EXHIBIT B

Project - Professional Services - Soils and Materials Testing

Location of Business	
Location	**Points**
Within Winston-Salem	5
Within North Carolina	3
Outside of North Carolina	0

Work Experience	
Level	**Points**
>5 Relevant Projects	5
4-5 Relevant Projects	4
3-4 Relevant Projects	3
1-2 Relevant Projects	2
0 Relevant Projects	0

Understanding of Project	
Level	**Points**
Superior: Proposer fully addresses all aspects of the criterion, convincingly demonstrates that it will meet the project's performance requirements, and demonstrates no weaknesses	5
Above Average: Proposer fully addresses all aspects of the criterion, convincingly demonstrates a likelihood of meeting the project's requirements, and demonstrates only a few minor weaknesses	4
Average: Proposer addresses all aspects of the criterion and demonstrates the ability to meet the project's performance requirements. May contain significant weaknesses and/or a number of minor weaknesses.	3
Below Average: Proposer does not address all aspects of the criterion nor is evidence presented indicating the likelihood of successfully meeting the project's requirements. Significant weaknesses are demonstrated and clearly outweigh any strengths presented.	2
Poor: Proposer does not address all aspects of the criterion and the information presented indicates a strong likelihood of failure to meet the project's requirements	1

Past Performance	
Level	**Points**
Superior: proposer maintained an exceptional working relationship with the City's project managers and/or private entities project managers. They communicated issues well in advance with all parties efficiently, got project completed on ahead of schedule, within budget, and how they said it look/turnout in the proposal.	5
Superior: proposer maintained an exceptional working relationship with the City's project managers and/or private entities project managers. They communicated issues well in advance with all parties efficiently, got project completed on ahead of schedule, within budget, and how they said it look/turnout in the proposal.	4
Superior: proposer maintained an exceptional working relationship with the City's project managers and/or private entities project managers. They communicated issues well in advance with all parties efficiently, got project completed on ahead of schedule, within budget, and how they said it look/turnout in the proposal.	3
Superior: proposer maintained an exceptional working relationship with the City's project managers and/or private entities project managers. They communicated issues well in advance with all parties efficiently, got project completed on ahead of schedule, within budget, and how they said it look/turnout in the proposal.	2
Superior: proposer maintained an exceptional working relationship with the City's project managers and/or private entities project managers. They communicated issues well in advance with all parties efficiently, got project completed on ahead of schedule, within budget, and how they said it look/turnout in the proposal.	1

Firm Name:	Terracon		
Evaluation Criteria	**Weight**	**Grade**	**Total**
Business Location	20.00	5.00	100.00
Work Experience	25.00	4.67	116.67
Understanding of Project	15.00	4.50	67.50
Past Performance	20.00	5.00	100.00
Final Score			**384.2**
	80.00		**Max Score = 400**

Firm Name:	NOVA		
Evaluation Criteria	**Weight**	**Grade**	**Total**
Business Location	20.00	3.00	60.00
Work Experience	25.00	4.17	104.17
Understanding of Project	15.00	4.17	62.50
Past Performance	20.00	5.00	100.00
Final Score			**326.7**
	80.00		**Max Score = 400**

Firm Name:	Michael Baker International		
Evaluation Criteria	**Weight**	**Grade**	**Total**
Business Location	20.00	3.00	60.00
Work Experience	25.00	4.00	100.00
Understanding of Project	15.00	3.67	55.00
Past Performance	20.00	3.00	60.00
			275.0
	80.00		**Max Score = 400**

Firm Name:	ECS Southeast		
Evaluation Criteria	**Weight**	**Grade**	**Total**
Business Location	20.00	3.00	60.00
Work Experience	25.00	3.83	95.83
Understanding of Project	15.00	3.33	50.00
Past Performance	20.00	3.00	60.00
Final Score			**265.8**
	80.00		**Max Score = 400**

Firm Name:	Atlantic Coast Eng.		
Evaluation Criteria	**Weight**	**Grade**	**Total**
Business Location	20.00	0.00	0.00
Work Experience	25.00	3.58	89.58
Understanding of Project	15.00	2.92	43.75
Past Performance	20.00	5.00	100.00
Final Score			**233.3**
	80.00		**Max Score = 400**

Firm Name:	Kleinfelder		
Evaluation Criteria	**Weight**	**Grade**	**Total**
Business Location	20.00	3.00	60.00
Work Experience	25.00	4.00	100.00
Understanding of Project	15.00	3.58	53.75
Past Performance	20.00	0.00	0.00
Final Score			**213.8**
	80.00		**Max Score = 400**