID STEPS

A. Construction Contract
1. Affidavit of Advertised with clipping
2. Bid form of low bidder with listing of subcontractors
3. Bid security of low bidder with power of attorney (5% of bid)
4. Certified Bid Tabulation sent to all bidders within ten (10) days
5. Notice of Intent to Award sent to all bidders if contract is over $50,000 or Notice of Award sent to all bidders if less than $50,000
6. Fully Executed Construction Contract
7. Performance Bond and Labor and Materials Payment Bond with Power of Attorney (100% of contract).
8. Contractor’s Certificate of Insurance
9. Board approval of bid
10. Notice to Proceed to contractor

B. Change Orders
1. All change orders to construction contract approved by the District, Board or OSP&B as applicable
2. Compare change order approval dates with applications for payment.

C. Payment of Contractor
1. Application for payment for construction contract
2. Retention not to exceed 10%

D. Request for sole source procurement.
Steps A - B do not apply

E. Request for emergency procurement
Steps A - B do not apply
Attributes

(A) The proper approved requisition agrees with the purchase order and the vendor invoice for items procured and amount. Invoice and purchase order amounts agree. The voucher is supported by the proper receiving reports which are signed and dated by receiving personnel. Dates of documents indicate that the procurement was properly authorized.

(B) Discounts were taken and payment was made in a timely manner. Only S.C. sales taxes were paid.

(C) All changes to the purchase order (i.e., price and quantity changes) were properly documented and approved.

(D) Materials Management Office term contracts were properly utilized. If term contract prices beaten by 10%, determine that term contract vendor was offered chance to match price.

(E) The procurement was handled in accordance with the Consolidated Procurement Code and Regulations.

- Small Purchases (< $25,000.00)
  - $1,500.00 - Price was fair and reasonable
  - $1,500.00 - $4,999.99 - 3 Phone quotes requested and documented
  - $5,000.00 - $9,999.99 - 3 Written quotes requested and documented
  - $10,000.00 - $24,999.99 - 5 Written request for quotations documented
  - Written responses documented
  - SCBO advertisement documented

- Competitive Sealed Bids (> $25,000.00)
  - Written invitation for bids documented w/bidders list
  - Written responses documented and tabulated
  - SCBO advertisement documented
  - Notice of award posting documented

- Competitive Sealed Proposals (> $25,000.00)
  - Same as competitive sealed bids above; and
  - Determinations to do RFP's and award RFP's prepared

- Sole Source
  - Written determination prepared in advance and approved by authorized official
  - Single source was appropriate
  - Transaction reported to MMO

- Emergency
  - Written determination prepared and approved by authorized official
  - Emergency was justified
  - Competition, as practicable was sought
  - Transaction reported to MMO

- Procurement > $50,000.00
  - Notice of Intent to Award mailed all respondents (IFB's & RFP's)
  - Drug Free Workplace Certification obtained (All type procurements)

(F) All other aspects of the procurement appear proper.
MEMORANDUM

TO: LS3P Architects
    Mozingo & Associates
    Pegram & Associates
    Usry, Wolfe, Koll Architecture
    Wilkins, Wood, Goforth & Pike

FROM: Thomas S. Baldwin, AIA

RE: Horry County School District
    Building Program

DATE: December 11, 1994

In regards to your design schedule and ultimate approval and permitting of your projects, it is important to remember that the Office of District Facilities Management has a backlog of projects and the approval process could take longer than normal. Due to this, it is imperative that you submit your projects as soon as possible in order to not delay the proposed bidding. In addition, any other agency approvals that may be required due to location of your particular project and jurisdiction it may come under needs to be considered when submitting your projects for approval.

If we can be of any assistance during this time, please feel free to give me a call.

CC: Mr. Edward P. Rodelsperger
Mr. David Northam  
State of South Carolina  
Department of Education  
1429 Senate Street  
Columbia, SC 29201

RE: Aynor Elementary School  
Design Development Submittal

Dear David:

Please find enclosed our design development drawings for your review. Enclosed are the following:

2. Architectural drawings inclusive of floor plans, elevations, building sections, as well as large scale floor plans.  
3. Site development package by D.D.C. Engineers.  
4. Building code analysis and fire wall delineations.

You will note that we have tried to incorporate your previous comments from your preliminary review of the FAX you recently received. Hopefully, the design revisions made will address the noted code problems. Please keep in mind, these are design development drawings, as our design is continuing to be developed and refined.

Your comments and continued efforts are appreciated. Please call should you have questions. I am.

Sincerely,

S. Derrick Mozingo Associates

SDM/pm

ITEM III EXHIBIT J
February 7, 1996

Mr. John B. Kent, Director
District Facilities Management
State Department of Education
706 Rutledge Building
1429 Senate Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

RE: Horry County School District
Aynor Elementary School

Dear John,

As a follow-up to your letter of February 2, 1996 and my meeting with you Monday, the District and Southern Management Group were surprised at the lack of submittals and approvals from ODFM by the Architect on the Aynor Elementary School site. Therefore, we are pulling the Aynor Elementary School building package off the street and instructing the Architect to make whatever revisions that are currently required by your office and resubmit according to the requirements of the South Carolina Department of Education Facilities Guide. Once we receive written approval from your office, we intend on re-advertising and rebidding this project. This obviously will delay the completion of this project, however, in light of the status of this project, Eddie and I agreed it is the appropriate course of action.

However, in regards to the Aynor Elementary School site development package, as we discussed on Monday, that project has been bid, contracted and is virtually complete. The Architect states that he submitted this site package on July 6, 1995. It was obvious from our meeting on Monday that ODFM never received them and had the Architect and/or his Engineers followed up with his submittal and approval process as outlined in Section 14 of your Guide, this problem would not have occurred.

On behalf of the Horry County School District, we respectfully request that you review the site package, which is part of the submittal of September 22, 1995 and provide any further comments as they relate to this site. We received SCDOT's comments on September 15, 1995 and they recommend an additional exit out of the teacher parking lot of 60'. We will incorporate this additional work into the paving contract to bid at a later date. We received OCRM approval on September 6, 1995. Anything that you, Robert, or David can do to expedite this process would greatly be appreciated by the Horry County School District.
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Again, we apologize for the lack of properly submitting and following up on the approval process as it relates to this project. It certainly was not intentional on behalf of Horry County School District and Southern Management Group. Should you require any additional information in regards to this matter, please feel free to give me a call.

Very Truly Yours,

[Signature]

Tom Baldwin

TB/sjw

cc: Mr. Eddie Rodelsperger
    Mr. Paul Moscati
February 9, 1996

Mr. David Northam
Department of Education
Office of District Facilities Management
1429 Senate Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

RE: Horry County School District
Aynor Elementary School

Dear David,

Please allow this letter to serve as confirmation of our telephone conversation of Wednesday afternoon, February 7, 1996 regarding final ODFM approval of the site development bid package for Aynor Elementary School.

During our conversation, you acknowledged receipt of a copy of Mr. Tom Baldwin's letter to Mr. John Kent, dated February 7, 1996, regarding the withdraw of the Aynor Elementary School bid documents. However, as Mr. Baldwin states, the site drawings contained within the September 22, 1995 submittal are the same plans which have been used to build the site to its present status. It is for this reason that a separate ODFM site development approval is requested. It became obvious to me during our conversation that upon receipt of the September 22 submittal, your office intended to address the building and site drawing submittal as one package requiring one approval. However, as you are well aware, this is not the case, as put forth in Mr. Baldwin's letter.

To this end, based on Mr. Baldwin's request for ODFM approval for the site package, you acknowledged the receipt of the review comments from the South Carolina Department of Transportation contained in their September 15, 1995 letter and September 5, 1995 drawing titled School Site Review, located on-site as Aynor Elementary School on S-24. In response to your comment regarding the 60' additional exit from the teacher parking lot as discussed by Mr. Baldwin, no plans to date have been revised to incorporate same into this project. However, because of the present status of the site in that no SABC material has been installed yet, I have advised Mr. Baldwin following our conversation that we may proceed at this time to incorporate that portion of the work pertaining to grading and base installation for this exit into the present site contractor's contract. As stated in Mr. Baldwin's letter, the paving of same would be done at a later date.

Another issue you indicated must be addressed is that concerning the highway improvements shown along Highway 24 on both sides of the two site entrances. Mr. Baldwin and I both acknowledge that this work, or some form of it, to varying degrees of detail acceptable to the SCDOT, is mandatory. However, as I stated to you during our
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conversation, this work is not included in the scope of work as defined in the present site development contract. It is my further understanding that these improvements, or accepted form thereof, must be installed prior to the opening of the school. To this end, please be advised that this office intends to pursue the installation of the highway improvements as shown on the SCDOT plan sheet, or some revised form of this plan mutually agreed upon by all concerned parties. To date, an Engineer has not been engaged to perform the necessary design work for this installation. I will keep you informed of same. It is our intention to pave the site as part of the contract to construct and pave the highway improvements in order to provide a uniform and new look to the asphalt on the entire project.

Your final concern was that of the SCDHEC-OCRM Stormwater permit. I have enclosed a copy of same dated September 6, 1995. It is my understanding that this letter, in addition to the comments concerning the highway improvements, represents the only outstanding documentation and issues necessary to be addressed prior to issuing a final ODFM site approval for the referenced project. Should this not be the case, please advise immediately.

I appreciate all of your assistance to date and look forward to working with you and Robert on the new schools to be built in Horry County. Should you have any questions concerning any of the above, please do not hesitate to contact me at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Paul M. Moscati

cc: Mr. Tom Baldwin, AIA
     Mr. S. Derrick Mozingo, AIA

ITEM III EXHIBIT L
Mr. Tom Baldwin
Southern Management
1600 9th Avenue
Conway, SC 29526

RE: AYNOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
HORRY COUNTY (51)
STORMWATER

Dear Mr. Baldwin:

The staff of the SCDHEC-OCRM certifies that the plans submitted for the above referenced project, dated August 14, 1995, meet the minimum requirements of the S. C. Sediment Reduction and Storm Water Management Act. This land disturbance permit is contingent on the following special conditions:

(a) The SCDHEC-OCRM must be notified at least seven (7) days prior to actual land disturbance in order to arrange sediment/erosion control inspections.

(b) The responsible day-to-day contact must have a SCDHEC-OCRM stamped set of plans on site at all times.

(c) Prior to final project approval, a registered professional responsible for construction will submit a statement certifying that construction is complete and in accordance with approved plans and specifications. SCDHEC-OCRM staff will then conduct a final site inspection for design compliance.

(d) All sediment control measures shall be inspected at least every seven (7) calendar days and after any storm event of greater than 0.5 inches of precipitation during a 24-hour period. All sediment control measures shall be maintained until final stabilization has been obtained.

(e) The person responsible for maintenance shall perform or cause to be performed periodic inspections and preventive maintenance of all completed storm water management practices to ensure proper functioning. SCDHEC-OCRM will conduct periodic maintenance inspections.
Vegetative stabilization or equivalent measures shall be initiated as soon as practicable in portions of the site where construction activities have temporarily or permanently ceased. The site must be stabilized within 14 days after construction on that portion has temporarily or permanently ceased, unless activity in that portion will resume within 21 days.

Approved plans remain valid for five (5) years from the date of an approval. Extensions or renewals of the plan approvals may be granted by the SCDHEC-OCR upon written request by the person responsible for the land disturbing activity.

Provided that no freshwater wetlands, as determined by the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, are disturbed or altered without Corps authorization.

Failure to comply with any of the conditions of this permit may result in enforcement actions and/or penalties.

The receipt of this permit does not relieve you of the responsibility of acquiring any other federal or local permits that may be required.

Sincerely,

Steven G. Strickland, P. E.
Environmental Engineer

cc:  Dr. H. Wayne Beam
     Mr. Christopher L. Brooks
     Mr. Terry Boyd, SCDHEC
     U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
     DDC Engineers
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February 12, 1996

Mr. Gerry Wallace
S. Derrick Mozingo Associates
618 Chestnut Road, Suite 205
Myrtle Beach, South Carolina 29572

Re: Site Development - Aynor Elementary
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Dear Mr. Wallace:

This will confirm our contingent approval of the Site Development portion only on the above referenced project on February 12, 1996. Approval is contingent upon all special conditions documented in the letter dated September 6, 1995 from Mr. Steve Strickland with DHEC to Mr. Tom Baldwin with Southern Management being complied with and acceptable to DHEC and approval is also contingent upon South Carolina Department of Transportation approval relative to off site improvements along Highway S-24 and access to and egress from the site.

The final site drawings and specifications on the above captioned project are considered functionally adequate in accordance with the rules and regulations of the Office of District Facilities Management.

The responsibility for structural, mechanical and electrical adequacy rests with those whose names and license numbers appear on the drawings. You are hereby notified that the primary responsibility for compliance with applicable state and local statutes, regulations, building codes, fire and health regulations and local ordinances rests with the architects and engineers as agents of the owner.

This approval does not constitute any grant or waiver for any Law or Code restriction.

Please keep in mind that the South Carolina School Facilities Planning and Construction Guide requires that certain transmittals be forwarded to the Office of District Facilities Management during bidding and completion of project.

Yours very truly,

David H. Northam, R.A., C.B.O.
DISTRICT FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

DHN/isg

cc: Eddie Rodelsparger, District
Paul Moscati, Southern Management
ADDENDUM NO. 5
FOR
AYNOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
GENERAL CONTRACT

PREPARED BY

S. DERRICK MOZINGO ASSOCIATES
618 CHESTNUT ROAD, SUITE 205
MYRTLE BEACH, SOUTH CAROLINA 29572
(803) 449-8000

AND

SOUTHERN MANAGEMENT GROUP
1600 NINTH AVENUE
P. O. BOX 907
CONWAY, SOUTH CAROLINA 29526
(803) 248-8656

Date of Issue - FEBRUARY 9, 1996

TO: ALL PRIME BIDDERS OF RECORD

The following items shall take precedence over the drawings and specifications for the above named project and shall become part of the Contract Documents. Where any item called for in the specifications, Addendum Nos. 1, 2, 3, 3-Revised, and 4, or indicated on the drawings is not supplemented hereby, the original requirements shall remain in effect. Where any original item is amended, voided, or superseded hereby, the provisions of such item not specifically amended, voided or superseded, shall remain in effect.

ITEM 5-1:  REFERENCE THE SPECIFICATIONS
DIVISION 00100 - INVITATION FOR BIDS

The BID DATE has been postponed indefinitely. Bidders are requested to return full sets of plans to this office for a full refund or a credit on the subsequent set of bid documents for the above referenced project. The revised bid documents for this project shall be advertised at a later date. This office is grateful to all bidders for your continued patience and interest in this project, and apologize for any inconvenience created as a result of this action. Your continued participation in this project is encouraged and appreciated.

ITEM III EXHIBIT N
February 6, 1996

Mr. John B. Kent, Director
District Facilities Management
State Department of Education
706 Rutledge Building
1429 Senate Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

RE: Horry County School District
8th Attendance Zone High/Middle School

Dear John,

As a follow-up to your letter of February 2, 1996, and your meeting with Tom Baldwin on February 5, 1996, it is my understanding that ODFM approval of the site package for the 8th Attendance Zone High/Middle School is being withheld pending approval from SCDOT. SCDOT will not sign off on the plans until all easements and access roads have been finalized.

As you are aware, this has been an ongoing process as evidenced by the attached brief summary that was reviewed with you on February 5th. Therefore, I am requesting ODFM approval on the sitework inside the property line. It is my understanding that this work has been reviewed in the past and that previous comments have been incorporated into these drawings. I also understand that once all the easements and site access issues are resolved, that we will need to resubmit these drawings to ODFM for review and approval.

Please advise on what I need to have LS3P Architects do, if anything, to receive this approval.

Thank you very much for your assistance in this matter.

Very Truly Yours,

Eddie Rodelsperger

ER/sjw

cc: Mr. Tom Baldwin
Ms. Susan Baker
8TH ATTENDANCE ZONE HIGH SCHOOL/MIDDLE SCHOOL ACCESS STATUS

1. Site has two easements from Gardner Lacy Road, however, not in the most desirable location.

2. Adjacent land Owners have always expressed a willingness to work with the School District, however, still unable to finalize easements.

3. LS3P submitted drawings to O.D.F.M. on April 18, 1995. Site plans within property lines are okay (LS3P), however, final approval is being withheld pending satisfactory resolution of access.

4. In May 1995 a meeting was held with the South Carolina Department of Transportation, O.D.F.M., Mr. Rodelsperger and Tom Baldwin. Department of Transportation expressed a desire to obtain access over to Perry Road in lieu of additional railroad crossing (see attached 10/12/95 memo).

5. Adjacent land Owner eventually said no to easement from High School/Middle School site to Perry Road.

6. I.P. and Developers began perusing other avenues from High School/Middle School site to Perry Road.

7. September 95, District submitted to County for two permits to cross railroad tracks.

8. Late December the County advised that they will give one permit provided certain modifications are made and we resubmit.

9. Permit application resubmitted last week.

10. Once County permits are received, we will finalize access to site and resubmit.

This is and has been, a lengthy process. Had we waited on all of the above to be finalized, we still would not be under construction and vulnerable to escalating cost increases. The relief from overcrowding at the two High Schools would be at least 2 years away. The Architect has built flexibility into the design to allow ease of incorporation of final easements into sites.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Ms. Susan Baker, AIA
FROM: Tom Baldwin, AIA
DATE: October 12, 1995
RE: Horry County School District
    8th Attendance Zone High/Middle School
    Railroad Crossing

In reference to your letter, Mr. Rodelsperger and I did meet with Erskine Suber and Robert Mitchell in Columbia in regards to access to the site and railroad crossings. In that meeting they expressed concern about the amount of railroad crossings indicated on the drawing. In addition, their SCDOT Public Safety Officer was present and he stated that the current trend was to reduce railroad crossings.

They indicated that they would like to see some type of plan that would route the traffic from the High School site east to the new Perry Road and cross the railroad track at that point. We, then and still do, concur with that idea. We agreed to pursue the potential for getting an access from the High School to Perry Road along the railroad track.

In addition, I had a follow-up meeting with Mark Faulk in regards to minimum size of right-of-way in order to install a two lane road because of the golf course adjacent to the railroad track. After meetings with the adjacent property owner, and International Paper, and also visual inspections, the golf course design will not allow a connecting road from the High School site over to Perry Road on the north side of the railroad track.

The developer and International Paper, along with the School District, are currently pursuing easements to provide a connecting road from Perry Road down to the High School site south of the railroad track, which would require an additional railroad crossing.

Mr. Suber stated in that meeting that he preferred we workout the easement and connection to Perry Road, but if a railroad crossing at the site was our only option, we could work it out.

In addition, Mark Faulk did express a concern about stacking space where we may potentially cross the railroad track as it relates to the road that we are installing parallel to the railroad track.
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In light of this, we have instructed the contractor not to install any of this road under his current contract. We are in the process of receiving a credit for this work and then will incorporate this work into the final paving plans once all the above issues have been resolved.

In regards to the Gardner Lacy Road access, we are having continuous meetings with the local Owners, developers, and County officials. As you know, Gardner Lacy Road is a County road not State. The developers and landowners have hired DDC Engineers, Inc., a local engineering firm, to design intersections on Gardner Lacy Road to incorporate, not only the High School and Middle School traffic, but the future development that is currently being planned north on Gardner Lacy Road. Once these access points and intersections have been worked out with the landowners, developers, and with County Planning, then we would submit the these drawings to ODFM and/or SCDOT for their review and approval.

However, based on my experience with this crowd to date, if we were to wait on them to finalize all these points, the school would not be built for another three or four years. Therefore, as we have discussed in the past, we are proceeding forward and have left flexibility in the overall site plan to allow some variation for access once all these concerns have been worked out.

This memo and our phone conversation should bring you up to date on this situation. In the meantime, I will advise Mr. Rodelsperger of Robert Mitchell’s concerns and request that he give Robert Mitchell a call direct to discuss the issues with him.

I look forward to seeing you next Friday at 9:00 a.m. Should you have any questions, please feel free to give me a call.

cc: Mr. Eddie Rodelsperger
    Mr. Paul Moscati
    Mr. Robert Mitchell
    Mr. Buddy Jones
ITEM III EXHIBIT P
1. We just received ODFM comments from Robert Mitchell yesterday and need to incorporate these into the documents. We plan to issue written items, sketches and some new sheets as addendums. After we have low bidders, we will need to issue additional new sheets so that the sketch and written information is included on new sheets. (This per Robert Mitchell.) Tom indicated that we should proceed as planned.

2. Have you decided on the new bid date yet? This will guide our schedule with the addendums. The bid date will be changed in an addendum today to November 9, 1995. It is possible that it may move again to the 16th, but we should work to the 9th for now.

3. We wanted to verify that plans and specs were sent to Danny Badgett with the Horry County Building Department. Robert Mitchell inquired as to whether the local fire and building officials had approved the project. We are concerned that we have tried and tried to contact Mr. Badgett for his comments but he has not returned our calls. He may have very significant comments. Plans and specs were not sent. SMG understood that LS3P was going to do this while LS3P understood that SMG was going to do this. In a later conversation with Sandra, she offered to help by confirming the submittal procedure and ordering a set of plans and specs. LS3P will write any letters, etcetera needed. Sandra will call back and let us know what is required. NOTE: If we get these drawings to them as soon as possible and if the bid date does move to the 16th, we will still have a shot at getting any comments into a late addendum.

4. We are now required to provide doors on any gang restrooms that contain electric hand dryers or ceiling heaters. (This is new.) We can either add doors and keep the hand dryers and heaters or keep the baffle wall system (without doors) and eliminate the hand dryers and heaters. Which do you prefer? Eliminate the electric hand dryers and ceiling heaters. Do not add doors. Tom will verify whether they prefer tri-fold or roll paper towels.
February 14, 1996

Mr. Thomas S. Baldwin, AIA
Southern Management Group
1600 Ninth Avenue
Conway, South Carolina 29526

RE: New High School and Middle School for the 8th Attendance Zone
LS3P Commission No. 94023
ODFM

Dear Tom:

I am forwarding this letter to you to clarify the conversations and understandings we have had with ODFM regarding the review and approval of the construction documents for this project.

The final construction documents were forwarded from the printer to ODFM on approximately October 2, 1995. Ken Harkins went to Columbia and met with Robert Mitchell of ODFM to review the documents and receive his comments on October 17, 1996. Since Robert had some substantial comments, he advised Ken that the comments were to be incorporated into the documents rather than just included in addenda. LS3P incorporated all ODFM comments by addenda during the bidding phase and also incorporated them into the computer documents to allow new sets to be provided to the low bidder and ODFM after the bids were received. Southern Management extended the bid period to allow adequate review of the new information. When the bids were received and were too high, LS3P held off on printing the new, corrected set since we were aware that changes to the project documents would be required. We did not want to create additional work for ODFM by submitting a set that would be substantially different from what would eventually be built.

On February 6, 1996, I again discussed the project with Robert Mitchell and reviewed my understanding of our agreement with him. I indicated that although I may have misunderstood I was under the impression that it was acceptable with him for us to include all ODFM comments in the addenda and to provide corrected final sets to ODFM and the low bidder after bids came in. I documented this information in a fax to Southern Management dated October 18, 1996. Robert stated that he felt he had requested corrected sets to be reissued to all bidders prior to the bids coming in, but acknowledged that he had been dealing with several projects at once and may have agreed to the revised plan of action. We also discussed that Southern Management had extended the bid period to allow the contractors time to absorb the information contained in the addenda.
Robert agreed that he does not want to review the documents twice and asked us to not resubmit the new set incorporating ODFM comments until the cost saving changes are incorporated as well. He stated that he would consider reviewing the classroom buildings separate from the core and courtyard buildings. Later that day, I received a call from you indicating that you had talked with Robert and John Kent and that they had agreed that we will only resubmit the revised drawings, including the original ODFM comments, and that we may submit the documents for the classroom buildings as a separate package. We are now proceeding on this basis.

Sincerely,

LS3P ARCHITECTS, LTD.

Susan C. Baker, AIA
Vice President
ITEMS DISCUSSED:

The following is a log of Susan Baker’s conversations with both Robert and Tom concerning ODFM approvals on this project:

From Tom Baldwin: Tom met with Robert and John Kent to address the lack of approvals on the site and building package drawings. It was agreed that ODFM will issue conditional approval on the site package contingent on the access and DOT approvals. John asked that we go ahead and send them the set of drawings with their comments incorporated.

To Robert Mitchell: I reviewed my understanding of where we stand on this project with Robert. LS3P incorporated ODFM comments into our computer documents with the intention of providing these final corrected drawings to ODFM and the low bidder after the bids came in. This was per Susan’s understanding of her conversation with Robert on October 17, 1995. All ODFM comments were incorporated in the addenda and SMG extended the bid period to allow bidders to review the addenda. Since the ODFM comments were comprehensive, it took some time to completely incorporate all comments. At that time, the bids came in too high and we recognized that cost reductions would have to be made. Since we knew any changes would need to be resubmitted to ODFM for their approval, we did not forward the corrected drawings to Robert but elected to wait until the revisions were decided on and incorporated. We did not feel that we should expect Robert to essentially review the project twice, since the changes would need to be fairly major in scope to decrease costs enough.

Robert stated that our assumption that he would not want to review the drawings twice was correct. He asked that we wait to submit the drawings until we have all of the cost reduction changes incorporated. I asked if we might be able to submit two packages to him for review; first the completed drawings for the houses and second, the core and remaining sections of the facility. The reason behind this request is that we have relatively few comments to incorporate on the houses but are being asked to complete redesign sections of the core. Thus, the schedule for the core will be much longer than that for the houses and the contractor needs to begin work to meet the Owner’s schedule. Robert indicated that he prefers all of the information at once but he will consider this. He also offered to take our package when it came in, after finishing whatever he was working on.
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To Tom Baldwin: I passed the above conversation on to Tom. He indicated that John had just finished telling him that we should go ahead and resubmit. He called John and Robert and called me back. They agreed that we will only submit the new, revised drawings, including all of the original ODFM comments. It will be acceptable for us to submit the seven classroom houses (complete) first, followed by the rest of the facility. Tom asked that we resubmit the houses ASAP since MB Kahn needs to proceed in order to meet the Owner's schedule. I will call Tom back with a schedule as soon as we talk with the consultants.

NOTE: Should there be a discrepancy in any of the aforementioned items, please contact LS3P within 3 calendar days upon receipt.

LS3P ARCHITECTS, LTD.
24 NORTH MARKET STREET · SUITE 300 · CHARLESTON, SC · 29401
PHONE: 803-577-4444  FAX: 803-722-4789
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Tom Baldwin, AIA  
Southern Management Group  
P.O. Box 907  
Conway, SC 29526

RE: State Submittals  
Middle Schools

Dear Tom:

I had a pleasant conversation with Robert Mitchell this morning and indicated to him that we would be resubmitting revised drawings on Myrtle Beach Middle and Forestbrook Middle once all work regarding value engineering changes was completed and coordinated. I indicated to him that all his previous comments had been incorporated into the revised drawings and forwarded to Martin Engineering to insure incorporation into their work scope. He indicated that a single resubmittal incorporating all changes to date, as well as his last comments, was acceptable. Also, he did not have a given time frame or requirement on when our revised drawings had to be resubmitted to his office. He indicated that he was backed up on his review's for other projects and, if we sent the drawings in today, it would be at least thirty days before they would be reviewed! I informed him that we are working toward final resubmittals in three to four weeks and agreed to give him a week's notice prior to our projected submittal date. He asked me to itemize all noted changes in order to expedite the review process, to which I agreed.

Tom, we have all been working under extreme pressures to meet the requirements of the owner regarding bid dates, construction initiation, and building occupancy expectations. Meeting those schedules has not at all been easy due to the last minute addendum changes as well as ODFM’s back log of work and delayed review times.

To date this office has met every submittal requirement with follow-up submittals noting all requested changes/corrections from ODFM reviews with the exception of the last follow-up review. Please keep in mind that the middle schools had already received a final review with all corrections made and resubmitted to the state. These last comments came in after the job had already bid and were in addition to the previously addressed and corrected items.
We forwarded ODFM's list of remaining items to your office and asked you at that time if we should resubmit the noted changes. Since the bids had come in over the budget, and with all of us knowing that extensive value engineering would be required, we collectively decided to resubmit to the state once all the changes had been decided upon to simplify the process in order to avoid further confusion, and to save money on additional printing and submittal costs.

Regarding the site approvals, we never received any comments from ODFM on site issues, and knew that their final approval was simply a formality after receiving the required DHEC, Coastal Council, and South Carolina Department of Highways approvals. I assume that Paul's two letters to ODFM of 2/9/96 will address these concerns and, thus, satisfy ODFM's approval. Please advise me as soon as possible on the status of ODFM's site approvals and if this office needs to do anything more to assist in this matter.

Tom, as mentioned earlier, it is very unfair to expect this office to accept total responsibility for the lack of these final ODFM approvals. ODFM's backlog of work created our delayed review and, the fact that we did not receive their follow-up final comments until after these jobs were bid, put us in an impossible situation. To satisfy the owner's scheduling requirements, the jobs had to be bid when they were! Everyone knew that final approvals were pending but proceeded with the bid anyway, making it necessary to negotiate all necessary changes required by the state with the low bidder on the work. The only other option that we had was to delay the bids, and consequently the owner's desires. We all took the course we did with the owner's approval in order to meet the schedules and needs of the school district. It was impossible to satisfy everyone in that situation which is obviously why we have the problems we currently have with the state!

Please understand that this office will make every effort to resubmit to ODFM as soon as possible in order for our work to be in compliance with all state regulations. Thank you in regard to this matter. I am,

Sincerely,

S. DERRICK MOZINGO ASSOCIATES

S. Derrick Mozingo, Jr., AIA, NCARB

cc: Eddie Rodelsperger

SDM/plm
February 9, 1996

Mr. Robert O. Mitchell, Jr., AIA
Department of Education
Office of District Facilities Management
1429 Senate Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

RE: Horry County School District
Aynor Elementary School
Myrtle Beach Middle School

Dear Robert,

Please allow this letter to serve as confirmation of our telephone conversation of Wednesday afternoon, February 7, 1996 regarding Aynor Elementary School and Myrtle Beach Middle School.

As discussed with Mr. Tom Baldwin in your office on Monday, February 5, 1996, and later confirmed in writing by Mr. Baldwin to Mr. John Kent on February 7, 1996, the bid documents for Aynor Elementary are being officially withdrawn from the bidding marketplace. Based on your recommendation, an addendum was issued on this date notifying all prospective bidders of same. I have enclosed a copy of this document for your files.

With regard to Myrtle Beach Middle School, as discussed, I have enclosed a copy of a letter from the South Carolina Department of Transportation, dated June 26, 1995, on which you were copied, detailing their review comments on this project. You will also find enclosed a copy of a letter from SCDHEC, Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management, dated June 8, 1995, regarding the Stormwater permit for the school site. As per our conversation, I am forwarding copies of these documents for your files. With regard to the SCDHEC-OCRM Stormwater permit, I would have assumed that proper routing procedures of such a critical approval document would have dictated forwarding it to you immediately upon receipt of same. I regret this oversight occurred.

As I mentioned during our conversation, it is my recollection that prior to the receipt of the site development bids for this project, previous telephone discussions between you and I indicated that the only item delaying ODFM approval of the site development bid package was the receipt of the two documents enclosed and noted above. While you noted that you may not recall specific conversations with me regarding same, you offered to check your notes and records to determine if any other documents or permits were necessary prior to finalizing your approval of the site bid documents. I would greatly appreciate it if you...
would consult your files and confirm if this approval is forthcoming based on the receipt of the enclosed.

I appreciate your continued cooperation and guidance on the present building program in Horry County. I look forward to seeing you on Monday at your office as I confirmed a 9:00 AM meeting with you and Tom Baldwin earlier today.

Should you have any questions or comments pertaining to any of the above, please do not hesitate to contact me at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Paul M. Moscati

cc: Mr. Tom Baldwin, AIA
     Mr. S. Derrick Mozingo, AIA w/encls.
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ADDENDUM NO. 5
FOR
AYNOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
GENERAL CONTRACT
PREPARED BY
S. DERRICK MOZINGO ASSOCIATES
618 CHESTNUT ROAD, SUITE 205
MYRTLE BEACH, SOUTH CAROLINA 29572
(803) 449-8000

AND
SOUTHERN MANAGEMENT GROUP
1600 NINTH AVENUE
P. O. BOX 907
CONWAY, SOUTH CAROLINA 29526
(803) 248-8656

Date of Issue - FEBRUARY 9, 1996

TO: ALL PRIME BIDDERS OF RECORD

The following items shall take precedence over the drawings and specifications for the above named project and shall become part of the Contract Documents. Where any item called for in the specifications, Addendum Nos. 1, 2, 3, 3-Revised, and 4, or indicated on the drawings is not supplemented hereby, the original requirements shall remain in effect. Where any original item is amended, voided, or superseded hereby, the provisions of such item not specifically amended, voided or superseded, shall remain in effect.

ITEM 5-1: REFERENCE THE SPECIFICATIONS
DIVISION 00100 - INVITATION FOR BIDS

The BID DATE has been postponed indefinitely. Bidders are requested to return full sets of plans to this office for a full refund or a credit on the subsequent set of bid documents for the above referenced project. The revised bid documents for this project shall be advertised at a later date. This office is grateful to all bidders for your continued patience and interest in this project, and apologize for any inconvenience created as a result of this action. Your continued participation in this project is encouraged and appreciated.
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South Carolina
Department of Transportation

June 26, 1995

Horry County Traffic
Myrtle Beach

Mr. William B. Grant, P.E.
Project Manager
DEC Engineers, Inc.
2208 Highway 17 South
North Myrtle Beach, South Carolina 29582

Dear Mr. Grant:

Myrtle Beach Middle School on S-263 (38th Avenue North),
S-1315 (Central Parkway), and S-1316

We have reviewed the school site plans provided with your May 1 letter, and our
recommended revisions are shown circled in red on the attached plan.

The revisions consist of radii improvements, modifications to the proposed student
drop-off/pick-up loop, design changes for the road connecting both schools to S-1316, and
widening on S-263 to provide turn lanes. We are recommending revisions for the
proposed student loop to improve and simplify access at both driveways, and increase on-
site storage inside the loop for parents. However, to facilitate the driveway revisions, it will
be necessary to modify the road connecting both schools to S-1316 as shown on the
attached plan. These design changes will improve access to the loop and provide a safer,
more efficient operation from a traffic standpoint. Concerning revisions to S-1316, this
two-lane road is on the State-Highway-System and presently serves the existing High
School; therefore, the School District will be responsible for reconstructing S-1316 in
accordance with the attached plan under an approved encroachment permit issued by the
Department. An approved permit must be obtained before any work begins.

To accommodate the increase in traffic generated by the new middle school and
provide for the safety of both the parents and students while in transit, widening
improvements to accommodate turning traffic will be required on 38th Avenue North at
the proposed S-1316 intersection as detailed on the attached plan. These improvements
should reduce the potential for accidents and are consistent with what the Department
requires at all new school sites statewide.
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The Department does not have any way to fund widening improvements of this
type; therefore, the cost will be the responsibility of the School District. The School
District may wish to request "C" funds for these improvements and if this is the case, a
request should be submitted to the Horry County Transportation Committee for their
review and consideration. If the School District wishes to pursue this course of action,
they should contact our State Traffic Operations Coordinator in Columbia, Mr. V. Erskine
Suber, Jr., and he will coordinate preparation of a cost estimate for accomplishing the
improvements.

Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to review the plans and offer
recommendations that should improve traffic operations at and adjacent to the new school.

Sincerely,

Original Signed By

Richard B. Werts
Director of Traffic Engineering

c: Dr. Gary Smith, Superintendent, Horry County Schools
Mr. Edward P. Rodeisperger, Horry County School District
Mr. Thomas Baldwin, AIA, Southern Management Group
Mr. S. Derick Mozango Associates
Mr. Robert Mitchell, AIA, Office of District Facilities Management
Director of Pre-Construction
District Engineering Administrator - District No. 6

ITEM III EXHIBIT U
Southern Management Group  
P. O. Box 907  
Conway, SC 29526

RE: MYRTLE BEACH MIDDLE SCHOOL  
HORRY COUNTY (51)  
STORMWATER

Dear Sirs:

The staff of the SCDHEC-OCR M certifies that the plans submitted for the above referenced project, dated April 18, 1995, meet the minimum requirements of the S. C. Sediment Reduction and Storm Water Management Act. This land disturbance permit is contingent on the following special conditions:

(a) The SCDHEC-OCR M must be notified at least seven (7) days prior to actual land disturbance in order to arrange sediment/erosion control inspections. Sediment and erosion controls must be installed at the beginning of any land disturbing activity.

(b) The responsible day-to-day contact must have a SCDHEC-OCR M stamped set of plans on site at all times.

(c) Prior to final project approval, a registered professional responsible for construction will submit a statement certifying that construction is complete and in accordance with approved plans and specifications. SCDHEC-OCR M staff will conduct a final site inspection for design compliance.

(d) All sediment control measures shall be inspected at least every seven (7) calendar days and after any storm event of greater than 0.5 inches of precipitation during a 2 hour period. All sediment control measures shall be maintained until final stabilization has been obtained.

(e) The person responsible for maintenance shall perform or cause to be performed periodic inspections and preventive maintenance of all completed storm water management practices to ensure proper functioning. SCDHEC-OCR M will conduct periodic maintenance inspections.
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(f) Vegetative stabilization or equivalent measures shall be initiated as soon as practicable in portions of the site where construction activities have temporarily or permanently ceased. The site must be stabilized within 14 days after construction on that portion has temporarily or permanently ceased, unless activity in that portion of the site resumes within 21 days.

(g) Approved plans remain valid for five (5) years from the date of an approval. Extensions or renewals of the plan approvals may be granted by the SCDHEC OCRRM upon written request by the person responsible for the land disturbing activities.

(h) Provided that no freshwater wetlands, as determined by the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, are disturbed or altered without Corps authorization.

(i) Failure to comply with any of the conditions of this permit may result in enforcement actions and/or penalties.

The receipt of this permit does not relieve you of the responsibility of acquiring other federal or local permits that may be required.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Steven G. Strickland, P.E.
Environmental Engineer

SGS/bas/swi

cc: Dr. H. Wayne Beam, OCRRM
Mr. Christopher L. Brooks, OCRRM
Mr. Mark Caldwell, OCRRM
Mr. Terry Boyd, SCDHEC
U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
William Grant, Engineer
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I hereby certify that I have thoroughly reviewed the application, plans and supporting documents and found them to be in compliance with the letter and the intent of the law. This stamp of approval on the plans is solely an acknowledgment of satisfactory compliance with the requirements of these regulations. The approval stamp does not constitute a representation or warranty to the applicant or any other person concerning the safety, appropriateness of effectiveness of any provisions, or omission from the storm water and sediment plan.

[Signature]

Plan Reviewer

2. WILL A BUILT CERTIFICATION BY A REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBLE FOR CONSTRUCTION BE REQUIRED FOR THIS PROJECT FOR FINAL APPROVAL? (TO BE SPECIFIED BY REVIEWER)

[ ] YES [ ] NO

If Yes

Prior to final approval, a registered professional responsible for construction will submit a statement certifying that construction is complete and in accordance with approved plans and specifications will be based upon periodic observations of construction and a final inspection for compliance by me or a representative of my office who is under my supervision.

Signature

S.C. Registration No.

[ ] ENGINEER
[ ] TIER 2 LAND SURVEYOR
[ ] LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT

For Applicant Use

Please distribute 3 copies of the approved plans as shown.

Please have a copy of the plans with the approval stamp on the site at all times.

1. Owner/Person Financially Responsible
2. Design Professional
3. Contractor
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DATE: 

Mr. Steven G. Strickland, P. E.
SCDHEC-OCRM
1601 N Oak Street, Suite 203
Myrtle Beach, SC 29577

RE: START OF CONSTRUCTION

PROJECT: ______________________

Dear Mr. Strickland:

This letter is to inform the Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management (OCRM) that construction on the above referenced project will begin within seven (7) days from the date shown above. The following person will be responsible for ensuring compliance with the Stormwater Permit.

ON-SITE CONTACT: ______________________

TELEPHONE #: ______________________

Sincerely,

PROJECT MANAGER: ______________________

COMPANY NAME: ______________________
DATE: __________________________

Mr. Steven G. Strickland, P.E.
SCDHEC-OCRM
1601 N. Oak Street, Suite 203
Myrtle Beach, SC 29577

RE: PROJECT CERTIFICATION
FINAL SITE INSPECTION REQUEST
PROJECT: __________________________

Dear Mr. Strickland:

This letter is to certify that construction of the stormwater management system at the referenced project has been completed in accordance with the approved plans and specifications. This certification is based upon periodic observations of construction and a final inspection to verify design compliance by me or a representative of my office who is under my supervision. Any changes from the approved plans are shown on the attached as-built drawing (if applicable).

I would like for OCRM to schedule a final site inspection for design compliance on:

DATE: __________________________

Sincerely,

PROJECT MANAGER: __________________________

COMPANY NAME: __________________________

ITEM III EXHIBIT U
**PROJECT NAME:**
**STORMWATER SITE INSPECTION CHECKLIST**
**MUST BE POSTED AT SITE**

SITE MUST BE INSPECTED WEEKLY AND AFTER MORE THAN 1/2" RA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>SILT FENCE</th>
<th>CATCH BASINS</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCE</th>
<th>RUNOFF CUTLET</th>
<th>CHECK DAMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

February 14, 1996

Dr. Barbara Stock Nielsen
State Superintendent of Education

Mr. Derrick Mozingo
S. Derrick Mozingo Associates
618 Chestnut Road, Suite 205
Myrtle Beach, South Carolina 29572

Re: Site Development
Myrtle Beach Middle School
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Dear Mr. Mozingo:

This will confirm our contingent approval of the Site Development portion only on the above referenced project on February 14, 1996. Approval is contingent upon all special conditions documented in the letter dated June 8, 1995 from Mr. Steve Strickland with DHEC to Southern Management Group being compiled with and acceptable to DHEC and approval is also contingent upon South Carolina Department of Transportation approval.

The final site drawings and specifications on the above captioned project are considered functionally adequate in accordance with the rules and regulations of the Office of District Facilities Management.

The responsibility for structural, mechanical and electrical adequacy rests with those whose names and license numbers appear on the drawings. You are hereby notified that the primary responsibility for compliance with applicable state and local statutes, regulations, building codes, fire and health regulations and local ordinances rests with the architects and engineers as agents of the owner.

This approval does not constitute any grant or waiver for any Law or Code restriction.

Please keep in mind that the South Carolina School Facilities Planning and Construction Guide requires that certain transmittals be forwarded to the Office of District Facilities Management during bidding and completion of project.

Yours very truly,

David H. Northam, R.A., C.B.O.
DISTRICT FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

cc: Eddie Rodelsperger, District
Paul Moscati, Southern Management

1425 SENATE STREET COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201 803-734-8492 FAX 803-734-8624
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HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS  
BUILDING COMMITTEE MEETING  
MINUTES  
Monday, June 20, 1994  

A special meeting of the Horry County Board of Education Building Committee was held on Monday, June 20, 1994 at 4:00 p.m. in Conference Room 11 of the District Office Annex. The purpose of the meeting was to apprise the Committee of administration's meeting with International Paper concerning sites for schools in the 8th attendance area. The following were present: Ferrell Lee, Co-Chairperson of the Committee; Bruce Rush, Patti Hilton and Ronald Bessant, Committee Members; Richard Heath, Ex-Officio Member of the Committee; Helen Smith and Iva Finkenbiner, Board Members; Gary Smith, Superintendent of Schools; Dallas Johnson and Eddie Rodelsperger, District Office Staff; Tom Baldwin, Southern Management Group; Kelly Strayer, WPDE-TV 15; and Rhonda Snowden, Building Committee Secretary. Mary Jane Duke arrived at 4:35 p.m., as the meeting was being adjourned. The media had been notified of the meeting. The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. by Ferrell Lee and the invocation was given by Bruce Rush.

The Board approved Phase I Building Program recommends that a high school, middle school and elementary school be built in the new 8th attendance area. Administration recommended the purchase of two tracts of land on Highway 501 between Myrtle Beach National Golf course and Perry Road to build three schools. One site of 110.35 acres would be to accommodate a new high school and middle school and one site of 25 acres would be to accommodate an elementary school. Gary Smith discussed some of the legal issues involved. A representative of the State Department of Education is scheduled to be in Horry County on June 23rd to make a determination on approval of the land purchase. Richard Heath suggested that the collateral given in the Note on the property only include the property and not the good faith of the Horry County School District.

Following the discussion, a Motion was made by Bruce Rush to approve the purchase of two tracts of land on Highway 501 between Myrtle Beach National Golf Course and Perry Road to build three schools. One site of 110.35 acres will accommodate a new high school and middle school and one site of 25 acres will accommodate an elementary school. The District will offer $5,500 per acre for usable land and $500 per acre for wetlands, contingent upon approval by the State Department of Education. The motion was seconded by Patti Hilton. The Motion carried with a 4-1 vote as follows: In favor--Lee, Heath, Rush and Hilton; Abstained--Bessant.

Following the vote, further discussion was held concerning the Note to be given as collateral on the property. A Motion was then made by Bruce Rush to amend his original Motion as follows: To approve the purchase of two tracts of land on Highway 501 between Myrtle Beach National Golf Course and Perry Road to build three schools. One site of 110.35 acres will accommodate a new high school and middle school and one site of 25 acres will accommodate an elementary school. The District will offer $5,500 per acre for usable land and $500 per acre for usable land and $500 per acre for
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wetlands, contingent upon approval by the State Department of Education. This purchase will be financed by a 5% Purchase Money Mortgage Note with a 20% non-refundable down payment of the total purchase price, with a term not to exceed one (1) year and with no pre-payment penalty. The Amended Motion was seconded by Patti Hilton and carried with a 4-1 vote as follows: In favor—Lee, Heath, Rush and Hilton; Abstained—Bessant.

Adjournment

A Motion was made by Patti Hilton to adjourn at 4:34 p.m. The Motion was seconded by Bruce Rush and carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rhonda G. Snowden
Secretary

APPROVED: August 24, 1994
COUNTY: Horry  DISTRICT: Horry County  DATE: 6-23-94

DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT: DR. GARY SMITH  GRADES INCLUDED: K-5

SCHOOL TYPE: Elementary X  Middle  Jr. High  High  Vocational

Or, if property is for other purpose: ___________________________

SCHOOL ENROLLMENT: Initial Capacity: 650  Projected Expansion: NONE

NUMBER OF ACRES: 25  COST PER ACRE: $5500  TOTAL COST: $137,500

LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION OF SITE: OFF OF 501 AT PERRY ROAD ON TRACT 3 OF INTERNATIONAL PAPER

ACCESSIBILITY: FROM 4 LANE ROAD BEING INSTALLED BY INTERNATIONAL PAPER

TOPOGRAPHY: TYPICAL

SOURCE OF FIRE PROTECTION:

CHECK UTILITIES AVAILABLE:

Gas  Electricity X  Telephone X

Water (Describe Source): GRAND STRAND WATER & SEWER

Sewage Disposal (Describe): GRAND STRAND WATER & SEWER

WILL THE PROPERTY HAVE FEE SIMPLE TITLE?  YES

GENERAL REMARKS:

OBSERVED on: 6-23-94

OBSERVED BY: ____________________________  REQUESTED BY: ____________________________

Office of School Planning and Building  District Board Chairman

APPROVED BY: ____________________________  Distric Superintendent

Office of School Planning and Building  Distric Superintendent

Office of School Planning and Building Site No. 26-24

REvised
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SDE 45-012-00  P 13-4
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT
BUILDING COMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES

Tuesday, June 15, 1993

The Horry County Board of Education Building Committee met on Tuesday, June 15, 1993 at 4:30 p.m. in the Conference Room of Socastee Middle School. The following were present: Ferrell Lee and Mary Jane Duke, Co-Chairpersons of the Committee; Patti Hilton and Bruce Rush, Committee Members; Richard Heath, Board Member; Eddie Rodelsperger, District Office Staff; Dewanna Lofton of the Sun News; Mike Campi, Director, Horry County Shelter Home; and Rhonda Snowden, secretary. The media had been notified of the meeting. The meeting was called to order at 4:39 p.m. by Ferrell Lee. Mrs. Duke and Ms. Lofton joined the meeting at 4:55 p.m.

The invocation was given by Bruce Rush.

The Committee was informed of two items that needed to be added to the agenda which were the windows at Green Sea Floyds and Loris High Schools and information on portable needs. A motion was made by Bruce Rush to add these items to the agenda. The motion was seconded by Patti Hilton and carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEMS

Approval of minutes of May 10, 1993 Meeting

A motion was made by Patti Hilton to approve the minutes of the May 10, 1993 Building Committee meeting. The motion was seconded by Bruce Rush and carried.

Presentation by Mike Campi, Director, Horry County Shelter Home

Mr. Campi informed the Committee of the need for additional space and programs to meet the needs of the children in foster care in Horry County. In an effort to help to meet the needs, the Horry County Shelter Home proposes to use the Adult Education facility located on Highway 90 to develop a program to have family specialists, therapists, homebound instructors, dieticians, etc. on site to assist with meeting some immediate needs of the children, as well as to house the male children separately from female children and to separate the children according to age. In the proposal, he is asking that the Horry County School District not sale the subject property for four (4) years. In the first year, the Shelter Home would like to get the program started and then to have three years of the program in operation. The Shelter Home would be responsible for all maintenance, repairs, renovations and expenses related to the building and would request a grant to cover these costs as well as to install central air in the building. It is the belief of the Board of Directors of the Shelter Home that after four years of such a program in operation, they would be able to get a grant to purchase the building from the School District and that the building would have a higher appraised value at that time and that the benefit to the School District would be a higher income from the sale of the property.
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Building Committee Meeting
June 15, 1993
Minutes - Page 2

Mary Jane Duke stated she would like to have a lease/purchase arrangement with the Shelter Home at the current appraised value, stating that such a program would be a benefit to the School District by assisting the young people of Horry County.

A motion was made by Bruce Rush that the Administration meet with Mr. Campi and/or the Horry County Shelter Home Board of Directors and come back to the Building Committee with a recommendation. Eddie Rodelsperger questioned the appropriateness of having the Shelter Home representatives meet with the Curriculum Committee and Learning Services personnel to discuss further the educational programs that would be offered through the Shelter Home if this is approved. The motion was seconded by Patti Hilton and carried unanimously.

 Procedures to Dispose of District Surplus Property

The procedures for disposal of District surplus property were explained to the Committee and a motion was made by Patti Hilton to proceed with the exception of the Highway 90 Adult Education property and the Bucksport property. The motion was seconded by Bruce Rush. Mr. Heath offered the suggestion that the School District market the property which may increase the sale/fair market value, wherein the School District would seek buyers for the properties. Ms. Hilton withdrew her motion. A motion was then made by Bruce Rush to direct Administration to present to the Building Committee a plan of action through a marketing arrangement which would be most beneficial to all Horry County School District children with the exception of the Highway 90 and Bucksport properties. The motion was seconded by Patti Hilton and carried unanimously.

Parking Lot for Myrtle Beach Primary School

A motion was made by Patti Hilton to approve Fifteen Thousand ($15,000) Dollars to expand the parking lot at Myrtle Beach Primary School and the motion was seconded by Bruce Rush. The motion carried with a 4-1 vote, with Lee, Rush, Hilton and Duke voting in favor and Heath opposed.

Recommendations on Capital Improvements

Eddie Rodelsperger explained the process of prioritizing the capital improvement requests received from the schools. Mary Jane Duke made a motion that action not be taken on the Capital Improvement Project lists to allow time to review the lists. The motion died for lack of a second. A motion was then made by Richard Heath to recommend to the full Board to proceed with the items as shown on the Capital Improvement Project lists that were recommended by Administration for approval, and which included all items on Priority 1, and items marked on Priority 3 and the Paving Priority lists, with the exception of the paving at Myrtle Beach Primary School as shown on the Paving Priority list in the amount of $15,000, which was approved as a separate item and to deduct $20,000 for Item #18, storm water runoff at North Myrtle Beach Primary, on the Priority 1 list which is being dealt with as a separate item, leaving a total recommended for approval of $1,940,563. The motion was seconded by Patti Hilton and carried with a 4-1 vote, with Heath, Hilton, Rush and Lee in favor and Duke opposed.
Building Fund Financial Report

The monthly Building Fund Financial Report was offered as information.

Windows at Green Sea Floyds and Loris High Schools

The Building Committee was informed that at Green Sea Floyds High and Loris High Schools the hollow metal windows that surround the courtyard need repair and the warranty period has expired on these two buildings. However, the architectural firm, Wilkins, Wood, Goforth Associates and the engineering firm, Martin Engineering, have agreed to split the cost of repair with the School District. The cost to the School District would be $5,333.33, being one-third of the cost to repair the windows.

A motion was made by Bruce Rush to approve $5,333.33 to repair the hollow metal windows at Loris High and Green Sea Floyds High Schools. The motion was seconded by Patti Hilton and carried unanimously.

Portable Needs

The Building Committee was informed of the need for portables across the District and of the possibility of having to regain possession of some of the portables located at Coastal Carolina College. A motion was made by Bruce Rush to allow the Administration to check into the portable requests and the available portables across the District and to allow the Administration to make whatever decision is deemed necessary. The motion was seconded by Patti Hilton and carried with a 4-1 vote, with Rush, Hilton, Heath and Lee in favor and Duke opposed. Mrs. Duke left the meeting following this vote at 6:30 p.m.

July Meeting Date

The Building Committee meeting for July was scheduled for 7:30 a.m. on Tuesday, July 6, 1993 to be held at Pee Dee Elementary School if the school is open at that time.

Adjournment

A motion was made by Richard Heath to adjourn, was seconded by Patti Hilton and carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 6:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rhonda G. Snowden
Secretary
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Est Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Myrtle Beach Primary</td>
<td>Expand teacher parking lot behind school</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Conway Primary</td>
<td>Wire, post, gate for playground</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Green Sea Floyds Elementary</td>
<td>Pave area for basketball courts</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Myrtle Beach Middle</td>
<td>Resurface outside basketball area</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Loris Elementary</td>
<td>Pave area between the basketball court and sidewalk</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>North Myrtle Beach High</td>
<td>36 Parking spaces and paved lot</td>
<td>$9,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>North Myrtle Beach High</td>
<td>Paving and striping</td>
<td>$28,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>North Myrtle Beach High</td>
<td>Paving and striping</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>North Myrtle Beach High</td>
<td>Pave the road to the student parking lot and athletic field, the student parking lot, driveway behind gym, bus parking, lot, front driveway, staff parking lot, and back service driveway</td>
<td>$116,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Socastee Middle</td>
<td>Pave parking lots</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Aynor Conway Career Center</td>
<td>Increase student parking lot capacity and reseal all existing paved areas</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Conway Elementary</td>
<td>Paving teacher parking lot</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Loris Middle</td>
<td>Resurface all paved areas</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Finklea Career Center</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Socastee Cluster Group</td>
<td>Paving and striping</td>
<td>$31,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Socastee High</td>
<td>Resurface and pave all parking lots</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Green Sea Floyds Elementary</td>
<td>Pave area for basketball courts</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Myrtle Beach Middle</td>
<td>Resurface outside basketball area</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>AMENDED PAVING PROJECT LIST MAY 17 1993</td>
<td>Est Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>North Myrtle Beach High</td>
<td>Make a separate exit from the traffic circle to the highway</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Socastee Middle</td>
<td>Landscape playground and repair basketball court</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Loris Elementary</td>
<td>Pave/divert water on sidewalk between office and media center</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$455,850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$4,391,350
HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS
BUILDING COMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES

Tuesday, March 29, 1994

The Horry County Board of Education Building Committee held its April meeting on Tuesday, March 29, 1994 at 4:00 p.m. in Conference Room 11 of the District Office Annex. The following were present: Ferrell Lee, Co-Chairperson of the Committee; Patti Hilton, Committee Member; Richard Heath, Ex-Officio Member of the Committee; Eddie Rodelsperger and Wayne Smith, District Office Staff; Dave Bush of Hawthorne Services, Inc.; and Rhonda Snowden, recording secretary. The media had been notified of the meeting. The meeting was called to order at 4:27 p.m. by Ferrell Lee and the invocation was given by Mr. Lee.

AGENDA ITEMS

Approval of Minutes of March 8, 1994 Meeting

A motion was made by Patti Hilton to approve the minutes of the March 8, 1994 Building Committee meeting. The motion was seconded by Richard Heath and carried unanimously.

Presentation on Privatization by Hawthorne Services, Inc.

A presentation was made by Dave Bush of Hawthorne Services, Inc. on privatization. Mr. Bush stated that Hawthorne Services is a privatization contractor and he gave an overview of the services his company offers. Some of the suggestions offered by Mr. Bush included conducting a pre-award survey should the District decide to privatize, checking references on companies, finding out about key personnel that would carry out the contract, consider obtaining a performance bond if the service is critical and checking financial records. Following the presentation, Mr. Bush answered specific questions. A motion was then made by Richard Heath that administration draft a Request for Proposal, wherein a consultant would prepare a statement of work covering the maintenance department under a privatization contract. The motion was seconded by Patti Hilton and carried unanimously. Mr. Bush left the meeting at 5:15 p.m. A five minute break was requested and the Committee reconvened at 5:20 p.m.

1994/95 Capital Improvement Projects

Eddie Rodelsperger explained the process of soliciting the top three priorities from each principal for their respective school for capital improvement projects for the 1994/95 school year. Recommendations were also received from Southern Management Group and from the Maintenance Department. The total cost for the requests from principals and the recommended projects from Southern Management Group and Maintenance is $3,217,768. In an effort to reduce the cost of the projects, roofing and HVAC projects were pulled because they are included in Phase I of the Building Program. Also pulled from the projects were schools that are up for major renovations or new schools in Phase I of the Building Program. Projects that are being recommended by administration were listed specifically and are as shown on the attached Exhibit "A" and Exhibit "B". The projects would be broken down into two phases. Phase I has a total cost of $639,935 and Phase II has a total cost of $605,339. Phase I projects are projects that are to be completed by the end of the Summer of '94 and Phase II projects are to be held