



CITY OF ORLANDO

2nd ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

RQS14-0193

Request for Qualification Statements for

Electrical Engineering Design and Construction Administration Services for 480 Volt Improvements at the Iron Bridge Regional Water Reclamation Facility

May 27, 2014 – 9 a.m.

Agenda Conference Rooms (2nd Floor) and "R" Conference Room (2nd Floor)

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

The Advisory Committee for the above project convened on Tuesday, May 27, 2014, at 9:00 a.m. at City Hall in Orlando, Florida. The purpose of this meeting was to hold discussions, hear presentations from shortlisted firms and review, score, and rank each of those firms on its qualification statement, submitted in response to RQS14-0193, and its clarifying presentation/interview session.

Committee Members Present:

Robert Rutter, Project Manager II (Chair)

Robert Rang, IB RWRP Treatment Plant Manager

John Guntner, Industrial Automation Group High Voltage Specialist

William Wood, Industrial Automation Group Manager

Rene Carcamo, Compliance Investigator II

Other City Personnel Present:

Roger Cooper, Contract Administrator (Facilitator)

Members of the Public Present:

None

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

Presentation Schedule of Shortlisted Firms:

<u>Time</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Company Name</u>	<u>Meeting Room</u>	<u>Floor</u>
9:00 – 9:35 am	5/27/14	C&S Engineers, Inc.	Agenda Conference Room	2nd
9:45 - 10:20 am	5/27/14	Hazen and Sawyer, P.C.	"R" Conference Room	2nd
10:30 – 11:05 am	5/27/14	Milan Engineering, Inc.	Agenda Conference Room	2nd

After presentations, the Facilitator indicated that the pre-determined scores used in Short-Listing will also be used in the Final Scoring. The Categories for these Scores are as follows:

- 1) MWBE Participation Scores (Final Ranking Category C) - prepared by MBE Office
- 2) Proximity of the Location of Respondent's Office (Final Ranking Category F)
- 2) Volume of Previous Work Awarded to Each Respondent (Final Ranking Category G).

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.

Committee members held discussions and individually scored and conducted rankings for each shortlisted firm according to the criteria outlined in the Request for Qualification Statements and clarified during presentations.

The results are as follows:

- 1) Milan Engineering, Inc.
- 2) Hazen and Sawyer, P.C.
- 3) C&S Engineers, Inc.

A motion was made by John Guntner, and seconded by William Wood, to accept the rankings and to recommend to City Council for City staff to commence negotiations for a contract for professional services with the top ranked firm in ranked order until successful. There were no members of the public present. The motion carried unanimously.

A motion was made by John Guntner, and seconded by Rene Carcamo, to adjourn at 11:37 a.m. The motion carried unanimously.

These minutes are considered to be the official minutes of the RQS14-0193 Advisory Committee Meeting held on May 27, 2014, 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:



Robert J. Rutter (Chair)
Project Manager II
Public Works Department

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

RQS14-0193 Electrical Engineering Design and Construction Administration Services for 480 Volt Improvements at the Iron Bridge Regional
Water Reclamation Facility Project
Pre-determined Scores for
MWBE Participation, Prior Work \$'s, and Proximity

Consultant Name	MBE Office Announced Scores for MWBE Participation (C)	Proximity Score (F)	Prior Dollars Score (G)
C&S Engineers, Inc.	14	4	5
Hazen and Sawyer P.C.	13.4	4	0
Milan Engineering, Inc.	14	3	3

RQS14-0193 Electrical Engineering Design and Construction Administration Services for 480 Volt Improvements at the Iron
Bridge Regional Water Reclamation Facility
Final Scoring and Ranking

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Robert Rutter	Bob Rang	William Wood	John Gunter	Renee Carcamo
---------------	----------	--------------	-------------	---------------

CONSOLIDATED RANKING:

	Robert Rutter	Bob Rang	William Wood	John Gunter	Renee Carcamo	Total	Ranking
C&S Engineers, Inc.	3	2	2	3	3	13	3
Hazen and Sawyer, P.C.	2	3	3	2	2	12	2
Milan Engineering, Inc.	1	1	1	1	1	5	1

INDIVIDUAL SCORING AND RANKING:

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	C&S Engineers, Inc.	Hazen and Sawyer, P.C.	Milan Engineering, Inc.
A	25	21	22	24
B	15	9	14	14
C	16	14	13.4	14
D	15	12	13	13
E	10	9	9	9
F	4	4	4	3
G	5	5	0	3
H	10	8	8	8
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	82	83.4	88
Robert Rutter		3	2	1
Ranking				

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	C&S Engineers, Inc.	Hazen and Sawyer, P.C.	Milan Engineering, Inc.
A	25	21	23	25
B	15	13	14	15
C	16	14	13.4	14
D	15	13	14	15
E	10	9	8	10
F	4	4	4	3
G	5	5	0	3
H	10	10	10	10
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	89	86.4	95
Bob Rang		2	3	1
Ranking				

RQS14-0193 Electrical Engineering Design and Construction Administration Services for 480 Volt Improvements at the Iron
Bridge Regional Water Reclamation Facility
Final Scoring and Ranking

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	C&S Engineers, Inc.	Hazen and Sawyer, P.C.	Milan Engineering, Inc.
A	25	20	25	25
B	15	15	10	15
C	16	14	13.4	14
D	15	15	10	15
E	10	10	8	8
F	4	4	4	3
G	5	5	0	3
H	10	9	9	10
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	92	79.4	93
William Wood		2	3	1
Ranking				

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	C&S Engineers, Inc.	Hazen and Sawyer, P.C.	Milan Engineering, Inc.
A	25	23	25	25
B	15	10	13	13
C	16	14	13.4	14
D	15	3	5	10
E	10	10	10	10
F	4	4	4	3
G	5	5	0	3
H	10	0	10	10
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	69	80.4	88
John Gunter		3	2	1
Ranking				

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	C&S Engineers, Inc.	Hazen and Sawyer, P.C.	Milan Engineering, Inc.
A	25	22	25	25
B	15	13	15	14
C	16	14	13.4	14
D	15	14	15	15
E	10	9	10	10
F	4	4	4	3
G	5	5	0	3
H	10	8	10	10
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	89	92.4	94
Renee Carcamo		3	2	1
Ranking				

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL SCORING

**RQS14-0193, Electrical Engineering Design and Construction Administration Services for
480 Volt Improvements at the Iron Bridge Regional Water Reclamation Facility, Project**

Committee Member: Robert Rutter R/R

Date: May 27, 2014

Firm Name: C & S Engineers, Inc.

Ranked: 3

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respondents based upon their Qualification Statements in accordance with the following rating factors.

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	24
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	9
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and qualifying 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.	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	5
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	8
TOTAL SCORE	100	82.0

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.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL SCORING

**RQS14-0193, Electrical Engineering Design and Construction Administration Services for
480 Volt Improvements at the Iron Bridge Regional Water Reclamation Facility, Project**

Committee Member: Robert Rubter RH

Date: May 27, 2014

Firm Name: HAZEN SAWYER, P.C.

Ranked: 2

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respondents based upon their Qualification Statements in accordance with the following rating factors.

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	22
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	14
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	13.4
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.	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
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	8
TOTAL SCORE	100	83.4

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.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL SCORING

**RQS14-0193, Electrical Engineering Design and Construction Administration Services for
480 Volt Improvements at the Iron Bridge Regional Water Reclamation Facility, Project**

Committee Member: Robert Rutter RP

Date: May 27, 2014

Firm Name: Miken Engineering, Inc.

Ranked: 1

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respondents based upon their Qualification Statements in accordance with the following rating factors.

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	24
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	14
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and qualifying 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.	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	3
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	3
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	8
TOTAL SCORE	100	88

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.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL SCORING

**RQS14-0193, Electrical Engineering Design and Construction Administration Services for
480 Volt Improvements at the Iron Bridge Regional Water Reclamation Facility, Project**

Committee Member: ROBERT RANG

Date: May 27, 2014

Firm Name: C+S

Ranked: 2

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respondents based upon their Qualification Statements in accordance with the following rating factors.

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	21
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	13
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and qualifying 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.	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	5
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	10
TOTAL SCORE	100	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.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL SCORING

**RQS14-0193, Electrical Engineering Design and Construction Administration Services for
480 Volt Improvements at the Iron Bridge Regional Water Reclamation Facility, Project**

Committee Member: ROBERT RANG

Date: May 27, 2014

Firm Name: HAZENUSAWYER

Ranked: 3

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respondents based upon their Qualification Statements in accordance with the following rating factors.

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	23
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	14
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	13.4
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.	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
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	10
TOTAL SCORE	100	86.4

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.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL SCORING

RQS14-0193, Electrical Engineering Design and Construction Administration Services for 480 Volt Improvements at the Iron Bridge Regional Water Reclamation Facility, Project

Committee Member: ROBERT RANG

Date: May 27, 2014

Firm Name: MILAN

Ranked: 1

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respondents based upon their Qualification Statements in accordance with the following rating factors.

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	25
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	15
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and qualifying 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.	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	3
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	3
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	10
TOTAL SCORE	100	95

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.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL SCORING

**RQS14-0193, Electrical Engineering Design and Construction Administration Services for
480 Volt Improvements at the Iron Bridge Regional Water Reclamation Facility, Project**

Committee Member: WILLIAM WOOD

Date: May 27, 2014

Firm Name: C&S ENGINEERS

Ranked: 2

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respondents based upon their Qualification Statements in accordance with the following rating factors.

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	20
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	15
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and qualifying 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.	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	5
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	9
TOTAL SCORE	100	73 92

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.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL SCORING

**RQS14-0193, Electrical Engineering Design and Construction Administration Services for
480 Volt Improvements at the Iron Bridge Regional Water Reclamation Facility, Project**

Committee Member: WILLIAM WOOD

Date: May 27, 2014

Firm Name: HAZEN AND SAWYER P C

Ranked: 3

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respondents based upon their Qualification Statements in accordance with the following rating factors.

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	25
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	10
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	13.4
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.	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	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
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	9
TOTAL SCORE	100	54.4 79.4

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.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL SCORING

RQS14-0193, Electrical Engineering Design and Construction Administration Services for 480 Volt Improvements at the Iron Bridge Regional Water Reclamation Facility, Project

Committee Member: WILLIAM WOOD

Date: May 27, 2014

Firm Name: MILAN

Ranked: 1

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respondents based upon their Qualification Statements in accordance with the following rating factors.

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	25
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	15
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and qualifying 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.	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	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	3
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	10
TOTAL SCORE	100	68 93

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.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL SCORING

**RQS14-0193, Electrical Engineering Design and Construction Administration Services for
480 Volt Improvements at the Iron Bridge Regional Water Reclamation Facility, Project**

Committee Member: Timberlake

Date: May 27, 2014

Firm Name: CHS ENGINEER INC

Ranked: 3

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respondents based upon their Qualification Statements in accordance with the following rating factors.

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	23
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	10
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and qualifying 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.	15	3
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	5
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	69

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.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL SCORING

**RQS14-0193, Electrical Engineering Design and Construction Administration Services for
480 Volt Improvements at the Iron Bridge Regional Water Reclamation Facility, Project**

Committee Member:

Blumenthal

Date: May 27, 2014

Firm Name:

Hazen & Sawyer

Ranked:

2

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respondents based upon their Qualification Statements in accordance with the following rating factors.

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	25
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	13
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	13.4
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.	15	5
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
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	10
TOTAL SCORE	100	80.4

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.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL SCORING

**RQS14-0193, Electrical Engineering Design and Construction Administration Services for
480 Volt Improvements at the Iron Bridge Regional Water Reclamation Facility, Project**

Committee Member: Tamara Kuer

Date: May 27, 2014

Firm Name: M. Yan Engineering

Ranked: 1

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respondents based upon their Qualification Statements in accordance with the following rating factors.

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	25
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	13
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and qualifying 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.	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	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	3
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	10
TOTAL SCORE	100	98.0

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.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL SCORING

**RQS14-0193, Electrical Engineering Design and Construction Administration Services for
480 Volt Improvements at the Iron Bridge Regional Water Reclamation Facility, Project**

Committee Member: RENE CARCAMO

Date: May 27, 2014

Firm Name: CES ENGINEERS, INC.

Ranked: 3 ~~1~~

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respondents based upon their Qualification Statements in accordance with the following rating factors.

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	22
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	13
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and qualifying 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.	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	9
F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando.	4	4
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	8
TOTAL SCORE	100	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.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL SCORING

**RQS14-0193, Electrical Engineering Design and Construction Administration Services for
480 Volt Improvements at the Iron Bridge Regional Water Reclamation Facility, Project**

Committee Member: RENE CARCANO

Date: May 27, 2014

Firm Name: HAZEN AND SADYER, P.C.

Ranked: 2

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respondents based upon their Qualification Statements in accordance with the following rating factors.

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	25
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	15
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	13.4
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.	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
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	10
TOTAL SCORE	100	92.4

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.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL SCORING

**RQS14-0193, Electrical Engineering Design and Construction Administration Services for
480 Volt Improvements at the Iron Bridge Regional Water Reclamation Facility, Project**

Committee Member: RENE CARCAMO

Date: May 27, 2014

Firm Name: MIHAN ENGINEERING, INC.

Ranked: 1

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the Respondents based upon their Qualification Statements in accordance with the following rating factors.

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	25
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	14
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and qualifying 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.	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	3
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	3
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	10
TOTAL SCORE	100	94

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.