

SCOTT ROAD EXTENSION ENGINEERING PROPOSAL EVALUATION MATRIX

MAX. POINTS (point allocation)	CRITERIA	CONSULTING FIRM							
		WOOD	GMC	ARETE	SEI	PC SIMONTON	GRIFFIN & DAVIS	FALCON	
20 <u>1 pt</u> = less than 5 submitted <u>5 pt</u> = 5 to 8 submitted <u>20 pt</u> = all 9 submitted	Responsiveness to Submission Criteria (III A.1 to III A.9)	20	20	20	20	5	20	5	Missing all submission requirements
25 <u>5 pt</u> = firm and PM experience with requirements very limited; weak presentation of examples <u>10 pt</u> = firm and PM has 2-3 examples of success although specificity limited) <u>15 pt</u> = firm has more experience than PM – greater than 3 examples <u>20 pt</u> = PM has more experience on meeting requirements <u>25 pt</u> = PM and firm have significant and substantive experience meeting all requirements with > 3 examples each	Qualifications of Firm & Project Team Members <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualifications of firm to complete tasks within budget and on time, lead effective public meetings, “outside the box thinking” and dealing with GDOT (examples) • Qualifications of assigned Project Manager (PM) to complete tasks within budget and on time, lead effective public meetings, “outside the box thinking” and dealing with GDOT (examples) 	25	25	25	25	10	25	10	Some GDOT experience but not strong
25 <u>0 pt</u> = no clue! <u>5 pt</u> = Basic understanding w/ minimal understanding <u>15 pt</u> = good understanding w/ some detail <u>25 pt</u> = detailed explanation of how to address most if not all the project issues	Demonstrated Experience of Project Scope and Relevant Issues	20	20 no discussion of side street impacts	15 did not walk site - did not discuss env. permitting; confused w/ this bring a local project and no state funding	20 no discussion of side street impacts	5	15 Great understanding of project but “cut and paste” from another project was evident	15	
10 <u>0 pt</u> = clients provided but lacking good references <u>5 pt</u> = clients provided and good references <u>10 pt</u> = excellent references from clients	References - Current & Former Clients	10	10	10	10	5 NO GDOT clients	10	5	
5 <u>0 pt</u> = PM workload not well defined <u>5 pt</u> = detailed outline of current and future workload	Demonstrated Experience and Willingness to Meet Project Deadlines	5	5	5	5	0	5	5	
5 <u>0 pt</u> = schedule provided but no explanation or not realistic, intangibles lacking <u>5 pt</u> = Good schedule and explained w/ intangibles	Design Schedule Proposed & Intangibles	5	5	5	5	2.5	5	0	
10 (low to high)	Fee Schedule (if short listed)	4 \$202,500	7 \$124,336	1 \$273,988.64	8 \$116,750	3 \$191,380	6 \$189,000	10 \$74,000	
100	TOTAL POINTS	89	92	81	93	30	86	50	

TIE for 1st: GMC & SEI
2nd: WOOD
3rd: Griffin & Davis

NOTE: SELECTION TEAM CHOSE SEI