



CITY OF ORLANDO

1st ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

RQS14-0233

**Request for Qualification Statements for
Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for
Citywide Sidewalks
June 11, 2014 – 9 a.m.
Agenda Conference Rooms (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:

Steve Wiedenbeck, Project Manager II (Chair)
Howard Elkin, Assistant Manager, Streets and Drainage
Paul Crouter, Assistant Manager, Capital Improvements
Adam Scobby, Construction Manager
Byron Raysor, Contract Compliance Investigator III

Other City Personnel Present:

Roger Cooper, Contract Administrator (Facilitator)

Members of the Public Present:

DeWayne Smith, Atlantic Gulf Companies

Actions/Discussion/Motions:

The Facilitator called the meeting to order at 9:05 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 Byron Raysor, and seconded by Steve Wiedenbeck, to accept the Public Input Procedures. The motion carried unanimously.

The Facilitator indicated that four (4) sealed qualification statements were submitted in response to the solicitation and that all firms had been certified as qualified by the Consultants' Qualifications Board on May 19, 2014. Those firms are as follows:

- 1) Mehta and Associates, Inc.
- 2) MLH Consulting, LLC
- 3) Page One Consultants, Inc.
- 4) PSA Constructors, Inc.

The Facilitator handed out the pre-determined scores for the Volume of Previous Work Awarded to Each Respondent (Shortlist Category E).

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

The meeting was turned over to the Chair, and the Committee discussed each firm's submittal. At the end of discussions, each Committee member individually scored and ranked each firm -- resulting in the following Consolidated Ranking:

- 1) Mehta and Associates, Inc.
- 2) Page One Consultants, Inc.
- 3) PSA Constructors, Inc.
- 4) MLH Consulting, LLC

A motion was made by Steve Wiedenbeck, and seconded by Paul Crouter, to invite the top three (3) firms for presentations and interviews. No Members from the Public were present at this time. The motion carried unanimously.

One member of the public (DeWayne Smith of Atlantic Gulf Companies) came into the meeting just after the meeting started but left before the completion of scoring/ranking.

Paul Crouter made a motion, seconded by Byron Raysor, to allow twenty (20) minutes for each presentation and a fifteen (15) minute question-and-answer period, with ten (10) minute breaks in between sessions. The motion carried unanimously.

Presentations are scheduled for June 25, 2014, beginning at 9 a.m. in the Veterans Conference Room and alternating between Veterans Conference Room (2nd Floor) and Tarpon Conference Room (4th Floor) of City Hall.

A motion was made by Steve Wiedenbeck, and seconded by Howard Elkin, to adjourn at 9:58 a.m. The motion carried unanimously.

These minutes are considered to be the official minutes of the RQS14-0233 Advisory Committee Meeting held on June 11, 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:



Steve Wiedenbeck (Chair)
Project Manager II
Public Works Department



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

RQS14-0233 Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for City Sidewalks

Consultant Name	Prior Dollars Score (E)
Mehta and Associates, Inc.	5
MLH Consulting, LLC	4
Page One Consultants, Inc.	5
PSA Constructors, Inc.	5

1st Meeting Scoring/Short-List Ranking
RQS14-0233 Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Citywide Sidewalks

COMMITTEE MEMBERS -->	Steve Wiedenbeck	Howard Elkin	Paul Crouter	Adam Scobby	Byron Raysor
---------------------------------	------------------	--------------	--------------	-------------	--------------

CONSOLIDATED RANKING:

	Steve Wiedenbeck	Howard Elkin	Paul Crouter	Adam Scobby	Byron Raysor	Total	Ranking
Mehta and Associates, Inc.	1	2	1	3	1	8	1
MLH Consulting, LLC	4	4	4	4	4	20	4
Page One Consultants, Inc.	3	1	2	1	2	9	2
PSA Constructors, Inc.	2	3	3	2	3	13	3

INDIVIDUAL SCORING AND RANKING:

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Mehta and Associates, Inc.	MLH Consulting, LLC	Page One Consultants, Inc.	PSA Constructors, Inc.
A	35	30	25	30	30
B	25	25	15	23	22
C	25	23	15	20	22
D	10	10	8	9	10
E	5	5	4	5	5
F					
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	93	67	87	89
Steve Wiedenbeck		1	4	3	2
Ranking					

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Mehta and Associates, Inc.	MLH Consulting, LLC	Page One Consultants, Inc.	PSA Constructors, Inc.
A	35	33	25	35	33
B	25	24	21	25	24
C	25	23	15	23	22
D	10	10	8	10	10
E	5	5	4	5	5
F	0				
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	95	73	98	94
Howard Elkin		2	4	1	3
Ranking					

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Mehta and Associates, Inc.	MLH Consulting, LLC	Page One Consultants, Inc.	PSA Constructors, Inc.
A	35	30	27	29	28
B	25	25	22	24	23

1st Meeting Scoring/Short-List Ranking

RQS14-0233 Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Citywide Sidewalks

C	25	25	25	25	25
D	10	9	5	8	7
E	5	5	4	5	5
F	0				
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	94	83	91	88
Paul Crouter		1	4	2	3
Ranking					

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Mehta and Associates, Inc.	MLH Consulting, LLC	Page One Consultants, Inc.	PSA Constructors, Inc.
A	35	34	33	35	35
B	25	25	25	25	25
C	25	24	23	24	23
D	10	9	8	10	10
E	5	5	4	5	5
F	0				
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	97	93	99	98
Adam Scobby		3	4	1	2
Ranking					

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Mehta and Associates, Inc.	MLH Consulting, LLC	Page One Consultants, Inc.	PSA Constructors, Inc.
A	35	34	32	33	33
B	25	24	23	24	23
C	25	24	23	24	24
D	10	9	8	9	9
E	5	5	4	5	5
F	0				
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	96	90	95	94
Byron Raysor		1	4	2	3
Ranking					

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0233: Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Citywide Sidewalks

Committee Member: Wiedenbeck **June 11, 2014**

Firm Name: Meh ta

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.	35	30
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	25	25
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	23
D. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	10
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	93

Notes regarding Exhibit "E": Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors to determine the short-listing of the Respondents. Each member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each member will rank the Respondents based upon the member's score for each Respondent. The ranking established by each member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Respondents' total scores from each member will be added and compared. The Respondent with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Respondents.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0233: Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Citywide Sidewalks

Committee Member:

Wiedenk

June 11, 2014

Firm Name:

MLH

Ranked:

4

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.	35	<i>25</i>
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	25	<i>15</i>
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	<i>15</i>
D. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	<i>8</i>
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	<i>4</i>
TOTAL SCORE	100	<i>67</i>

Notes regarding Exhibit "E": Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors to determine the short-listing of the Respondents. Each member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each member will rank the Respondents based upon the member's score for each Respondent. The ranking established by each member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Respondents' total scores from each member will be added and compared. The Respondent with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Respondents.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0233: Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Citywide
Sidewalks

Committee Member:

Wiedenbeck

June 11, 2014

Firm Name: _____

Page 1

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.	35	<i>30</i>
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	25	<i>23</i>
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	<i>20</i>
D. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	<i>9</i>
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	<i>5</i>
TOTAL SCORE	100	<i>87</i>

Notes regarding Exhibit "E": Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors to determine the short-listing of the Respondents. Each member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each member will rank the Respondents based upon the member's score for each Respondent. The ranking established by each member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Respondents' total scores from each member will be added and compared. The Respondent with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Respondents.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0233: Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Citywide Sidewalks

Committee Member: Wiedenbeck **June 11, 2014**

Firm Name: PSA

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.	35	30
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	25	22
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	22
D. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	10
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	89

Notes regarding Exhibit "E": Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors to determine the short-listing of the Respondents. Each member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each member will rank the Respondents based upon the member's score for each Respondent. The ranking established by each member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Respondents' total scores from each member will be added and compared. The Respondent with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Respondents.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0233: Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Citywide Sidewalks

Committee Member: Howard Etkin June 11, 2014

Firm Name: MEHTA

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.	35	33
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	25	24
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	23
D. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	10
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	95

Notes regarding Exhibit "E": Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors to determine the short-listing of the Respondents. Each member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each member will rank the Respondents based upon the member's score for each Respondent. The ranking established by each member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Respondents' total scores from each member will be added and compared. The Respondent with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Respondents.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0233: Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Citywide Sidewalks

Committee Member: HOWARD ECKIN June 11, 2014

Firm Name: MILM

Ranked: 4

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.	35	25
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	25	21
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	15
D. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	8
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	4
TOTAL SCORE	100	73

Notes regarding Exhibit "E": Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors to determine the short-listing of the Respondents. Each member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each member will rank the Respondents based upon the member's score for each Respondent. The ranking established by each member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Respondents' total scores from each member will be added and compared. The Respondent with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Respondents.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0233: Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Citywide Sidewalks

Committee Member: HOWARD ELKIN June 11, 2014

Firm Name: PAGE ONE

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.	35	35
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	25	25
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	23
D. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	10
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	98

Notes regarding Exhibit "E": Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors to determine the short-listing of the Respondents. Each member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each member will rank the Respondents based upon the member's score for each Respondent. The ranking established by each member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Respondents' total scores from each member will be added and compared. The Respondent with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Respondents.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0233: Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Citywide Sidewalks

Committee Member: HOWARD ELKIN June 11, 2014

Firm Name: PSA

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.	35	33
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	25	24
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	22
D. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	10
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	94

Notes regarding Exhibit "E": Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors to determine the short-listing of the Respondents. Each member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each member will rank the Respondents based upon the member's score for each Respondent. The ranking established by each member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Respondents' total scores from each member will be added and compared. The Respondent with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Respondents.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0233: Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Citywide Sidewalks

Committee Member: ADAM SCOOBY June 11, 2014

Firm Name: HEITA + ASSOCIATES, 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.	35	34
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	25	25
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	24
D. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	9
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	97

Notes regarding Exhibit "E": Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors to determine the short-listing of the Respondents. Each member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each member will rank the Respondents based upon the member's score for each Respondent. The ranking established by each member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Respondents' total scores from each member will be added and compared. The Respondent with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Respondents.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0233: Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Citywide Sidewalks

Committee Member: ADAM SCOBBY June 11, 2014

Firm Name: MLL CONSULTING

Ranked: 4

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.	35	33
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	25	25
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	23
D. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	8
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	4
TOTAL SCORE	100	93

Notes regarding Exhibit "E": Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors to determine the short-listing of the Respondents. Each member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each member will rank the Respondents based upon the member's score for each Respondent. The ranking established by each member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Respondents' total scores from each member will be added and compared. The Respondent with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Respondents.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0233: Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Citywide Sidewalks

Committee Member: ADAM SCOBBY

June 11, 2014

Firm Name: PAGE ONE CONSULTANTS, 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.	35	35
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	25	25
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	24
D. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	10
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	99

Notes regarding Exhibit "E": Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors to determine the short-listing of the Respondents. Each member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each member will rank the Respondents based upon the member's score for each Respondent. The ranking established by each member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Respondents' total scores from each member will be added and compared. The Respondent with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Respondents.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0233: Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Citywide Sidewalks

Committee Member: ADAM SCOBBY June 11, 2014

Firm Name: PSA CONSTRUCTORS, INC.

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.	35	35
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	25	25
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	25 23
D. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	10
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	98

Notes regarding Exhibit "E": Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors to determine the short-listing of the Respondents. Each member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each member will rank the Respondents based upon the member's score for each Respondent. The ranking established by each member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Respondents' total scores from each member will be added and compared. The Respondent with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Respondents.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0233: Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Citywide Sidewalks

Committee Member: Byron Rayson **June 11, 2014**

Firm Name: Mehra and Associates, 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.	35	34
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	25	24
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	24
D. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	9
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	96

Notes regarding Exhibit "E": Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors to determine the short-listing of the Respondents. Each member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each member will rank the Respondents based upon the member's score for each Respondent. The ranking established by each member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Respondents' total scores from each member will be added and compared. The Respondent with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Respondents.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0233: Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Citywide Sidewalks

Committee Member: Byron Raysor **June 11, 2014**

Firm Name: MLH Consulting, LLC

Ranked: 4

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.	35	32
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	25	23
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	23
D. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	8
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	4
TOTAL SCORE	100	90

Notes regarding Exhibit "E": Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors to determine the short-listing of the Respondents. Each member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each member will rank the Respondents based upon the member's score for each Respondent. The ranking established by each member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Respondents' total scores from each member will be added and compared. The Respondent with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Respondents.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0233: Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Citywide Sidewalks

Committee Member: Byron Raynor **June 11, 2014**

Firm Name: Page One Consultants, Inc

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.	35	33
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	25	24
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	24
D. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	9
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	95

Notes regarding Exhibit "E": Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors to determine the short-listing of the Respondents. Each member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each member will rank the Respondents based upon the member's score for each Respondent. The ranking established by each member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Respondents' total scores from each member will be added and compared. The Respondent with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Respondents.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0233: Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Citywide Sidewalks

Committee Member:

Byron Bayser

June 11, 2014

Firm Name:

PSA Constructors, 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.	35	33
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	25	23
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	24
D. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	9
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	94

Notes regarding Exhibit "E": Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors to determine the short-listing of the Respondents. Each member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each member will rank the Respondents based upon the member's score for each Respondent. The ranking established by each member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Respondents' total scores from each member will be added and compared. The Respondent with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Respondents.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0233: Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Citywide Sidewalks

Committee Member: PAUL CROUTER **June 11, 2014**

Firm Name: Mehtra

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.	35	30
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	25	25
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	25
D. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	9
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	94

Notes regarding Exhibit "E": Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors to determine the short-listing of the Respondents. Each member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each member will rank the Respondents based upon the member's score for each Respondent. The ranking established by each member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Respondents' total scores from each member will be added and compared. The Respondent with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Respondents.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0233: Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Citywide Sidewalks

Committee Member: Paul Crouter June 11, 2014

Firm Name: MLH

Ranked: 4

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.	35	27
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	25	22
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	25
D. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	5
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	4
TOTAL SCORE	100	83

Notes regarding Exhibit "E": Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors to determine the short-listing of the Respondents. Each member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each member will rank the Respondents based upon the member's score for each Respondent. The ranking established by each member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Respondents' total scores from each member will be added and compared. The Respondent with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Respondents.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0233: Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Citywide Sidewalks

Committee Member: PAUL CROTER **June 11, 2014**

Firm Name: PAGE ONE

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.	35	29
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	25	24
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	25
D. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	8
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	91

Notes regarding Exhibit "E": Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors to determine the short-listing of the Respondents. Each member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each member will rank the Respondents based upon the member's score for each Respondent. The ranking established by each member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Respondents' total scores from each member will be added and compared. The Respondent with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Respondents.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

RQS14-0233: Construction Engineering and Inspection Professional Services for Citywide Sidewalks

Committee Member: PAUL COUTER **June 11, 2014**

Firm Name: P.S.A.

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.	35	28
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	25	23
C. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	25
D. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	7
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	88

Notes regarding Exhibit "E": 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.