



CITY OF ORLANDO

2nd ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

RQS15-0060

Request for Qualification Statements for Design Review, Construction Administration, and Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation January 21, 2015 – 9 a.m.

Agenda Conference Rooms (2th Floor) and Tarpon Conference Room (4th Floor)
City Hall, 400 S. Orange Ave., Orlando, FL

The purpose of the subject meeting was to hold discussions and hear presentations from shortlisted firms and then review, score, and rank each of those firms.

Committee Members Present:

Michael Melzer, P.E., Project Manager / Construction Manager, CIID, PW (Chair)
Charles Shultz, P.E., Assistant Wastewater Division Manager, PW
Ben Gray, Stormwater Assistant Division Manager, PW
Ron Proulx, Construction Manager, CIID, PW
Byron Raysor, Compliance Investigator III, MWBE Office

Other City Personnel Present:

Roger Cooper, Contract Administrator (Facilitator)

Members of the Public Present:

None

City staff introduced themselves and signed the attendance roster. The meeting was publicly posted for more than 48 hours in advance, and there was a quorum present.

Presentation Schedule of Shortlisted Firms:

<u>Time</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Company Name</u>	<u>Meeting Room</u>	<u>Floor</u>
9:00 -- 9:25 a.m.	1/21/15	AECOM Technical Services	Agenda Conference Room	2nd
9:35 -- 10:00 a.m.	1/21/15	CPH, Inc.	Tarpon Conference Room	4th
10:10 -- 10:35 a.m.	1/21/15	Mehta and Associates, Inc.	Agenda Conference Room	2nd

After presentations, 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 Committee Chair, who conducted discussions with the Committee members. At the end of those discussions, each Committee Member individually scored and ranked each firm. The consolidated results of that ranking are as follows:

1. CPH, Inc.
2. AECOM Technical Services
3. Mehta and Associates, Inc.

A motion was made by Charles Shultz, and seconded by Byron Raysor, to accept the rankings and to recommend to City Council for City staff to commence negotiations for a contract with the top ranked firm in ranked order until successful. There were no members of the general public present. The motion carried unanimously.

A motion was made by Ron Proulx, and seconded by Ben Gray, to adjourn at 11:18 a.m. The motion carried unanimously.

These minutes are considered to be the official minutes of the RQS15-0060 Advisory Committee Meeting held on January 21, 2015, and no other notes, tapes, or other recordings taken by anyone takes precedence.

Submitted by:



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

Reviewed by:



Teddi McCorkle, CPPB, C.P.M.
Sr. Contract Administrator

Reviewed and Accepted by:



Michael Melzer, P.E. (Chair)
Project Mgr / Construction Mgr
Public Works Department

Attachments: List of Predetermined Scores
Spreadsheet of Individual and Consolidated Rankings
Individual Scores and Rankings

Pre-Determined Scores
Rating Factor E
Volume of Work Previously Awarded to Respondent by City
(Actual Dollars Paid as Per Solicitation Section 7)

<u>Name of Company</u>	<u>Score for Rating Factor E</u>
AECOM Technical Services	0
CPH, Inc.	0
Mehta and Associates, Inc.	5

2nd Meeting Final Scoring/Ranking
RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation

COMMITTEE MEMBERS -->	Michael Melzer	Charles Shultz	Ben Gray	Ron Proulx	Byron Raysor
-------------------------------------	-------------------	-------------------	----------	------------	-----------------

CONSOLIDATED RANKING:

	Michael Melzer	Charles Shultz	Ben Gray	Ron Proulx	Byron Raysor	Total	Ranking
AECOM Technical Services	2	2	2	2	3	11	2
CPH, Inc.	1	1	1	1	2	6	1
Mehta and Associates, Inc.	3	3	3	3	1	13	3

INDIVIDUAL SCORING AND RANKING:

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	AECOM Technical Services	CPH, Inc.	Mehta and Associates, Inc.
A	30	28	29	25
B	20	18	17	16
C	25	24	23	21
D	10	9	9	8
E	5	0	0	5
F	10	7	9	8
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	86	87	83
Michael Melzer		2	1	3
Ranking				

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	AECOM Technical Services	CPH, Inc.	Mehta and Associates, Inc.
A	30	25	28	22
B	20	15	18	17
C	25	20	20	18
D	10	8	9	7
E	5	0	0	5
F	10	8	9	6
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	76	84	75
Charles Shultz		2	1	3
Ranking				

2nd Meeting Final Scoring/Ranking
RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	AECOM Technical Services	CPH, Inc.	Mehta and Associates, Inc.
A	30	27	28	25
B	20	20	20	20
C	25	20	25	20
D	10	10	10	8
E	5	0	0	5
F	10	8	10	5
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	85	93	83
Ben Gray		2	1	3
Ranking				

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	AECOM Technical Services	CPH, Inc.	Mehta and Associates, Inc.
A	30	27	28	22
B	20	16	17	12
C	25	18	21	15
D	10	6	8	4
E	5	0	0	5
F	10	6	9	5
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	73	83	63
Ron Proulx		2	1	3
Ranking				

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	AECOM Technical Services	CPH, Inc.	Mehta and Associates, Inc.
A	30	29	29	28
B	20	19	19	19
C	25	24	24	24
D	10	9	9	8
E	5	0	0	5
F	10	8	9	7
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	89	90	91
Byron Raysor		3	2	1
Ranking				

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: Mike Melzer DATE: 1/21/15

FIRM NAME: AECOM

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.	30	28
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	18
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, as well as make effective public presentations.	10	9
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0
F. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	7
TOTAL SCORE	100	86

RANK: 2

Notes regarding Exhibit "H:" 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.

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: Mike Melzer DATE: 1/21/15

FIRM NAME: CPH

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.	30	29
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	17
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, as well as make effective public presentations.	10	9
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0
F. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	9
TOTAL SCORE	100	87

RANK: 1

Notes regarding Exhibit "H:" 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.

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: Mike Melzer DATE: 1/21/15

FIRM NAME: MENTA

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.	30	25
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	16
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, as well as make effective public presentations.	10	8
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
F. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	8
TOTAL SCORE	100	83

RANK: 3

Notes regarding Exhibit "H:" 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.

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: Chuck Skwartz DATE: 1-21-2015

FIRM NAME: AELcom

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.	30	25
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	15
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, as well as make effective public presentations.	10	8
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0
F. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	8
TOTAL SCORE	100	76

RANK: 2

Notes regarding Exhibit "H:" 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.

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: Kevin Switz DATE: 1-21-2015

FIRM NAME: CPH, Inc

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.	30	28
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	18
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, as well as make effective public presentations.	10	9
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0
F. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	9
TOTAL SCORE	100	84

RANK: 1

Notes regarding Exhibit "H:" 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.

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: Chuck Shultz DATE: 1-21-2015

FIRM NAME: Manta

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.	30	22
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	17
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	18
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, as well as make effective public presentations.	10	7
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
F. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	6
TOTAL SCORE	100	75

RANK: 3

Notes regarding Exhibit "H:" 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.

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: Ron Prolix DATE: 1/21/15

FIRM NAME: AECOM

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.	30	27
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	16
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	18
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, as well as make effective public presentations.	10	6
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0
F. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	6
TOTAL SCORE	100	73

RANK: 2

Notes regarding Exhibit "H:" 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.

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: RON PROULX DATE: 1/21/15

FIRM NAME: CPH

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.	30	28
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	17
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, as well as make effective public presentations.	10	8
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0
F. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	9
TOTAL SCORE	100	83

RANK: 1

Notes regarding Exhibit "H:" 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.

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: RON PROULX **DATE:** 1/21/15

FIRM NAME: MEHTA AND ASSOCIATES

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.	30	22
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	12
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, as well as make effective public presentations.	10	4
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
F. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	63

RANK: 3

Notes regarding Exhibit "H:" 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.

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: Ben Gray DATE: 1/21/2015

FIRM NAME: AECOM Technical Services

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.	30	27
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	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, as well as make effective public presentations.	10	10
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0
F. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	8
TOTAL SCORE	100	85

RANK: 2

Notes regarding Exhibit "H:" 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.

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: Ben Gray DATE: 1/21/2015

FIRM NAME: CPH, Inc.

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.	30	28
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	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	25
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, as well as make effective public presentations.	10	10
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0
F. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	10
TOTAL SCORE	100	93

RANK: 1

Notes regarding Exhibit "H:" 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.

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: Ben Gray DATE: 1/21/2015

FIRM NAME: Mehta and Associates

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.	30	25
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	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, as well as make effective public presentations.	10	8
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
F. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	83

RANK: 3

Notes regarding Exhibit "H:" 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.

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: Byron Rayson DATE: 1/21/2015

FIRM NAME: AECOM Technical Services

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.	30	29
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	19
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, as well as make effective public presentations.	10	9
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0
F. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	8
TOTAL SCORE	100	89

RANK: 3

Notes regarding Exhibit "H:" 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.

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: Byron Rayson DATE: 1/21/2015

FIRM NAME: CPH, INC

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.	30	29
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	19
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, as well as make effective public presentations.	10	9
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0
F. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	9
TOTAL SCORE	100	90

RANK: 2

Notes regarding Exhibit "H:" 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.

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: Byron Raysor DATE: 1/21/2015

FIRM NAME: Mehra + Associates, Inc

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.	30	28
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	19
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, as well as make effective public presentations.	10	8
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
F. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	7
TOTAL SCORE	100	91

RANK: 1

Notes regarding Exhibit "H:" 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.