CITY OF ORLANDO

SIXTH (6th) ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
for
RFP15-0011
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM (EDIS)
Tuesday, March 31, 2015
Sustainability Conference Room, City Hall, 2nd Floor
8:00 AM

The Sixth (6th) Advisory Committee (Committee) for the above project convened on March 31, 2015, at 8:00 am at the Sustainability Conference Room, City Hall. The purpose of this meeting was to review and discuss the responsive proposals, and to individually score and rank.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

1. Mike Rhodes – Code Enforcement Division Manager (Chair)
2. Lisa Henry – Streets and Stormwater Division Manager
3. Tim Johnson – Permitting Division Manager
4. Chris McCullion - Treasurer
5. Lillian Scott-Payne – Business Development Division Manager
6. Roger Selch - Dover Shores East HOA
7. Rich Wales - Deputy Fire Chief
8. Richard Levey - Levey Consulting
9. Tisa Mitchell - Fiscal Manager – Economic Development
10. Rosa Akhtarkhavari – Chief Information Officer

COMMITTEE MEMBER ABSENT:

Roger Selch - Dover Shores East HOA

PROCUREMENT REPRESENTATIVE:

1. Teddi McCorkle, Senior Contract Administrator (Facilitator)
2. Maureen Bowman, Purchasing Agent II

OTHERS PRESENT (CITY STAFF):

1. Joe Szewczyk – Fire Prevention Inspector III, OFD
2. Wendy Horency – Code Enforcement Manager
3. Sanjiv Gandhi - Technology Business Analyst
4. Deidre A Becker - Client Support Services Manager
5. Dawn Chin Shue – Contract Compliance Invest. III W/MBE
6. Mike Mills - Applications Developer IV
7. John Oppermann - Applications Administrator
8. Crystal Speirs - Applications Developer V – TM
9. Tammy Hughes – Fire Marshal - Fire

Discussion and Motions:

Ms. McCorkle, Facilitator, took the following actions:

1) Introduced herself.
2) Called the meeting to order at 8:09 a.m.
3) Advised the Committee that a quorum is established.
4) Announced that the meeting is being recorded.

5) Reviewed Public Input Procedures – No public present.
6) Asked all attendees to sign the sign-in sheet.
7) Announced that the meeting was publicly posted more than 48 hours in advance.
8) All Committee members, Technical Advisor(s) and presenters to introduce themselves.

DISCUSSION AND MOTIONS:

A motion was made by Mr. Johnson, seconded by Mr. McCullion, to accept the minutes of the Fourth (4th) February 16, 2015 and Fifth (5th) March 16/17, 2015 Committee Meetings as presented. Discussion ensued. Motion carried unanimously.

Ms. McCorkle noted for the record that there was no one present from the public.

After review and discussion, Ms. McCorkle distributed the scoring sheet to each voting member to individually score and rank each short listed proposer. Results were tabulated on a ranking form by Ms. McCorkle. The ranking is as follows (ranking tally and scoring sheets are attached):

Rank	Firm
1	Infor Public Sector, Inc.
2	Accela, Inc.
3	CSDC systems, Inc.
4	Computronix (U.S.A.), Inc.

A motion was made by ----------Mr. Johnson and seconded by Ms. Akhtarkhavari to accept the ranking and evaluations of the proposals, and recommend to City Council that the Chief Procurement Officer negotiate a contract with one (1) Proposer in the ranked order until successful. No one was present from the public. Discussion ensued. Motion carried unanimously.

Ms. McCorkle reminded the Committee that all the rules are still in place until contracts are signed and that all proposal and evaluation materials will be collected after the meeting is adjourned.

The meeting was adjourned by Mr. Rhodes, Chair, at 9:32 am. Meeting adjourned.

These minutes are considered to be the official minutes of the RFP15-0011 Advisory Committee Meeting held on March 31, 2015, and no other notes, tapes, or other recordings taken by anyone takes precedence.

Submitted by:

Teddi McCorkle
Senior Contract Administrator
(Facilitator)

Review and Accepted by:

Mike Rhodes
Division Manager
(Chair)

Attachment(s): Sign-in Sheets

Evaluation Criteria – Scoring Sheets

CITY OF ORLANDO

Procurement and Contracts Division
6th Advisory Committee Meeting Sign-In Sheet

Date: 3-31-15	Time: 8:00 a.m.	Bid Number: RFP15-0011	Location: Sustainability Conference Room, 2nd Floor, City Hall Orlando, FL

Title: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM (EDIS)

COMPANY NAME & ADDRESS DEPARTMENT/BUREAU	COMPANY REPRESENTATIVE (PLEASE PRINT LEGIBLE YOUR NAME & PROVIDE SIGNATURE)	EMAIL ADDRESS! IMPORTANT (DO NOT LEAVE IN BLANK)	TELEPHONE #	FAX #
Procurement & Contracts Div. 400 South Orange Avenue Orlando, Florida 32801	**Teddi McCorkle, Contract Administrator Maureen Bowman, Purchasing Agent II**	**teddi.mccorkle@cityoforlando.net Maureen.bowman@cityoforlando.net**	**(407) 246-2332 (407) 246-2363**	**(407) 246-2869**
Code Enforcement Division City of Orlando 53 West Central Blvd. Orlando, Florida 32801	**Mike Rhodes, Code Enforcement Division Manager (Chair)**	**mike.rhodes@cityoforlando.net**		
Streets & Stormwater Division 400 South Orange Avenue, 8th Floor, City Hall Orlando, Florida 32801	**Lisa Henry, Streets & Stormwater Division Manager**	**lisa.henry@cityoforlando.net**		
Permitting Services Division 400 South Orange Avenue, 1st Floor, City Hall Orlando, Florida 32801	**Tim Johnson, Permitting Division Manager**	**timothy.johnson@cityoforlando.net**		
Technology Management Div. 400 South Orange Avenue, 5th Floor, City Hall Orlando, Florida 32801	**Rosa Akhtarkhavari, Chief Information Officer**	**rosa.akhtarkhavari@cityoforlando.net**		

CITY OF ORLANDO

Procurement and Contracts Division
6th Advisory Committee Meeting Sign-In Sheet

Date: 3-31-15	Time: 8:00 a.m.	Bid Number: RFP15-0011	Location: Sustainability Conference Room, 2nd Floor, City Hall Orlando, FL

Title: **ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM (EDIS)**

COMPANY NAME & ADDRESS DEPARTMENT/BUREAU	COMPANY REPRESENTATIVE (PLEASE PRINT LEGIBLE YOUR NAME & PROVIDE SIGNATURE)	EMAIL ADDRESS: IMPORTANT (DO NOT LEAVE IN BLANK)	TELEPHONE #	FAX #
Business and Financial Services Department 400 South Orange Avenue, 4th Floor, City Hall Orlando, Florida 32801	Chris McCullion, Treasurer	christopher.mccullion@cityoforlando.net	(407) 246-4274	
Business Development Division City of Orlando 400 South Orange Avenue, 6th Floor, City Hall Orlando, Florida 32801	Lillian Scott-Payne, Business Development Division Manager	lillian.scottpayne@cityoforlando.net	(407) 246-3648	
Economical Development Department 400 South Orange Avenue, 6th Floor, City Hall Orlando, Florida 32801	Tisa Mitchell, Fiscal Manager, Economical Development	tisa.mitchell@cityoforlando.net	(407) 246-3179	
Orlando Fire Department City of Orlando 78 West Central Boulevard Orlando, Florida 32801	Rich Wales, Deputy Fire Chief	richard.wales@cityoforlando.net	(407) 246-2135	
Levey Consulting 611 Avalon Boulevard Orlando, Florida 32806	Richard Levey, Levey Consulting	rlevey@leveyconsulting.com		

CITY OF ORLANDO

Procurement and Contracts Division
6th Advisory Committee Meeting Sign-In Sheet

Date: 3-31-15	Time: 8:00 a.m.	Bid Number: RFP15-0011	Location: Sustainability Conference Room, 2nd Floor, City Hall Orlando, FL

Title: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM (EDIS)

COMPANY NAME & ADDRESS DEPARTMENT/BUREAU	COMPANY REPRESENTATIVE (PLEASE PRINT LEGIBLE YOUR NAME & PROVIDE SIGNATURE)	EMAIL ADDRESS: IMPORTANT (DO NOT LEAVE IN BLANK)	TELEPHONE #	FAX #
Dover Shores East HOA 781 Marscastle Avenue Orlando, Florida 32807-1024	**Roger Selch, Dover Shores East HOA**	**selcgr@gmail.com**		
CITY OF ORLANDO	MIKE MILLS			
City of Orlando Tech. Mgmt.	Sanjiv Gandhi	Sanjiv.Gandhi@City of Orlando.me.	x3054	
City of Orlando Code Enforcement	Wendy Herency	Wendy.herency@City of orlando.net	3381	
MBE OFFICE CITY OF ORLANDO	DAWN CHIN SHUE Dawn Chin Shue			

CITY OF ORLANDO

Procurement and Contracts Division
6th Advisory Committee Meeting Sign-In Sheet

Date: 3-31-15	Time: 8:00 a.m.	Bid Number: RFP15-0011	Location: Sustainability Conference Room, 2nd Floor, City Hall Orlando, FL

Title: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM (EDIS)

COMPANY NAME & ADDRESS DEPARTMENT/BUREAU	COMPANY REPRESENTATIVE (PLEASE PRINT LEGIBLE YOUR NAME & PROVIDE SIGNATURE)	EMAIL ADDRESS: IMPORTANT (DO NOT LEAVE IN BLANK)	TELEPHONE #	FAX #
City of Orlando TM	JOHN OPPERMANN	john.opperman@cityoforlando.net	407 246 3049	
City of Orlando	Dee Becker		4072463057	
City of Orlando	Crystal Speirs	crystal.speirs@cityoforlando.net	4072463045	
City of Orland	Tony [illegible]	Kee Mashy	407 246 302	
City of Orlando OFD	Joseph Szewczyk	joseph.szewczyk@cityoforlando.net	407-246-3134	

RFP15-0011 Economic Development Information System (EDIS)
Committee Scoring and Ranking Tally
March 31, 2015

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Mike Rhodes	Lisa Henry	Tim Johnson	Rosa Akhtarkhavari	Chris McCullion	Lillian Scott-Payne	Tisa Mitchell	Rich Wales	Richard Levey	Roger Selch

CONSOLIDATED RANKING:

	Mike Rhodes	Lisa Henry	Tim Johnson	Rosa Akhtarkhavari	Chris McCullion	Lillian Scott-Payne	Tisa Mitchell	Rich Wales	Richard Levey	Roger Selch	Total	Ranking
Accela	**2**	**3**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**4**	**3**	**0**	**22**	**2**
Computronix	**3**	**4**	**3**	**4**	**3**	**4**	**3**	**3**	**4**	**0**	**31**	**4**
CSDC Systems	**4**	**2**	**4**	**3**	**4**	**3**	**4**	**1**	**2**	**0**	**27**	**3**
Infor Public Sector	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**2**	**1**	**0**	**10**	**1**

INDIVIDUAL SCORING / RANKING:

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Accela	Computronix	CSDC Systems	Infor Public Sector
A	**20**	18	15	12	18
B	**10**	8	6	7	9
C	**33**	28	20	22	33
D	**5**	5	3	0	0
E	**2**	0	0	0	0
F	**30**	15	20	22	28
TOTAL POINT VALUE	**100**	**74**	**64**	**63**	**88**
Mike Rhodes Ranking		**2**	**3**	**4**	**1**

Mike Rhodes

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Accela	Computronix	CSDC Systems	Infor Public Sector
A	**20**	20	17	16	16
B	**10**	7	8	6	7

RFP15-0011 Economic Development Information System (EDIS)
Committee Scoring and Ranking Tally
March 31, 2015

C	**33**	20	10	25	25
D	**5**	5	3	0	0
E	**2**	0	0	0	0
F	**30**	20	26	26	27
TOTAL POINT VALUE	**100**	**72**	**64**	**73**	**75**
Lisa Henry		**3**	**4**	**2**	**1**
Ranking					

Lisa Henry

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Accela	Computronix	CSDC Systems	Infor Public Sector
A	**20**	10	5	5	20
B	**10**	4	2	2	10
C	**33**	15	10	10	33
D	**5**	5	3	0	0
E	**2**	0	0	0	0
F	**30**	5	10	5	30
TOTAL POINT VALUE	**100**	**39**	**30**	**22**	**93**
Tim Johnson		**2**	**3**	**4**	**1**
Ranking					

Tim Johnson

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Accela	Computronix	CSDC Systems	Infor Public Sector
A	**20**	17	12	12	19
B	**10**	9	8	8	9
C	**33**	23	15	20	31
D	**5**	5	4	0	0
E	**2**	0	0	0	0
F	**30**	20	18	19	26
TOTAL POINT VALUE	**100**	**74**	**57**	**59**	**85**

Rosa Akhtarkhavari

RFP15-0011 Economic Development Information System (EDIS)
Committee Scoring and Ranking Tally
March 31, 2015

Rosa Akhtarkhavari	2	4	3	1
Ranking				

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Accela	Computronix	CSDC Systems	Infor Public Sector
A	**20**	20	16	15	20
B	**10**	10	8	6	10
C	**33**	30	25	22	33
D	**5**	5	3	0	0
E	**2**	0	0	0	0
F	**30**	20	26	27	30
TOTAL POINT VALUE	**100**	**85**	**78**	**70**	**93**
Chris McCullion		**2**	**3**	**4**	**1**
Ranking					

Chris McCullion

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Accela	Computronix	CSDC Systems	Infor Public Sector
A	**20**	15	10	15	20
B	**10**	5	5	5	10
C	**33**	25	10	20	30
D	**5**	5	0	0	0
E	**2**	0	0	0	0
F	**30**	15	15	15	15
TOTAL POINT VALUE	**100**	**65**	**40**	**55**	**75**
Lillian Scott-Payne		**2**	**4**	**3**	**1**
Ranking					

Lillian Scott-Payne

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Accela	Computronix	CSDC Systems	Infor Public Sector
A	**20**	15	14	13	18
B	**10**	8	7	7	10

RFP15-0011 Economic Development Information System (EDIS)
Committee Scoring and Ranking Tally
March 31, 2015

C	**33**	20	25	15	33
D	**5**	5	3	0	0
E	**2**	0	0	0	0
F	**30**	20	17	15	30
TOTAL POINT VALUE	**100**	**68**	**66**	**50**	**91**
Tisa Mitchell		**2**	**3**	**4**	**1**
Ranking					

Tisa Mitchell

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Accela	Computronix	CSDC Systems	Infor Public Sector
A	**20**	15	12	15	12
B	**10**	8	6	8	7
C	**33**	20	24	30	27
D	**5**	5	3	0	0
E	**2**	0	0	0	0
F	**30**	20	24	24	28
TOTAL POINT VALUE	**100**	**68**	**69**	**77**	**74**
Rich Wales		**4**	**3**	**1**	**2**
Ranking					

Rich Wales

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Accela	Computronix	CSDC Systems	Infor Public Sector
A	**20**	20	20	20	20
B	**10**	10	10	10	10
C	**33**	15	20	28	33
D	**5**	5	3	0	0
E	**2**	0	0	0	0
F	**30**	25	20	20	30
TOTAL POINT VALUE	**100**	**75**	**73**	**78**	**93**

Richard Levey

RFP15-0011 Economic Development Information System (EDIS)
Committee Scoring and Ranking Tally
March 31, 2015

Richard Levey	3	4	2	1
Ranking				

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Accela	Computronix	CSDC Systems	Infor Public Sector
A	20				
B	10				
C	33				
D	5				
E	2				
F	30				
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	0	0	0	0
Roger Selch		0	0	0	0
Ranking					

Roger Selch

TOTAL SCORES

RFP15-0011 Economic Development Information System (EDIS)
Committee Scoring and Ranking Tally
March 31, 2015

Accela	Computronix	CSDC Systems	Infor Public Sector

Accela	Computronix	CSDC Systems	Infor Public Sector	0	0	0

74	64	63	88	0	0	0

RFP15-0011 Economic Development Information System (EDIS)
Committee Scoring and Ranking Tally
March 31, 2015

72	64	73	75	0	0	0
39	30	22	93	0	0	0
74	57	59	85	0	0	0

RFP15-0011 Economic Development Information System (EDIS)
Committee Scoring and Ranking Tally
March 31, 2015

85	78	70	93	0	0	0
65	40	55	75	0	0	0

RFP15-0011 Economic Development Information System (EDIS)
Committee Scoring and Ranking Tally
March 31, 2015

68	66	50	91	0	0	0
68	69	77	74	0	0	0
75	73	78	93	0	0	0

RFP15-0011 Economic Development Information System (EDIS)
Committee Scoring and Ranking Tally
March 31, 2015

0	0	0	0	0	0	0
620	541	547	767	0	0	0
Accela	Computronix	CSDC Systems	Infor Public Sector	0	0	0

EVALUATION CRITERIA ~~FOR SHORT-LISTING~~

RFP15-0011 Economic Development Information System

Committee Meeting #6, March 30, 2015

Committee Member: Mike Rhodes
(Print Name)

Committee Member Signature: Mike Rhodes

Date: 3-31-15

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respondents based upon the following Evaulation Criteria.

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	Accela, Inc.	Computronix (U.S.A.), Inc.	CSDC Systems, Inc.	Infor Public Sector, Inc.
A. Proposer's Experience.	20	18	15	12	18
B. Staff Experience.	10	8	6	7	9
C. Business/Project Plan and Functional Capabilities Questionnaire.	33	28	20	22	33
D. Minority and Women Owned Business Enterprise - The degree of participation by City certified or recognized M/WBE in subcontracts.	5	5	3	0	0
E. Veteran Business Enterprise participation in subcontracts.	2	0	0	0	0
E. Price Proposal.	30	15	20	22	28
TOTAL SCORE	**100**	74	64	63	88
RANKING		2	3	4	1

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.

EVALUATION CRITERIA ~~FOR SHORT-LISTING~~

RFP15-0011 Economic Development Information System

Committee Meeting #6, March 30, 2015

Committee Member: Lisa Henry
(PrintName)

Committee Member Signature: _____ Date: 3.31.15

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respondents based upon the following Evaulation Criteria.

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	Accela, Inc.	Computronix (U.S.A.), Inc.	CSDC Systems, Inc.	Infor Public Sector, Inc.
A. Proposer's Experience.	20	20	17	16	16
B. Staff Experience.	10	7	8	6	7
C. Business/Project Plan and Functional Capabilities Questionnaire.	33	20	10	25	25
D. Minority and Women Owned Business Enterprise - The degree of participation by City certified or recognized M/WBE in subcontracts.	5	5	3	0	0
E. Veteran Business Enterprise participation in subcontracts.	2	0	0	0	0
E. Price Proposal.	30	20	26	26	27
TOTAL SCORE	**100**	72	64	73	75
RANKING		3	4	2	1

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.

EVALUATION CRITERIA ~~FOR SHORT-LISTING~~

RFP15-0011 Economic Development Information System

Committee Meeting #6, March 31, 2015

Committee Member: TIMOTHY L. JOHNSON
(Print Name)

Committee Member Signature: [signature]

Date: 3/31/2015

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respondents based upon the following Evaulation Criteria.

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	Accela, Inc.	Computronix (U.S.A.), Inc.	CSDC Systems, Inc.	Infor Public Sector, Inc.
A. Proposer's Experience.	20	10	5	5	20
B. Staff Experience.	10	4	2	2	10
C. Business/Project Plan and Functional Capabilities Questionnaire.	33	15	10	10	33
D. Minority and Women Owned Business Enterprise - The degree of participation by City certified or recognized M/WBE in subcontracts.	5	5	3	0	0
E. Veteran Business Enterprise participation in subcontracts.	2	0	0	0	0
E. Price Proposal.	30	5	10	5	30
TOTAL SCORE	**100**	39	30	22	93
RANKING		2	3	4	1

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.

EVALUATION CRITERIA ~~FOR SHORT-LISTING~~

RFP15-0011 Economic Development Information System

Committee Meeting #6, March 30, 2015

Committee Member: CHRISTOPHER McCLELLON
(Print Name)

Committee Member Signature: [signature]

Date: 3/31/2015

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respondents based upon the following Evaulation Criteria.

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	Accela, Inc.	Computronix (U.S.A.), Inc.	CSDC Systems, Inc.	Infor Public Sector, Inc.
A. Proposer's Experience.	20	20	16	15	20
B. Staff Experience.	10	10	8	6	10
C. Business/Project Plan and Functional Capabilities Questionnaire.	33	30	25	22	33
D. Minority and Women Owned Business Enterprise - The degree of participation by City certified or recognized M/WBE in subcontracts.	5	5	3	0	0
E. Veteran Business Enterprise participation in subcontracts.	2	0	0	0	0
E. Price Proposal.	30	20	26	27	30
TOTAL SCORE	**100**	85	78	70	93
RANKING		2	3	4	1

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.

EVALUATION CRITERIA ~~FOR SHORT-LISTING~~

RFP15-0011 Economic Development Information System

Committee Meeting #6, March 30, 2015

Committee Member: Lillian Scott-Payne
(Print Name)

Committee Member Signature: Lillian Scott-Payne Date: 3/31/15

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respondents based upon the following Evaulation Criteria.

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	Accela, Inc.	Computronix (U.S.A.), Inc.	CSDC Systems, Inc.	Infor Public Sector, Inc.
A. Proposer's Experience.	20	15	10	15	20
B. Staff Experience.	10	5	5	5	10
C. Business/Project Plan and Functional Capabilities Questionnaire.	33	25	10	20	30
D. Minority and Women Owned Business Enterprise - The degree of participation by City certified or recognized M/WBE in subcontracts.	5	5	0	0	0
E. Veteran Business Enterprise participation in subcontracts.	2	0	0	0	0
E. Price Proposal.	30	15	15	15	15
TOTAL SCORE	**100**	65	40	55	75
RANKING		2	4	3	1

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.

EVALUATION CRITERIA ~~FOR SHORT LISTING~~

RFP15-0011 Economic Development Information System

Committee Meeting #6, March 20, 2015

Committee Member: Rich Wyles (Print Name)

Committee Member Signature: [signature]

Date: 3/31/15

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respondents based upon the following Evaulation Criteria.

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	Accela, Inc.	Computronix (U.S.A.), Inc.	CSDC Systems, Inc.	Infor Public Sector, Inc.
A. Proposer's Experience.	20	15	12	15	12
B. Staff Experience.	10	8	6	8	7
C. Business/Project Plan and Functional Capabilities Questionnaire.	33	20	24	30	27
D. Minority and Women Owned Business Enterprise - The degree of participation by City certified or recognized M/WBE in subcontracts.	5	5	3	0	0
E. Veteran Business Enterprise participation in subcontracts.	2	0	0	0	0
E. Price Proposal.	30	20	24	24	28
TOTAL SCORE	**100**	68	69	77	74
RANKING		4	3	1	2

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.

EVALUATION CRITERIA ~~FOR SHORT-LISTING~~

RFP15-0011 Economic Development Information System

Committee Meeting #6, March 30, 2015

Committee Member: RICHARD LEVEY
(Print Name)

Committee Member Signature: _____ Date: 3.31.15

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respondents based upon the following Evaulation Criteria.

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	Accela, Inc.	Computronix (U.S.A.), Inc.	CSDC Systems, Inc.	Infor Public Sector, Inc.
A. Proposer's Experience.	20	20	20	20	20
B. Staff Experience.	10	10	10	10	10
C. Business/Project Plan and Functional Capabilities Questionnaire.	33	15	20	28	33
D. Minority and Women Owned Business Enterprise - The degree of participation by City certified or recognized M/WBE in subcontracts.	5	5	3	0	0
E. Veteran Business Enterprise participation in subcontracts.	2	0	0	0	0
E. Price Proposal.	30	25	20	20	30
TOTAL SCORE	**100**	75	73	78	93
RANKING		3	4	2	1

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.

EVALUATION CRITERIA ~~FOR SHORT-LISTING~~

RFP15-0011 Economic Development Information System

Committee Meeting #6, March 30, 2015

Committee Member: Tisa Mitchell
(Print Name)

Committee Member Signature: [signature]

Date: 3/31/15

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respondents based upon the following Evaulation Criteria.

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	Accela, Inc.	Computronix (U.S.A.), Inc.	CSDC Systems, Inc.	Infor Public Sector, Inc.
A. Proposer's Experience.	20	15	14	13	18
B. Staff Experience.	10	8	7	7	10
C. Business/Project Plan and Functional Capabilities Questionnaire.	33	20	25	15	33
D. Minority and Women Owned Business Enterprise - The degree of participation by City certified or recognized M/WBE in subcontracts.	5	5	3	0	0
E. Veteran Business Enterprise participation in subcontracts.	2	0	0	0	0
E. Price Proposal.	30	20	17	15	30
TOTAL SCORE	**100**	68	66	50	91
RANKING		2	3	4	1

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.

EVALUATION CRITERIA ~~FOR SHORT-LISTING~~

RFP15-0011 Economic Development Information System

Committee Meeting #6, March 30, 2015

Committee Member: Redwan "Roza" AKhtarKhavari
(Print Name)

Committee Member Signature: Redwan Ce

Date: 3-31-2015

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respondents based upon the following Evaulation Criteria.

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	Accela, Inc.	Computronix (U.S.A.), Inc.	CSDC Systems, Inc.	Infor Public Sector, Inc.
A. Proposer's Experience.	20	17	12	12	19
B. Staff Experience.	10	9	8	8	9
C. Business/Project Plan and Functional Capabilities Questionnaire.	33	23	15	20	31
D. Minority and Women Owned Business Enterprise - The degree of participation by City certified or recognized M/WBE in subcontracts.	5	5	4	Ø	Ø
E. Veteran Business Enterprise participation in subcontracts.	2	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø
E. Price Proposal.	30	20	18	19	26
TOTAL SCORE	**100**	74	57	59	85
RANKING		2	4	3	1

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.