

1st ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES RQS14-0324

Request for Qualification Statements for Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street September 18, 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:

Frank Consoli, Traffic Operations Engineer (Chair)
John Rhoades, Economic Development Department
Jeremy Crowe, Civil Engineer IV, Public Works Department
Howard Elkin, Streets and Stormwater, Assistant Division Manager
Byron Raysor, Compliance Investigator III, MWBE Office

Other City Personnel Present:

Roger Cooper, Contract Administrator (Facilitator) Silvia Coste, Purchasing Agent II Cynthia Jordan, Purchasing Agent III

Members of the Public Present:

None

Actions/Discussion/Motions:

The Facilitator called the meeting to order at 9:05 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) Facilitator review Advisory Committee Rules
- 6) Reviewed Public Input Procedures

A motion was made by John Rhoades, and seconded by Howard Elkin, to accept the Public Input Procedures. The motion carried unanimously.

The Facilitator indicated that six (6) 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 August 29, 2014. Those firms are as follows:

- 1) CPH, Inc.
- 2) England-Thims & Miller, Inc.
- 3) Mehta and Associates, Inc.
- 4) Page One Consultants, Inc.
- 5) PSA Constructors, Inc.
- 6) Target Engineering Group, Inc.

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.

At this point the meeting was turned over to the technical Chair, who conducted discussions with the Committee. At the end of discussion, each Committee member individually scored and ranked each firm as follows:

- 1) Mehta and Associates, Inc.
- 2) Page One Consultants, Inc.
- 3) Target Engineering Group, Inc.
- 4) CPH, Inc.
- 5) England-Thims & Miller, Inc.
- 6) PSA Constructors, Inc.

A motion was made by John Rhoades, and seconded by Howard Elkin, to invite a small group of essential personnel from the top three (3) ranked firms for presentations with instructions that each firm should discuss it's understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion. No Members from the Public were present. The motion carried unanimously.

John Rhoades made a motion, seconded by Jeremy Crowe, to allow up to twenty (20) minutes for each presentation and up to a ten (10) minute question-and-answer period with the top three (3) ranked firms, with ten (10) minute breaks in between sessions. The motion carried unanimously.

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

A motion was made by John Rhoades, and seconded by Howard Elkin, to adjourn at 10:45 a.m. The motion carried unanimously.

These minutes are considered to be the official minutes of the RQS14-0324 Advisory Committee Meeting held on September 18, 2014, and no other notes, tapes, or other recordings taken by anyone takes precedence.

submitted by:

Reviewed by:

Reviewed and Accepted by:

Roger Cooper, CPPO, C.P.M. (Facilitator)

Contract Administrator

Teddi McCorkle, CPPB, C.P.M.

Sr. Contract Administrator

Frank Consoli (Chair)
Traffic Operations Engineer

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.

RQS14-0324 Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements for Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street

Consultant Name	Prior Dollars Score (E)
CPH, Inc.	0
England-Thims & Miller, Inc.	5
Mehta and Associates, Inc.	5
Page One Consultants, Inc.	5
PSA Constructors, Inc.	5
Target Engineering Group, Inc.	5

1st Meeting Scoring/Short-List Ranking RQS14-0324 Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street

COMMITTEE	Frank Consoli	John	Jeremy	Howard	Byron
MEMBERS>	Frank Consoli	Rhoades	Crowe	Elkin	Raysor

CONSOLIDATED RANKING:

	Frank Consoli	John Rhoades	Jeremy Crowe	Howard Elkin	Byron Raysor	Total	Ranking
CPH, Inc.	6	2	4	6	6	24	4
England-Thims & Miller, Inc.	4	5	6	5	4	24	4
Mehta and Associates, Inc.	1	1	2	2	1	7	1
Page One Consultants, Inc.	2	4	1	1	2	10	2
PSA Constructors, Inc.	5	6	5	4	5	25	6
Target Engineering Group, Inc.	3	3	3	2	3	14	3

TIE BREAKER ANALYSIS:

Since there is a tie between the following two firms for the number four position, the TOTAL SCORES for these same firms are compared below in order to break this tie:

		John	Jeremy	Howard	Byron		
	Frank Consoli	Rhoades	Crowe	Elkin	Raysor	Total	Ranking
CPH, Inc.	80	89	79	88	87	423	4
England-Thims & Miller, Inc.	86	83	70	91	90	420	5

FINAL RANKING:

Company	Ranking
Mehta and	1
Associates, Inc.	•
Page One	2
Consultants, Inc.	Z
Target Engineering	3
Group, Inc.	3
CPH, Inc.	4
England-Thims &	5
Miller, Inc.	3
PSA Constructors,	6
Inc.	U

1st Meeting Scoring/Short-List Ranking RQS14-0324 Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street

INDIVIDUAL SCORING AND RANKING:

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	CPH, Inc.	England- Thims & Miller, Inc.	Mehta and Associates, Inc.	Page One Consultants, Inc.	PSA Constructors, Inc.	Target Engineering Group, Inc.
A	35	29	29	31	29	27	29
В	25	22	23	22	23	21	22
С	25	21	22	23	22	21	22
D	10	8	7	9	9	8	9
Е	5	0	5	5	5	5	5
F							
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	80	86	90	88	82	87
Frank Consoli	Frank Consoli		4	1	2	5	3
Ranking	g	6	7	1	2	3	3

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	CPH, Inc.	England- Thims & Miller, Inc.	Mehta and Associates, Inc.	Page One Consultants, Inc.	PSA Constructors, Inc.	Target Engineering Group, Inc.
A	35	33	30	33	31	30	33
В	25	25	25	21	21	25	25
С	25	21	15	23	21	15	15
D	10	10	8	10	9	6	10
Е	5	0	5	5	5	5	5
F	0						
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	89	83	92	87	81	88
John Rhoades		2	5	1	4	6	3
Ranking	g	2	3	1	7	U	3

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	CPH, Inc.	England- Thims & Miller, Inc.	Mehta and Associates, Inc.	Page One Consultants, Inc.	PSA Constructors, Inc.	Target Engineering Group, Inc.
A	35	30	20	32	33	20	31
В	25	21	20	22	23	22	20
С	25	20	20	20	20	20	20
D	10	8	5	7	6	4	8
Е	5	0	5	5	5	5	5
F	0						
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	79	70	86	87	71	84
Jeremy Crowe		4	6	2	1	5	3
Ranking	g	_ *	U	2	1	3	3

1st Meeting Scoring/Short-List Ranking RQS14-0324 Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	CPH, Inc.	England- Thims & Miller, Inc.	Mehta and Associates, Inc.	Page One Consultants, Inc.	PSA Constructors, Inc.	Target Engineering Group, Inc.
A	35	34	32	33	33	33	33
В	25	22	24	24	24	23	23
С	25	23	22	23	24	22	24
D	10	9	8	10	10	9	10
Е	5	0	5	5	5	5	5
F	0						
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	88	91	95	96	92	95
Howard Elkin		6	5	2	1	4	2
Ranking		U	S	<i>_</i>	1	,	2

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	CPH, Inc.	England- Thims & Miller, Inc.	Mehta and Associates, Inc.	Page One Consultants, Inc.	PSA Constructors, Inc.	Target Engineering Group, Inc.
A	35	33	32	34	33	32	34
В	25	23	22	24	24	23	24
С	25	23	23	24	24	23	24
D	10	8	8	9	9	6	7
Е	5	0	5	5	5	5	5
F	0						
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	87	90	96	95	89	94
Byron Raysor Rankin	g	6	4	1	2	5	3

RQS14-0324 Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements for Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street

Committee Member: TRANK A. Co	NSOLJ Ser	otember 18, 2014
Firm Name: CPH		_
Ranked:		
The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respo	ondents based upon the	ir Qualification
Statements in accordance with the following rating factors.		T Management by average and
RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.		0.0
	35	29
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-		
consultants.	25	22
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records		
of successful performances on past projects		
including factors such as cost control, work	25	0.1
quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to	3	2.1
schedules and budgetary requirements for such		0,
projects. D. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants'		
personnel to devote necessary time to the project	10	_^
and work successfully with City staff and any	10	1 8
other stakeholders.		
E. Volume of work previously awarded to		
Respondent by the City.	5	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	92

06

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0324 Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements for Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street

Committee Member: TRANK A . (CONSOLI Ser	otember 18, 2014
Firm Name: ETM Ranked: 4 The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Re	espondents based upon the	ir Qualification
Statements in accordance with the following rating fact	ors.	
RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications	35	29
B. The experience and qualifications of the subconsultants.	25	23
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	22
D. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.		7
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	9/

RQS14-0324 Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements for Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street

λ ()

C	ommittee Member: TRANK A. Co	NSOLI Sep	otember 18, 2014
	rm Name: MGHTA		
Ra	anked:		
	ne Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Responsatements in accordance with the following rating factors.		ir Qualification
	RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
	A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	35	31
	B. The experience and qualifications of the subconsultants.	25	22
	C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	23
	D. Ability of Respondent's and 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	90

RQS14-0324 Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements for Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street

Tool A C

Committee Member: TRAN	K M. CON	SOLI Sep	<u>tember 18, 2014</u>	
Firm Name: $\frac{PAGE}{2}$	NE			
The Advisory Committee will evaluate Statements in accordance with the following the content of	e and score the Respo	ndents based upon thei	r Qualification	
RATING FACTO		MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE	
A. Respondent's experience ar	nd qualifications.	35	29	
B. The experience and qualifica consultants.	tions of the sub-	25	23	
C. The Respondent and subcons of successful performances on pincluding factors such as cost or quality and demonstrated ability schedules and budgetary require projects.	past projects ontrol, work to adhere to	25	22	
D. Ability of Respondent's and personnel to devote necessary ti and work successfully with City other stakeholders.	me to the project	10	9	-
E. Volume of work previously a Respondent by the City.	warded to	5	5	
TOTAL SCOR	E	100	90	4

RQS14-0324 Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements for Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street

X

Committee Me	mber: FRANK A. Co	NSOY Sep	tember 18, 2014
Firm Name:	PSA 5		
	mmittee will evaluate and score the Respo	ndents based upon the	ir Qualification
Statements in acc	ordance with the following rating factors.		T
	RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respond	ent's experience and qualifications.	35	27
B. The exper consultants.	ience and qualifications of the sub-	25	21
of successful including fac quality and d	performances on past projects tors such as cost control, work emonstrated ability to adhere to d budgetary requirements for such	25	21
D. Ability of personnel to	Respondent's and subconsultants' devote necessary time to the project reessfully with City staff and any olders.	10	8
E. Volume o Respondent b	f work previously awarded to by the City.	5	5
	TOTAL SCORE	100	82

RQS14-0324 Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements for Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street

To a Comment

Committee Member: FRANK A · COT	1504 Ser	otember 18, 2014
Firm Name: TEG	y = 15	
Ranked: 3		
The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respo	ondents based upon the	ir Qualification
Statements in accordance with the following rating factors.		
RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	35	29
B. The experience and qualifications of the subconsultants.	25	22
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	22
D. Ability of Respondent's and 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	87

Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0324 Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements for Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street

Committee M	ember: Jul	1/4 Mhund	September 18, 2014
Firm Name:	CPH	,	
Ranked:	2		

000110

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. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	35	33
B. The experience and qualifications of the subconsultants.	25	33 25
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	21
D. Ability of Respondent's and 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	89

Fr

RQS14-0324 Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements for Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street

Committee Memb	er: Aus	174	Mhr	M	September 18, 2014	
Firm Name: E	TM	•				
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. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	35	30
B. The experience and qualifications of the subconsultants.	25	30 25
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	15
D. Ability of Respondent's and 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	83

Ja

RQS14-0324 Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements for Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street

Committee 1	Member: //	Il Mark	September 18, 2014
Firm Name: _	MEHTA		
Ranked: _	1		

0 1 01 01

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. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	35	33
B. The experience and qualifications of the subconsultants.	25	21
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	23
D. Ability of Respondent's and 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	92

RQS14-0324 Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements for Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street

Committee Member: John	1 Mark	September 18, 2014
Firm Name: PAGE ONE	V	
Ranked:		

010/00

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. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	35	31
B. The experience and qualifications of the subconsultants.	25	21
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	21
D. Ability of Respondent's and 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	87

RQS14-0324 Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements for Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street

Committee 1	Member:	and Il.	Church	September 18, 2014
Committee	viciniber.	/ / /		Deptember 10, 2014
Firm Name: _	PSA	<u> </u>		·
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. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	35	30
B. The experience and qualifications of the subconsultants.	25	30 25
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	15
D. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	6
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	81

RQS14-0324 Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements for Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street

Committee	Member:	Juh	1/2	Pho	oh	September 18, 2014
Firm Name:	TEG		,			
Ranked:		3				

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. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	35	33
B. The experience and qualifications of the subconsultants.	25	25
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	15
D. Ability of Respondent's and 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	88

Jas

September 18, 2014

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0324 Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements for Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street

Fi	rm Name: CPH, Inc.		
R	anked: 4		
	ne Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respo atements in accordance with the following rating factors.	ondents based upon their	r Qualification
	RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
	A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	35	30
	B. The experience and qualifications of the subconsultants.	25	21
	C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	20
	D. Ability of Respondent's and 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	0
	TOTAL SCORE	100	79

and work successfully with City staff and any

TOTAL SCORE

E. Volume of work previously awarded to

other stakeholders.

Respondent by the City.

September 18, 2014

70

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0324 Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements for Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street

Firm Name: ETM, Inc.		
Ranked: 6		
The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respo	ondents based upon their	r Qualification
Statements in accordance with the following rating factors.		r
RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	35	20
B. The experience and qualifications of the subconsultants.	25	20
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	20
D. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project	10	5

Notes regarding Exhibit "E": 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

other stakeholders.

Respondent by the City.

E. Volume of work previously awarded to

TOTAL SCORE

September 18, 2014

86

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0324 Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements for Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street

	V		
Firm Name: MEHT	A, Inc.	s I v	
Ranked: 2			
	will evaluate and score the Respo	ondents based upon the	ir Qualification
	with the following rating factors. IG FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's ex	perience and qualifications.	35	32
B. The experience an consultants.	d qualifications of the sub-	25	22
of successful perform including factors such quality and demonstra	nd subconsultants' records lances on past projects as cost control, work lated ability to adhere to ary requirements for such	25	20
personnel to devote n	dent's and subconsultants' ecessary time to the project y with City staff and any	10	7

Notes regarding Exhibit "E": 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

September 18, 2014

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0324 Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements for Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street

Fir	rm Name: POC		
	nked:		
	e Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respontements in accordance with the following rating factors.	ondents based upon their	r Qualification
	RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
	A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	35	33
	B. The experience and qualifications of the subconsultants.	25	23
	C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	20
	D. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	6
	E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
	TOTAL SCORE	100	87

T

C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work

quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such

D. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project

and work successfully with City staff and any

E. Volume of work previously awarded to

projects.

other stakeholders.

Respondent by the City.

20

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0324 Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements for Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street

<u>C</u>	Committee Member: Jeveny Crobe	Sep	<u>tember 18, 2014</u>
Fi	irm Name: PSA	95	
R	anked: 5		
	he Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Responsatements in accordance with the following rating factors.	ondents based upon their	r Qualification
	RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
	A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	35	20
	B. The experience and qualifications of the subconsultants.	25	22

25

10

5

Notes regarding Exhibit "E": 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

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.

E. Volume of work previously awarded to

TOTAL SCORE

Respondent by the City.

September 18, 2014

84

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0324 Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements for Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street

Firm Name: TEG, luc.		
Ranked: 3	*	
The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Responsible Statements in accordance with the following rating factors.	-	r Qualification
RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	35	31
B. The experience and qualifications of the subconsultants.	25	20
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	20
D. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	8

Notes regarding Exhibit "E": 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

MARIN

Committee Member:

September 18, 2014

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0324 Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements for Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street

Firm Name: CPI	+			
Ranked: 6				
	Ill evaluate and score the Responsible the following rating factors.	ndents based upon the	ir Qualification	
	G FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE	
A. Respondent's expo	erience and qualifications.	35	34	
B. The experience and consultants.	qualifications of the sub-	25	22	
of successful performa including factors such quality and demonstrat	as cost control, work	25	23	
personnel to devote ne	ent's and subconsultants' cessary time to the project with City staff and any	10	9	
E. Volume of work pro Respondent by the City		5	0	
TOTA	AL SCORE	100	88	

Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0324 Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements for Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street

Committee N	Aember:	No	WARD	ELKIN		September 18, 2014
Firm Name:	ETH	1			N .,	
Ranked:	X	5	De	· · ·		

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. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	35	32
B. The experience and qualifications of the subconsultants.	25	zy
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	Zζ
D. Ability of Respondent's and 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

Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street

TOWARD

Committee Member:

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0324 Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements for Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street

Firm Name: MEHTA		
Ranked: Z		
The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Responsible Statements in accordance with the following rating factors. RATING FACTORS	ondents based upon the	ir Qualification
RATING FACTORS	POINTS	TEMBEORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	35	33
B. The experience and qualifications of the subconsultants.	25	24
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	23
D. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	/ 0
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	95

Committee Member:

HOWARD

September 18, 2014

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0324 Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements for Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street

Firm Name: PALE ONE		
Ranked:		
The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respo Statements in accordance with the following rating factors.	ndents based upon their	r Qualification
RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	35	33
B. The experience and qualifications of the subconsultants.	. 25	24
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	24
D. Ability of Respondent's and 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	96

Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0324 Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements for Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street

Committee M	ember:	HOWARD	ELKIN	September 18, 2014
Firm Name:	PSA			
Ranked:	×	4 12.		
The Advisory C	ommittaa I	will avaluate and a	ages the Desmandants l	accad upon their Qualification

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. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	35	33
B. The experience and qualifications of the subconsultants.	25	23
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	22
D. Ability of Respondent's and 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

Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street

HOWARD

Committee Member:

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0324 Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements for Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street

ELKIN

Firm Name: TEG		
Ranked: 2		
The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Responsatements in accordance with the following rating factors.		
RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	35	33
B. The experience and qualifications of the subconsultants.	25	23
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	24
D. Ability of Respondent's and 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	95

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0324 Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements for Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street

BURDO RANSOT

Committee Member: By Now RAYSOF	Ser	otember 18, 2014
Firm Name: CPH, JNC Ranked: 6		
The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Responsite Evaluation of the Responsite Evaluation o		
RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	35	33
B. The experience and qualifications of the subconsultants.	25	23
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such	25	
projects.		23
D. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any	10	Q.
other stakeholders. E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	87

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0324 Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements for Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street

Ruces Raysur

Committee Member: By run Kaysur	Sep	tember 18, 2014
Firm Name: England - Thims + Miller	, the	
Ranked: 4		
The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Responsatements in accordance with the following rating factors.		ir Qualification
RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	35	32
B. The experience and qualifications of the subconsultants.	25	22
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such	25	
projects.		23
D. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project	10	
and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.		8
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	S
TOTAL SCORE	100	90

TOTAL SCORE

Committee Member:

September 18, 2014

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0324 Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements for Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street

Ruger Rayers

	200	tember 10, 2011
Firm Name: Mehta + Associate		
Firm Name: Menta & Associate		
Ranked:		
The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Responsatements in accordance with the following rating factors.	ndents based upon thei	r Qualification
RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	2.1
	35	34
B. The experience and qualifications of the subconsultants.	25	24
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to	25	
schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.		24
D. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any	10	
other stakeholders.		9
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5

Notes regarding Exhibit "E": 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.

100

96

Committee Member:

September 18, 2014

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0324 Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements for Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street

Byron Raysur

Firm Name: Page One Consultants, In	C	
Ranked: 2		
The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Responsatements in accordance with the following rating factors.		r Qualification
RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	35	33
B. The experience and qualifications of the subconsultants.	25	24
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	24
D. Ability of Respondent's and 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

Committee Member:

September 18, 2014

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0324 Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements for Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street

Ruan Ransur

Fi	irm Name: PSA Consultants, Inc		
R	anked:5		
	the Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Responsatements in accordance with the following rating factors.	ondents based upon their	r Qualification
,	RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
	A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	35	32
	B. The experience and qualifications of the subconsultants.	25	23
	C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such	25	
	projects. D. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	23 b
	E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
	TOTAL SCORE	100	89

Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0324 Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Road and Drainage Improvements for Sligh Boulevard and Columbia Street

Committee Member: Byron Raysor	Sep	tember 18, 2014
Firm Name: Target Engineering Grown Ranked:	ip, Inc	
The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respo	ondents based upon their	r Qualification
Statements in accordance with the following rating factors. RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	35	34
B. The experience and qualifications of the subconsultants.	25	24
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such	25	24
projects. D. Ability of Respondent's and 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	94