



CITY OF ORLANDO

1st ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
RQS15-0060
Request for Qualification Statements for
Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation
January 7, 2015 – 9 a.m.
Agenda Conference Rooms (2th 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:

Michael Melzer, P.E., Project Manager / Construction Manager, CIID, PW (Chair)
Charles Shultz, P.E., Assistant Wastewater Division Manager, PW
Ben Gray, Stormwater Assistant Division Manager, PW
Ron Proulx, Construction Manager, CIID, PW
Byron Raysor, Compliance Investigator III, MWBE Office

Other City Personnel Present:

Roger Cooper, Contract Administrator (Facilitator)

Members of the Public Present:

None

Actions/Discussion/Motions:

The meeting was called to order at 9:03 a.m., and the Facilitator 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 Ron Proulx, and seconded by Charles Shultz, to accept the Public Input Procedures. The motion carried unanimously.

The Facilitator indicated that six (6) 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 December 5, 2014. Those firms are as follows:

- 1) AECOM Technical Services
- 2) CPH, Inc.
- 3) Hill International, Inc.
- 4) JBS Engineering Technical Services, Inc.
- 5) Mehta and Associates, Inc.
- 6) 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.

At this point the meeting was turned over to the technical Chair, who conducted discussions with the Committee. At the end of discussion, each Committee member individually scored and ranked each firm as follows:

- 1) CPH, Inc.
- 2) AECOM Technical Services
- 3) Mehta and Associates, Inc.
- 4) Hill International, Inc.
- 5) JBS Engineering Technical Services, Inc.
- 6) PSA Constructors, Inc.

A motion was made by Charles Shultz, and seconded by Byron Raysor, to invite a small core group from the top three (3) firms for presentations with instructions that each firm should discuss it's understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion. No Members from the Public were present. The motion carried unanimously.

Ron Proulx made a motion, seconded by Charles Shultz, to allow up to fifteen (15) minutes for each presentation and up to a ten (10) minute question-and-answer period with each firm, with ten (10) minute breaks in between sessions. The motion carried unanimously.

Presentations are scheduled for January 21, 2015, beginning at 9:00 a.m. in the Tarpon Conference Room (4th Floor) and alternating between Tarpon Conference Room and Agenda Conference Room (2nd Floor) of City Hall.

A motion was made by Byron Raysor, and seconded by Charles Shultz to adjourn at 10:36 a.m. The motion carried unanimously.

These minutes are considered to be the official minutes of the RQS15-0060 Advisory Committee Meeting held on January 7, 2015, 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:



Michael Melzer, P.E. (Chair)
Project Mgr/Construction Mgr
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

Pre-Determined Scores
Rating Factor E
Volume of Work Previously Awarded to Respondent by City
(Actual Dollars Paid as Per Solicitation Section 7)

<u>Name of Company</u>	<u>Score for Rating Factor E</u>
AECOM Technical Services	0
CPH, Inc.	0
Hill International, Inc.	5
JBS Engineering Technical Services, Inc.	5
Mehta and Associates, Inc.	5
PSA Constructors, Inc.	5

1st Meeting Scoring/Short-List Ranking
RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation

COMMITTEE MEMBERS -->	Michael Melzer	Charles Shultz	Ben Gray	Ron Proulx	Byron Raysor
---------------------------------	----------------	----------------	----------	------------	--------------

CONSOLIDATED RANKING:

	Michael Melzer	Charles Shultz	Ben Gray	Ron Proulx	Byron Raysor	Total	Ranking
AECOM Technical Services	2	2	3	3	4	14	2
CPH, Inc.	1	1	1	1	3	7	1
Hill International, Inc.	5	3	2	2	6	18	4
JBS Engineering Technical Services, Inc.	4	6	3	5	5	23	5
Mehta and Associates, Inc.	3	4	3	4	1	15	3
PSA Constructors, Inc.	6	5	6	6	2	25	6

INDIVIDUAL SCORING AND RANKING:

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	AECOM Technical Services	CPH, Inc.	Hill International, Inc.	JBS Engineering Technical Services, Inc.	Mehta and Associates, Inc.	PSA Constructors, Inc.
A	35	33	34	28	30	30	28
B	25	23	23	21	21	22	20
C	25	23	24	21	22	22	20
D	10	9	10	8	8	8	8
E	5	0	0	5	5	5	5
F							
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	88	91	83	86	87	81
Michael Melzer		2	1	5	4	3	6
Ranking							

1st Meeting Scoring/Short-List Ranking
RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	AECOM Technical Services	CPH, Inc.	Hill International, Inc.	JBS Engineering Technical Services, Inc.	Mehta and Associates, Inc.	PSA Constructors, Inc.
A	35	25.5	33	25	20	20	23
B	25	20	23	18	18	21	17
C	25	20	23	18	15	15	15
D	10	8	8	7	7	7	7
E	5	0	0	5	5	5	5
F	0						
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	73.5	87	73	65	68	67
Charles Shultz		2	1	3	6	4	5
Ranking							

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	AECOM Technical Services	CPH, Inc.	Hill International, Inc.	JBS Engineering Technical Services, Inc.	Mehta and Associates, Inc.	PSA Constructors, Inc.
A	35	30	30	25	25	20	25
B	25	15	20	20	15	20	15
C	25	20	25	20	20	20	15
D	10	5	10	5	5	5	5
E	5	0	0	5	5	5	5
F	0						
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	70	85	75	70	70	65
Ben Gray		3	1	2	3	3	6
Ranking							

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	AECOM Technical Services	CPH, Inc.	Hill International, Inc.	JBS Engineering Technical Services, Inc.	Mehta and Associates, Inc.	PSA Constructors, Inc.
A	35	31	33	30	19	19	19
B	25	20	22	21	15	22	15
C	25	21	22	22	20	21	20
D	10	8	9	9	6	7	5
E	5	0	0	0	5	5	5
F	0						
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	80	86	82	65	74	64
Ron Proulx		3	1	2	5	4	6
Ranking							

[illegible]

AECOM

Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation

RQS15-0060

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Nike Melzer DATE: 1/7/15

FIRM NAME: AECOM

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 83 87 88
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	35	33 30 33
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	25	23 22 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 22 23 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 9 9
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0 0 0
TOTAL SCORE	100	88

RANK: 2

Notes regarding Exhibit "G": 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.

CPH

Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation

RQS15-0060

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Mike Melzer DATE: 11/7/15
FIRM NAME: CPH

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 91
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	35	34 34
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	25	23 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 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	11 10
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0 0
TOTAL SCORE	100	91

RANK: 1

Notes regarding Exhibit "G": 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.

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Mike Melzer DATE: 11/7/15

FIRM NAME: Hill International

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	28 28 28
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 21 21
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 8 8
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5 5
TOTAL SCORE	100	83

RANK: 5

Notes regarding Exhibit "G": 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.

JBS

Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation

RQS15-0060

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Mike Melzer DATE: 1/2/15

FIRM NAME: JBS

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
		86
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	35	32 30 30
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	25	24 22 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	24 22 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	9 8 8
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5 5 5
TOTAL SCORE	100	86

RANK: 4

Notes regarding Exhibit "G": 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.

Poor grammar in proposal!

MEHTA

Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation

RQS15-0060

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Mike Melzer DATE: 1/7/15

FIRM NAME: MEHTA

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 87
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	25	31 30 30
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 22 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	21 20 22
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	8 8 8
TOTAL SCORE	100	5 5 5
		87

RANK: 3

Notes regarding Exhibit "G": 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.

PSA

Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation

RQS15-0060

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Mike Melzer DATE: 1/7/15

FIRM NAME: PSA

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 28 28
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	25	22 20 20
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	21 20 20
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 8 8
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5 5 5
TOTAL SCORE	100	81

RANK: 6

Notes regarding Exhibit "G": 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.

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Chuck Shultz DATE: 1-7-2015

FIRM NAME: AE Com

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	29.5
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	25	20
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	20
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	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	73.5

RANK: 2

Notes regarding Exhibit "G": 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.

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Chuck Shultz DATE: 1-7-2015

FIRM NAME: CPH

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	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	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	87

RANK: 1

Notes regarding Exhibit "G": 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.

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Choco Shultz DATE: 1-7-2015

FIRM NAME: Hill International

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	³ 25
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	25	18
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	18
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	73

RANK: 3

Notes regarding Exhibit "G": 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.

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Cheryl Saultz DATE: 1-7-2015

FIRM NAME: JBS Engineering

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

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	35	<u>20</u>
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	25	<u>18</u>
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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>7</u>
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	<u>5</u>
TOTAL SCORE	100	<u>65</u>

RANK: 6

Notes regarding Exhibit "G": 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.

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Chuck Schultz DATE: 1-7-2015

FIRM NAME: Melita

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	20
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	7
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	68

RANK: 4

Notes regarding Exhibit "G": 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.

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Chuck Shultz DATE: 1-7-2015

FIRM NAME: PSA

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	23
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	25	17
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	7
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	67

RANK: 5

Notes regarding Exhibit "G": 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.

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Ben G. May DATE: 1/7/2015

FIRM NAME: AE COM

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	15
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	20
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	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	70

RANK: 3

Notes regarding Exhibit "G": 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.

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Ben Gray DATE: 1/7/2015

FIRM NAME: CPH, Inc.

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

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	35	30
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	25	20
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	10
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	85 <i>100</i>

RANK: 1

Notes regarding Exhibit "G": 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.

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: BEN GRAY DATE: 1/7/2015
FIRM NAME: Hill

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	20
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	20
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	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	75

RANK: 2

Notes regarding Exhibit "G": 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.

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Ben Gray DATE: 11/7/2015
FIRM NAME: JBS

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	15
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	20
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	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	70 BG

RANK: 3

Notes regarding Exhibit "G": 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.

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Bern Gray DATE: 1/7/2015
FIRM NAME: Menta

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	20
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	25	20
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	20
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	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	70 BG

RANK: 3

Notes regarding Exhibit "G": 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.

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: BEN GRAY DATE: 11/7/2015

FIRM NAME: PSA

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	15
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	5
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	65

RANK: 6

Notes regarding Exhibit "G": 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.

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Ron Probst DATE: 1/2/15

FIRM NAME: AECOM

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	31
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	25	20
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	21
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	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	80

RANK: 3

Notes regarding Exhibit "G": 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.

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Ron Proulx DATE: 1/6/15

FIRM NAME: CPH

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	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	9
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	86

RANK: 1

Notes regarding Exhibit "G": 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.

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Don Proulx DATE: 1/7/15

FIRM NAME: Will International

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	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	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	9
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	82

RANK: ~~82~~ 2

Notes regarding Exhibit "G": 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.

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Ron Proulx DATE: 1/7/15

FIRM NAME: JBS

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	19
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	25	15
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	1920
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	56
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	6465

RANK: 5

Notes regarding Exhibit "G": 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.

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Ron Prolx DATE: 1/7/15

FIRM NAME: MEhta

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	19
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	20 21
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	6 7
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	74

RANK: 4

Notes regarding Exhibit "G": 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.

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Row Prolx DATE: 1/7/15

FIRM NAME: PSA

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	19
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	25	15
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	19 20
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	4 5
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	3 5
TOTAL SCORE	100	60 64

RMP

RMP

RMP

RMP

RANK: 6

Notes regarding Exhibit "G": 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.

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Byron Raysor **DATE:** 1/7/15

FIRM NAME: AECOM

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	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	90

RANK: 4

Notes regarding Exhibit "G": 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.

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Byron Raysor **DATE:** 1/7/2015

FIRM NAME: CPH, Inc

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

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	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	0
TOTAL SCORE	100	91

RANK: 3

Notes regarding Exhibit "G": 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.

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Byron Rayson **DATE:** 1/7/15

FIRM NAME: Hill International

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	31
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	6
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	88

RANK: 6

Notes regarding Exhibit "G": 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.

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Byron Rayser **DATE:** 1/7/15

FIRM NAME: JBS Engineering Technical Services, Inc

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

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	35	31
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	9
E. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
TOTAL SCORE	100	89

RANK: 5

Notes regarding Exhibit "G": 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.

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Byron Raynor **DATE:** 1/7/2015

FIRM NAME: Mehra + Associates

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

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	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

RANK: 1

Notes regarding Exhibit "G": 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.

**RQS15-0060 Design Review, Construction Administration, and
Construction Inspection for I-4 Ultimate Utility Relocation**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Byron Raynor **DATE:** 1/7/2015

FIRM NAME: PSA Constructors, Inc

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

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	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

RANK: 2

Notes regarding Exhibit "G": 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.