



CITY OF ORLANDO

1st ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

RQS15-0294

Request for Qualification Statements for Continuing Geotechnical and Materials Testing Services

July 8, 2015 – 9 a.m.

Tarpon Conference Rooms (4th 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:

Stephen Wiedenbeck, Project Manager II (Chair)
Cade Braud, Signal Systems Engineer
Peter Holzer, Construction Manager
Olivia Boykin, Construction Inspector Supervisor
Rene Carcamo, Compliance Investigator III, Executive Offices/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 9:05 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 reviewed Advisory Committee Rules
- 6) Reviewed Public Input Procedures

A motion was made by Steve Wiedenbeck, and seconded by Rene Carcamo, to accept the Public Input Procedures. The motion carried unanimously.

The Facilitator indicated that seven (7) 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 June 8, 2015. Those firms are as follows:

- 1) Ardaman & Associates, Inc.
- 2) Geotechnical and Environmental Consultants, Inc.
- 3) Nova Engineering and Environmental, LLC
- 4) Professional Services Industries, Inc.
- 5) Terracon Consultants, Inc.
- 6) Tierra South Florida, Inc.
- 7) Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc.

The Facilitator handed out the pre-determined scores for **Rating Factor C** (Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work), **Rating Factor F** (Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on

this project), and **Rating Factor G** (Volume of Previous Work Awarded to Each Respondent by the City). The first of these three Rankings was completed by the MBE Office, and the last two were computed by the Procurement and Contracts Division in accordance with solicitation instructions.

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 discussions, each Committee member individually scored and ranked each firm -- which resulted in a consolidated ranking as follows:

- 1) Geotechnical and Environmental Consultants, Inc.
- 2) Professional Services Industries, Inc.
- 3) Ardaman & Associates, Inc.
- 4) Terracon Consultants, Inc.
- 5) Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc.
- 6) Tierra South Florida, Inc.
- 7) Nova Engineering and Environmental, LLC

A motion was made by Peter Holzer, and seconded by Cade Braud, to invite a small core group from the top six (6) firms for presentations. No Member from the Public was present. The motion carried unanimously.


Olivia Boykin made a motion, seconded by Steve Wiedenbeck, to allow up to twenty (20) minutes for each presentation and up to fifteen (15) minutes for a question-and-answer period with each firm, with ten (10) minute-breaks in between sessions. The motion carried unanimously.

Presentations are scheduled for July 24, 2015, beginning at 9:00 a.m. in the Agenda Conference Room (2nd Floor of City Hall) and then alternating between the Agenda Conference Room and the North Collaborations Conference Room (1st Floor of City Hall).

A motion was made by Steve Wiedenbeck, and seconded by Rene Carcamo to adjourn at 10:31 a.m. The motion carried unanimously.

These minutes are considered to be the official minutes of the RQS15-0294 Advisory Committee Meeting held on July 8, 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:



Stephen Wiedenbeck (Chair)
Project Manager II
Capital Improvement Division



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

RQS15-0294 Continuing Geotechnical and Materials Testing Services
Pre-determined Scores for
MWBE Participation, Proximity, and Prior Work \$

| Consultant Name | MBE Office Announced Scores for MWBE Participation (C) | Proximity Score (F) | Prior Dollars Score (G) |
|--|--|---------------------|-------------------------|
| Ardaman & Associates, Inc. | 14 | 3 | 1 |
| Geotechnical and Environmental Consultants, Inc. | 13.88 | 4 | 1 |
| Nova Engineering and Environmental, LLC | 14 | 1 | 3 |
| Professional Services Industries, Inc. | 15 | 4 | 3 |
| Terracon Consultants, Inc. | 14 | 3 | 0 |
| Tierra South Florida, Inc. | 14 | 1 | 5 |
| Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc. | 13.04 | 4 | 0 |

Request for Qualification Statements
RQS15-0294 Continuing Geotechnical and Materials Testing Services
Shortlist Scoring / Ranking

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| Committee Members --> | Stephen Wiedenbeck | Cade Braud | Peter Holzer | Olivia Boykin | Rene Carcamo |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|

CONSOLIDATED SCORING / RANKING:

| | Stephen Wiedenbeck | Cade Braud | Peter Holzer | Olivia Boykin | Rene Carcamo | Total | Ranking |
|---|---------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|--------------|----------------|
| Ardaman & Associates, Inc. | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 12 | 2 |
| Geotechnical and Environmental Consultants, Inc. | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 1 |
| Nova Engineering and Environmental, LLC | 6 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 34 | 7 |
| Professional Services Industries, Inc. | 4 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 2 |
| Terracon Consultants, Inc. | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 22 | 4 |
| Tierra South Florida, Inc. | 7 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 27 | 6 |
| Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc. | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 23 | 5 |

TIE BREAKER:

| Since there is a tie between the following two firms for the number Two Position, the TOTAL SCORES for these same firms are compared below in order to break the tie: | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------|--------------------|
| | Stephen Wiedenbeck | Cade Braud | Peter Holzer | Olivia Boykin | Rene Carcamo | TOTALS | NEW RANKING |
| Ardaman & Associates, Inc. | 93 | 75.5 | 90 | 93 | 90 | 441.5 | 3 |
| Professional Services Industries, Inc. | 90 | 79.5 | 86 | 97 | 96 | 448.5 | 2 |

INDIVIDUAL SCORING / RANKING:

| NO. | POSSIBLE POINTS | Ardaman & Associates, Inc. | Geotechnical and Environmental Consultants, Inc. | Nova Engineering and Environmental, LLC | Professional Services Industries, Inc. | Terracon Consultants, Inc. | Tierra South Florida, Inc. | Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc. |
|------------|------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| A | 30 | 30 | 29 | 27 | 29 | 30 | 26 | 28 |

Shortlist Scoring / Ranking

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|-----|----|-------|----|----|----|----|-------|
| B | 20 | 20 | 20 | 18 | 18 | 20 | 17 | 18 |
| C | 16 | 14 | 13.88 | 14 | 15 | 14 | 14 | 13.04 |
| D | 15 | 15 | 15 | 12 | 13 | 15 | 13 | 14 |
| E | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 8 | 10 | 8 | 9 |
| F | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| G | 5 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL POINT VALUE | 100 | 93 | 92.88 | 85 | 90 | 92 | 84 | 86.04 |
| Stephen Wiedenbeck | | 1 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 5 |
| Ranking | | | | | | | | |

| NO. | POSSIBLE POINTS | Ardaman & Associates, Inc. | Geotechnical and Environmental Consultants, Inc. | Nova Engineering and Environmental , LLC | Professional Services Industries, Inc. | Terracon Consultants, Inc. | Tierra South Florida, Inc. | Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc. |
|-------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|--|--|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| A | 30 | 25 | 27.5 | 22.5 | 25 | 25 | 24 | 25 |
| B | 20 | 15 | 17.5 | 12.5 | 15 | 15 | 14 | 15 |
| C | 16 | 14 | 13.88 | 14 | 15 | 14 | 14 | 13.04 |
| D | 15 | 10 | 12.5 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 |
| E | 10 | 7.5 | 8 | 7 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 7 | 7.5 |
| F | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| G | 5 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| | 0 | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL POINT VALUE | 100 | 75.5 | 84.38 | 69 | 79.5 | 74.5 | 74 | 74.54 |
| Cade Braud | | 3 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 4 |
| Ranking | | | | | | | | |

[illegible]

**RQS15-0294 CONTINUING GEOTECHNICAL
AND MATERIALS TESTING SERVICES**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: CODE BRAUN DATE: 7/8/15

FIRM NAME: ARDA MAN

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

| RATING FACTORS | MAXIMUM POINTS | ITEM SCORE |
|--|----------------|-----------------------|
| A. Respondent's experience and qualifications. | 30 | 25 |
| B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants. | 20 | 15 |
| C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work. | 16 | 14 |
| D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects. | 15 | 10 |
| E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders. | 10 | 7.5 |
| F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando. | 4 | 3 |
| G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City. | 5 | 1 |
| TOTAL SCORE | 100 | 102.5 75.5 |

RANK: 3

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

**RQS15-0294 CONTINUING GEOTECHNICAL
AND MATERIALS TESTING SERVICES**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: CODE BRAND DATE: 7/8/15

FIRM NAME: GEC

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

| RATING FACTORS | MAXIMUM POINTS | ITEM SCORE |
|--|----------------|--------------|
| A. Respondent's experience and qualifications. | 30 | 27.5 |
| B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants. | 20 | 17.5 |
| C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work. | 16 | 13.88 |
| D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects. | 15 | 12.5 |
| E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders. | 10 | 8 |
| F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando. | 4 | 4 |
| G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City. | 5 | 1 |
| TOTAL SCORE | 100 | 84.38 |

RANK: 21

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

**RQS15-0294 CONTINUING GEOTECHNICAL
AND MATERIALS TESTING SERVICES**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: CADE BRAUN DATE: 7/8/15

FIRM NAME: NOVA

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

| RATING FACTORS | MAXIMUM POINTS | ITEM SCORE |
|--|-------------------|------------|
| A. Respondent's experience and qualifications. | 30 | 22.5 |
| B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants. | 20 | 12.5 |
| C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work. | 16 | 14 |
| D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects. | 15 | 9 |
| E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders. | 10 | 7 |
| F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando. | 4 | 1 |
| G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City. | 5 | 3 |
| TOTAL SCORE | 100 | 69 |

RANK: 87

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

**RQS15-0294 CONTINUING GEOTECHNICAL
AND MATERIALS TESTING SERVICES**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: CIDE BRAUN DATE: 7/8/15

FIRM NAME: PSI

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

| RATING FACTORS | MAXIMUM POINTS | ITEM SCORE |
|--|-------------------|-------------|
| A. Respondent's experience and qualifications. | 30 | 25 |
| B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants. | 20 | 15 |
| C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work. | 16 | 15 |
| D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects. | 15 | 10 |
| E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders. | 10 | 7.5 |
| F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando. | 4 | 4 |
| G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City. | 5 | 3 |
| TOTAL SCORE | 100 | 79.5 |

RANK: 82

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

**RQS15-0294 CONTINUING GEOTECHNICAL
AND MATERIALS TESTING SERVICES**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: CADE BRAND DATE: 7/8/15

FIRM NAME: TERRACON

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

| RATING FACTORS | MAXIMUM POINTS | ITEM SCORE |
|--|----------------|-------------|
| A. Respondent's experience and qualifications. | 30 | 25 |
| B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants. | 20 | 15 |
| C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work. | 16 | 14 |
| D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects. | 15 | 10 |
| E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders. | 10 | 7.5 |
| F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando. | 4 | 3 |
| G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City. | 5 | 0 |
| TOTAL SCORE | 100 | 74.5 |

RANK: 5

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

**RQS15-0294 CONTINUING GEOTECHNICAL
AND MATERIALS TESTING SERVICES**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: CADE BRAUN DATE: 7/8/15

FIRM NAME: TIERRA South FLORIDA

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

| RATING FACTORS | MAXIMUM POINTS | ITEM SCORE |
|--|----------------|------------------|
| A. Respondent's experience and qualifications. | 30 | 24 |
| B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants. | 20 | 14 |
| C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work. | 16 | 14 |
| D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects. | 15 | 9 |
| E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders. | 10 | 7 |
| F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando. | 4 | 1 |
| G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City. | 5 | 5 |
| TOTAL SCORE | 100 | 74 74 |

RANK: 6

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

**RQS15-0294 CONTINUING GEOTECHNICAL
AND MATERIALS TESTING SERVICES**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: CARLE BRAD DATE: 7/8/15

FIRM NAME: UNIVERSA I

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

| RATING FACTORS | MAXIMUM POINTS | ITEM SCORE |
|--|----------------|--------------|
| A. Respondent's experience and qualifications. | 30 | 25 |
| B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants. | 20 | 15 |
| C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work. | 16 | 13.04 |
| D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects. | 15 | 10 |
| E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders. | 10 | 7.5 |
| F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando. | 4 | 4 |
| G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City. | 5 | 0 |
| TOTAL SCORE | 100 | 74.54 |

RANK: 4

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

**RQS15-0294 CONTINUING GEOTECHNICAL
AND MATERIALS TESTING SERVICES**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Peter Holzer DATE: 7/8/15

FIRM NAME: Ardaman and Associates

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

| RATING FACTORS | MAXIMUM POINTS | ITEM SCORE |
|--|-------------------|------------|
| A. Respondent's experience and qualifications. | 30 | 30 |
| B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants. | 20 | 18 |
| C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work. | 16 | 14 |
| D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects. | 15 | 14 |
| E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders. | 10 | 10 |
| F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando. | 4 | 3 |
| G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City. | 5 | 1 |
| TOTAL SCORE | 100 | 90 |

RANK: 1

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

**RQS15-0294 CONTINUING GEOTECHNICAL
AND MATERIALS TESTING SERVICES**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Peter Holzer DATE: 7/8/15

FIRM NAME: Geotechnical and Environmental Consultants

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

| RATING FACTORS | MAXIMUM POINTS | ITEM SCORE |
|--|----------------|--------------|
| A. Respondent's experience and qualifications. | 30 | 29 |
| B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants. | 20 | 18 |
| C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work. | 16 | 13.88 |
| D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects. | 15 | 13 |
| E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders. | 10 | 9 |
| F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando. | 4 | 4 |
| G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City. | 5 | 1 |
| TOTAL SCORE | 100 | 87.88 |

RANK: 2

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

**RQS15-0294 CONTINUING GEOTECHNICAL
AND MATERIALS TESTING SERVICES**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Peter Holzer DATE: 7/8/15

FIRM NAME: Nova Engineering and Environmental

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

| RATING FACTORS | MAXIMUM POINTS | ITEM SCORE |
|--|----------------|------------|
| A. Respondent's experience and qualifications. | 30 | 29 |
| B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants. | 20 | 17 |
| C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work. | 16 | 14 |
| D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects. | 15 | 12 |
| E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders. | 10 | 6 |
| F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando. | 4 | 1 |
| G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City. | 5 | 3 |
| TOTAL SCORE | 100 | 82 |

RANK: 7

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

**RQS15-0294 CONTINUING GEOTECHNICAL
AND MATERIALS TESTING SERVICES**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Peter Holzer DATE: 7/8/15

FIRM NAME: Professional Service Industries (PSI)

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

| RATING FACTORS | MAXIMUM POINTS | ITEM SCORE |
|--|----------------|------------|
| A. Respondent's experience and qualifications. | 30 | 28 |
| B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants. | 20 | 15 |
| C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work. | 16 | 15 |
| D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects. | 15 | 13 |
| E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders. | 10 | 8 |
| F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando. | 4 | 4 |
| G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City. | 5 | 3 |
| TOTAL SCORE | 100 | 86 |

RANK: 4

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

**RQS15-0294 CONTINUING GEOTECHNICAL
AND MATERIALS TESTING SERVICES**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Peter Holzer DATE: 7/8/15

FIRM NAME: Terracon

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

| RATING FACTORS | MAXIMUM POINTS | ITEM SCORE |
|--|-------------------|------------|
| A. Respondent's experience and qualifications. | 30 | 28 |
| B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants. | 20 | 18 |
| C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work. | 16 | 14 |
| D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects. | 15 | 14 |
| E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders. | 10 | 10 |
| F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando. | 4 | 3 |
| G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City. | 5 | 0 |
| TOTAL SCORE | 100 | 87 |

RANK: 3

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

**RQS15-0294 CONTINUING GEOTECHNICAL
AND MATERIALS TESTING SERVICES**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Peter Halzer DATE: 7/8/15

FIRM NAME: Tierra South Florida

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

| RATING FACTORS | MAXIMUM POINTS | ITEM SCORE |
|--|----------------|------------|
| A. Respondent's experience and qualifications. | 30 | 28 |
| B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants. | 20 | 17 |
| C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work. | 16 | 14 |
| D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects. | 15 | 13 |
| E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders. | 10 | 6 |
| F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando. | 4 | 1 |
| G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City. | 5 | 5 |
| TOTAL SCORE | 100 | 84 |

RANK: 6

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

**RQS15-0294 CONTINUING GEOTECHNICAL
AND MATERIALS TESTING SERVICES**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Peter Holzer DATE: 7/8/15

FIRM NAME: Universal Engineering Sciences

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

| RATING FACTORS | MAXIMUM POINTS | ITEM SCORE |
|--|----------------|--------------|
| A. Respondent's experience and qualifications. | 30 | 28 |
| B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants. | 20 | 18 |
| C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work. | 16 | 13.04 |
| D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects. | 15 | 14 |
| E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders. | 10 | 8 |
| F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando. | 4 | 4 |
| G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City. | 5 | 0 |
| TOTAL SCORE | 100 | 85.04 |

RANK: 5

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

**RQS15-0294 CONTINUING GEOTECHNICAL
AND MATERIALS TESTING SERVICES**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Olivia R. Boykin DATE: 7/8/15

FIRM NAME: Arda Man & Associates

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

| RATING FACTORS | MAXIMUM POINTS | ITEM SCORE |
|--|----------------|------------------|
| A. Respondent's experience and qualifications. | 30 | 30 |
| B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants. | 20 | 20 20 |
| C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work. | 16 | 14 |
| D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects. | 15 | 15 |
| E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders. | 10 | 10 |
| F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando. | 4 | 3 |
| G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City. | 5 | 1 |
| TOTAL SCORE | 100 | 93 |

RANK: (1) (3)

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

**RQS15-0294 CONTINUING GEOTECHNICAL
AND MATERIALS TESTING SERVICES**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Olivia L. Boykin DATE: 7/8/15

FIRM NAME: GEC

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

| RATING FACTORS | MAXIMUM POINTS | ITEM SCORE |
|--|----------------|--------------|
| A. Respondent's experience and qualifications. | 30 | 30 |
| B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants. | 20 | 20 |
| C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work. | 16 | 13.88 |
| D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects. | 15 | 15 |
| E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders. | 10 | 10 |
| F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando. | 4 | 4 |
| G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City. | 5 | 1 |
| TOTAL SCORE | 100 | 93.88 |

RANK: (1) (2)

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

**RQS15-0294 CONTINUING GEOTECHNICAL
AND MATERIALS TESTING SERVICES**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Olivia R Boykin **DATE:** 8/7/8/15

FIRM NAME: Nova Engineering & Environmental

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

| RATING FACTORS | MAXIMUM POINTS | ITEM SCORE |
|--|-----------------------|-------------------|
| A. Respondent's experience and qualifications. | 30 | 30 |
| B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants. | 20 | 20 |
| C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work. | 16 | 14 |
| D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects. | 15 | 1 |
| E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders. | 10 | 1 |
| F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando. | 4 | 1 |
| G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City. | 5 | 3 |
| TOTAL SCORE | 100 | 70 |

RANK: 7

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

**RQS15-0294 CONTINUING GEOTECHNICAL
AND MATERIALS TESTING SERVICES**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER:

Olivia R. Boykin

DATE:

7/8/15

FIRM NAME:

P.S.I.

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

| RATING FACTORS | MAXIMUM POINTS | ITEM SCORE |
|--|----------------|------------|
| A. Respondent's experience and qualifications. | 30 | 30 |
| B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants. | 20 | 20 |
| C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work. | 16 | 15 |
| D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects. | 15 | 15 |
| E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders. | 10 | 10 |
| F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando. | 4 | 4 |
| G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City. | 5 | 3 |
| TOTAL SCORE | 100 | 97 |

RANK:

①

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

**RQS15-0294 CONTINUING GEOTECHNICAL
AND MATERIALS TESTING SERVICES**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER:

Alivia R. Boykin

DATE:

7/8/15

FIRM NAME:

TERRACON

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

| RATING FACTORS | MAXIMUM POINTS | ITEM SCORE |
|--|----------------|------------|
| A. Respondent's experience and qualifications. | 30 | 30 |
| B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants. | 20 | 20 |
| C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work. | 16 | 14 |
| D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects. | 15 | 15 |
| E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders. | 10 | 10 |
| F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando. | 4 | 3 |
| G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City. | 5 | 0 |
| TOTAL SCORE | 100 | 92 |

RANK:

(5)

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

**RQS15-0294 CONTINUING GEOTECHNICAL
AND MATERIALS TESTING SERVICES**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Olivia R Boykin DATE: 7/8/15
FIRM NAME: Tierra A South Florida

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

| RATING FACTORS | MAXIMUM POINTS | ITEM SCORE |
|--|----------------|------------|
| A. Respondent's experience and qualifications. | 30 | 30 |
| B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants. | 20 | 20 |
| C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work. | 16 | 14 |
| D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects. | 15 | 1 |
| E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders. | 10 | 1 |
| F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando. | 4 | 1 |
| G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City. | 5 | 5 |
| TOTAL SCORE | 100 | 72 |

RANK: (6)

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

**RQS15-0294 CONTINUING GEOTECHNICAL
AND MATERIALS TESTING SERVICES**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Olivia R. Boykin DATE: 7/8/15

FIRM NAME: Universal Engineering Sciences

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

| RATING FACTORS | MAXIMUM POINTS | ITEM SCORE |
|--|----------------|------------------------|
| A. Respondent's experience and qualifications. | 30 | 30 |
| B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants. | 20 | 20 |
| C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work. | 16 | 13.04 |
| D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects. | 15 | 15 |
| E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders. | 10 | 10 |
| F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando. | 4 | 4 |
| G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City. | 5 | 30 |
| TOTAL SCORE | 100 | 92.04 92.04 |

RANK: ④ 4

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

**RQS15-0294 CONTINUING GEOTECHNICAL
AND MATERIALS TESTING SERVICES**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: RENE CARCAMO DATE: 07/08/2015

FIRM NAME: ARDAMAN & ASSOCIATES, INC.

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

| RATING FACTORS | MAXIMUM POINTS | ITEM SCORE |
|--|----------------|------------|
| A. Respondent's experience and qualifications. | 30 | 29 |
| B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants. | 20 | 19 |
| C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work. | 16 | 14 |
| D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects. | 15 | 15 |
| E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders. | 10 | 9 |
| F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando. | 4 | 3 |
| G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City. | 5 | 1 |
| TOTAL SCORE | 100 | 90 |

RANK: 4

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

**RQS15-0294 CONTINUING GEOTECHNICAL
AND MATERIALS TESTING SERVICES**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: RENE CARCAMO DATE: 07/08/2015

FIRM NAME: GEOTECHNICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS, INC. (GEC)

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

| RATING FACTORS | MAXIMUM POINTS | ITEM SCORE |
|--|----------------|--------------|
| A. Respondent's experience and qualifications. | 30 | 29 |
| B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants. | 20 | 20 |
| C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work. | 16 | 13.88 |
| D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects. | 15 | 15 |
| E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders. | 10 | 9 |
| F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando. | 4 | 4 |
| G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City. | 5 | 1 |
| TOTAL SCORE | 100 | 91.88 |

RANK: 3

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

**RQS15-0294 CONTINUING GEOTECHNICAL
AND MATERIALS TESTING SERVICES**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: RENÉ CARCAMO DATE: 07/08/2015

FIRM NAME: NOVA ENGINEERING AND ENVIRONMENTAL, LLC

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

| RATING FACTORS | MAXIMUM POINTS | ITEM SCORE |
|--|----------------|------------|
| A. Respondent's experience and qualifications. | 30 | 25 |
| B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants. | 20 | 18 |
| C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work. | 16 | 14 |
| D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects. | 15 | 13 |
| E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders. | 10 | 10 |
| F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando. | 4 | 1 |
| G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City. | 5 | 3 |
| TOTAL SCORE | 100 | 84 |

RANK: 7

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

**RQS15-0294 CONTINUING GEOTECHNICAL
AND MATERIALS TESTING SERVICES**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: RENE CARCAMO DATE: 07/08/2015

FIRM NAME: PROFESSIONAL SERVICE INDUSTRIES, INC. (PSI)

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

| RATING FACTORS | MAXIMUM POINTS | ITEM SCORE |
|--|----------------|------------|
| A. Respondent's experience and qualifications. | 30 | 29 |
| B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants. | 20 | 20 |
| C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work. | 16 | 15 |
| D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects. | 15 | 15 |
| E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders. | 10 | 10 |
| F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando. | 4 | 4 |
| G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City. | 5 | 3 |
| TOTAL SCORE | 100 | 96 |

RANK: 1

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

**RQS15-0294 CONTINUING GEOTECHNICAL
AND MATERIALS TESTING SERVICES**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: RENE CARCAMO DATE: 07/08/2015

FIRM NAME: TERRACON CONSULTANTS, Inc.

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

| RATING FACTORS | MAXIMUM POINTS | ITEM SCORE |
|--|----------------|------------|
| A. Respondent's experience and qualifications. | 30 | 29 |
| B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants. | 20 | 19 |
| C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work. | 16 | 14 |
| D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects. | 15 | 15 |
| E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders. | 10 | 8 |
| F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando. | 4 | 3 |
| G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City. | 5 | 0 |
| TOTAL SCORE | 100 | 88 |

RANK: 6

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

**RQS15-0294 CONTINUING GEOTECHNICAL
AND MATERIALS TESTING SERVICES**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: RENE CARCAMO DATE: 07/08/2015

FIRM NAME: TIERRA SOUTH FLORIDA, INC. (TSF)

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

| RATING FACTORS | MAXIMUM POINTS | ITEM SCORE |
|--|----------------|------------|
| A. Respondent's experience and qualifications. | 30 | 29 |
| B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants. | 20 | 19 |
| C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work. | 16 | 14 |
| D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects. | 15 | 15 |
| E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders. | 10 | 10 |
| F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando. | 4 | 1 |
| G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City. | 5 | 5 |
| TOTAL SCORE | 100 | 93 |

RANK: 2

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

**RQS15-0294 CONTINUING GEOTECHNICAL
AND MATERIALS TESTING SERVICES**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: RENE CARCANO DATE: 07/08/2015

FIRM NAME: UNIVERSAL ENGINEERING SERVICES, INC. (UES)

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

| RATING FACTORS | MAXIMUM POINTS | ITEM SCORE |
|--|----------------|--------------|
| A. Respondent's experience and qualifications. | 30 | 29 |
| B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants. | 20 | 19 |
| C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work. | 16 | 13.04 |
| D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects. | 15 | 15 |
| E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders. | 10 | 9 |
| F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando. | 4 | 4 |
| G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City. | 5 | 0 |
| TOTAL SCORE | 100 | 89.04 |

RANK: 5

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

**RQS15-0294 CONTINUING GEOTECHNICAL
AND MATERIALS TESTING SERVICES**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Steve Wiedenbeck DATE: 7-8-15

FIRM NAME: Ardaman

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

| RATING FACTORS | MAXIMUM POINTS | ITEM SCORE |
|--|----------------|------------|
| A. Respondent's experience and qualifications. | 30 | 30 |
| B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants. | 20 | 20 |
| C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work. | 16 | 14 |
| D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects. | 15 | 15 |
| E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders. | 10 | 10 |
| F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando. | 4 | 3 |
| G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City. | 5 | 1 |
| TOTAL SCORE | 100 | 93 |

RANK: 1

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

**RQS15-0294 CONTINUING GEOTECHNICAL
AND MATERIALS TESTING SERVICES**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Steve Wicdenbeck DATE: 7-8-15

FIRM NAME: Geotechnical & Environmental Consultants.

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

| RATING FACTORS | MAXIMUM POINTS | ITEM SCORE |
|--|----------------|--------------|
| A. Respondent's experience and qualifications. | 30 | 29 |
| B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants. | 20 | 20 |
| C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work. | 16 | 13.88 |
| D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects. | 15 | 15 |
| E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders. | 10 | 10 |
| F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando. | 4 | 4 |
| G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City. | 5 | 1 |
| TOTAL SCORE | 100 | 92.88 |

RANK: 2

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

**RQS15-0294 CONTINUING GEOTECHNICAL
AND MATERIALS TESTING SERVICES**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Steve Wiedenbeck DATE: 7-8-15

FIRM NAME: Nova Engineering & Environmental

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

| RATING FACTORS | MAXIMUM POINTS | ITEM SCORE |
|--|-------------------|------------|
| A. Respondent's experience and qualifications. | 30 | 27 |
| B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants. | 20 | 18 |
| C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work. | 16 | 14 |
| D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects. | 15 | 12 |
| E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders. | 10 | 10 |
| F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando. | 4 | 1 |
| G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City. | 5 | 3 |
| TOTAL SCORE | 100 | 85 |

RANK: 6

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

**RQS15-0294 CONTINUING GEOTECHNICAL
AND MATERIALS TESTING SERVICES**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Steve Wiedenbeck DATE: 7-8-15

FIRM NAME: P. S. I., Inc.

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

| RATING FACTORS | MAXIMUM POINTS | ITEM SCORE |
|--|-------------------|------------|
| A. Respondent's experience and qualifications. | 30 | 29 |
| B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants. | 20 | 18 |
| C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work. | 16 | 15 |
| D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects. | 15 | 13 |
| E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders. | 10 | 8 |
| F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando. | 4 | 4 |
| G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City. | 5 | 3 |
| TOTAL SCORE | 100 | 90 |

RANK: 4

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

**RQS15-0294 CONTINUING GEOTECHNICAL
AND MATERIALS TESTING SERVICES**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Steve Wiedenbeck DATE: 7-8-15

FIRM NAME: Terracen Consultants

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

| RATING FACTORS | MAXIMUM POINTS | ITEM SCORE |
|--|----------------|------------|
| A. Respondent's experience and qualifications. | 30 | 30 |
| B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants. | 20 | 20 |
| C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work. | 16 | 14 |
| D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects. | 15 | 15 |
| E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders. | 10 | 10 |
| F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando. | 4 | 3 |
| G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City. | 5 | 0 |
| TOTAL SCORE | 100 | 92 |

RANK: 3

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

**RQS15-0294 CONTINUING GEOTECHNICAL
AND MATERIALS TESTING SERVICES**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Steve Wiedenbeck DATE: 7-8-15

FIRM NAME: Tierra South Florida, Inc.

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

| RATING FACTORS | MAXIMUM POINTS | ITEM SCORE |
|--|-------------------|------------|
| A. Respondent's experience and qualifications. | 30 | 26 |
| B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants. | 20 | 17 |
| C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work. | 16 | 14 |
| D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects. | 15 | 13 |
| E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders. | 10 | 8 |
| F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando. | 4 | 1 |
| G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City. | 5 | 5 |
| TOTAL SCORE | 100 | 84 |

RANK: 7

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

**RQS15-0294 CONTINUING GEOTECHNICAL
AND MATERIALS TESTING SERVICES**

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SHORT-LISTING

MEMBER: Steve Wiedenbeck DATE: 7-8-15

FIRM NAME: Universal Eng.

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

| RATING FACTORS | MAXIMUM POINTS | ITEM SCORE |
|--|----------------|--------------|
| A. Respondent's experience and qualifications. | 30 | 28 |
| B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants. | 20 | 18 |
| C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work. | 16 | 13.04 |
| D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects. | 15 | 14 |
| E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders. | 10 | 9 |
| F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando. | 4 | 4 |
| G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City. | 5 | 0 |
| TOTAL SCORE | 100 | 86.04 |

RANK: 5

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