

## 1st ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES ROS14-0234

Request for Qualification Statements for Professional Engineering Services for the Brownfield Cleanup July 9, 2014 – 9 a.m. Tarpon Conference Rooms (4th Floor) City Hall, 400 S. Orange Ave., Orlando, FL

First Meeting of the Advisory Committee to review and evaluate responsive qualification statements submitted in response to the subject solicitation.

#### **Committee Members Present:**

Dan Dashtaki, Environmental Manager (Chair) Steven Howe, Environmental Specialists Sr. Athena Parslow, Wastewater Compliance Program Manager Adam Scobby, Construction Manager Rene Carcamo, Contract Compliance Investigator II

#### **Other City Personnel Present:**

Roger Cooper, Contract Administrator (Facilitator) Yold Delius, Procurement & Contracts Division Erik L. Melear, Wastewater Assistant Division Manager

#### **Members of the Public Present:**

Flormari Blackburn, E Science

#### **Actions/Discussion/Motions:**

The Facilitator called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and took the following actions:

- 1) Introduced himself and asked all in attendance to introduce themselves.
- 2) Advised that Committee was approved and ethics forms were received.
- 3) Advised the Committee that a quorum was established.
- 4) Announced that the meeting was publicly posted for more than 48 hours in advance.
- 5) Reviewed Advisory Committee Rules
- 6) Reviewed Public Input Procedures

A motion was made by Athena Parslow, and seconded by Steve Howe, to accept the Public Input Procedures. The motion carried unanimously.

The Facilitator indicated that eight (8) sealed qualification statements were submitted in response to the solicitation and that all firms had been certified as qualified by the Consultants' Qualifications Board on June 24, 2014. Those firms are as follows:

- 1) Cardno TBE
- 2) Conestoga-Rovers & Associates
- 3) Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.
- 4) E Science
- 5) HRP Associates, Inc.
- 6) PPM Consultants
- 7) Tetra Tech, Inc.
- 8) Universal Engineering Sciences

The Facilitator handed out the pre-determined scores for the Volume of Previous Work Awarded to Each Respondent (Shortlist Category E).

Committee Members were advised that Qualification Statements must be independently scored by each Member; that Committee Members should not indicate what score he/she gives to a particular firm; and that Committee Members must not attempt to influence other Committee Members in their scoring.

The Committee discussed each firm's submittal. At the end of discussion, each Committee member individually scored and ranked each firm.

The consolidated results of those rankings are as follows:

- 1) Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.
- 2) Cardno TBE
  2) Tetra Tech, Inc.
  3-way tie
  2) PPM Consultants
  3-way tie
- 5) Conestoga-Rovers & Associates
- 6) HRP Associates, Inc.
- 7) E Sciences
- 8) Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc.

The scoring instructions indicate that "in the event of a tie, the tied Respondents' scores from each member will be added and compared. The Respondent with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Respondents." The results are as follows:

2) Cardno TBE total score of 442
3) Tetra Tech, Inc. total score of 432
4) PPM Consultants total score of 409

Therefore, the final ranking is as follows:

- 1) Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.
- 2) Cardno TBE
- 3) Tetra Tech. Inc.
- 4) PPM Consultants
- 5) Conestoga-Rovers & Associates
- 6) HRP Associates, Inc.
- 7) E Sciences
- 8) Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc.

A motion was made by Adam Scobby, and seconded by Steven Howe, to invite the top four (4) firms for presentations and interviews. Member from the Public declined to make a comment. The motion carried unanimously.

Adam Scobby made a motion, seconded by Steven Howe, to allow up to twenty (20) minutes for each presentation and a ten (10) minute question-and-answer period, with fifteen (15) minute breaks in between sessions. The motion carried unanimously.

Presentations are scheduled for July 24, 2014, beginning at 9 a.m. in the Veterans Conference Room and alternating between Veterans Conference Room (2nd Floor) and Tarpon Conference Room (4th Floor) of City Hall.

A motion was made by Athena Parslow, and seconded by Rene Carcamo, to adjourn at 10:19 am. The motion carried unanimously.

These minutes are considered to be the official minutes of the RQS14-0234 Advisory Committee Meeting held on July 9, 2014, and no other notes, tapes, or other recordings taken by anyone takes precedence.

Submitted by:

Roger Cooper, CPPO, C.P.M. (Facilitator) Teddi McCorkle, CPPB, C.P.M.

Contract Administrator

Reviewed by:

Sr. Contract Administrator

Reviewed and Accepted by:

Dan Dashtaki (Chair) **Environmental Manager** Public Works Department

#### MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** September 30, 2013

**TO:** Procurement and Contracts Division Staff

**FROM:** David Billingsley, CPSM, C.P.M., Chief Procurement Officer

**SUBJECT: Public Input** 

The Florida Legislature recently enacted a new state law, s. 286.1114, which requires that all local government boards and committees that are subject to the sunshine law provide an opportunity for reasonable public input prior to taking official action on any item (with the exception of administrative items such as approval of minutes and quasijudicial proceedings). Such comment must be allowed at the meeting where the board or committee takes action on the item or at a meeting in reasonable proximity to that date. Boards and Committees may adopt rules or policies governing the public input.

Procurement Advisory Committees are affected by this statue since they are sunshine committees and are making an award recommendation to City Council. Procurement Advisory Committees must adopt procedures for all meetings after October 1, 2013.

The statute provides that each committee can provide for its own implementation rules. As such, Procurement Advisory Committees should make a motion at the first meeting to follow these rules. For a particular procurement, the committee may modify or amend the procedures applicable to that solicitation. For example, if the procurement has a large public interest, the committee could establish longer comment periods.

Attached are recommended procedures for public input during Procurement Advisory Committees meetings.

# Public Input Procedures For Procurement Advisory Committees

- A. After each motion (and a second) but before committee discussion on all non-ministerial motions, public comment will be permitted. Ministerial motions would be those that are not substantive actions, including most procedural motions, motions to approve minutes, and motions to adjourn.
- B. Each speaker is limited to 5 minutes. The Committee Chairperson may grant more time to a speaker, provided that if any other committee member objects to the granting of more time, the committee as a whole will vote on the extension.
- C. Public comment is limited to 30 minutes per motion.
- D. Groups are to be asked (not required) to appoint a spokesperson to avoid redundancy and stay within allotted time periods.
- E. If there are more speakers than would allow each to get their full 5 minutes, time periods will be reduced proportionally to not less than 1 minute per speaker unless the committee votes to extend the comment period. If there are more speakers than minutes in the comment period, by act of the Chairperson without objection from a member of the committee, or after a committee vote if there is an objection, the maximum comment period may be extended. As a practical matter, committees should try to extend the time where possible to allow everyone a chance to speak. If this is not possible due to time constraints or number of requests, comments should be taken in random order from all those requesting to speak until time expires.
- F. Each person addressing the committee should give their name and address for the record (minutes). Per the statute, a form asking to speak can be used (which may help with drafting the minutes and establishing priority to speak).
- G. Remarks should be addressed to the committee as a whole, not to individual members of the committee. This is not a question and answer period. The public may comment on the issues before the committee, but the committee is not required to respond to questions.
- H. Minutes should reflect that public comment was solicited even where no public comment was given, i.e. "The chairperson asked if there was anyone from the public who would like to speak, but no requests were received" or similar words should appear in the minutes.

## RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

Consultant Name	Prior Dollars Score (E)
TBE Group dba Cardno TBE	5
Conestoga-Rovers & Associates	5
Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.	3
E Sciences	3
HRP Associates, Inc.	5
PPM Consultants	5
Tetra Tech, Inc.	0
Universal Engineering Sciences	0

## Request for Qualification Statements for RQS14-0234 Professional Engineering Services for the Brownfield Cleanup

#### **COMMITTEE MEMBERS:**

Dan	Steven	Adam Saabby At	thena	Rene
Dashtaki	Howe	Adam Scobby Pa	arslow	Carcamo

#### **CONSOLIDATED RANKING:**

	Dan Dashtaki	Steven Howe	Adam Scobby	Athena Parslow	Rene Carcamo	Total	Ranking
Cardno TBE	3	4	5	5	2	19	2
Conestoga- Rovers & Associates	6	1	3	4	6	20	5
Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.	1	2	2	1	1	7	1
E Sciences	6	8	6	3	6	29	7
HRP Associates, Inc.	5	3	7	6	5	26	6
PPM Consultants	2	6	1	7	3	19	2
Tetra Tech, Inc.	4	5	4	2	4	19	2
Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc.	8	7	8	8	8	39	8

## BREAKING 2ND PLACE TIES BY COMPARING TOTAL SCORES:

	Cardno TBE	PPM Consultants	Tetra Tech, Inc.
Dan Dashtaki	91	92	87
Steven Howe	90	64	80
Adam Scobby	89	95	91
Athena Parslow	80	67	90
Rene Carcamo	92	91	84
TOTAL SCORES	442	409	432
	Cardno TBE	PPM Consultants	Tetra Tech, Inc.
Ranking Based on Total Scores	2	4	3

## **INDIVIDUAL SCORING / RANKING:**

	NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Cardno TBE	Conestoga- Rovers & Associates	Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.	E Sciences	HRP Associates, Inc.	PPM Consultants	Tetra Tech, Inc.	Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc.
I	A	30	27	23	30	24	24	28	28	24

## Request for Qualification Statements for RQS14-0234 Professional Engineering Services for the Brownfield Cleanup

В	35	33	28	35	29	26	32	33	28
С	20	18	15	20	15	17	18	18	16
D	10	8	7	10	7	7	9	8	7
Е	5	5	5	3	3	5	5	0	0
F	0								
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	91	78	98	78	79	92	87	75
Dan Dashtaki Ran	king	3	6	1	6	5	2	4	8

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Cardno TBE	Conestoga- Rovers & Associates	Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.	E Sciences	HRP Associates, Inc.	PPM Consultants	Tetra Tech, Inc.	Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc.
A	30	30	30	30	8	30	10	25	15
В	35	25	35	35	10	35	35	25	18
С	20	20	20	20	20	18	7	20	10
D	10	10	10	10	10	5	7	10	10
Е	5	5	5	3	3	5	5	0	0
F	0								
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	90	100	98	51	93	64	80	53
Steven Howe Ran	king	4	1	2	8	3	6	5	7

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Cardno TBE	Conestoga- Rovers & Associates	Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.	E Sciences	HRP Associates, Inc.	PPM Consultants	Tetra Tech, Inc.	Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc.
A	30	28	28	29	28	26	28	29	25
В	35	33	34	34	33	31	34	34	31
C	20	14	19	19	16	17	19	19	18
D	10	9	7	9	8	8	9	9	8
Е	5	5	5	3	3	5	5	0	0

## Request for Qualification Statements for RQS14-0234 Professional Engineering Services for the Brownfield Cleanup

F	0								
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	89	93	94	88	87	95	91	82
Adam Scobby Ran	king	5	3	2	6	7	1	4	8

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Cardno TBE	Conestoga- Rovers & Associates	Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.	E Sciences	HRP Associates, Inc.	PPM Consultants	Tetra Tech, Inc.	Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc.
A	30	25	25	30	27	20	20	30	20
В	35	30	30	35	30	30	20	30	25
С	20	15	15	20	15	10	17	20	15
D	10	5	8	10	10	5	5	10	5
Е	5	5	5	3	3	5	5	0	0
F	0								
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	80	83	98	85	70	67	90	65
Athena Parslo Ran	ow oking	5	4	1	3	6	7	2	8

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Cardno TBE	Conestoga- Rovers & Associates	Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.	E Sciences	HRP Associates, Inc.	PPM Consultants	Tetra Tech, Inc.	Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc.
A	30	28	22	29	22	24	28	28	25
В	35	33	27	33	26	26	29	28	25
С	20	16	13	20	17	16	19	18	16
D	10	10	9	8	8	8	10	10	7
E	5	5	5	3	3	5	5	0	0
F	0								
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	92	76	93	76	79	91	84	73
Rene Carcamo Ran	olking	2	6	1	6	5	3	4	8

RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

Committee Mei	nber: DAN	DASHTAKI	Date: <u>7 - 9 - 1</u> 9
Firm Name:	CARDNO	TBE	
Ranked:	3		

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respondents based upon their Qualification rdance with the following rating factors

atements in accordance with the following rating factors.		
RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. The experience and qualifications of the Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	30	27
B. The experience and qualifications of the personnel proposed to be assigned to the project by Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	35	33
C. The Respondent and its professional subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	20	18
D. Ability of Respondent's and its professional subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the Project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	8
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	91

RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

Committee Me	ember: DAN DASHTAKI	Date: $7 - 9 - 19$
Firm Name:	CONESTOGA-ROVER	
Ranked:	6/7	

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respondents based upon their Qualification

Statements in accordance with the following rating factors.

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. The experience and qualifications of the Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	30	23
B. The experience and qualifications of the personnel proposed to be assigned to the project by Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	35	28
C. The Respondent and its professional subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	20	15
D. Ability of Respondent's and its professional subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the Project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	7
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	78

RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

Committee Member:	DAV	DASHTAKI	Date:	7-9-14
Firm Name:	CT			
Ranked:	<u> </u>			
The Advisory Committee	e will evalua	te and score the Respondents based upon t	heir Qualif	ication

Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respondents based upon their Qualificatements in accordance with the following rating factors.

RATING FACTORS  RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. The experience and qualifications of the Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	30	30
B. The experience and qualifications of the personnel proposed to be assigned to the project by Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	35	35
C. The Respondent and its professional subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	20	20
D. Ability of Respondent's and its professional subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the Project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	10
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	3
TOTAL SCORE	100	98

RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

Committee M	ember: DAN	DASHTAKI	Date: _	7-9-19
Firm Name:	E-SCIE	VCBS	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Ranked:	6/7			

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respondents based upon their Qualification

Statements in accordance with the following rating factors.

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. The experience and qualifications of the Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	30	24
B. The experience and qualifications of the personnel proposed to be assigned to the project by Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	35	29
C. The Respondent and its professional subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	20	15
D. Ability of Respondent's and its professional subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the Project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	7
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	3
TOTAL SCORE	100	78

RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

Committee Member	r: DAN	OASHTAKI	Date: $1 - 9 - 19$
Firm Name:	HRP		
Ranked:	5		

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respondents based upon their Qualification Statements in accordance with the following rating factors.

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. The experience and qualifications of the Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	30	24
B. The experience and qualifications of the personnel proposed to be assigned to the project by Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	35	26
C. The Respondent and its professional subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	20	17
D. Ability of Respondent's and its professional subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the Project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	7
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	79

RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

Committee Mem	ber: DAN	DASHATAM	Date	: 7-9-14
Firm Name:	PPM	a		
Ranked:	2			

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respondents based upon their Qualification

Statements in accordance with the following rating factors.

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. The experience and qualifications of the Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	30	28
B. The experience and qualifications of the personnel proposed to be assigned to the project by Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	35	32
C. The Respondent and its professional subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	20	18
D. Ability of Respondent's and its professional subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the Project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	9
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	92

City staff and any other stakeholders.

Respondent by the City.

E. Volume of work previously awarded to

TOTAL SCORE

#### **EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING**

RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

Committee Member: DAN DAS	HTAKI	Date: $7 - 9 - 14$
Firm Name: TETRA TECH		
Ranked:		
The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Responsite temporary in accordance with the following rating factors.		
RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. The experience and qualifications of the Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	30	28
B. The experience and qualifications of the personnel proposed to be assigned to the project by Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	35	3 <b>3</b>
C. The Respondent and its professional subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	20	18
D. Ability of Respondent's and its professional subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the Project and work successfully with	10	8

Notes regarding Exhibit "C": Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors to determine the short-listing of the Respondents. Each member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each member will rank the Respondents based upon the member's score for each Respondent. The ranking established by each member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Respondents' total scores from each member will be added and compared. The Respondent with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Respondents.

5

100

professional services.

subconsultants'

C. The Respondent and

records

such as cost control, work quality demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.

City staff and any other stakeholders.

Respondent by the City.

performances on past projects including factors

D. Ability of Respondent's and its professional subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary

time to the Project and work successfully with

E. Volume of work previously awarded to

TOTAL SCORE

#### **EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING**

RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

Committee Member: DAN DASHT	AK/	Date: $7 - 9 - 14$
Firm Name: UNIVERSAL END		
Ranked:		
The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respo Statements in accordance with the following rating factors.	ndents based upon the	r Qualification
RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. The experience and qualifications of the Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	30	24
B. The experience and qualifications of the personnel proposed to be assigned to the project by Respondent and its subconsultants providing	35	28

professional successful

20

10

5

100

its

of

RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

Committee Me	ember: <u>S</u>	tevent	PHOC	9e	Date: 7, 9, 2014
Firm Name:	TBE	9000	dba	Cardno	TBE
Ranked:					

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respondents based upon their Qualification Statements in accordance with the following rating factors.

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. The experience and qualifications of the Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	30	30
B. The experience and qualifications of the personnel proposed to be assigned to the project by Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	35	25
C. The Respondent and its professional subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	20	20
D. Ability of Respondent's and its professional subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the Project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	10
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	90

The Respondent and

records

performances on past projects including factors

such as cost control, work quality and

subconsultants'

#### **EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING**

RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

Committee Member: Steven Pa Ho	0 e	Date: 7, 9, 2011
Firm Name: Conestaga-Rove	ers & assoc	iates
Ranked:		
The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Responstatements in accordance with the following rating factors.	ndents based upon their	r Qualification
RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. The experience and qualifications of the Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	30	\$ 30
B. The experience and qualifications of the personnel proposed to be assigned to the project by Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	35	535

demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.

D. Ability of Respondent's and its professional subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the Project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.

E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.

TOTAL SCORE

100

professional successful

20

its

of

RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

Committee Me	ember:	Steven	P. Howe	Date: _	7. 9. 2014
Firm Name:	Ev	vivonmental	Consulting	& Techn	ology, Inc
Ranked:	2				

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respondents based upon their Qualification

Statements in accordance with the following rating factors.

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. The experience and qualifications of the Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	30	30
B. The experience and qualifications of the personnel proposed to be assigned to the project by Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	35	35
C. The Respondent and its professional subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	20	20
D. Ability of Respondent's and its professional subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the Project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	10
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	3
TOTAL SCORE	100	98

RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

Committee Member: Steven P. 1	lowe	Date: 7, 9, 201
Firm Name: E. Sciences		
Ranked:		
The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respo Statements in accordance with the following rating factors.	ondents based upon their	r Qualification
RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. The experience and qualifications of the Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	30	8
B. The experience and qualifications of the personnel proposed to be assigned to the project by Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	35	10
C. The Respondent and its professional subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	20	20
D. Ability of Respondent's and its professional subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the Project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	10
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	3
TOTAL SCORE	100	51

RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

Committee Member	S	tesen P.	Howe	Date: _	7.4.2014
Firm Name:	HAP	associates	, Inc		
Ranked:	3_				
The Advisory Commi	ttee will evalua	te and score the Resp	ondents based ur	oon their Qualif	ication

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respondents based Statements in accordance with the following rating factors.

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. The experience and qualifications of the Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	30	\$30
B. The experience and qualifications of the personnel proposed to be assigned to the project by Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	35	3530
C. The Respondent and its professional subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	20	18
D. Ability of Respondent's and its professional subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the Project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	5
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	15)
TOTAL SCORE	100	93

0

## EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

C	ommittee Member: Steven P. H	<u> </u>	Date: 7, 9, 2014
Fi	rm Name: PPM Cons	sultants	
R	anked:		
	ne Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Responatements in accordance with the following rating factors.	ndents based upon thei	r Qualification
Si	RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
	A. The experience and qualifications of the Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	30	10
	B. The experience and qualifications of the personnel proposed to be assigned to the project by Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	35	35
	C. The Respondent and its professional subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	20	7
	D. Ability of Respondent's and its professional subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the Project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	7
	E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
	TOTAL SCORE	100	64

RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

0

11

Committ	ee Member:	even h'	Nowe	Date: 1, 9, 00
Firm Na	me: Tetra	Tech	Inc.	
Ranked:	5			
	sory Committee will evaluate a		ndents based upon their	r Qualification
Statemen	ts in accordance with the follow RATING FACTOR		MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
Respo	he experience and qualify ondent and its subconsul- ssional services.		30	25
B. To person by Re	he experience and qualify nnel proposed to be assigne espondent and its subconsu- ssional services.	ed to the project	35	25 25
C. subco	The Respondent and it	f successful neluding factors quality and	20	20
D. A subcotime	bility of Respondent's and onsultants' personnel to do to the Project and work so staff and any other stakehold	its professional evote necessary accessfully with	10	10
E. V	Volume of work previous ondent by the City.		5	0
	TOTAL SCORE		100	80

RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

C	ommittee Member: Steven P.					
Firm Name: Universal Engineering Services						
R	anked:					
	ne Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respo atements in accordance with the following rating factors.	ndents based upon their	r Qualification			
50	RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE			
	A. The experience and qualifications of the Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	30	15			
	B. The experience and qualifications of the personnel proposed to be assigned to the project by Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	35	18			
	C. The Respondent and its professional subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	20	10			
	D. Ability of Respondent's and its professional subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the Project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	10			
	E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	$\bigcirc$			
	TOTAL SCORE	100	5.3			

RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

Committee Member: ADAM SCOBBY		Date: 7/9/14
Firm Name: TBE GROUP CARD	NO	
Ranked: 5		
The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Statements in accordance with the following rating		ir Qualification
RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. The experience and qualifications of Respondent and its subconsultants proprofessional services.		28
B. The experience and qualifications of personnel proposed to be assigned to the personnel by Respondent and its subconsultants proprofessional services.	project 35	33
C. The Respondent and its professubconsultants' records of succeperformances on past projects including such as cost control, work quality demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	cessful factors 20	14
D. Ability of Respondent's and its professubconsultants' personnel to devote necessitime to the Project and work successfull City staff and any other stakeholders.	ssional cessary 10	٩
E. Volume of work previously award Respondent by the City.	led to 5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	89

7/0/1

City staff and any other stakeholders.

Respondent by the City.

E. Volume of work previously awarded to

TOTAL SCORE

## **EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING**

RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

Committee Member: 12044 Scott 7		Date
Firm Name: CONESTOCA ROLL 1 ASSOCI	are!	
Ranked: 3		
The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Responsitements in accordance with the following rating factors.	ndents based upon the	ir Qualification
RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. The experience and qualifications of the Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	30	28
B. The experience and qualifications of the personnel proposed to be assigned to the project by Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	35	34
C. The Respondent and its professional subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	20	19
D. Ability of Respondent's and its professional subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the Project and work successfully with	10	7

Notes regarding Exhibit "C": Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors to determine the short-listing of the Respondents. Each member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each member will rank the Respondents based upon the member's score for each Respondent. The ranking established by each member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Respondents' total scores from each member will be added and compared. The Respondent with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Respondents.

5

100

5

93

94

100

## **EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING**

RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

C	ommittee Member:	ADAM SCOBBY	A V	Date:	7/9/14
F	irm Name: Envisor	UMBLITAL CONSULTING	+ TECHNOLOGY		
R	anked:l				
	he Advisory Committee will ev		ndents based upon their	r Qualific	ation
Si	RATING FA		MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM	SCORE
	A. The experience and Respondent and its sub professional services.		30	2	.9
	B. The experience and personnel proposed to be by Respondent and its surprofessional services.	assigned to the project	35	3	4
	subconsultants' records performances on past pro	jects including factors work quality and	20	1	9
	D. Ability of Respondent subconsultants' personnel time to the Project and v City staff and any other sta	to devote necessary work successfully with	10	d	Ì
	E. Volume of work process Respondent by the City.		5	3	

Notes regarding Exhibit "C": Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors to determine the short-listing of the Respondents. Each member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each member will rank the Respondents based upon the member's score for each Respondent. The ranking established by each member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Respondents' total scores from each member will be added and compared. The Respondent with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Respondents.

TOTAL SCORE

RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

Commi	ttee Member:ADAMScc	667		Date: 7/9/1
Firm N	ame: E Sciences			*
Ranked	l:6			
	visory Committee will evaluate and scents in accordance with the following ra		nts based upon the	ir Qualification
	RATING FACTORS		MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORI
Res	The experience and qualification pondent and its subconsultants essional services.		30	28
pers by 1	The experience and qualification onnel proposed to be assigned to Respondent and its subconsultants ressional services.	the project	35	33
subo perf such	The Respondent and its possible consultants' records of formances on past projects included as cost control, work quantitated ability to adhere to sched	successful ing factors ality and	20	16
D. subo	Ability of Respondent's and its proposed to the Project and work success staff and any other stakeholders.	rofessional necessary	10	8
E.	Volume of work previously a pondent by the City.	warded to	5	3
	TOTAL SCORE		100	88

RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

C	ommittee Member: ADAM SOBBY		Date: 7/9/14
Fi	irm Name: HEP AssociATES, INC.		
R	anked:1		
	he Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respo	ndents based upon thei	r Qualification
St	RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
	A. The experience and qualifications of the Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	30	26
	B. The experience and qualifications of the personnel proposed to be assigned to the project by Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	35	31
	C. The Respondent and its professional subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	20	17
	D. Ability of Respondent's and its professional subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the Project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	8
	E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
	TOTAL SCORE	100	87

RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

C	ommittee Member:ADAM Scobby		Date:	/14
F	irm Name: PPM Consultants			91
R	anked:	f.,		
	he Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respon	ndents based upon the	ir Qualification	
51	RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SC	ORE
	A. The experience and qualifications of the Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	30	28	
	B. The experience and qualifications of the personnel proposed to be assigned to the project by Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	35	34	
	C. The Respondent and its professional subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	20	19	
	D. Ability of Respondent's and its professional subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the Project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	9	
	E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5	
	TOTAL SCORE	100	95	

RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

Co	mmittee Member:	-	Date: 7/9/14
Fir	m Name: TETRA TECH		
Ra	nked:t		
	e Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respo	ndents based upon thei	r Qualification
Sta	tements in accordance with the following rating factors.  RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
	A. The experience and qualifications of the Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	30	ટવ
	B. The experience and qualifications of the personnel proposed to be assigned to the project by Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	35	34
2	C. The Respondent and its professional subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	20	19
	D. Ability of Respondent's and its professional subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the Project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	q
	E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	a
ı			190

Notes regarding Exhibit "C": Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors to determine the short-listing of the Respondents. Each member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each member will rank the Respondents based upon the member's score for each Respondent. The ranking established by each member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Respondents' total scores from each member will be added and compared. The Respondent with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Respondents.

TOTAL SCORE

100

91

RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

Committee Member:	ADAM SCORBY		_ Date: _	7/9/14
Firm Name:	LUIVERSAL ENGINEERING			
Ranked: 8				
	will evaluate and score the Respon with the following rating factors.	dents based upon the	eir Qualifi	cation
	NG FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITE	M SCORE
A. The experience Respondent and in professional services	and qualifications of the s subconsultants providing	30		25
B. The experience personnel proposed	and qualifications of the to be assigned to the project its subconsultants providing	35		31
C. The Respond subconsultants' performances on passuch as cost cost	ent and its professional	20		18
D. Ability of Resp subconsultants' per	ondent's and its professional sonnel to devote necessary and work successfully with	10		8
	ork previously awarded to	5		0
TO	TAL SCORE	100		92

RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

		54 IV			
Committee Member: Athena Karslow Date: 79-14					
Firm Name: Cordno					
Ranked: 5					
The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respo	ndents based upon their	Qualification			
Statements in accordance with the following rating factors.  RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM	ITEM SCORE			
RATING FACTORS	POINTS	TILMSCORE			
A. The experience and qualifications of the Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	30	25			
B. The experience and qualifications of the personnel proposed to be assigned to the project by Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	35	30			
C. The Respondent and its professional subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	20	15			
D. Ability of Respondent's and its professional subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the Project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	5			
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5			
TOTAL SCORE	100	80			

RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

Committee Mer	mber: Athena	Poiss low	Date: 7-9-1 ×
Firm Name:	Con est og	a-Kovers	
Ranked:	4		

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respondents based upon their Qualification

Statements in accordance with the following rating factors.

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. The experience and qualifications of the Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	30	25
B. The experience and qualifications of the personnel proposed to be assigned to the project by Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	35	30
C. The Respondent and its professional subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	20	15.
D. Ability of Respondent's and its professional subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the Project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	18
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	83

RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

Committee Member: Hthona Yar	15/0W	Date: $7 - 9 - 19$
Firm Name: ECT	<u> </u>	
Ranked:		
The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respo Statements in accordance with the following rating factors.	ndents based upon their	Qualification
RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. The experience and qualifications of the Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	30	30
B. The experience and qualifications of the personnel proposed to be assigned to the project by Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	35	35
C. The Respondent and its professional subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	20	20
D. Ability of Respondent's and its professional subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the Project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	10
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	7

Notes regarding Exhibit "C": Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors to determine the short-listing of the Respondents. Each member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each member will rank the Respondents based upon the member's score for each Respondent. The ranking established by each member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Respondents' total scores from each member will be added and compared. The Respondent with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Respondents.

TOTAL SCORE

100

RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

Committee Mem	ber: Athena Parslow	Date: 79-14
Firm Name:	E Sciences	
Ranked:	3	

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respondents based upon their Qualification Statements in accordance with the following rating factors.

atements in accordance with the following rating factors.		
RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. The experience and qualifications of the Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	30	28
B. The experience and qualifications of the personnel proposed to be assigned to the project by Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	35	30
C. The Respondent and its professional subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	20	15
D. Ability of Respondent's and its professional subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the Project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	10
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	3
TOTAL SCORE	100	85

AIL.

time to the Project and work successfully with

E. Volume of work previously awarded to

TOTAL SCORE

City staff and any other stakeholders.

Respondent by the City.

## EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

Committee Member: Athena Parsle	20	Date: 7-9-14
Firm Name: HRP ASSOC	iates Ir	C
Ranked:		
The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respo Statements in accordance with the following rating factors.		
RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. The experience and qualifications of the Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	30	20
B. The experience and qualifications of the personnel proposed to be assigned to the project by Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	35	30
C. The Respondent and its professional subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	20	10
D. Ability of Respondent's and its professional subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary	10	

5

100

RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

Committee Member: Athena Parslow Date: 7-9-14
Firm Name: P. M.
Ranked:
The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respondents based upon their Qualification Statements in accordance with the following rating factors.

Statements in accordance with the following rating factors.		
RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. The experience and qualifications of the Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	30	20
B. The experience and qualifications of the personnel proposed to be assigned to the project by Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	35	20
C. The Respondent and its professional subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	20	17
D. Ability of Respondent's and its professional subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the Project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	5
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	67.

RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

Committee M	Iember:	nena	Parslow	Date: _	7-9-14
Firm Name:	Tetra	Tee	h		
Ranked:	2				

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respondents based upon their Qualification Statements in accordance with the following rating factors.

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. The experience and qualifications of the Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	30	30
B. The experience and qualifications of the personnel proposed to be assigned to the project by Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	35	30
C. The Respondent and its professional subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	20	20
D. Ability of Respondent's and its professional subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the Project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	10
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0 .
TOTAL SCORE	100	90.

RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

Со	mmittee Member: Athena Parsim Name: Upiversal E	6w	Date: 7-9-14
Fir	m Name: Universal E	ncines	ino
Ra Th	nked:  Barbara Samuel Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respo		
Sta	tements in accordance with the following rating factors.	DA A SYTRATION	ITEM SCODE
	RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
	A. The experience and qualifications of the Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	30	20
	B. The experience and qualifications of the personnel proposed to be assigned to the project by Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	35	23
	C. The Respondent and its professional subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	20	15
	D. Ability of Respondent's and its professional subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the Project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	5
	E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	
ı			

Notes regarding Exhibit "C": Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors to determine the short-listing of the Respondents. Each member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each member will rank the Respondents based upon the member's score for each Respondent. The ranking established by each member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Respondents' total scores from each member will be added and compared. The Respondent with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Respondents.

TOTAL SCORE

Date: 07/09/2014

Committee Member: REVE CARCAMO

time to the Project and work successfully with

E. Volume of work previously awarded to

TOTAL SCORE

City staff and any other stakeholders.

Respondent by the City.

### **EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING**

RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

Firm Name: TRE GROUP, INC. DBA C	ADDIO TRE	
Ranked:	*	
The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respo Statements in accordance with the following rating factors.	ndents based upon thei	r Qualification
RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. The experience and qualifications of the Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	30	28
B. The experience and qualifications of the personnel proposed to be assigned to the project by Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	35	33
C. The Respondent and its professional subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	20	1 Le
D. Ability of Respondent's and its professional subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary	10	

Notes regarding Exhibit "C": Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors to determine the short-listing of the Respondents. Each member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each member will rank the Respondents based upon the member's score for each Respondent. The ranking established by each member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Respondents' total scores from each member will be added and compared. The Respondent with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Respondents.

5

RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

Co	mmittee Member: RENE CARCAMO  m Name: Consession - Rovers & A:		Date: <u>67/69/20</u> 14
Fii	m Name: Consission - Rovers & A:	SSOCIATES, INC	o
	nked:		
	e Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respontements in accordance with the following rating factors.	ndents based upon their	r Qualification
	RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
	A. The experience and qualifications of the Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	30	22
	B. The experience and qualifications of the personnel proposed to be assigned to the project by Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	35	27
	C. The Respondent and its professional subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	20	/3
	D. Ability of Respondent's and its professional subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the Project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	9
	E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
	TOTAL SCORE	100	76

RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

Committee Me	mber: REVE CARCAMO		Date: 07/09/2014	
Firm Name: ENIROLMENTAL CONSULTING of TECHNOLOGY, INC. (ECT)				
Ranked:				
	ommittee will evaluate and score the Respondence with the following rating factors.	ndents based upon thei	r Qualification	
	RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE	
	perience and qualifications of the and its subconsultants providing l services.	30	29	
B. The expersonnel p	sperience and qualifications of the proposed to be assigned to the project dent and its subconsultants providing	35	33	
C. The subconsulta performanc such as	Respondent and its professional	20	20	
D. Ability subconsultatime to the	of Respondent's and its professional ants' personnel to devote necessary Project and work successfully with and any other stakeholders.	10	8	
E. Volume	e of work previously awarded to by the City.	5	3	
	TOTAL SCORE	100	93	

RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

Committee Member: RENE CARCAMO  Firm Name: E SerENCES, FAC.	<b>3</b>	Date: 07/09/2014
Firm Name: E Serences, Inc.		
Ranked: Lo		
The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Responsitements in accordance with the following rating factors.		ir Qualification
RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. The experience and qualifications of the Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	30	22
B. The experience and qualifications of the personnel proposed to be assigned to the project by Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.		26
C. The Respondent and its professional subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	20	17
D. Ability of Respondent's and its professional subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the Project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	8
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	3

Notes regarding Exhibit "C": Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors to determine the short-listing of the Respondents. Each member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each member will rank the Respondents based upon the member's score for each Respondent. The ranking established by each member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Respondents' total scores from each member will be added and compared. The Respondent with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Respondents.

TOTAL SCORE

100

RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

Committee Me	ember: REN	E CARCAM	0	 Date: 07/09/2014
Firm Name:	ARP ASS	OCIATES,	Ide,	
Ranked:	_5			

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respondents based upon their Qualification

Statements in accordance with the following rating factors

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. The experience and qualifications of the Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	30	24
B. The experience and qualifications of the personnel proposed to be assigned to the project by Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	35	24
C. The Respondent and its professional subconsultants records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	20	12e
D. Ability of Respondent's and its professional subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the Project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	8
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	79

RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

Committee Member: Reve Carcano Date: 07/09/2014

Firm Name: PPM Consultants, FAC.

Ranked:

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respondents based upon their Qualification Statements in accordance with the following rating factors.

atements in accordance with the following rating factors.		
RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. The experience and qualifications of the Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	30	28
B. The experience and qualifications of the personnel proposed to be assigned to the project by Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	35	29
C. The Respondent and its professional subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	20	19
D. Ability of Respondent's and its professional subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the Project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	10
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	91

City staff and any other stakeholders.

Respondent by the City.

E. Volume of work previously awarded to

TOTAL SCORE

### **EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING**

RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

		1 . 1
Committee Member: REJE CARCAMO		Date: 07/09/2014
Firm Name: TETRA TECH INC.		
Ranked:		
The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Responsatements in accordance with the following rating factors.		
RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. The experience and qualifications of the Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	30	28
B. The experience and qualifications of the personnel proposed to be assigned to the project by Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.		28
C. The Respondent and its professional subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	20	18
D. Ability of Respondent's and its professional subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the Project and work successfully with	10	10

Notes regarding Exhibit "C": Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors to determine the short-listing of the Respondents. Each member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each member will rank the Respondents based upon the member's score for each Respondent. The ranking established by each member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Respondents' total scores from each member will be added and compared. The Respondent with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Respondents.

5

RQS14-0234 Professional Services for Brownfield Cleanup

Committee M	ember: RENE (	Ancamo		_ Date: _	01/09/2014
Firm Name:	WIVERSAL	ENGINEERING	SCIENCES,	File.	
Ranked:	8				

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respondents based upon their Qualification Statements in accordance with the following rating factors.

atements in accordance with the following rating factors.		
RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. The experience and qualifications of the Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	30	25
B. The experience and qualifications of the personnel proposed to be assigned to the project by Respondent and its subconsultants providing professional services.	35	25
C. The Respondent and its professional subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	20	16
D. Ability of Respondent's and its professional subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the Project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	7
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	73