

Advisory Committee Meeting Final Ranking
RFQu14-0325 Citywide Rapid Response and Minor Projects for
General Grouting and Repair or Replacement of Drainage Wells

COMMITTEE MEMBERS -->	Hector Sanchez	Chuck Shultz	Howard Elkins	Paul Crouter	Byron Raysor
-------------------------------------	-------------------	-----------------	------------------	-----------------	-----------------

CONSOLIDATED RANKING:

	Hector Sanchez	Chuck Shultz	Howard Elkins	Paul Crouter	Byron Raysor	Total	Ranking
Henderson Wilder, Contractor	1	0	1	1	1	4	1
Schuller Contractors Incorporated	2	0	2	2	2	8	2

INDIVIDUAL SCORING AND RANKING:

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Henderson Wilder, Contractor	Schuller Contractors Incorporated
A	32	28	27
B	32	28	26
C	10	8	10
D	10	9	9
E	16	14	14
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	87	86
Hector Sanchez		1	2
Ranking			

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Henderson Wilder, Contractor	Schuller Contractors Incorporated
A	32		
B	32		
C	10		
D	10		
E	16		
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	0	0
Chuck Shultz		0	0
Ranking			

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Henderson Wilder, Contractor	Schuller Contractors Incorporated
A	32	30	29

Advisory Committee Meeting Final Ranking
RFQu14-0325 Citywide Rapid Response and Minor Projects for
General Grouting and Repair or Replacement of Drainage Wells

B	32	30	29
C	10	9	9
D	10	11	8
E	16	14	14
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	94	89
Howard Elkins		1	2
Ranking			

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Henderson Wilder, Contractor	Schuller Contractors Incorporated
A	32	32	30
B	32	32	30
C	10	10	10
D	10	10	9
E	16	14	14
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	98	93
Paul Crouter		1	2
Ranking			

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Henderson Wilder, Contractor	Schuller Contractors Incorporated
A	32	30	29
B	32	31	29
C	10	10	10
D	10	11	10
E	16	14	14
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	96	92
Byron Raysor		1	2
Ranking			

**RFQu14-0325 Request for Qualification Statements for
Citywide Rapid Response and Minor Projects for Infrastructure
& General Grouting and Repair or Maintenance of Drainage Wells**

**GENERAL GROUTING & REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE
WELLS EVALUATION CRITERIA**

Committee Member Hector Sanchez September 25, 2014

Firm Name: Henderson Wilder Contractor

Ranked: 1

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of General Grouting & Repair or Replacement of Drainage Wells in Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	28
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	28
C. Sufficiency of financial resources and ability to perform the Contract.	10	8
D. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	11	9
E. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	87

Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors and 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.

**RFQu14-0325 Request for Qualification Statements for
Citywide Rapid Response and Minor Projects for Infrastructure
& General Grouting and Repair or Maintenance of Drainage Wells**

**GENERAL GROUTING & REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE
WELLS EVALUATION CRITERIA**

Committee Member Hector Sanchez September 25, 2014

Firm Name: Schuller Contractor, 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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of General Grouting & Repair or Replacement of Drainage Wells in Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	27
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	26
C. Sufficiency of financial resources and ability to perform the Contract.	10	10
D. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	11	9
E. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	86

Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors and 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.

**RFQu14-0325 Request for Qualification Statements for
Citywide Rapid Response and Minor Projects for Infrastructure
& General Grouting and Repair or Maintenance of Drainage Wells**

**GENERAL GROUTING & REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE
WELLS EVALUATION CRITERIA**

Committee Member Howard Elkin September 25, 2014

Firm Name: HENDERSON

Ranked: 1

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of General Grouting & Repair or Replacement of Drainage Wells in Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	30
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	30
C. Sufficiency of financial resources and ability to perform the Contract.	10	9
D. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	11	11
E. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	94

Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors and 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.

**RFQu14-0325 Request for Qualification Statements for
Citywide Rapid Response and Minor Projects for Infrastructure
& General Grouting and Repair or Maintenance of Drainage Wells**

**GENERAL GROUTING & REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE
WELLS EVALUATION CRITERIA**

Committee Member HOWARD ELKIN September 25, 2014

Firm Name: SCHOLLER

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of General Grouting & Repair or Replacement of Drainage Wells in Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	29
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	29
C. Sufficiency of financial resources and ability to perform the Contract.	10	9
D. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	11	8
E. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	89

Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors and 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.

**RFQu14-0325 Request for Qualification Statements for
Citywide Rapid Response and Minor Projects for Infrastructure
& General Grouting and Repair or Maintenance of Drainage Wells**

**GENERAL GROUTING & REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE
WELLS EVALUATION CRITERIA**

Committee Member Paul Crouter September 25, 2014

Firm Name: Hewdson Wilder, Contractor

Ranked: 1

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of General Grouting & Repair or Replacement of Drainage Wells in Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	32
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	32
C. Sufficiency of financial resources and ability to perform the Contract.	10	10
D. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	11	10
E. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	98

Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors and 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.

**RFQu14-0325 Request for Qualification Statements for
Citywide Rapid Response and Minor Projects for Infrastructure
& General Grouting and Repair or Maintenance of Drainage Wells**

**GENERAL GROUTING & REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE
WELLS EVALUATION CRITERIA**

Committee Member P. Crouter September 25, 2014

Firm Name: Schuller Contractors 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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of General Grouting & Repair or Replacement of Drainage Wells in Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	30
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	30
C. Sufficiency of financial resources and ability to perform the Contract.	10	10
D. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	11	9
E. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	93

Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors and 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.

**RFQu14-0325 Request for Qualification Statements for
Citywide Rapid Response and Minor Projects for Infrastructure
& General Grouting and Repair or Maintenance of Drainage Wells**

**GENERAL GROUTING & REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE
WELLS EVALUATION CRITERIA**

Committee Member Byron Rayson September 25, 2014

Firm Name: Henderson Wilder, Contractor

Ranked: 1

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of General Grouting & Repair or Replacement of Drainage Wells in Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	30
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	31
C. Sufficiency of financial resources and ability to perform the Contract.	10	10
D. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	11	11
E. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	96

Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors and 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.

**RFQu14-0325 Request for Qualification Statements for
Citywide Rapid Response and Minor Projects for Infrastructure
& General Grouting and Repair or Maintenance of Drainage Wells**

**GENERAL GROUTING & REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE
WELLS EVALUATION CRITERIA**

Committee Member Byron Rayson September 25, 2014

Firm Name: Schuller Contractors Incorporated

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of General Grouting & Repair or Replacement of Drainage Wells in Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	29
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	29
C. Sufficiency of financial resources and ability to perform the Contract.	10	10
D. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules.	11	10
E. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	92

Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors and 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.