

Final Scoring - Security and Company Police Services

Cost	Points
Lowest cost compared to other proposals	5
Less than 10% above lowest proposal	4
10% - 25% above lowest proposal	3
26% - 35% above lowest proposal	2
Greater than 35% above lowest proposal	0

References / Experience	Points
Three or More Verified References, 1,200 manhours week, CPO, Armed & Unarmed	5
Two Verified Relating references, at least 1,000 manhours a week, CPO & Armed	3
One Verified Relating reference, at least 800 manhours a week, and CPO's	1
No Verified References, less than 800 manhours a week, no CPO's	0

Technical Approach & Scope Understanding	Points
Detailed site specific plans (RFP difference WSTA and others), emergency response, incident escalation	5
General approach some detail plans for response & incidents	3
Generic or incomplete approach	0

Risk Management & Training	Points
Detailed: Prehire and random drug screening, training de-escalation, ADA awareness, hiring standards & General details; staff drug screening, background checks, training.	5
General details; staff drug screening, background checks, training.	3
Generic or incomplete approach	0

Interview Evaluation	Points
Superior: Interview with proposer demonstrates in-depth understanding of project objectives, scope and addresses technical complexities. Methodology is detailed and logical and gives a clear outline of specific tools, techniques and resources that will be utilized.	5
Above Average: Interview with proposer demonstrates a solid understanding of the project objectives and scope. The methodology is logical, and outlines appropriate tools and resources that will be used. Meets requirements with minor weaknesses that are manageable.	4
Average: Interview with proposer demonstrates understanding of project scope and meets the minimum requirements. The methodology is generic or lacks details on specific tools, techniques and resources. Minor weaknesses are noted that are manageable.	3
Below Average: Interview with proposer does not address all aspects of the project scope. Significant weaknesses are observed which do not indicate a successful project outcome.	1
Poor: Interview with proposal demonstrates a failure to understand project scope and objectives and significant weaknesses are observed which indicate a likelihood of unsuccessful project outcome.	0

Firm Name: Allied			
Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Grade	Total
Cost	40	5.00	200.00
References / Experience	15	5.00	75.00
Understanding	30	3.50	105.00
Risk Management & Training	15	3.00	45.00
Interview Evaluation	N/A	17.00	17.00
Final Score			442.0

Max Score = 520

Firm Name: North State			
Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Grade	Total
Cost	40	3.00	120.00
References / Experience	15	5.00	75.00
Understanding	30	4.50	135.00
Risk Management & Training	15	5.00	75.00
Interview Evaluation	N/A	12.00	12.00
Final Score			417.0

Max Score = 520

Firm Name: Universal			
Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Grade	Total
Cost	40	4.00	160.00
References / Experience	15	2.50	37.50
Understanding	30	3.00	90.00
Risk Management & Training	15	4.00	60.00
Final Score			347.5

Max Score = 500

Firm Name: Hinton			
Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Grade	Total
Cost	40	4.00	160.00
References / Experience	15	1.25	18.75
Understanding	30	3.00	90.00
Risk Management & Training	15	4.50	67.50
Final Score			336.3

Max Score = 500

COST SUMMARY

CITY HALL/BAS/PARKING DECK	
TOTAL YEAR ONE COST:	\$586,721.00
TOTAL YEAR TWO COST:	\$609,673.80
TOTAL YEAR THREE COST:	\$620,348.10
TOTAL CONTRACT COST:	\$1,816,742.90

CLARK CAMPBELL TRANSPORTATION CENTER	
TOTAL YEAR ONE COST:	\$459,916.60
TOTAL YEAR TWO COST:	\$473,097.30
TOTAL YEAR THREE COST:	\$486,718.70
TOTAL CONTRACT COST:	\$1,419,732.60

TOTAL THREE-YEAR CONTRACT AMOUNT	
	\$3,236,475.50