Summary of All Scores

RFQ # PSUT-19-01

"Power Electrical Engineering Services for the Utilities Division"

Evaluation Committee Score Sheet
Monday, July 01, 2019

	Evaluator/Vendor	Karl Kennedy	George Wrves	Paul Thompson	Giraldo Hernandez	Jonathan Cooper	Total	**Rank**
A	Hillers Electrical Engineering, Inc	1	1	1	1	1	5	1
B	Smith Engineering Consultants, Inc.	2	2	2	3	3	12	2
C	SGM Engineering, Inc	4	4	5	2	2	17	3
D	A&P Consulting Transportation Engineers Corp	3	3	7	4	4	21	4
E	ME Engineering Consultants, Inc	6	5	3	7	6	27	5
F	Ingemel SA LLC	5	7	6	5	5	28	6
G	EC Fennell PA	7	5	4	6	7	29	7

Certifier of Score

Katherine Bergstrom
Please Print Name

Katherine Bergstrom
Signature

7/1/2019
Date

RFQ # PSUT-19-01
"Power Electrical Engineering Services for the Utilities Division"

Evaluator Score Sheet
July 1, 2019

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

1) Evaluation Instructions
2) This Evaluation Scoring Sheet
3) Bid Tabulation
3) CCNA # PSUT-19-01 Electrical Engineering Services for the Utilities Division
5) Vendor's Responses
6) Reference Checks

After your evaluation of the information provided, you will score each of the weighted categories that have a "Category Multiplier" on the evaluator score sheet based on how you feel the material rates according to the following quality levels in the table below:

Quality	Level	Description
Excellent	5	Meets all requirements; reflects significant enhancements or strengths as compared to minimum levels of acceptability; no offsetting weaknesses.
Very Good	4	Meets all requirements; reflects some enhancements or strengths; few if any offsetting weaknesses.
Good	3	Meets minimum requirements; strengths and weaknesses, if any, tend to offset one another equally.
Fair	2	Contains significant weaknesses only partially offset by less pronounced strengths; may meet minimum requirements but doubt exists.
Poor	1	Serious doubt exists about ability to meet needs but may be sufficient; significant weaknesses without offsetting strengths.
Deficient	0	Will not meet minimum requirements.

The respective "Quality Level" will then be multiplied by the respective "Category Multiplier" to get the Total Score for the respective category. For example, if a category has an pre-assigned "Category Multiplier" of 6 and the evaluator assigns a "Quality" of "Good" which would result in the "Quality Level" of 3 being multiplied by the "Category Multiplier" of 6 to get a Total Score of 18 for the respective category. See sample below.

When scoring on a computer, you can click on the pink cells to choose a "Quality" from the dropdown list which will automatically calculate the corresponding score for that Category.

For categories such as **"Whether a firm is a certified minority business enterprise"**, the firm will be given all 5 points if they are a certified minority business enterprise or 0 points if they are not a certified minority business enterprise.

The Evaluation Committee shall have the opportunity to discuss the qualifications of the proposers during the public evaluation committee meeting. 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.

Please enter any comments or notes for why you scored each vendor the way that you have in the corresponding "Notes/Comments" section of the spreadsheet or provide additional pages of Notes/Comments on the following tab.

		Adequacy of Personnel / Ability of Professional Personnel	Whether a firm is a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Past Record / Past Performance	Firm's Understanding and Approach to the Work	Capabilities	Experience (of the firm or individual)	Total	Rank	Notes/Comments
	Category Multiplier	4	N/A	4	4	4	3	100.00		
	Maximum Score	20	5	20	20	20	15			
	Sample	Excellent	Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Very Good	Very Good	Fair	Poor	68.00		
		20.00	5.00	16.00	16.00	8.00	3.00			
A	A&P Consulting Transportation Engineers Corp	Very Good	Not a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Very Good	Very Good	Excellent	Very Good	80.00	3	
		16.00	0.00	16.00	16.00	20.00	12.00			
B	EC Fennell PA	Very Good	Not a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Good	Very Good	Very Good	Good	69.00	5	
		16.00	0.00	12.00	16.00	16.00	9.00			
C	Hillers Electrical Engineering, Inc	Excellent	Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	100.00	1	
		20.00	5.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	15.00			
D	Ingemel SA LLC	Very Good	Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Good	Good	Good	Fair	63.00	7	
		16.00	5.00	12.00	12.00	12.00	6.00			
E	ME Engineering Consultants, Inc	Very Good	Not a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Good	Very Good	Good	Good	65.00	6	
		16.00	0.00	12.00	16.00	12.00	9.00			
F	SGM Engineering, Inc	Very Good	Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Good	Good	Very Good	Good	70.00	4	
		16.00	5.00	12.00	12.00	16.00	9.00			
G	Smith Engineering Consultants, Inc Inc.	Excellent	Not a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Excellent	Very Good	Excellent	Excellent	91.00	2	
		20.00	0.00	20.00	16.00	20.00	15.00			

Note: In the event a score for an individual evaluator results in a **tie** or the overall score results in a tie, the evaluator or evaluation committee 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.

In the event the score still results in a tie, the evaluator or evaluation committee will be asked to break the tie and give preference to a business that certifies that it has implemented a **drug-free workplace program** on the Vendor Drug-Free Workplace Certification Form.

In the event the score still results in a tie, the evaluator or evaluation committee will be asked to break the tie by **publicly drawing lots**.

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 Wrves
Please Print Name

Signature

7/1/19
Date

RFQ # PSUT-19-01
"Power Electrical Engineering Services for the Utilities Division"

Evaluator Score Sheet
July 1, 2019

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

1) Evaluation Instructions
2) This Evaluation Scoring Sheet
3) Bid Tabulation
3) CCNA # PSUT-19-01 Electrical Engineering Services for the Utilities Division
5) Vendor's Responses
6) Reference Checks

After your evaluation of the information provided, you will score each of the weighted categories that have a "Category Multiplier" on the evaluator score sheet based on how you feel the material rates according to the following quality levels in the table below:

Quality	Level	Description
Excellent	5	Meets all requirements; reflects significant enhancements or strengths as compared to minimum levels of acceptability; no offsetting weaknesses.
Very Good	4	Meets all requirements; reflects some enhancements or strengths; few if any offsetting weaknesses.
Good	3	Meets minimum requirements; strengths and weaknesses, if any, tend to offset one another equally.
Fair	2	Contains significant weaknesses only partially offset by less pronounced strengths; may meet minimum requirements but doubt exists.
Poor	1	Serious doubt exists about ability to meet needs but may be sufficient; significant weaknesses without offsetting strengths.
Deficient	0	Will not meet minimum requirements.

The respective "Quality Level" will then be multiplied by the respective "Category Multiplier" to get the Total Score for the respective category. For example, if a category has an pre-assigned "Category Multiplier" of 6 and the evaluator assigns a "Quality" of "Good" which would result in the "Quality Level" of 3 being multiplied by the "Category Multiplier" of 6 to get a Total Score of 18 for the respective category. See sample below.

When scoring on a computer, you can click on the pink cells to choose a "Quality" from the dropdown list which will automatically calculate the corresponding score for that Category.

For categories such as **"Whether a firm is a certified minority business enterprise"**, the firm will be given all 5 points if they are a certified minority business enterprise or 0 points if they are not a certified minority business enterprise.

The Evaluation Committee shall have the opportunity to discuss the qualifications of the proposers during the public evaluation committee meeting. 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.

Please enter any comments or notes for why you scored each vendor the way that you have in the corresponding "Notes/Comments" section of the spreadsheet or provide additional pages of Notes/Comments on the following tab.

		Adequacy of Personnel / Ability of Professional Personnel	Whether a firm is a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Past Record / Past Performance	Firm's Understanding and Approach to the Work	Capabilities	Experience (of the firm or individual)	Total	Rank	Notes/Comments
	Category Multiplier	4	N/A	4	4	4	3	100.00		
	Maximum Score	20	5	20	20	20	15			
	Sample	Excellent	Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Very Good	Very Good	Fair	Poor	68.00		
		20.00	5.00	16.00	16.00	8.00	3.00			
A	A&P Consulting Transportation Engineers Corp	Excellent	Not a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Very Good	Good	Excellent	Very Good	**80.00**	**3**	
		20.00	0.00	16.00	12.00	20.00	12.00			
B	EC Fennell PA	Very Good	Not a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Good	Good	Very Good	Good	**65.00**	**7**	
		16.00	0.00	12.00	12.00	16.00	9.00			
C	Hillers Electrical Engineering, Inc	Excellent	Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Excellent	Good	Excellent	Excellent	**92.00**	**1**	
		20.00	5.00	20.00	12.00	20.00	15.00			
D	Ingemel SA LLC	Excellent	Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Good	Good	Excellent	Good	**78.00**	**5**	
		20.00	5.00	12.00	12.00	20.00	9.00			
E	ME Engineering Consultants, Inc	Excellent	Not a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Good	Good	Excellent	Good	**73.00**	**6**	
		20.00	0.00	12.00	12.00	20.00	9.00			
F	SGM Engineering, Inc	Excellent	Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Good	Good	Excellent	Good	**78.00**	**4**	
		20.00	5.00	12.00	12.00	20.00	9.00			
G	Smith Engineering Consultants, Inc Inc.	Excellent	Not a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Excellent	Good	Excellent	Excellent	**87.00**	**2**	
		20.00	0.00	20.00	12.00	20.00	15.00			

Note: In the event a score for an individual evaluator results in a **tie** or the overall score results in a tie, the evaluator or evaluation committee 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.

In the event the score still results in a tie, the evaluator or evaluation committee will be asked to break the tie and give preference to a business that certifies that it has implemented a **drug-free workplace program** on the Vendor Drug-Free Workplace Certification Form.

In the event the score still results in a tie, the evaluator or evaluation committee will be asked to break the tie by **publicly drawing lots**.

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:

Karl Kennedy
Please Print Name

Signature

7/1/19
Date

RFQ # PSUT-19-01
"Power Electrical Engineering Services for the Utilities Division"

Evaluator Score Sheet
July 1, 2019

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

1) Evaluation Instructions
2) This Evaluation Scoring Sheet
3) Bid Tabulation
3) CCNA # PSUT-19-01 Electrical Engineering Services for the Utilities Division
5) Vendor's Responses
6) Reference Checks

After your evaluation of the information provided, you will score each of the weighted categories that have a "Category Multiplier" on the evaluator score sheet based on how you feel the material rates according to the following quality levels in the table below:

Quality	Level	Description
Excellent	5	Meets all requirements; reflects significant enhancements or strengths as compared to minimum levels of acceptability; no offsetting weaknesses.
Very Good	4	Meets all requirements; reflects some enhancements or strengths; few if any offsetting weaknesses.
Good	3	Meets minimum requirements; strengths and weaknesses, if any, tend to offset one another equally.
Fair	2	Contains significant weaknesses only partially offset by less pronounced strengths; may meet minimum requirements but doubt exists.
Poor	1	Serious doubt exists about ability to meet needs but may be sufficient; significant weaknesses without offsetting strengths.
Deficient	0	Will not meet minimum requirements.

The respective "Quality Level" will then be multiplied by the respective "Category Multiplier" to get the Total Score for the respective category. For example, if a category has an pre-assigned "Category Multiplier" of 6 and the evaluator assigns a "Quality" of "Good" which would result in the "Quality Level" of 3 being multiplied by the "Category Multiplier" of 6 to get a Total Score of 18 for the respective category. See sample below.

When scoring on a computer, you can click on the pink cells to choose a "Quality" from the dropdown list which will automatically calculate the corresponding score for that Category.

For categories such as **"Whether a firm is a certified minority business enterprise"**, the firm will be given all 5 points if they are a certified minority business enterprise or 0 points if they are not a certified minority business enterprise.

The Evaluation Committee shall have the opportunity to discuss the qualifications of the proposers during the public evaluation committee meeting. 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.

Please enter any comments or notes for why you scored each vendor the way that you have in the corresponding "Notes/Comments" section of the spreadsheet or provide additional pages of Notes/Comments on the following tab.

		Adequacy of Personnel / Ability of Professional Personnel	Whether a firm is a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Past Record / Past Performance	Firm's Understanding and Approach to the Work	Capabilities	Experience (of the firm or individual)	Total	Rank	Notes/Comments
	Category Multiplier	4	N/A	4	4	4	3	100.00		
	Maximum Score	20	5	20	20	20	15			
	Sample	Excellent	Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Very Good	Very Good	Fair	Poor	68.00		
		20.00	5.00	16.00	16.00	8.00	3.00			
A	A&P Consulting Transportation Engineers Corp	Good	Not a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Fair	Poor	Good	Good	45.00	4	
		12.00	0.00	8.00	4.00	12.00	9.00			
B	EC Fennell PA	Fair	Not a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Fair	Poor	Fair	Fair	34.00	7	
		8.00	0.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	6.00			
C	Hillers Electrical Engineering, Inc	Excellent	Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Excellent	Very Good	Excellent	Excellent	96.00	1	
		20.00	5.00	20.00	16.00	20.00	15.00			
D	Ingemel SA LLC	Fair	Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Fair	Poor	Good	Fair	43.00	5	
		8.00	5.00	8.00	4.00	12.00	6.00			
E	ME Engineering Consultants, Inc	Fair	Not a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Good	Poor	Fair	Fair	38.00	6	
		8.00	0.00	12.00	4.00	8.00	6.00			
F	SGM Engineering, Inc	Good	Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Fair	Poor	Good	Good	50.00	2	
		12.00	5.00	8.00	4.00	12.00	9.00			
G	Smith Engineering Consultants, Inc Inc.	Good	Not a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Good	Poor	Good	Good	49.00	3	
		12.00	0.00	12.00	4.00	12.00	9.00			

Note: In the event a score for an individual evaluator results in a **tie** or the overall score results in a tie, the evaluator or evaluation committee 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.

In the event the score still results in a tie, the evaluator or evaluation committee will be asked to break the tie and give preference to a business that certifies that it has implemented a **drug-free workplace program** on the Vendor Drug-Free Workplace Certification Form.

In the event the score still results in a tie, the evaluator or evaluation committee will be asked to break the tie by **publicly drawing lots**.

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:

Jonathan Cowen
Please Print Name

Signature

7/1/19
Date

RFQ # PSUT-19-01
"Power Electrical Engineering Services for the Utilities Division"

Evaluator Score Sheet
July 1, 2019

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

1) Evaluation Instructions
2) This Evaluation Scoring Sheet
3) Bid Tabulation
3) CCNA # PSUT-19-01 Electrical Engineering Services for the Utilities Division
5) Vendor's Responses
6) Reference Checks

After your evaluation of the information provided, you will score each of the weighted categories that have a "Category Multiplier" on the evaluator score sheet based on how you feel the material rates according to the following quality levels in the table below:

Quality	Level	Description
Excellent	5	Meets all requirements; reflects significant enhancements or strengths as compared to minimum levels of acceptability; no offsetting weaknesses.
Very Good	4	Meets all requirements; reflects some enhancements or strengths; few if any offsetting weaknesses.
Good	3	Meets minimum requirements; strengths and weaknesses, if any, tend to offset one another equally.
Fair	2	Contains significant weaknesses only partially offset by less pronounced strengths; may meet minimum requirements but doubt exists.
Poor	1	Serious doubt exists about ability to meet needs but may be sufficient; significant weaknesses without offsetting strengths.
Deficient	0	Will not meet minimum requirements.

The respective "Quality Level" will then be multiplied by the respective "Category Multiplier" to get the Total Score for the respective category. For example, if a category has an pre-assigned "Category Multiplier" of 6 and the evaluator assigns a "Quality" of "Good" which would result in the "Quality Level" of 3 being multiplied by the "Category Multiplier" of 6 to get a Total Score of 18 for the respective category. See sample below.

When scoring on a computer, you can click on the pink cells to choose a "Quality" from the dropdown list which will automatically calculate the corresponding score for that Category.

For categories such as **"Whether a firm is a certified minority business enterprise"**, the firm will be given all 5 points if they are a certified minority business enterprise or 0 points if they are not a certified minority business enterprise.

The Evaluation Committee shall have the opportunity to discuss the qualifications of the proposers during the public evaluation committee meeting. 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.

Please enter any comments or notes for why you scored each vendor the way that you have in the corresponding "Notes/Comments" section of the spreadsheet or provide additional pages of Notes/Comments on the following tab.

		Adequacy of Personnel / Ability of Professional Personnel	Whether a firm is a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Past Record / Past Performance	Firm's Understanding and Approach to the Work	Capabilities	Experience (of the firm or individual)	Total	Rank	Notes/Comments
	Category Multiplier	4	N/A	4	4	4	3	100.00		
	Maximum Score	20	5	20	20	20	15			
	Sample	Excellent	Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Very Good	Very Good	Fair	Poor	68.00		
		20.00	5.00	16.00	16.00	8.00	3.00			
A	A&P Consulting Transportation Engineers Corp	Excellent	Not a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	**80.00**	**4**	
		20.00	0.00	16.00	16.00	16.00	12.00			
B	EC Fennell PA	Very Good	Not a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Very Good	Good	Very Good	Good	**69.00**	**6**	
		16.00	0.00	16.00	12.00	16.00	9.00			
C	Hillers Electrical Engineering, Inc	Excellent	Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Excellent	Very Good	Excellent	Excellent	**96.00**	**1**	
		20.00	5.00	20.00	16.00	20.00	15.00			
D	Ingemel SA LLC	Very Good	Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Good	**78.00**	**5**	
		16.00	5.00	16.00	16.00	16.00	9.00			
E	ME Engineering Consultants, Inc	Good	Not a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Good	Good	Good	Good	**57.00**	**7**	
		12.00	0.00	12.00	12.00	12.00	9.00			
F	SGM Engineering, Inc	Excellent	Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Excellent	**88.00**	**2**	
		20.00	5.00	16.00	16.00	16.00	15.00			
G	Smith Engineering Consultants, Inc Inc.	Excellent	Not a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Very Good	Very Good	Excellent	Very Good	**84.00**	**3**	
		20.00	0.00	16.00	16.00	20.00	12.00			

Note: In the event a score for an individual evaluator results in a **tie** or the overall score results in a tie, the evaluator or evaluation committee 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.

In the event the score still results in a tie, the evaluator or evaluation committee will be asked to break the tie and give preference to a business that certifies that it has implemented a **drug-free workplace program** on the Vendor Drug-Free Workplace Certification Form.

In the event the score still results in a tie, the evaluator or evaluation committee will be asked to break the tie by **publicly drawing lots**.

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:

Giraldo Hernandez
Please Print Name

Signature

7-1-19
Date

RFQ # PSUT-19-01
"Power Electrical Engineering Services for the Utilities Division"

Evaluator Score Sheet
July 1, 2019

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

1) Evaluation Instructions
2) This Evaluation Scoring Sheet
3) Bid Tabulation
3) CCNA # PSUT-19-01 Electrical Engineering Services for the Utilities Division
5) Vendor's Responses
6) Reference Checks

After your evaluation of the information provided, you will score each of the weighted categories that have a "Category Multiplier" on the evaluator score sheet based on how you feel the material rates according to the following quality levels in the table below:

Quality	Level	Description
Excellent	5	Meets all requirements; reflects significant enhancements or strengths as compared to minimum levels of acceptability; no offsetting weaknesses.
Very Good	4	Meets all requirements; reflects some enhancements or strengths; few if any offsetting weaknesses.
Good	3	Meets minimum requirements; strengths and weaknesses, if any, tend to offset one another equally.
Fair	2	Contains significant weaknesses only partially offset by less pronounced strengths; may meet minimum requirements but doubt exists.
Poor	1	Serious doubt exists about ability to meet needs but may be sufficient; significant weaknesses without offsetting strengths.
Deficient	0	Will not meet minimum requirements.

The respective "Quality Level" will then be multiplied by the respective "Category Multiplier" to get the Total Score for the respective category. For example, If a category has an pre-assigned "Category Multiplier" of 6 and the evaluator assigns a "Quality" of "Good" which would result in the "Quality Level" of 3 being multiplied by the "Category Multiplier" of 6 to get a Total Score of 18 for the respective category. See sample below.

When scoring on a computer, you can click on the pink cells to choose a "Quality" from the dropdown list which will automatically calculate the corresponding score for that Category.

For categories such as **"Whether a firm is a certified minority business enterprise"**, the firm will be given all 5 points if they are a certified minority business enterprise or 0 points if they are not a certified minority business enterprise.

The Evaluation Committee shall have the opportunity to discuss the qualifications of the proposers during the public evaluation committee meeting. 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.

Please enter any comments or notes for why you scored each vendor the way that you have in the corresponding "Notes/Comments" section of the spreadsheet or provide additional pages of Notes/Comments on the following tab.

		Adequacy of Personnel / Ability of Professional Personnel	Whether a firm is a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Past Record / Past Performance	Firm's Understanding and Approach to the Work	Capabilities	Experience (of the firm or individual)	Total	Rank	Notes/Comments
	Category Multiplier	4	N/A	4	4	4	3	100.00		
	Maximum Score	20	5	20	20	20	15			
	Sample	Excellent	Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Very Good	Very Good	Fair	Poor	68.00		
		20.00	5.00	16.00	16.00	8.00	3.00			
A	A&P Consulting Transportation Engineers Corp	Good	Not a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Good	Good	Good	Good	**57.00**	**7**	
		12.00	0.00	12.00	12.00	12.00	9.00			
B	EC Fennell PA	Very Good	Not a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Very Good	Very Good	Good	Very Good	**72.00**	**4**	
		16.00	0.00	16.00	16.00	12.00	12.00			
C	Hillers Electrical Engineering, Inc	Excellent	Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	**100.00**	**1**	
		20.00	5.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	15.00			
D	Ingemel SA LLC	Very Good	Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Good	Very Good	Good	Good	**70.00**	**6**	
		16.00	5.00	12.00	16.00	12.00	9.00			
E	ME Engineering Consultants, Inc	Very Good	Not a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	**76.00**	**3**	
		16.00	0.00	16.00	16.00	16.00	12.00			
F	SGM Engineering, Inc	Very Good	Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Good	Good	Very Good	Good	**70.00**	**5**	
		16.00	5.00	12.00	12.00	16.00	9.00			
G	Smith Engineering Consultants, Inc Inc.	Excellent	Not a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	**95.00**	**2**	
		20.00	0.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	15.00			

Note: In the event a score for an individual evaluator results in a **tie** or the overall score results in a tie, the evaluator or evaluation committee 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.

In the event the score still results in a tie, the evaluator or evaluation committee will be asked to break the tie and give preference to a business that certifies that it has implemented a **drug-free workplace program** on the Vendor Drug-Free Workplace Certification Form.

In the event the score still results in a tie, the evaluator or evaluation committee will be asked to break the tie by **publicly drawing lots**.

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:

PAUL THOMPSON
Please Print Name


Signature

7/1/2019
Date