



CITY OF ORLANDO

2nd ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

RQS17-0137

Request for Qualification Statements for

Continuing Professional Services for Landscape Architecture and Planning Design

March 22, 2017 – 9 a.m.

Veterans Conference Room (2nd Floor)

Agenda Conference Room (2nd 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:

Beth Gruber, Landscape Architect, Senior/Planner (Chair)

Denise Riccio, FPR Planner and Grants Manager

Ken Pelham, Planner III

Kenneth Marcum, Facilities Project Manager

LaChisha Lewis, Contract Compliance Investigator II, MWBE 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. to 9:35 a.m.	3/22/2017	Dix.Hite + Partners, Inc.	Veterans Conference Room	2 nd
9:40 a.m. to 10:15 a.m.	3/22/2017	GAI Consultants, Inc.	Agenda Conference Room	2 nd
10:20 a.m. to 10:55 a.m.	3/22/2017	Magley Design, LLC	Veterans Conference Room	2 nd

After presentations, the Facilitator asked the Committee for approval of the first Meeting Minutes of March 8, 2017. These Minutes had been distributed by email to all Committee Members. A motion was made by Beth Gruber, and seconded by Kenneth Marcum, 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. GAI Consultants, Inc.
2. Magley Design, LLC
3. Dix.Hite + Partners, Inc.

A motion was made by Kenneth Marcum, and seconded by Denise Riccio, to accept the rankings and to recommend to City Council for authorization for the Chief Procurement Officer (CPO) to negotiate and execute contracts, and all subsequent renewals, for Continuing Contracts with the top two (2) ranked firms. There were no members of the public present. The motion carried unanimously.

A motion was made by Ken Pelham, and seconded by Beth Gruber, to adjourn at 11:50 am. The motion carried unanimously.

These minutes are considered to be the official minutes of the RQS17-0137 Advisory Committee Meeting held on March 22, 2017, and no other notes, tapes, or other recordings taken by anyone takes precedence.

Submitted by:


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


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

Reviewed and Accepted by:


Beth Gruber (Chair)
Landscape Architect
Senior/Planner

Attachments:

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

RQS17-0137 Continuing Landscape Architectural and Planning Design Professional 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)
Dix.Hite+Partners, Inc.	14	2	5
Gai Consultants, Inc.	15	4	5
Magley Design, LLC.	16	4	4

RQS17-0137 Continuing Professional Services for
Landscape Architecture and Planning Design
Final Scoring

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Beth Gruber	Denise Riccio	Ken Pelham	Kenneth Marcum	LaChisha Lewis
----------------	------------------	------------	-------------------	-------------------

	Beth Gruber	Denise Riccio	Ken Pelham	Kenneth Marcum	LaChisha Lewis	Total	Ranking
Dix.Hite + Partners, Inc.	3	3	3	3	3	15	3
GAI Consultants, Inc.	2	1	1	1	1	6	1
Magley Design, LLC	1	2	2	2	1	8	2

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Dix.Hite + Partners, Inc.	GAI Consulstants, Inc.	Magley Design, LLC
A	25	22	23	24
B	15	13	14	15
C	16	14	15	16
D	15	14	15	15
E	10	9	10	9
F	4	2	4	4
G	5	5	5	4
H	10	9	10	10
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	88	96	97
Beth Gruber		3	2	1
Ranking				

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Dix.Hite + Partners, Inc.	GAI Consulstants, Inc.	Magley Design, LLC
A	25	24	25	24
B	15	15	15	15
C	16	14	15	16
D	15	13	14	15
E	10	10	10	9
F	4	2	4	4
G	5	5	5	4
H	10	8	10	10
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	91	98	97
Denise Riccio		3	1	2
Ranking				

RQS17-0137 Continuing Professional Services for
Landscape Architecture and Planning Design
Final Scoring

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Dix.Hite + Partners, Inc.	GAI Consultants, Inc.	Magley Design, LLC
A	25	23	24	22
B	15	12	15	13
C	16	14	15	16
D	15	15	15	15
E	10	10	10	9
F	4	2	4	4
G	5	5	5	4
H	10	7	10	9
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	88	98	92
Ken Pelham		3	1	2
Ranking				

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Dix.Hite + Partners, Inc.	GAI Consultants, Inc.	Magley Design, LLC
A	25	23	25	24
B	15	15	15	15
C	16	14	15	16
D	15	13	15	15
E	10	10	10	9
F	4	2	4	4
G	5	5	5	4
H	10	10	10	10
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	92	99	97
Kenneth Marcum		3	1	2
Ranking				

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Dix.Hite + Partners, Inc.	GAI Consusltants, Inc.	Magley Design, LLC
A	25	25	25	25
B	15	15	15	15
C	16	14	15	16
D	15	15	15	15
E	10	10	10	10
F	4	2	4	4
G	5	5	5	4
H	10	6	10	10

RQS17-0137 Continuing Professional Services for
Landscape Architecture and Planning Design
Final Scoring

TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	92	99	99
LaChisha Lewis				
Ranking		3	1	1

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: Beth Gruber DATE: 3-22-17

FIRM NAME: Dix-Hite + Partners, Inc.

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

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	22
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	13
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	14
D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules 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	2
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	9
TOTAL SCORE	100	88

RANK: 3

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

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: Beth Gruber DATE: 3.22.17

FIRM NAME: Gai Consultants, Inc

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

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	23
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	14
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	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, 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	5
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	10
TOTAL SCORE	100	96

RANK: 2

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

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: Beth Gruber DATE: 3.22.17

FIRM NAME: Magley Design, LLC

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the short-listed Respondents based upon their Qualification Statements and their interviews 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 qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	14
D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules 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, 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	4
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	10
TOTAL SCORE	100	97

RANK: 1

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

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: Ken Pelham DATE: 3/21/17

FIRM NAME: Dix-Hite Partners, Inc.

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the short-listed Respondents based upon their Qualification Statements and their interviews 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	12
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	14
D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules 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, 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	2
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	7
TOTAL SCORE	100	88

RANK: 3

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

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: Ken Pelham DATE: 3/21/17

FIRM NAME: GAI Consultants, Inc.

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the short-listed Respondents based upon their Qualification Statements and their interviews 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 qualifying 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, 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	5
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	10
TOTAL SCORE	100	98

RANK: 1

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

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: Ken Pelham DATE: 3/21/17

FIRM NAME: Magley Design LLC

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

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	22
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	13
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	16
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, 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	4
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	9
TOTAL SCORE	100	92

RANK: 2

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

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: Denise Riccio DATE: 3/22/17

FIRM NAME: Dix-Hite Partners, Inc.

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the short-listed Respondents based upon their Qualification Statements and their interviews 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 qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	14
D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules 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	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	2
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	8
TOTAL SCORE	100	91

RANK: 3

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

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: Denise Riccio DATE: 3/22/17

FIRM NAME: GAI Consultants, Inc.

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

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	25
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	15
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	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	5
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	10
TOTAL SCORE	100	98

RANK: 1

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

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: Denise Riccio DATE: 3/22/17

FIRM NAME: Magley Design, LLC

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the short-listed Respondents based upon their Qualification Statements and their interviews 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 qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	16
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, as well as make effective public presentations.	10	10 ^{PR}
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	4
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	10
TOTAL SCORE	100	97

RANK: 2

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

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: Chisha Lewis DATE: March 22, 2017
FIRM NAME: Dix. Hite + Partners, Inc.

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

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	15
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	15
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	14
D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules 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, 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	2
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	6
TOTAL SCORE	100	92

RANK: 3

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

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: Chisha Lewis DATE: March 22, 2017

FIRM NAME: GAI Consultants, Inc.

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

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	25
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	15
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	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, 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	5
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	10
TOTAL SCORE	100	99

RANK: 1

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

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: Chisha Lewis DATE: March 22, 2017

FIRM NAME: Magley Design, LLC

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

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	25
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	15
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	16
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, 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	4
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	10
TOTAL SCORE	100	99

RANK: 1

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

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: Kenneth Marcum DATE: 22 Mar 17

FIRM NAME: Dix Hite

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the short-listed Respondents based upon their Qualification Statements and their interviews 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	15
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	14
D. The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules 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	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	2
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	5
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	10
TOTAL SCORE	100	92

RANK: 3

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

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: Kenneth Marcom DATE: 22 March 17

FIRM NAME: Gai Consultants

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

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	25
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	15
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	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, 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	5
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	10
TOTAL SCORE	100	99

RANK: 1

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

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

MEMBER: Kenneth Masum DATE: 22 March 17

FIRM NAME: Maglex Design

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the short-listed Respondents based upon their Qualification Statements and their interviews 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 qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	16
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, 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	4
H. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	10
TOTAL SCORE	100	97

RANK: 2

Notes regarding Exhibit "B": Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors to determine the final ranking of the short-listed 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.