



CITY OF ORLANDO

2nd ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

RQS16-0094

Request for Qualification Statements for

The Econlockhatchee (Econ) Trail Roadway Expansion Project

January 27, 2016 – 8:30 a.m.

Veterans Conference Room (2nd Floor) and Iron Bridge Conference Room (8th)

City Hall, 400 S. Orange Ave., Orlando, FL

The purpose of this meeting was to hold discussions with shortlisted firms and review, score, and rank each of those firms on its qualification statement submitted in response to solicitation and its clarifying presentation/interview session.

Committee Members Present:

Bill Burns, Project Manager II (Chair)

Jim Hunt, Deputy Public Works Director – City Engineer

Howard Elkin, Streets/Drainage Asst. Division Mgr.

Frank Consoli, Traffic Operations Engineer

Dawn Chin Shue, Contract Compliance Investigator III, MBE 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>
8:30 a.m. -- 9:10 a.m.	1/27/16	Dewberry Engineers, Inc.	Veterans Conference Room	2 nd
9:30 a.m. –10:10 a.m.	1/27/16	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	Iron Bridge Conference Room	8 th
10:30 a.m. -- 11:10 a.m.	1/27/16	Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc.	Veterans Conference Room	2 nd

After discussions, the Facilitator asked the Committee for approval of the first Meeting Minutes of January 7, 2016. These Minutes had been distributed by email to all Committee Members. A motion was made by Jim Hunt, and seconded by Frank Consoli, to accept those Minutes as written. The motion carried unanimously.

The Facilitator handed out the pre-determined scores (calculated as per solicitation requirements) for each Respondent. These scores did not change from the first meeting.

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

The Meeting was turned over to the technical Chair and discussion ensued, and, then, Committee members individually scored/ranked each shortlisted firm according to the criteria outlined in the Request for Qualification Statements.

The consolidated results are as follows:

1. Dewberry Engineers, Inc.
2. Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc.
3. Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

A motion was made by Jim Hunt, and seconded by Frank Consoli, to accept the ranking and to recommend to City Council for authorization for the Chief Procurement Officer (CPO) to negotiate a contract with the top ranked firm in ranked order until successful. There were no members of the public present. The motion carried unanimously.

A motion was made by Frank Consoli, and seconded by Howard Elkin, to adjourn at 12:06 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

These minutes are considered to be the official minutes of the RQS16-0094 Advisory Committee Meeting held on January 27, 2016, 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:


Bill Burns (Chair)
Project Manager II
CIID, PWD

Attachments:

Predetermined Scores
Consolidated Scoring and Rating Spreadsheet
Individual Scoring and Rating Sheets

RQS16-0094 The Econlockhatchee (Econ) Trail Roadway Expansion Project
Pre-determined Scores for
MWBE Participation, Proximity, and Prior Work \$

Consultant Name	MBE Office Announced Scores for MWBE Participation (C)	Proximity Score (F)	Prior Dollars Score (G)
Dewberry Engineers, Inc.	14	4	5
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	14	4	3
Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc.	14	4	5

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Bill Burns	Jim Hunt	Howard Elkin	Frank Consoli	Dawn Chin Shue
------------	----------	--------------	---------------	----------------

CONSOLIDATED RANKING:

	Bill Burns	Jim Hunt	Howard Elkin	Frank Consoli	Dawn Chin Shue	Total	Ranking
Dewberry Engineers, Inc.	1	1	1	2	1	6	1
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	2	3	2	3	3	13	3
Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc.	2	2	3	1	2	10	2

INDIVIDUAL SCORING AND RANKING:

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Dewberry Engineers, Inc.	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc.
A	25	25	22	23
B	15	15	15	13
C	16	14	14	14
D	15	14	14	13
E	10	10	10	10
F	4	4	4	4
G	5	5	3	5
H	10	10	8	8
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	97	90	90
Bill Burns		1	2	2
Ranking				

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Dewberry Engineers, Inc.	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc.
A	25	22	20	20
B	15	14	14	12
C	16	14	14	14
D	15	15	13	12
E	10	9	9	9
F	4	4	4	4
G	5	5	3	5
H	10	10	7	9
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	93	84	85
Jim Hunt		1	3	2
Ranking				

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Dewberry Engineers, Inc.	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc.
A	25	24	23	24
B	15	14	15	12
C	16	14	14	14
D	15	15	13	13
E	10	9	9	8
F	4	4	4	4
G	5	5	3	5
H	10	10	8	8
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	95	89	88
Howard Elkin		1	2	3
Ranking				

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Dewberry Engineers, Inc.	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc.
A	25	23	22	24
B	15	13	13	14
C	16	14	14	14
D	15	13	13	13
E	10	8	9	8
F	4	4	4	4
G	5	5	3	5
H	10	8	7	9
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	88	85	91
Frank Consoli		2	3	1
Ranking				

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Dewberry Engineers, Inc.	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc.
A	25	24	22	23
B	15	13	12	13
C	16	14	14	14
D	15	14	13	14
E	10	8	7	8
F	4	4	4	4
G	5	5	3	5
H	10	9	8	7
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	91	83	88
Dawn Chin Shue		1	3	2
Ranking				

**RQS16-0094 PROFESSIONAL
THE ECONLOCKHATCHEE (ECON) TRAIL
ROADWAY EXPANSION PROJECT**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: W. Burns DATE: 1/27/2016

FIRM NAME: Dewberry Engineers, 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.	25	25
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	15
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	14
D. 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.	15	14
E. 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
F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando.	4	4
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	10
TOTAL SCORE	100	97

RANK: 1

Notes regarding Exhibit "B": 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.

**RQS16-0094 PROFESSIONAL
THE ECONLOCKHATCHEE (ECON) TRAIL
ROADWAY EXPANSION PROJECT**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: W. Burns DATE: 1/27/2016

FIRM NAME: Kinley Hoan & Assoc.'s, 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.	25	22
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	15
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	14
D. 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.	15	14
E. 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
F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando.	4	4
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	3
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	8
TOTAL SCORE	100	90

RANK: 2

Notes regarding Exhibit "B": 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.

**RQS16-0094 PROFESSIONAL
THE ECONLOCKHATCHEE (ECON) TRAIL
ROADWAY EXPANSION PROJECT**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: W. BURNS DATE: 1/27/2016
FIRM NAME: PARSONS BRINCKERHOFF, 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.	25	23
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	13
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	14
D. 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.	15	13
E. 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
F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando.	4	4
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	8
TOTAL SCORE	100	90

RANK: 2

Notes regarding Exhibit "B": 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.

Deuberry

**RQS16-0094 PROFESSIONAL
THE ECONLOCKHATCHEE (ECON) TRAIL
ROADWAY EXPANSION PROJECT**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: Hunt DATE: 01/27/16
FIRM NAME: Deuberry

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.	25	22
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	14
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	14
D. 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.	15	15
E. 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
F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando.	4	4
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
H. 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 "B": 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.

K-H

**RQS16-0094 PROFESSIONAL
THE ECONLOCKHATCHEE (ECON) TRAIL
ROADWAY EXPANSION PROJECT**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: Hunt DATE: 01/27/16

FIRM NAME: Kimley Horn

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.	25	20
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	14
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	14
D. 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.	15	13
E. 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
F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando.	4	4
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	3
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	7
TOTAL SCORE	100	84

RANK: 3

Notes regarding Exhibit "B": 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.

**RQS16-0094 PROFESSIONAL
THE ECONLOCKHATCHEE (ECON) TRAIL
ROADWAY EXPANSION PROJECT**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: Hunt DATE: 01/27/16
FIRM NAME: Parsons

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.	25	20
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	12
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	14
D. 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.	15	12
E. 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
F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando.	4	4
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	9
TOTAL SCORE	100	85

RANK: 2

Notes regarding Exhibit "B": 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.

**RQS16-0094 PROFESSIONAL
THE ECONLOCKHATCHEE (ECON) TRAIL
ROADWAY EXPANSION PROJECT**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: HOWARD ELKIN DATE: 1/27/16
FIRM NAME: DENBERRY

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.	25	24
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	14
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	14
D. 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.	15	15
E. 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
F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando.	4	4
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	10
TOTAL SCORE	100	95

RANK: 1

Notes regarding Exhibit "B": 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.

**RQS16-0094 PROFESSIONAL
THE ECONLOCKHATCHEE (ECON) TRAIL
ROADWAY EXPANSION PROJECT**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: HOWARD ELKIN DATE: 1/27/16

FIRM NAME: KIMLEY HORN

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.	25	23
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	15
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	14
D. 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.	15	13
E. 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
F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando.	4	4
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5 3 R
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	8
TOTAL SCORE	100	89

RANK: 2

Notes regarding Exhibit "B": 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.

**RQS16-0094 PROFESSIONAL
THE ECONLOCKHATCHEE (ECON) TRAIL
ROADWAY EXPANSION PROJECT**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: HOWARD ELKIN DATE: 1/27/10

FIRM NAME: PARSONS BRINCKERHOFF

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.	25	24
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	12
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	14
D. 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.	15	13
E. 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
F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando.	4	4
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	8
TOTAL SCORE	100	88

RANK: 3

Notes regarding Exhibit "B": 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.

**RQS16-0094 PROFESSIONAL
THE ECONLOCKHATCHEE (ECON) TRAIL
ROADWAY EXPANSION PROJECT**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: FRANK A. CONSOLO DATE: 01-27-16
FIRM NAME: DEWBERRY ENGINEERS, 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.	25	23
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	13
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	14
D. 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.	15	13
E. 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
F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando.	4	4
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	8
TOTAL SCORE	100	88

RANK: 2

Notes regarding Exhibit "B": 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.

**RQS16-0094 PROFESSIONAL
THE ECONLOCKHATCHEE (ECON) TRAIL
ROADWAY EXPANSION PROJECT**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: FRANK A. CONSOLI **DATE:** 01-27-16

FIRM NAME: KIMLEY-HORN 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.	25	22
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	13
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	14
D. 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.	15	13
E. 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
F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando.	4	4
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	3
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	7
TOTAL SCORE	100	85

RANK: 3

Notes regarding Exhibit "B": 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.

**RQS16-0094 PROFESSIONAL
THE ECONLOCKHATCHEE (ECON) TRAIL
ROADWAY EXPANSION PROJECT**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: FRANK A. CONSOLI **DATE:** 01-27-15

FIRM NAME: PARSONS BRINCKERHOFF 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.	25	24
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	14
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	14
D. 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.	15	13
E. 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
F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando.	4	4
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	35 ²
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	9
TOTAL SCORE	100	89 91²

RANK: 1

Notes regarding Exhibit "B": 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.

**RQS16-0094 PROFESSIONAL
THE ECONLOCKHATCHEE (ECON) TRAIL
ROADWAY EXPANSION PROJECT**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: DAWN CHIN SHUE DATE: 1/27/16

FIRM NAME: DEWBERRY ENGINEERS, 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.	25	24
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	13
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	14
D. 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.	15	14
E. 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
F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando.	4	4
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	9
TOTAL SCORE	100	91

RANK: 1

Notes regarding Exhibit "B": 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.

**RQS16-0094 PROFESSIONAL
THE ECONLOCKHATCHEE (ECON) TRAIL
ROADWAY EXPANSION PROJECT**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: DAWN CHIN SHUE **DATE:** 1/27/16

FIRM NAME: KIMLEY-HORN & 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.	25	22
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	12
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	14
D. 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.	15	13
E. 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
F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando.	4	4
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	3
H. 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 "B": 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.

**RQS16-0094 PROFESSIONAL
THE ECONLOCKHATCHEE (ECON) TRAIL
ROADWAY EXPANSION PROJECT**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: DAWN CHIN SHUE **DATE:** 1/27/16

FIRM NAME: PARSONS BRINCKERHOFF, 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.	25	23
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	13
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	14
D. 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.	15	14
E. 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
F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando.	4	4
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	7
TOTAL SCORE	100	88

RANK: 2

Notes regarding Exhibit "B": 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.