



CITY OF ORLANDO

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

RFQu17-0359

Request for Qualification Statements for
Citywide Rapid Response and Minor Projects for Infrastructure and
General Grouting Repair or Replacement of Drainage Wells

September 6, 2017 – 9 a.m.

Tarpon Conference Room (4th Floor)

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

Advisory Committee Meeting to review and evaluate responsive qualification statements submitted in response to the subject solicitation.

Committee Members Present:

Hector Sanchez, P.E., CIID Project Manager (Chair)
Howard Elkin, Streets and Stormwater, Assistant Division Manager
Charles Shultz, P.E. Wastewater Assistant Division Manager
Ron Proulx, CIID Assistant Division Manager
Byron Raysor, Compliance Investigator III, MWBE Office

Other City Personnel Present:

Roger Cooper, Contract Administrator (Facilitator)
Fabio Henao, Purchasing Assistant

Members of the Public Present:

None

Actions/Discussion/Motions:

The meeting began at 9:10 a.m. The Facilitator called 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) Reviewed Advisory Committee Rules
- 6) Reviewed Public Input Procedures

A motion was made by Byron Raysor, and seconded by Hector Sanchez, to accept the Public Input Procedures. The motion carried unanimously.

The Facilitator indicated that eight (8) sealed qualification statements were submitted in response to the solicitation. Seven of those firms indicated that they were seeking to be selected for the Infrastructure (I) work while two (2) firms indicated that they were seeking to be selected for General Grouting and Repair or Replacement of Drainage Wells (G) work. Those firms are as follows:

<u>NAME OF FIRM</u>	<u>TYPE OF WORK</u>
1) Cathcart Construction Company-FL, LLC	(I)
2) C.E. James, Inc.	(I)
3) Gibbs & Register, Inc.	(I)
4) Henderson Wilder, Contractor	(G)
5) JCB Construction, Inc.	(I)
6) PCL Construction Services, Inc.	(G and I)
7) Prime Construction Group, Inc.	(I)

8) Schuller Contractors Incorporated (I)

Byron Raysor reviewed the pre-determined scores for the Presentation and Approach Submitted Regarding the Respondent Approach to Meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE Requirements (Category D). JCB Construction, Inc., received a score of 15. All other firms received a score of 14.

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

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

INFRASTRUCTURE (I)

- 1) Cathcart Construction Company-FL, LLC
- 2) PCL Construction Services, Inc.
- 3) Gibbs & Register, Inc.
- 4) Prime Construction Group, Inc.
- 5) Schuller Contractors Incorporated
- 6) C.E. James, Inc.
- 7) JCB Construction, Inc.

GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR (G)

- 1) Henderson Wilder, Contractor
- 2) PCL Construction Services, Inc.

A motion was made by Howard Elkin, and seconded by Charles Shultz, to accept the rankings and recommend that City Council authorize the Chief Procurement Officer to award Citywide Rapid Response Repair for Infrastructure contracts with the Four (4) top ranked firms in that category. No Members of the Public were present. The motion did not carry with Two (2) in favor and Three (3) voting against the motion.


A motion was made by Ron Proulx, and seconded by Hector Sanchez, to accept the rankings and recommend that City Council authorize the Chief Procurement Officer to award Citywide Rapid Response Repair for Infrastructure contracts with the Six (6) top ranked firms in that category. No Members of the Public were present. The motion carried with Three (3) in favor and Two (2) voting against the motion.

A motion was made by Hector Sanchez, and seconded by Charles Shultz, to accept the rankings and recommend that City Council authorize the Chief Procurement Officer to award Citywide Rapid Response Repair for General Grouting and Repair or Replacement of Drainage Wells contracts to the two (2) ranked firms in that category. There were no members of the public present. The motion carried unanimously.

A motion was made by Howard Elkin, and seconded by Ron Proulx, to adjourn at 10:41 a.m. The motion carried unanimously.

These minutes are considered to be the official minutes of the RFQu17-0359 Advisory Committee Meeting held on September 6, 2017, and no other notes, tapes, or other recordings taken by anyone takes precedence.

Submitted by:



Roger Cooper, CPPC, C.F.M. (Facilitator)
Contract Administrator

Reviewed by:



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

Reviewed and Accepted by:



Hector Sanchez, P.E. (Chair)
CIID Project Manager
Public Works Department



CITY OF ORLANDO

MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 30, 2013

TO: Procurement and Contracts Division Staff

FROM: David Billingsley, CPSM, C.P.M., Chief Procurement Officer

SUBJECT: Public Input

The Florida Legislature recently enacted a new state law, s. 286.1114, which requires that all local government boards and committees that are subject to the sunshine law provide an opportunity for reasonable public input prior to taking official action on any item (with the exception of administrative items such as approval of minutes and quasi-judicial proceedings). Such comment must be allowed at the meeting where the board or committee takes action on the item or at a meeting in reasonable proximity to that date. Boards and Committees may adopt rules or policies governing the public input.

Procurement Advisory Committees are affected by this statute since they are sunshine committees and are making an award recommendation to City Council. Procurement Advisory Committees must adopt procedures for all meetings after October 1, 2013.

The statute provides that each committee can provide for its own implementation rules. As such, Procurement Advisory Committees should make a motion at the first meeting to follow these rules. For a particular procurement, the committee may modify or amend the procedures applicable to that solicitation. For example, if the procurement has a large public interest, the committee could establish longer comment periods.

Attached are recommended procedures for public input during Procurement Advisory Committees meetings.

PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTS DIVISION

CITY HALL • 400 SOUTH ORANGE AVENUE • P.O. BOX 4990 • ORLANDO, FLORIDA 32802-4990
PHONE 407.246.2291 • FAX 407.246.2869 • CityofOrlando.net • esupplier.cityoforlando.net



CITY OF ORLANDO

Public Input Procedures For Procurement Advisory Committees

- A. After each motion (and a second) but before committee discussion on all non-ministerial motions, public comment will be permitted. Ministerial motions would be those that are not substantive actions, including most procedural motions, motions to approve minutes, and motions to adjourn.
- B. Each speaker is limited to 5 minutes. The Committee Chairperson may grant more time to a speaker, provided that if any other committee member objects to the granting of more time, the committee as a whole will vote on the extension.
- C. Public comment is limited to 30 minutes per motion.
- D. Groups are to be asked (not required) to appoint a spokesperson to avoid redundancy and stay within allotted time periods.
- E. If there are more speakers than would allow each to get their full 5 minutes, time periods will be reduced proportionally to not less than 1 minute per speaker unless the committee votes to extend the comment period. If there are more speakers than minutes in the comment period, by act of the Chairperson without objection from a member of the committee, or after a committee vote if there is an objection, the maximum comment period may be extended. As a practical matter, committees should try to extend the time where possible to allow everyone a chance to speak. If this is not possible due to time constraints or number of requests, comments should be taken in random order from all those requesting to speak until time expires.
- F. Each person addressing the committee should give their name and address for the record (minutes). Per the statute, a form asking to speak can be used (which may help with drafting the minutes and establishing priority to speak).
- G. Remarks should be addressed to the committee as a whole, not to individual members of the committee. This is not a question and answer period. The public may comment on the issues before the committee, but the committee is not required to respond to questions.
- H. Minutes should reflect that public comment was solicited even where no public comment was given, i.e. "The chairperson asked if there was anyone from the public who would like to speak, but no requests were received" or similar words should appear in the minutes.

PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTS DIVISION

CITY HALL • 400 SOUTH ORANGE AVENUE • P.O. BOX 4990 • ORLANDO, FLORIDA 32802-4990
PHONE 407.246.2291 • FAX 407.246.2869 • CityofOrlando.net • esupplier.cityoforlando.net

September 6, 2017 Advisory Committee Meeting Final Ranking
RFQu17-0359 Citywide Rapid Response and Minor Projects for
General Grouting and Repair or Replacement of Drainage Wells

COMMITTEE MEMBERS -->	Hector Sanchez	Chuck Shultz	Howard Elkins	Ron Proulx	Byron Raysor
-------------------------------------	-------------------	-----------------	------------------	------------	-----------------

CONSOLIDATED RANKING:

	Hector Sanchez	Chuck Shultz	Howard Elkins	Ron Proulx	Byron Raysor	Total	Ranking
Henderson Wilder, Contractor	1	1	1	1	1	5	1
PCL Construction Services, Inc.	2	2	2	1	2	9	2

INDIVIDUAL SCORING AND RANKING:

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Henderson Wilder, Contractor	PCL Construction Services, Inc.
A	32	32	25
B	32	30	25
C	21	20	21
D	15	14	14
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	96	85
Hector Sanchez		1	2
Ranking			

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Henderson Wilder, Contractor	PCL Construction Services, Inc.
A	32	30	26
B	32	30	26
C	21	20	15
D	15	14	14
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	94	81
Chuck Shultz		1	2
Ranking			

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Henderson Wilder, Contractor	PCL Construction Services, Inc.
A	32	30	29
B	32	29	28
C	21	20	20
D	15	14	14
	0		

September 6, 2017 Advisory Committee Meeting Final Ranking
RFQu17-0359 Citywide Rapid Response and Minor Projects for
General Grouting and Repair or Replacement of Drainage Wells

TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	93	91
Howard Elkins		1	2
Ranking			

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Henderson Wilder, Contractor	PCL Construction Services, Inc.
A	32	32	32
B	32	32	32
C	21	21	21
D	15	14	14
	0	0	0
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	99	99
Ron Proulx		1	1
Ranking			

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Henderson Wilder, Contractor	PCL Construction Services, Inc.
A	32	31	30
B	32	31	30
C	21	20	19
D	15	14	14
	0		
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	96	93
Byron Raysor		1	2
Ranking			

**RFQu17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS**

**EXHIBIT "1"
INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION CRITERIA**

MEMBER: Hector Sanchez **DATE:** 9/6/17

FIRM NAME: Cathcart Construction Company

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of Infrastructure Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	31
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	30
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	20
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements and use of qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	95
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.

**RFQ#17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS**

EXHIBIT "1"
INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION CRITERIA

MEMBER: Hector Sanchez **DATE:** 9/6/17

FIRM NAME: C.E. James, 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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of Infrastructure Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	28
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	28
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	20
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements and use of qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	90
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.

**RFQ#17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS**

**EXHIBIT "1"
INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION CRITERIA**

MEMBER: Hector Sanchez **DATE:** 9/6/2017

FIRM NAME: Gibbs & Register, 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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of Infrastructure Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	30
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	29
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	20
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements and use of qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	93
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.

**RFQu17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS**

EXHIBIT "1"
INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION CRITERIA

MEMBER: Hector Sanchez **DATE:** 9/6/17
FIRM NAME: JCB Construction

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of Infrastructure Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	22
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	20
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	18
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements and use of qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	15	15
TOTAL SCORE	100	75
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.

RFQ#17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS

EXHIBIT "1"
INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION CRITERIA

MEMBER: Hector Sanchez DATE: 9/6/17

FIRM NAME: PCL Construction

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of Infrastructure Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	30
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	30
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	20
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements and use of qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	94
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.

**RFQ#17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS**

**EXHIBIT "1"
INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION CRITERIA**

MEMBER: Hector Sanchez **DATE:** 9/6/17

FIRM NAME: PRIME Construction Group

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of Infrastructure Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	29
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	29
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	19
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements and use of qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	91
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.

**RFQu17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS**

**EXHIBIT "1"
INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION CRITERIA**

MEMBER: Hector Sanchez **DATE:** 9/6/17

FIRM NAME: Schuller Contractors, 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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of Infrastructure Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	25
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	25
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	15
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements and use of qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	79
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.

**RFQu17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS**

EXHIBIT "1"
INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION CRITERIA

MEMBER: Byron Kayser **DATE:** 9/6/17

FIRM NAME: Cathcart Construction Company

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of Infrastructure Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	31
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	31
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	20
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements and use of qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	15	14
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.

**RFQu17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS**

EXHIBIT "1"
INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION CRITERIA

MEMBER: Byron Bayser **DATE:** 9/6/17

FIRM NAME: C.E. James, 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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of Infrastructure Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	28
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	27
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	15
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements and use of qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	15	14
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.

**RFQu17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS**

EXHIBIT "1"
INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION CRITERIA

MEMBER: Byron Rayser **DATE:** 9/6/17

FIRM NAME: C. Hbs + Register

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of Infrastructure Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	30
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	30
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	17
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements and use of qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	91
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.

**RFQ17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS**

EXHIBIT "1"
INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION CRITERIA

MEMBER: Byron Rayser **DATE:** 9/6/17

FIRM NAME: JCB Construction, 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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of Infrastructure Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	29
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	28
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	17
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements and use of qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	15	15
TOTAL SCORE	100	89
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.

**RFQu17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS**

EXHIBIT "1"
INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION CRITERIA

MEMBER: Byron Kayser **DATE:** 9/6/17

FIRM NAME: FCL Construction

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of Infrastructure Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	30
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	30
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	19
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements and use of qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	93
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.

**RFQ17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS**

EXHIBIT "1"
INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION CRITERIA

MEMBER: Byron Rayson **DATE:** 9/6/17

FIRM NAME: Prime Construction Group, 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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of Infrastructure Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	30
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	30
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	20
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements and use of qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	94
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.

**RFQ#17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS**

EXHIBIT "1"
INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION CRITERIA

MEMBER: Byron Rayser **DATE:** 9/6/17

FIRM NAME: Schuller Contractors

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of Infrastructure Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	28
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	28
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	17
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements and use of qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	87
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.

**RFQ17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS**

**EXHIBIT "1"
INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION CRITERIA**

MEMBER: Ron Paouly **DATE:** 9/6/17

FIRM NAME: CCC

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of Infrastructure Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	32
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	32
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	21
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements and use of qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	15	15 14
TOTAL SCORE	100	100 99
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.

**RFQu17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS**

**EXHIBIT "1"
INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION CRITERIA**

MEMBER: Don Peouix **DATE:** 9/6/17

FIRM NAME: C.E. James

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of Infrastructure Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	30
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	30
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	20
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements and use of qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	15	15 14
TOTAL SCORE	100	95 94
RANK		57

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.

**RFQu17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS**

**EXHIBIT "1"
INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION CRITERIA**

MEMBER: Ron Proulx **DATE:** 9/6/17

FIRM NAME: G & R

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of Infrastructure Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	32
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	31
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	20
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements and use of qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	15	14 15
TOTAL SCORE	100	98 97 97
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.

**RFQu17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS**

**EXHIBIT "1"
INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION CRITERIA**

MEMBER: RON PROULX **DATE:** 9/6/17

FIRM NAME: JCB

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of Infrastructure Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	30
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	30
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	20
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements and use of qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	15	15
TOTAL SCORE	100	95
RANK		6 th 20 th

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.

RFQu17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS

EXHIBIT "1"
INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION CRITERIA

MEMBER: Ron Proulx DATE: 9/6/17

FIRM NAME: PCU

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of Infrastructure Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	30
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	31
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	21
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements and use of qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	96 96
RANK		4 4 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.

**RFQ#17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS**

**EXHIBIT "1"
INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION CRITERIA**

MEMBER: Don Proulx **DATE:** 9/6/17

FIRM NAME: PRIME

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of Infrastructure Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	31
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	31
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	20
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements and use of qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	15	14 15
TOTAL SCORE	100	96 97
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.

**RFQu17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS**

**EXHIBIT "1"
INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION CRITERIA**

MEMBER: Paul Prouly **DATE:** 9/6/17

FIRM NAME: Schuller

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of Infrastructure Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	32
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	31
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	20
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements and use of qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	97 97
RANK		2 3 97

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.

**RFQ17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS**

**EXHIBIT "1"
INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION CRITERIA**

MEMBER: HOWARD ELKIN **DATE:** SEPT 6, 2017

FIRM NAME: CATHCART CONSTRUCTION CO.

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of Infrastructure Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	28
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	30
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	19
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements and use of qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	15	14
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.

**RFQu17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS**

**EXHIBIT "1"
INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION CRITERIA**

MEMBER: HOWARD ELKIN **DATE:** SEP. 6, 2017

FIRM NAME: CE JAMES

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of Infrastructure Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	20
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	25
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	18
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements and use of qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	77
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.

**RFQ#17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS**

**EXHIBIT "1"
INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION CRITERIA**

MEMBER: HOWARD ELKIN **DATE:** SEPT 6, 2017

FIRM NAME: CHIBBS & REGISTER

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of Infrastructure Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	30
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	31
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	20
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements and use of qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	95
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.

RFQ#17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS

EXHIBIT "1"
INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION CRITERIA

MEMBER: HOWARD ELKIN DATE: SEPT 6, 2017

FIRM NAME: ICB CONSTRUCTION

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of Infrastructure Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	20
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	15
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	10
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements and use of qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	15	15
TOTAL SCORE	100	60
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.

**RFQu17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS**

EXHIBIT "1"
INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION CRITERIA

MEMBER: Howard Ervin **DATE:** Sept 6, 2017

FIRM NAME: PCL CONSTRUCTION

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of Infrastructure Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	29
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	31
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	20
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements and use of qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	94
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.

RFQu17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS

EXHIBIT "1"
INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION CRITERIA

MEMBER: HOWARD ELKIN DATE: SEPT. 6, 2017

FIRM NAME: PRIME CONSTRUCTION GROUP

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of Infrastructure Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	27
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	26
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	20
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements and use of qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	87
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.

**RFQu17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS**

EXHIBIT "1"
INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION CRITERIA

MEMBER: HOWARD ERKIN **DATE:** SEPT. 6, 2017

FIRM NAME: SCHULLERZ CONTRACTORS

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of Infrastructure Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	20
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	12
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	10
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements and use of qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	56
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.

RFQu17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS

EXHIBIT "1"
INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION CRITERIA

MEMBER: Chuck Shurtz DATE: 8-31-17

FIRM NAME: Cathcart

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of Infrastructure Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	30
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	30
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	20
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements and use of qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	94
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.

**RFQu17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS**

**EXHIBIT "1"
INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION CRITERIA**

MEMBER: Chasen Smith **DATE:** 8-31-17

FIRM NAME: Prime

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of Infrastructure Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	30
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	20.5
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	19
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements and use of qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	91.5
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.

**RFQu17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS**

EXHIBIT "1"
INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION CRITERIA

MEMBER: Chuck Shultz **DATE:** 8-31-17

FIRM NAME: PCL

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of Infrastructure Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	29
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	29
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	19
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements and use of qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	91
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.

**RFQu17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS**

EXHIBIT "1"
INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION CRITERIA

MEMBER: Chasen Schultz **DATE:** 8-31-17

FIRM NAME: G r R

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of Infrastructure Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	28
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	29
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	18
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements and use of qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	89
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.

RFQu17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS

EXHIBIT "1"
INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION CRITERIA

MEMBER: Chuck Shultz DATE: 8-31-17

FIRM NAME: CE James

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of Infrastructure Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	26
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	26
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	17.5
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements and use of qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	83.5
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.

**RFQu17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS**

EXHIBIT "1"
INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION CRITERIA

MEMBER: Chuck Shultz **DATE:** 8-31-17

FIRM NAME: JCB

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of Infrastructure Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	26
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	26
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	16
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements and use of qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	15	15 CS
TOTAL SCORE	100	CS 80 83
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.

**RFQ#17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS**

EXHIBIT "1"
INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION CRITERIA

MEMBER: Chuck Shulte **DATE:** 8-31-17

FIRM NAME: Schulte

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of Infrastructure Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	27
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	25
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	15
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements and use of qualifying VBE firms in the performance of the work.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	81
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.

RFQu17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS

EXHIBIT "2"
GENERAL GROUTING & REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS
EVALUATION CRITERIA

MEMBER: Hector Sanchez DATE: 9/6/17
FIRM NAME: Henderson Wilder, Contractor

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of General Grouting & Repair or Replacement of Drainage Wells in Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	32
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	30
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	20
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	96
RANK	1	

Notes regarding Exhibit "2": 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.

RFQ17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS

EXHIBIT "2"

GENERAL GROUTING & REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS
EVALUATION CRITERIA

MEMBER: Hector Sanchez DATE: 9/6/17
FIRM NAME: PCL Construction

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of General Grouting & Repair or Replacement of Drainage Wells in Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	25
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	25
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	21
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	85
RANK	2	

Notes regarding Exhibit "2": 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.

RFQ17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS

EXHIBIT "2"
GENERAL GROUTING & REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS
EVALUATION CRITERIA

MEMBER: HOWARD ELKIN DATE: SEPT 6, 2017

FIRM NAME: HENDERSON WILDER

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of General Grouting & Repair or Replacement of Drainage Wells in Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	30
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	29
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	20
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	93
RANK	1	

Notes regarding Exhibit "2": 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.

RFQu17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS

EXHIBIT "2"
GENERAL GROUTING & REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS
EVALUATION CRITERIA

MEMBER: HOWARD ELKIN DATE: SEPT 6, 2017

FIRM NAME: PCL CONST.

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of General Grouting & Repair or Replacement of Drainage Wells in Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	29
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	28
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	20
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	91
RANK	2	

Notes regarding Exhibit "2": 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.

**RFQu17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS**

EXHIBIT "2"
GENERAL GROUTING & REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS
EVALUATION CRITERIA

MEMBER: Chuck Shultz DATE: 8-30-2017

FIRM NAME: PCL

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of General Grouting & Repair or Replacement of Drainage Wells in Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	26
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	26
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	15
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	81
RANK	2	

Notes regarding Exhibit "2": 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.

RFQu17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS

EXHIBIT "2"
GENERAL GROUTING & REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS
EVALUATION CRITERIA

MEMBER: Chuck Shultz DATE: 8-30-2017

FIRM NAME: Henderson Wilder

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of General Grouting & Repair or Replacement of Drainage Wells in Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	30
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	30
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	20
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	94
RANK	1	

Notes regarding Exhibit "2": 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.

**RFQu17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS**

**EXHIBIT "2"
GENERAL GROUTING & REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS
EVALUATION CRITERIA**

MEMBER: Bob Proulx **DATE:** 9/6/17
FIRM NAME: PCL

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of General Grouting & Repair or Replacement of Drainage Wells in Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	32
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	32
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	21
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	99
RANK	1	

Notes regarding Exhibit "2": 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.

**RFQu17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS**

EXHIBIT "2"
GENERAL GROUTING & REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS
EVALUATION CRITERIA

MEMBER: RON PROULX DATE: 9/6/17

FIRM NAME: HENDERSON WILDER

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of General Grouting & Repair or Replacement of Drainage Wells in Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	32
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	32
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	21
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	99
RANK		1

Notes regarding Exhibit "2": 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.

**RFQu17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS**

EXHIBIT "2"
GENERAL GROUTING & REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS
EVALUATION CRITERIA

MEMBER: Byron Rayser **DATE:** 9/6/17

FIRM NAME: Henderson Wilder, Contractor

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of General Grouting & Repair or Replacement of Drainage Wells in Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	31
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	31
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	20
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	96
RANK	1	

Notes regarding Exhibit "2": 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.

**RFQ#17-0359 CITYWIDE RAPID RESPONSE AND MINOR PROJECTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE &
GENERAL GROUTING AND REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS**

EXHIBIT "2"
GENERAL GROUTING & REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF DRAINAGE WELLS
EVALUATION CRITERIA

MEMBER: Byron Rayser **DATE:** 9/6/17

FIRM NAME: PCL Construction

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. Proposer's understanding of the scope of work requested for these types of projects; Proposer's approach to successful completion of General Grouting & Repair or Replacement of Drainage Wells in Rapid Response Projects and Minor Projects, and Proposer's relevant experience on project areas of work selected.	32	30
B. Qualifications, ability, capacity, and skill of the Proposer and Proposer's team to perform the services on a timely basis. Responses of the Proposer's references. Quality, availability and adaptability of the Proposer's and Proposer's team services to meet the Project requirements.	32	30
C. The Proposer's and Proposer's team record of successful performance accomplishing similar services on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality, demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules, sufficiency of financial resources, and ability to perform the Contract.	21	19
D. Presentation and approach submitted regarding the Respondent approach to meet City of Orlando MBE/WBE requirements.	15	14
TOTAL SCORE	100	93
RANK	2	

Notes regarding Exhibit "2": 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.