



# CITY OF ORLANDO

## 2nd ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

RQS16-0270

Request for Qualification Statements for

Replacement of Lift Station No. 45

August 31, 2016 – 9 a.m.

Iron Bridge Conference Room (8<sup>th</sup> Floor)

Veterans Conference Room (2<sup>nd</sup> Floor)

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

The purpose of this meeting was to hold discussions with shortlisted firms and review, score, and rank each of those firms on its qualification statement and clarifying interview session.

### Committee Members Present:

Hector Sanchez, Project Manager (Chair)

Chuck Shultz, Assistant Wastewater Division Mgr.

Ron Proulx, CIID Assistant Division Mgr.

David Breitrick, Wastewater Tech Support Mgr.

Byron Raysor, Contract Compliance Investigator III, MBE Office

### Other City Personnel Present:

Roger Cooper, Contract Administrator (Facilitator)

Fabio Henao, Procurement Assistant

### Members of the Public Present:

None

### Actions/Discussion/Motions:

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

### Presentation Schedule of Shortlisted Firms:

<u>Time</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Company Name</u>	<u>Meeting Room</u>	<u>Floor</u>
9:00 a.m. -- 9:30 a.m.	8/31/2016	Hazen and Sawyer	Iron Bridge Conference Room	8 <sup>th</sup>
9:40 a.m. – 10:10 a.m.	8/31/2016	Tetra Tech, Inc.	Veterans Conference Room	2 <sup>nd</sup>
10:20 a.m. – 10:50 a.m.	8/31/2016	Wright-Pierce	Iron Bridge Conference Room	8 <sup>th</sup>

After presentations, the Facilitator asked the Committee for approval of the first Meeting Minutes of July 13, 2016. These Minutes had been distributed by email to all Committee Members. A motion was made by Chuck Shultz, and seconded by Ron Proulx, to accept those Minutes as written. The motion carried unanimously.

The Facilitator handed out the pre-determined scores (calculated as per solicitation requirements) to each Respondent. These scores did not change from the first meeting.

Committee Members were advised that Qualification Statements must be independently scored by each Member; that Committee Members should not indicate to the group what scores he/she gives to a

particular firm; and that Committee Members must not attempt to influence other Committee Members in their scoring.

The Meeting was turned over to the technical Chair and discussion ensued, and, then, Committee members individually scored/ranked the shortlisted firm according to the criteria outlined in the Request for Qualification Statements.

The consolidated results are as follows:

1. Wright-Pierce
2. Hazen and Sawyer, Inc.
3. Tetra Tech, Inc.

A motion was made by Chuck Shultz, and seconded by Byron Raysor, to accept the ranking and to recommend to City Council for authorization for the Chief Procurement Officer (CPO) to negotiate a contract with the top ranked firm in ranked order until successful. There were no members of the public present. The motion carried unanimously.

A motion was made by Byron Raysor, and seconded by David Breitrick, to adjourn at 11:21 a.m. The motion carried unanimously.

These minutes are considered to be the official minutes of the RQS16-0270 Advisory Committee Meeting held on August 31, 2016, and no other notes, tapes, or other recordings taken by anyone takes precedence.


Submitted by:

  
Roger Cooper CPPO, C.P.M. (Facilitator)  
Contract Administrator

Reviewed by:

  
Teddi McCorkle, CPPB, C.P.M.  
Sr. Contract Administrator

Reviewed and Accepted by:

  
Hector Sanchez (Chair)  
Project Manager  
Public Works CIID

Attachments:

Predetermined Scores  
Consolidated Scoring and Rating Spreadsheet  
Individual Scoring and Rating Sheets

RQS16-0270 Replacement of Lift Station No. 45  
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)
Hazen and Sawyer	15	4	0
Tetra Tech, Inc.	15	4	0
Wright-Pierce	13	3	5



RFP16-0270 Replacement of Lift Station No. 45  
Final Scoring and Ranking

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS:**

Hector Sanchez	Chuck Shultz	Ronnie Proulx	David Breitrick	Byron Raysor
----------------	--------------	---------------	-----------------	--------------

**CONSOLIDATED RANKING:**

	Hector Sanchez	Chuck Shultz	Ronnie Proulx	David Breitrick	Byron Raysor	Total	Ranking
Hazen and Sawyer	2	2	2	2	2	10	2
Tetra Tech, Inc.	1	3	3	3	2	12	3
Wright-Pierce	3	1	1	1	1	7	1

**INDIVIDUAL SCORING AND RANKING:**

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Hazen and Sawyer	Tetra Tech, Inc.	Wright-Pierce
A	25	23	24	23
B	15	14	14	13
C	16	15	15	13
D	15	14	14	13
E	10	9	9	8
F	4	4	4	3
G	5	0	0	5
H	10	10	10	10
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	89	90	88
Hector Sanchez				
Ranking		2	1	3

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Hazen and Sawyer	Tetra Tech, Inc.	Wright-Pierce
A	25	20	20	20
B	15	10	10	10
C	16	15	15	13
D	15	10	10	10
E	10	10	10	10
F	4	4	4	3
G	5	0	0	5
H	10	9	8	9
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	78	77	80
Chuck Shultz				
Ranking		2	3	1

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Hazen and Sawyer	Tetra Tech, Inc.	Wright-Pierce
A	25	25	25	25
B	15	15	15	15
C	16	15	15	13

RFP16-0270 Replacement of Lift Station No. 45  
Final Scoring and Ranking

D	15	14	14	14
E	10	10	9	9
F	4	4	4	3
G	5	0	0	5
H	10	10	10	10
<b>TOTAL POINT VALUE</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>94</b>
<b>Ronnie Proulx</b>				
<b>Ranking</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Hazen and Sawyer	Tetra Tech, Inc.	Wright-Pierce
A	25	24	22	24
B	15	15	15	15
C	16	15	15	13
D	15	14	14	14
E	10	10	10	10
F	4	4	4	3
G	5	0	0	5
H	10	9	8	9
<b>TOTAL POINT VALUE</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>David Breilrick</b>				
<b>Ranking</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Hazen and Sawyer	Tetra Tech, Inc.	Wright-Pierce
A	25	24	24	24
B	15	14	14	14
C	16	15	15	13
D	15	13	13	13
E	10	8	8	8
F	4	4	4	3
G	5	0	0	5
H	10	8	8	8
<b>TOTAL POINT VALUE</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>Byron Raysor</b>				
<b>Ranking</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>



**RQS16-0270 Replacement of Lift Station No. 45**

**EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING**

MEMBER: Hector Sanchez DATE: 8/31/2016

FIRM NAME: Hazen & Sawyer

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

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	23
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	14
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	15
D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	15	14
E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders, as well as make effective public presentations.	10	9
F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando.	4	4
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	10
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>89</b>

RANK: 2

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



**RQS16-0270 Replacement of Lift Station No. 45**  
**EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING**

MEMBER: Hector Sanchez DATE: 8/31/2016

FIRM NAME: Tetra Tech, Inc

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

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	24
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	14
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	15
D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	15	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, as well as make effective public presentations.	10	9
F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando.	4	4
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	10
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>90</b>

RANK: 1

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



**RQS16-0270 Replacement of Lift Station No. 45**  
**EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING**

MEMBER: Hector Sanchez DATE: 8/31/2016

FIRM NAME: Wright - Pierce

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

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	23
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	13
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	13
D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	15	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, as well as make effective public presentations.	10	8
F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando.	4	3
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	10
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>88</b>

RANK: 3

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



**RQS16-0270 Replacement of Lift Station No. 45**  
**EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING**

MEMBER: SHULTZ DATE: 8-31-2016

FIRM NAME: HAZEN + SAWYER

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

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	20
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	10
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, as well as make effective public presentations.	10	10
F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando.	4	4
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	9
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>78</b>

RANK: 2

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

**RQS16-0270 Replacement of Lift Station No. 45**  
**EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING**

MEMBER: SHULTZ DATE: 8-31-2016

FIRM NAME: TETRA TECH

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

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	20
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	10
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, as well as make effective public presentations.	10	10
F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando.	4	4
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	8
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>77</b>

RANK: 3

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



**RQS16-0270 Replacement of Lift Station No. 45**  
**EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING**

MEMBER: SHULTZ DATE: 8-31-2016

FIRM NAME: WRIGHT-PIERCE

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

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	20
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	10
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	13
D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	15	10
E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders, as well as make effective public presentations.	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	5
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	9
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>80</b>

RANK: 1

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

**RQS16-0270 Replacement of Lift Station No. 45**

**EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING**

MEMBER: RON PROULX DATE: 8/31/16

FIRM NAME: HAZEN AND SAWYER

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

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	25
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	15
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	15
D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	15	14
E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders, as well as make effective public presentations.	10	10
F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando.	4	4
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	10
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>93</b>

RANK: 2 *Pml*

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



**RQS16-0270 Replacement of Lift Station No. 45**  
**EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING**

MEMBER: Ron Peouly DATE: 8/31/16

FIRM NAME: TETRA Tech INC

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

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	25
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	15
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	15
D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	15	14
E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders, as well as make effective public presentations.	10	9
F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando.	4	4
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	10
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>92</b>

RANK: 3 *FW*

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



**RQS16-0270 Replacement of Lift Station No. 45**  
**EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING**

MEMBER: RON PROUBY DATE: 8/31/16

FIRM NAME: WRIGHT - PIERCE

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

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	25
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	15
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	13
D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	15	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, as well as make effective public presentations.	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	5
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	10
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>94</b>

RANK: 1

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



**RQS16-0270 Replacement of Lift Station No. 45**

**EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING**

MEMBER: Dave Breitnick DATE: 8/31/16

FIRM NAME: Hazen & Sawyer

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

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	24
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	15
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	15
D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	15	14
E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders, as well as make effective public presentations.	10	10
F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando.	4	4
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	9
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>91</b>

RANK: 2

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

**RQS16-0270 Replacement of Lift Station No. 45**

**EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING**

MEMBER: Dave Bretnek DATE: 8/31/16

FIRM NAME: Tetra Tech

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

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	22
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	15
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	15
D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	15	14
E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders, as well as make effective public presentations.	10	10
F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando.	4	4
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	8
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>88</b>

RANK: 3

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



**RQS16-0270 Replacement of Lift Station No. 45**  
**EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING**

MEMBER: Dave Breitruck DATE: 8/31/16

FIRM NAME: Wright-Pierce

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

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	24
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	15
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	13
D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	15	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, as well as make effective public presentations.	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	5
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	9
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>93</b>

RANK: 1

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

**RQS16-0270 Replacement of Lift Station No. 45**  
**EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING**

MEMBER: Byron Raynor DATE: 8/31/2016

FIRM NAME: Hazen & Sawyer

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

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	24
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	14
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and 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, as well as make effective public presentations.	10	8
F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando.	4	4
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	8
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>86</b>

RANK: 2

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



**RQS16-0270 Replacement of Lift Station No. 45**  
**EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING**

MEMBER: Byron RAYSON DATE: 8/31/16

FIRM NAME: Tetra Tech, Inc

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

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	24
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	14
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	15
D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	15	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, as well as make effective public presentations.	10	8
F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando.	4	4
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	8
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>86</b>

RANK: 2

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

**RQS16-0270 Replacement of Lift Station No. 45**

**EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING**

MEMBER: Byron Kayser DATE: 8/31/2016

FIRM NAME: Wright - Pierce

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

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	24
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	14
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	13
D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	15	13
E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders, as well as make effective public presentations.	10	8
F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando.	4	3
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	8
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>88</b>

RANK: 1

Notes regarding Exhibit "B": 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.