

# Summary of All Scores

CCNA # PSEN-18-02-03  
 "WTP Improvement Projects"  
 Part A "WTP Lime System Replacement"

Evaluation Committee Score Sheet  
 Thursday, January 03, 2019

	Evaluator/Vendor	George Wrrves	John England	Steve Buckland	Total	Rank
2	Carollo Engineers, Inc	1	1	1	3	1
1	Calvin, Giordano & Associates, Inc	2	2	2	6	2
5	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc	3	3	3	9	3
3	CPH, Inc	4	4	5	13	4
4	Ingemel S.A. LLC	5	5	4	14	5

Certifier of Score

*Katherine Bongstrom*

Please Print Name

*Katherine Bongstrom*

Signature

*1/3/2019*

Date

**CCNA # PSEN-18-02-03**  
**"WTP Improvement Projects"**  
**Part A "WTP Lime System Replacement"**

Evaluator Score Sheet  
January 3, 2019

**Instructions:**

Each /Evaluator is provided with the following information to assist with evaluating the proposals

- 1) RFQ # PSEN-18-02 - Professional Service Providers (Architectural, Engineering, Surveying & Mapping)
- 2) Bid Tabulation and Commission's Approval of the Pool of Providers and their respective Discipline(s)
- 3) Firms statements of qualifications and response to RFQ # PSEN-18-02

- 3) Instructions
- 5) Scope of Work for the Specific Project
- 6) Responses from Firms interested in the Specific Project

Each Evaluator is asked to evaluate each firm using the information provided and the following weighted criteria in the table below. The Evaluation Committee shall have the opportunity to discuss the qualifications of the proposers and score the proposals according to the percentage allotment afforded to each criteria. See example below. This step will take place for each of the firms. Once all firms have been reviewed, the committee will be given time to finalize their scores for each of the firms. Once the score cards are complete, the City Clerk will tally each evaluator's score card. For each evaluator's score card, the total scores will then be ranked, with the highest score receiving a 1.

Vendor Name		Ability of professional personnel	Whether a firm is a certified minority business enterprise	Past performance	Willingness to meet time and budget requirements	Location	Recent, current, and projected workloads of the firms	Total	Rank	Comments
		Maximum 30%	Maximum 5%	Maximum 30%	Maximum 15%	Maximum 10%	Maximum 10%	Maximum 100%		
Sample		23.00%	5.00%	10.00%	10.00%	4.00%	3.00%	55.00%		
1	Calvin, Giordano & Associates, Inc	25.00%	0.00%	25.00%	15.00%	10.00%	10.00%	85.00%	2	
2	Carollo Engineers, Inc	30.00%	0.00%	30.00%	15.00%	10.00%	10.00%	95.00%	1	
3	CPH, Inc	25.00%	0.00%	25.00%	15.00%	5.00%	10.00%	80.00%	4	
4	Ingemel S.A. LLC	15.00%	5.00%	10.00%	15.00%	5.00%	10.00%	60.00%	5	
5	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc	20.00%	0.00%	30.00%	15.00%	7.00%	10.00%	82.00%	3	

Note: In determining whether a firm is qualified, the Evaluation Committee shall consider such factors as the weighted criteria above and the **volume of work previously awarded to each firm by the City**, with the object of effecting an equitable distribution of contracts among qualified firms, provided such distribution does not violate the principle of selection of the most highly qualified firms. In the event a score for an individual evaluator results in a tie, the evaluator will be asked to **break the tie and rank the tied vendors based on the volume of work previously awarded to each firm by the City**, with the object of effecting an equitable distribution of contracts among qualified firms, provided such distribution does not violate the principle of selection of the most highly qualified firms. Once the scores have been read for all services, an evaluating member of the committee must make a motion, which must be approved by majority vote of the committee.

Certifier of Score

George Wilson  
Please Print Name

[Signature]  
Signature

1/3/19  
Date

**CCNA # PSEN-18-02-03**  
**"WTP Improvement Projects"**  
**Part A "WTP Lime System Replacement"**

Evaluator Score Sheet  
January 3, 2019

**Instructions:**

Each /Evaluator is provided with the following information to assist with evaluating the proposals

- 1) RFQ # PSEN-18-02 - Professional Service Providers (Architectural, Engineering, Surveying & Mapping)
- 2) Bid Tabulation and Commission's Approval of the Pool of Providers and their respective Discipline(s)
- 3) Firms statements of qualifications and response to RFQ # PSEN-18-02

- 3) Instructions
- 5) Scope of Work for the Specific Project
- 6) Responses from Firms interested in the Specific Project

Each Evaluator is asked to evaluate each firm using the information provided and the following weighted criteria in the table below. The Evaluation Committee shall have the opportunity to discuss the qualifications of the proposers and score the proposals according to the percentage allotment afforded to each criteria. See example below. This step will take place for each of the firms. Once all firms have been reviewed, the committee will be given time to finalize their scores for each of the firms. Once the score cards are complete, the City Clerk will tally each evaluator's score card. For each evaluator's score card, the total scores will then be ranked, with the highest score receiving a 1.

Vendor Name		Ability of professional personnel	Whether a firm is a certified minority business enterprise	Past performance	Willingness to meet time and budget requirements	Location	Recent, current, and projected workloads of the firms	Total	Rank	Comments
		Maximum 30%	Maximum 5%	Maximum 30%	Maximum 15%	Maximum 10%	Maximum 10%	Maximum 100%		
Sample		23.00%	5.00%	10.00%	10.00%	4.00%	3.00%	55.00%		
1	Calvin, Giordano & Associates, Inc	29.00%	0.00%	28.00%	15.00%	10.00%	10.00%	<b>92.00%</b>	<b>2</b>	
2	Carollo Engineers, Inc	30.00%	0.00%	29.00%	15.00%	10.00%	9.00%	<b>93.00%</b>	<b>1</b>	
3	CPH, Inc	29.00%	0.00%	29.00%	15.00%	8.00%	9.00%	<b>90.00%</b>	<b>4</b>	
4	Ingemel S.A. LLC	25.00%	5.00%	26.00%	15.00%	8.00%	7.00%	<b>86.00%</b>	<b>5</b>	
5	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc	29.00%	0.00%	28.00%	15.00%	10.00%	9.00%	<b>91.00%</b>	<b>3</b>	

Note: In determining whether a firm is qualified, the Evaluation Committee shall consider such factors as the weighted criteria above and the **volume of work previously awarded to each firm by the City**, with the object of effecting an equitable distribution of contracts among qualified firms, provided such distribution does not violate the principle of selection of the most highly qualified firms. In the event a score for an individual evaluator results in a tie, the evaluator will be asked to **break the tie and rank the tied vendors based on the volume of work previously awarded to each firm by the City**, with the object of effecting an equitable distribution of contracts among qualified firms, provided such distribution does not violate the principle of selection of the most highly qualified firms. Once the scores have been read for all services, an evaluating member of the committee must make a motion, which must be approved by majority vote of the committee.

Certifier of Score

John L. England  
Please Print Name

[Signature]  
Signature

1/3/19  
Date

**CCNA # PSEN-18-02-03**  
**"WTP Improvement Projects"**  
**Part A "WTP Lime System Replacement"**

Evaluator Score Sheet  
January 3, 2019

**Instructions:**

Each /Evaluator is provided with the following information to assist with evaluating the proposals

- 1) RFQ # PSEN-18-02 - Professional Service Providers (Architectural, Engineering, Surveying & Mapping)
- 2) Bid Tabulation and Commission's Approval of the Pool of Providers and their respective Discipline(s)
- 3) Firms statements of qualifications and response to RFQ # PSEN-18-02

- 3) Instructions
- 5) Scope of Work for the Specific Project
- 6) Responses from Firms interested in the Specific Project

Each Evaluator is asked to evaluate each firm using the information provided and the following weighted criteria in the table below. The Evaluation Committee shall have the opportunity to discuss the qualifications of the proposers and score the proposals according to the percentage allotment afforded to each criteria. See example below. This step will take place for each of the firms. Once all firms have been reviewed, the committee will be given time to finalize their scores for each of the firms. Once the score cards are complete, the City Clerk will tally each evaluator's score card. For each evaluator's score card, the total scores will then be ranked, with the highest score receiving a 1.

Vendor Name		Ability of professional personnel	Whether a firm is a certified minority business enterprise	Past performance	Willingness to meet time and budget requirements	Location	Recent, current, and projected workloads of the firms	Total	Rank	Comments
		Maximum 30%	Maximum 5%	Maximum 30%	Maximum 15%	Maximum 10%	Maximum 10%	Maximum 100%		
Sample		23.00%	5.00%	10.00%	10.00%	4.00%	3.00%	55.00%		
1	Calvin, Giordano & Associates, Inc	30.00%	0.00%	30.00%	15.00%	10.00%	10.00%	<b>95.00%</b>	<b>2</b>	
2	Carollo Engineers, Inc	30.00%	0.00%	30.00%	15.00%	10.00%	10.00%	<b>95.00%</b>	<b>1</b>	
3	CPH, Inc	25.00%	0.00%	30.00%	15.00%	8.00%	10.00%	<b>88.00%</b>	<b>5</b>	
4	Ingemel S.A. LLC	25.00%	5.00%	30.00%	15.00%	8.00%	10.00%	<b>93.00%</b>	<b>4</b>	
5	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc	30.00%	0.00%	30.00%	15.00%	9.00%	10.00%	<b>94.00%</b>	<b>3</b>	

Note: In determining whether a firm is qualified, the Evaluation Committee shall consider such factors as the weighted criteria above and the **volume of work previously awarded to each firm by the City**, with the object of effecting an equitable distribution of contracts among qualified firms, provided such distribution does not violate the principle of selection of the most highly qualified firms. In the event a score for an individual evaluator results in a tie, the evaluator will be asked to **break the tie and rank the tied vendors based on the volume of work previously awarded to each firm by the City**, with the object of effecting an equitable distribution of contracts among qualified firms, provided such distribution does not violate the principle of selection of the most highly qualified firms. Once the scores have been read for all services, an evaluating member of the committee must make a motion, which must be approved by majority vote of the committee.

Certifier of Score

STEVEN P BUCKLAND

Please Print Name



Signature

1-3-19

Date