



CITY OF ORLANDO

1st ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

RQS16-0190

Request for Qualification Statements for Continuing Professional Services for Environmental

Assessment, Testing, and Remediation

April 20, 2016 – 9 a.m.

Sustainability Conference Room (2nd Floor)

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

First Meeting of the Advisory Committee to review and evaluate responsive qualification statements submitted in response to the subject solicitation.

Committee Members Present:

Dan Dashtaki, Environmental Mgr. (Chair)

Erik Melear, Project Manager II

Tracy Waguespack, Environmental Specialist II

Adam Scobby, Construction Manager

Dawn Chin Shue, Contract Compliance Investigator III, MBE Office

Other City Personnel Present:

Roger Cooper, Contract Administrator (Facilitator)

Fabio Henao, Procurement Assistant

Members of the Public Present:

Flormari Blackburn, E Sciences Incorporated

Actions/Discussion/Motions:

The Facilitator called the meeting to order at 9:09 a.m. and took the following actions:

- 1) Introduced himself and asked all in attendance to introduce themselves.
- 2) Advised that Committee was approved and ethics forms were received.
- 3) Advised the Committee that a quorum was established.
- 4) Announced that the meeting was publicly posted for more than 48 hours in advance.
- 5) Facilitator review Advisory Committee Rules
- 6) Reviewed Public Input Procedures

A motion was made by Dan Dashtaki, and seconded by Adam Scobby, to accept the Public Input Procedures. The motion carried unanimously.

The Facilitator handed out the pre-determined scores for Rating Factors C, F, and G. Rating Factor C was supplied by the MBE Office.

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, who indicated that thirteen (13) sealed qualification statements were submitted in response to the solicitation. Twelve (12) of those qualification statements were certified as qualified by the Consultants' Qualifications Board on April 4, 2016.

The Chair indicated that those firms are as follows:

- 1) Aerostar SES LLC

- 2) American Compliance Technologies, Inc.
dba A·C·T Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc. (A·C·T)
- 3) Barnes, Ferland, and Associates, Inc.
- 4) Cherokee Enterprises, Inc.
- 5) ECS Florida, LLC
- 6) Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.
- 7) E Sciences Incorporated
- 8) PPM Consultants, Inc.
- 9) Professional Service Industries (PSI)
- 10) Terracon Consultants, Inc.
- 11) Tetra Tech, Inc.
- 12) Universal Engineering Sciences

The Committee had a brief discussion, and each Committee member individually scored and ranked each firm. The consolidated results are as follows:

- 1) Professional Service Industries (PSI)
- 2) PPM Consultants, Inc.
- 3) Tetra Tech, Inc.
- 4) E Sciences Incorporated
- 5) American Compliance Technologies, Inc.
dba A·C·T Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc. (A·C·T)
- 6) Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.
- 7) Barnes, Ferland, and Associates, Inc.
- 8) Aerostar SES LLC
- 9) Universal Engineering Sciences
- 10) Terracon Consultants, Inc.
- 11) ECS Florida, LLC
- 12) Cherokee Enterprises, Inc.

A motion was made by Erik Melear, and seconded by Adam Scobby, to invite the top six (6) firms for presentations and interviews. The member of the Public declined to make comments. The motion carried unanimously.


Erik Melear made a motion, seconded by Tracy Waguespack, to allow twenty (20) minutes for each presentation and a ten (10) minute question-and-answer period, with five (5) minute breaks in between sessions. The motion carried unanimously.

Presentations are scheduled for May 4, 2016, beginning at 9 a.m. in the Sustainability Conference Room (2nd Floor) and alternating between Sustainability Conference Room and the Agenda Conference Room (2nd Floor) of City Hall.

A motion was made by Erik Melear, and seconded by Dawn Chin Shue, to adjourn at 11:15 a.m. The motion carried unanimously.

These minutes are considered to be the official minutes of the RQS16-0190 Advisory Committee Meeting held on April 20, 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:



Dan Dashtaki (Chair)
Environmental Mgr.
Public Works Department

Attachments:

Public Input Procedures with CPO Memo dated 9/30/2013
Predetermined Scores
Consolidated Scoring and Rating Spreadsheet
Individual Scoring and Rating Sheets



CITY OF ORLANDO

MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 30, 2013

TO: Procurement and Contracts Division Staff

FROM: David Billingsley, CPSM, C.P.M., Chief Procurement Officer

SUBJECT: Public Input

The Florida Legislature recently enacted a new state law, s. 286.1114, which requires that all local government boards and committees that are subject to the sunshine law provide an opportunity for reasonable public input prior to taking official action on any item (with the exception of administrative items such as approval of minutes and quasi-judicial proceedings). Such comment must be allowed at the meeting where the board or committee takes action on the item or at a meeting in reasonable proximity to that date. Boards and Committees may adopt rules or policies governing the public input.

Procurement Advisory Committees are affected by this statute since they are sunshine committees and are making an award recommendation to City Council. Procurement Advisory Committees must adopt procedures for all meetings after October 1, 2013.

The statute provides that each committee can provide for its own implementation rules. As such, Procurement Advisory Committees should make a motion at the first meeting to follow these rules. For a particular procurement, the committee may modify or amend the procedures applicable to that solicitation. For example, if the procurement has a large public interest, the committee could establish longer comment periods.

Attached are recommended procedures for public input during Procurement Advisory Committees meetings.

PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTS DIVISION

CITY HALL • 400 SOUTH ORANGE AVENUE • P.O. BOX 4990 • ORLANDO, FLORIDA 32802-4990
PHONE 407.246.2291 • FAX 407.246.2869 • CityofOrlando.net • esupplier.cityoforlando.net



CITY OF ORLANDO

Public Input Procedures For Procurement Advisory Committees

- A. After each motion (and a second) but before committee discussion on all non-ministerial motions, public comment will be permitted. Ministerial motions would be those that are not substantive actions, including most procedural motions, motions to approve minutes, and motions to adjourn.
- B. Each speaker is limited to 5 minutes. The Committee Chairperson may grant more time to a speaker, provided that if any other committee member objects to the granting of more time, the committee as a whole will vote on the extension.
- C. Public comment is limited to 30 minutes per motion.
- D. Groups are to be asked (not required) to appoint a spokesperson to avoid redundancy and stay within allotted time periods.
- E. If there are more speakers than would allow each to get their full 5 minutes, time periods will be reduced proportionally to not less than 1 minute per speaker unless the committee votes to extend the comment period. If there are more speakers than minutes in the comment period, by act of the Chairperson without objection from a member of the committee, or after a committee vote if there is an objection, the maximum comment period may be extended. As a practical matter, committees should try to extend the time where possible to allow everyone a chance to speak. If this is not possible due to time constraints or number of requests, comments should be taken in random order from all those requesting to speak until time expires.
- F. Each person addressing the committee should give their name and address for the record (minutes). Per the statute, a form asking to speak can be used (which may help with drafting the minutes and establishing priority to speak).
- G. Remarks should be addressed to the committee as a whole, not to individual members of the committee. This is not a question and answer period. The public may comment on the issues before the committee, but the committee is not required to respond to questions.
- H. Minutes should reflect that public comment was solicited even where no public comment was given, i.e. "The chairperson asked if there was anyone from the public who would like to speak, but no requests were received" or similar words should appear in the minutes.

PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTS DIVISION

CITY HALL • 400 SOUTH ORANGE AVENUE • P.O. BOX 4990 • ORLANDO, FLORIDA 32802-4990
PHONE 407.246.2291 • FAX 407.246.2869 • CityofOrlando.net • esupplier.cityoforlando.net

RQS16-0190 Continuing Professional Services for Environmental Assessment, Testing, and Remediation
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)
Aerostar SES LLC	14	3	5
American Compliance Technologies, Inc. dba A*C*T Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc. (A*C*T)	14	1	3
Barnes, Ferland, And Associates, Inc.	15	4	0
Cherokee Enterprises, Inc.	5	1	5
ECS Florida, LLC	5	4	5
Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.	15	4	0
E Sciences Incorporated	14	4	2
PPM Consultants, Inc.	14	2	5
Professional Service Industries (PSI)	15	4	0
Terracon Consultants, Inc.	13	3	0
Tetra Tech Inc.	15	4	0
Universal Engineering Sciences	15	4	0

Shortlisting Scoring / Ranking

RQS16-0190 Continuing Professional Services for Environmental Assessment, Testing, and Remediation

Committee Members -->	Dan Dashtaki	Erik Melear	Adam Scobby	Tracy Waguespack	Dawn Chin Shue
-----------------------	--------------	-------------	-------------	------------------	----------------

Consolidated Ranking:

	Dan Dashtaki	Erik Melear	Adam Scobby	Tracy Waguespack	Dawn Chin Shue	Total	Ranking
Aerostar SES LLC	5	7	5	12	5	34	8
American Compliance Technologies, Inc.	4	4	9	2	10	29	5
Barnes, Ferland, and Associates, Inc.	8	6	4	10	5	33	7
Cherokee Enterprises, Inc.	12	12	12	11	12	59	12
ECS Florida, LLC	6	11	10	8	11	46	11
Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.	6	5	6	4	8	29	5
E Sciences Incorporated	9	1	7	6	3	26	4
PPM Consultants, Inc.	2	1	3	3	7	16	2
Professional Service Industries (PSI)	1	3	2	1	1	8	1

Breaking Tie for 5th Place (using total scores):

	Dan Dashtaki	Erik Melear	Adam Scobby	Tracy Waguespack	Dawn Chin Shue	Total	Revised Ranking
American Compliance Technologies, Inc.	82	85	78	82	80	407	5
Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.	75	84	81	80	84	404	6

Shortlisting Scoring / Ranking

RQS16-0190 Continuing Professional Services for Environmental Assessment, Testing, and Remediation

Terracon Consultants, Inc.	10	10	11	4	9	44	10
Tetra Tech, Inc.	3	7	1	9	4	24	3
Universal Engineering Sciences	10	9	8	7	1	35	9

Individual Scoring / Ranking:

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Aerostar SES LLC	American Compliance Technologies, Inc.	Barnes, Ferland, and Associates, Inc.	Cherokee Enterprises, Inc.	ECS Florida, LLC	Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.	E Sciences Incorporated	PPM Consultants , Inc.	Professional Service Industries	Terracon Consultants, Inc.	Tetra Tech, Inc.	Universal Engineering Sciences
A	30	23	26	24	20	25	23	22	26	28	23	27	22
B	20	14	17	14	13	15	15	14	17	18	13	16	12
C	16	14	14	15	5	5	15	14	14	15	13	15	15
D	15	10	13	10	9	13	11	10	13	15	10	13	9
E	10	7	8	6	6	8	7	6	8	10	5	8	5
F	4	3	1	4	1	4	4	4	2	4	3	4	4
G	5	5	3	0	5	5	0	2	5	0	0	0	0
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	76	82	73	59	75	75	72	85	90	67	83	67
Dan Dashtaki		5	4	8	12	6	6	9	2	1	10	3	10
Ranking													

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Aerostar SES LLC	American Compliance Technologies, Inc.	Barnes, Ferland, and Associates, Inc.	Cherokee Enterprises, Inc.	ECS Florida, LLC	Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.	E Sciences Incorporated	PPM Consultants , Inc.	Professional Service Industries (PSI)	Terracon Consultants, Inc.	Tetra Tech, Inc.	Universal Engineering Sciences
A	30	25	28	26	25	26	28	28	29	29	26	27	25
B	20	15	18	16	15	17	17	19	19	18	17	17	15
C	16	14	14	15	5	5	15	14	14	15	13	15	15
D	15	12	13	12	13	13	12	14	13	13	12	12	11
E	10	7	8	9	5	6	8	8	7	7	6	6	9
F	4	3	1	4	1	4	4	4	2	4	3	4	4

Shortlisting Scoring / Ranking

RQS16-0190 Continuing Professional Services for Environmental Assessment, Testing, and Remediation

G	5	5	3	0	5	5	0	2	5	0	0	0	0
	0												
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	81	85	82	69	76	84	89	89	86	77	81	79
Erik Melear		7	4	6	12	11	5	1	1	3	10	7	9
Ranking													

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Aerostar SES LLC	American Compliance Technologies, Inc.	Barnes, Ferland, and Associates, Inc.	Cherokee Enterprises, Inc.	ECS Florida, LLC	Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.	E Sciences Incorporated	PPM Consultants , Inc.	Professional Service Industries (PSI)	Terracon Consultants, Inc.	Tetra Tech, Inc.	Universal Engineering Sciences
A	30	25	25	27	25	27	25	25	27	28	25	28	25
B	20	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15
C	16	14	14	15	5	5	15	14	14	15	13	15	15
D	15	12	12	14	13	13	14	12	14	15	13	15	12
E	10	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	9	7	10	8
F	4	3	1	4	1	4	4	4	2	4	3	4	4
G	5	5	3	0	5	5	0	2	5	0	0	0	0
	0												
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	82	78	83	72	77	81	80	85	86	76	87	79
Adam Scobby		5	9	4	12	10	6	7	3	2	11	1	8
Ranking													

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Aerostar SES LLC	American Compliance Technologies, Inc.	Barnes, Ferland, and Associates, Inc.	Cherokee Enterprises, Inc.	ECS Florida, LLC	Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.	E Sciences Incorporated	PPM Consultants , Inc.	Professional Service Industries (PSI)	Terracon Consultants, Inc.	Tetra Tech, Inc.	Universal Engineering Sciences
A	30	20	27	23	25	25	25	24	26	28	26	24	27
B	20	15	15	14	15	18	17	15	15	18	15	16	7
C	16	14	14	15	5	5	15	14	14	15	13	15	15
D	15	8	14	11	13	12	12	12	12	13	13	9	14
E	10	7	8	7	9	7	7	7	7	7	10	7	10
F	4	3	1	4	1	4	4	4	2	4	3	4	4

RQS16-0190 Continuing Professional Services for Environmental Assessment, Testing, and Remediation

G	5	5	3	0	5	5	0	2	5	0	0	0	0
	0												
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	72	82	74	73	76	80	78	81	85	80	75	77
Tracy Waguespack		12	2	10	11	8	4	6	3	1	4	9	7
Ranking													

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Aerostar SES LLC	American Compliance Technologies, Inc.	Barnes, Ferland, and Associates, Inc.	Cherokee Enterprises, Inc.	ECS Florida, LLC	Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.	E Sciences Incorporated	PPM Consultants , Inc.	Professional Service Industries (PSI)	Terracon Consultants, Inc.	Tetra Tech, Inc.	Universal Engineering Sciences
A	30	27	26	28	18	26	27	28	27	29	28	28	29
B	20	16	16	18	10	17	18	19	18	19	18	18	19
C	16	14	14	15	5	5	15	14	14	15	13	15	15
D	15	13	12	13	8	12	13	13	12	14	13	13	14
E	10	8	8	8	7	6	7	8	7	8	8	9	8
F	4	3	1	4	1	4	4	4	2	4	3	4	4
G	5	5	3	0	5	5	0	2	5	0	0	0	0
	0												
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	86	80	86	54	75	84	88	85	89	83	87	89
Dawn Chin Shue		5	10	5	12	11	8	3	7	1	9	4	1
Ranking													

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: DAN DASATANI DATE: 4-20-16

FIRM NAME: AEROSTAR

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	23
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	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	10
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.	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	3
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	76

RANK: 5

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: DAN DASHTAKI DATE: 4-20-16

FIRM NAME: A.C.T.

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	26
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	17
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.	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	1
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	3
TOTAL SCORE	100	82

RANK: 4

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: DAN DASHATKI **DATE:** 7-20-16

FIRM NAME: BARNES FARLAND 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	24
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	14
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	15
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	10
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.	10	6
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	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	73

RANK: 8

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: DAN DASHITAM **DATE:** 4-20-16

FIRM NAME: CEI

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	20
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	13
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	5
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	9
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.	10	6
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	1
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	59

RANK: 12

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: DAN DASHTAIK **DATE:** 4-20-16

FIRM NAME: ECS

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. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	5
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.	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
TOTAL SCORE	100	75

RANK: 6

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: DAN DASHIALL **DATE:** 4-20-16

FIRM NAME: ECT

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	23
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	15
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	15
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	11
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.	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	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	75

RANK: 6

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: DAN DASHATAKI **DATE:** 4-20-16

FIRM NAME: E-SCIENCES 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	22
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	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	10
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.	10	6
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	2
TOTAL SCORE	100	72

RANK: 9

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: DAN DASATIA DATE: 4-20-16

FIRM NAME: PPM

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	26
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	17
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.	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	2
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	85

RANK: 2

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: DAN OASATAKI DATE: 4-20-16

FIRM NAME: PST

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. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	15
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.	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	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	90

RANK: 1

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: DAN DASHIAK **DATE:** 4-20-16

FIRM NAME: TERRACON CONSULTANTS, 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	23
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	13
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	13
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	10
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.	10	5
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	3
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	67

RANK: 10/11

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: DAN DASHTAKI **DATE:** 4-20-16

FIRM NAME: TETRA TECH

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. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	15
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.	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	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	83

RANK: 3

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: DAN DASHTAKI **DATE:** 4-20-16

FIRM NAME: UNIVERSAL ENGINEERING SCIENCES

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. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	15
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	9
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.	10	5
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	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	67

RANK: 10/11

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: DAWN CHIN SHUE DATE: 4/20/16

FIRM NAME: AEROSTAR SES, LLC

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. 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.	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	3
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	86

RANK: 5

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: DAWN CHIN SHUE **DATE:** 4/20/16

FIRM NAME: AMERICAN COMPLIANCE TECHNOLOGIES (A.C.T.)

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	26
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	16
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.	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	1
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	3
TOTAL SCORE	100	80

RANK: 10

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: DAWN CHIN SHUE DATE: 4/20/16

FIRM NAME: BARNES, FERLAND, AND 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	18
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	15
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.	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	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	86

RANK: 5

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: DAWN CHIU SHUE DATE: 4/20/16

FIRM NAME: Cherokee ENTERPRISES, 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	18
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	10
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	5
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	8
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.	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	1
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	54

RANK: 12

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: DAWN CHIN SHUE DATE: 4/20/16

FIRM NAME: ECS FLORIDA, LLC

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	26
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	17
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	5
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.	10	6
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
TOTAL SCORE	100	75

RANK: 11

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: DAWN CHIN SHUE DATE: 4/20/16

FIRM NAME: ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTING & TECHNOLOGY

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	18
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	15
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.	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	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	84

RANK: 8

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: DAWN CHIN SHUE **DATE:** 4/20/16

FIRM NAME: E SCIENCES INCORPORATED

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. 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.	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	2
TOTAL SCORE	100	88

RANK: 3

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: DAWN CHIN SHUE **DATE:** 4/20/16

FIRM NAME: PPM CONSULTANTS, 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	27
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	18
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.	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	2
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	85

RANK: 7

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: DAWN CHIN SHUE DATE: 4/20/16

FIRM NAME: Professional Service Industries (PSI)

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. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	15
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.	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	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	89

RANK: 1

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: DAWN CHIN SHUE **DATE:** 4/20/16

FIRM NAME: TERRACON CONSULTANTS, 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. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	13
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.	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	3
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	83

RANK: 9

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: DAWN CHIN SHUE DATE: 4/20/16

FIRM NAME: TETRA TECH 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. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	15
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.	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	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	87

RANK: 4

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: DAWON CHAD SHUE DATE: 4/20/16

FIRM NAME: UNIVERSAL ENGINEERING SCIENCES

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. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	15
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.	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	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	89

RANK: 1

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Erik L. McLean DATE: 04/20 / 2016

FIRM NAME: Aerostar

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. 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.	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	3
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	81

54

27

RANK: 7

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Erik L. Meleau

DATE: 4/20/2016

FIRM NAME: ACT

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. 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.	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	1
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	3
TOTAL SCORE	100	85

60

25

RANK: 85 4

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Erik L. McLean DATE: 04/20/2016

FIRM NAME: Barnes, Ferland & Assoc

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	26
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	16
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	15
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.	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	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	82

RANK: 25

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Erik L. Melan DATE: 04/20/2016

FIRM NAME: Cherokee Enterprises

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. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	5
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.	10	5
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	1
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	69

45

24

RANK: 12

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Erik L. McLean DATE: 04/20/2016

FIRM NAME: ECS FLORIDA

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	26
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	17
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	5
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.	10	6
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
TOTAL SCORE	100	76

48

28

RANK: 26 11

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Erik L. Mehan DATE: 04/20/2016

FIRM NAME: ECT

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. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	15
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.	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	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	84

60

24

RANK: 5

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Erik L. Melean DATE: 04/20/2016

FIRM NAME: E Sciences

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. 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.	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	2
TOTAL SCORE	100	89

61

28

RANK: ~~89~~ 1

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Erik L. Melew DATE: 04/20/2016

FIRM NAME: PPM Consultants

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. 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.	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	2
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	89

62

27

RANK: 89 |

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Erik L. Melean DATE: 04/20/2016

FIRM NAME: PSI

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	18
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	15
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.	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	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	86

62

24

RANK: ~~86~~ 3

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Erik L. Melean DATE: 04/20/2016

FIRM NAME: Terracon

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	26
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	17
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	13
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.	10	6
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	3
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	77

56

21

RANK: 77 10

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Erik L. Melan DATE: 04/20/2016

FIRM NAME: Tetra Tech

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	17
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	15
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.	10	6
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	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	81

59

22

RANK: 81 7

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Erik C. McLean DATE: 04/20/16

FIRM NAME: Universal Eng

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. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	15
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	11
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.	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	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	79

55

20

RANK: 9

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: ADAM SCORBY DATE: 4/20/16

FIRM NAME: AEROSTAR SES, LLC

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. 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.	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	3
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	82

RANK: 5

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: ADAM SCOBBY DATE: 4/20/16

FIRM NAME: ACT

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. 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.	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	1
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	3
TOTAL SCORE	100	78

RANK: 9

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: ADAM SCOBEE DATE: 4/20/16

FIRM NAME: BARNES FERLAND & 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	27
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	15
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	15
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.	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	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	83

RANK: 4

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: ADAM SCOBBY DATE: 4/20/16

FIRM NAME: CHEROKEE ENTERPRISES 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	25
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	15
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	5
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.	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	1
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	72

RANK: 12

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Adam Scobey DATE: 4/20/16

FIRM NAME: EC3 Florida LLC

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	15
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	5
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.	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
TOTAL SCORE	100	77

RANK: 10

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: ADAM SCOBEE DATE: 4/20/16

FIRM NAME: ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTING & TECHNOLOGY 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	25
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	15
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	15
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.	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	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	81

RANK: 6

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: ADAM SCORRY DATE: 4/20/16

FIRM NAME: E SCIENCES INCORPORATED

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. 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.	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	2
TOTAL SCORE	100	80

RANK: 7

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Adam Scobee DATE: 4/20/16

FIRM NAME: PPM CONSULTANTS 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	27
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	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.	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	2
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	85

RANK: 3

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Adam Scobey DATE: 4/20/16

FIRM NAME: PSI

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	15
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	15
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.	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	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	86

RANK: 2

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: ADAM SCORBY DATE: 4/20/16

FIRM NAME: TERRACON CONSULTANTS 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	25
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	15
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	13
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.	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	3
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	76

RANK: 11

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: ADAM SCOBIN DATE: 4/20/16

FIRM NAME: TETRA TECH 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	15
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	15
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.	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	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	87

RANK: 1

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: ADAM SCORBY DATE: 4/20/16

FIRM NAME: UNIVERSAL ENGINEERING SCIENCES

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. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	15
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.	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	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	79

RANK: 8

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Tracy Waaguespack DATE: 4-20-16

FIRM NAME: Aerostar SFS

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 20
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	18 17 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	8
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.	10	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	3
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	72

RANK: 12

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Tracy Waguespack DATE: 4-20-16

FIRM NAME: ACT

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	17 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.	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	1
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	3
TOTAL SCORE	100	84 82

RANK: 2

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Tracy Waguespack **DATE:** 4-20-16

FIRM NAME: BFA

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	23
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	14
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	15
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	11
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.	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	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	74

RANK: 10

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Tracy Waguespack **DATE:** 4-20-16

FIRM NAME: Cherokee Enterprises, LLC

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. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	5
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.	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	1
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	73

RANK: 11

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Tracy Waguespack **DATE:** 4-20-16

FIRM NAME: ECS Florida, LLC

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	18
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	5
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.	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	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	76

RANK: 8

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Tracy Waguespack **DATE:** 4-20-16

FIRM NAME: Environmental Consulting Technologies

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	17
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	15
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.	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	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	80

RANK: 4

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Tracy Waguespack **DATE:** 4-20-16

FIRM NAME: E Sciences, Incorporated

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	24
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	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	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.	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	2
TOTAL SCORE	100	78

RANK: 78 6

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Tracy Waguespack **DATE:** 4-20-16

FIRM NAME: PPM consultants

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	26
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	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	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.	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	2
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	81

RANK: 3

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Tracy Waguespack **DATE:** 4-20-16

FIRM NAME: PSI

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. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	15
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.	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	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	85

RANK: 1

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Tracy Weiguespack **DATE:** 4-20-16

FIRM NAME: Terracon Consultants

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	26
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	15
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	13
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.	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	3
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	80

RANK: 54

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Tracy Waguespack DATE: 4-20-16

FIRM NAME: Tetra Tech

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	24
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	16
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	15
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	9
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.	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	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	75

RANK: 9

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.

**RQS16-0190 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TESTING, AND REMEDIATION**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Tracy Waguespack **DATE:** 4-20-16

FIRM NAME: Universal Engineering

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 27
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	7
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	15
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.	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	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	77

RANK: 7~~8~~

Notes regarding Exhibit "A": 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.