

Project - Stormwater Engineering and Design Services

MWBE Commitment	
Percent goal met or good faith effort made?	Points
Certified MWBE Compliance-Primary Vendor (1) Submitted their M/WBE certificate in their proposal; OR (2) Will award required portion of the project to a named M/WBE certified subcontractor; OR (3) Has certified they made a good faith effort to comply but were unable to locate a qualified M/WBE subcontractor.	5
Not Qualified Vendors proposal indicated that they did not qualify for the M/WBE certification nor do they comply with the M/WBE subcontract participation requirement.	0

Business Location	
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: HDR Engineering, Inc			
Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Grade	Total
MWBE Commitment	20.00	5.00	100.00
Business Location	20.00	5.00	100.00
Work Experience	25.00	5.00	125.00
Understanding of Project	15.00	4.50	67.50
Past Performance	20.00	4.50	90.00
Final Score			482.5
	100.00		Max Score = 500

Firm Name: Kisinger Campo & Associates			
Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Grade	Total
MWBE Commitment	20.00	5.00	100.00
Business Location	20.00	5.00	100.00
Work Experience	25.00	5.00	125.00
Understanding of Project	15.00	3.75	56.25
Past Performance	20.00	3.50	70.00
Final Score			451.3
	100.00		Max Score = 500

Firm Name: LJB, Inc.			
Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Grade	Total
MWBE Commitment	20.00	5.00	100.00
Business Location	20.00	3.00	60.00
Work Experience	25.00	5.00	125.00
Understanding of Project	15.00	4.75	71.25
Past Performance	20.00	4.75	95.00
Final Score			451.3
	100.00		Max Score = 500

Firm Name: Wooten Company			
Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Grade	Total
MWBE Commitment	20.00	5.00	100.00
Business Location	20.00	5.00	100.00
Work Experience	25.00	4.00	100.00
Understanding of Project	15.00	3.25	48.75
Past Performance	20.00	2.75	55.00
Final Score			403.8
	100.00		Max Score = 500

Firm Name: Timmons Group			
Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Grade	Total
MWBE Commitment	20.00	5.00	100.00
Business Location	20.00	3.00	60.00
Work Experience	25.00	4.00	100.00
Understanding of Project	15.00	4.25	63.75
Past Performance	20.00	3.75	75.00
Final Score			398.8
	100.00		Max Score = 500

Firm Name: TGS Engineers			
Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Grade	Total
MWBE Commitment	20.00	5.00	100.00
Business Location	20.00	3.00	60.00
Work Experience	25.00	4.00	100.00
Understanding of Project	15.00	3.25	48.75
Past Performance	20.00	3.00	60.00
Final Score			368.8
	100.00		Max Score = 500

Firm Name: RKK			
Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Grade	Total
MWBE Commitment	20.00	5.00	100.00
Business Location	20.00	0.00	0.00
Work Experience	25.00	4.75	118.75
Understanding of Project	15.00	4.25	63.75
Past Performance	20.00	4.25	85.00
Final Score			367.5
	100.00		Max Score = 500

MWBE Commitment	
Percent goal met or good faith effort made?	Points
Certified MWBE Compliance-Primary Vendor (1) Submitted their M/WBE certificate in their proposal; OR (2) Will award required portion of the project to a named M/WBE certified subcontractor; OR (3) Has certified they made a good faith effort to comply but were unable to locate a qualified M/WBE subcontractor.	5
Not Qualified Vendors proposal indicated that they did not qualify for the M/WBE certification nor do they comply with the M/WBE subcontract participation requirement.	0

Business Location	
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: Alpha & Omega Group			
Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Grade	Total
MWBE Commitment	20.00	5.00	100.00
Business Location	20.00	3.00	60.00
Work Experience	25.00	3.00	75.00
Understanding of Project	15.00	4.00	60.00
Past Performance	20.00	3.50	70.00
Final Score			365.0
	100.00		Max Score = 500

Firm Name: NV5			
Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Grade	Total
MWBE Commitment	20.00	5.00	100.00
Business Location	20.00	0.00	0.00
Work Experience	25.00	4.00	100.00
Understanding of Project	15.00	4.00	60.00
Past Performance	20.00	4.00	80.00
Final Score			340.0
	100.00		Max Score = 500

Firm Name: AECOM Technical Services of NC, Inc.			
Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Grade	Total
MWBE Commitment	20.00	5.00	100.00
Business Location	20.00	0.00	0.00
Work Experience	25.00	5.00	125.00
Understanding of Project	15.00	3.25	48.75
Past Performance	20.00	3.00	60.00
Final Score			333.8
	100.00		Max Score = 500

Firm Name: Freese & Nichols, Inc.			
Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Grade	Total
MWBE Commitment	20.00	5.00	100.00
Business Location	20.00	0.00	0.00
Work Experience	25.00	4.00	100.00
Understanding of Project	15.00	4.00	60.00
Past Performance	20.00	3.00	60.00
Final Score			320.0
	100.00		Max Score = 500

Firm Name: Columbia Engineering			
Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Grade	Total
MWBE Commitment	20.00	5.00	100.00
Business Location	20.00	0.00	0.00
Work Experience	25.00	4.00	100.00
Understanding of Project	15.00	3.75	56.25
Past Performance	20.00	3.00	60.00
Final Score			316.3
	100.00		Max Score = 500

Firm Name: Vaughn Melton			
Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Grade	Total
MWBE Commitment	20.00	5.00	100.00
Business Location	20.00	0.00	0.00
Work Experience	25.00	4.00	100.00
Understanding of Project	15.00	3.25	48.75
Past Performance	20.00	3.00	60.00
Final Score			308.8
	100.00		Max Score = 500

Firm Name: LaBella Associates			
Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Grade	Total
MWBE Commitment	20.00	5.00	100.00
Business Location	20.00	0.00	0.00
Work Experience	25.00	4.00	100.00
Understanding of Project	15.00	3.25	48.75
Past Performance	20.00	2.75	55.00
Final Score			303.8
	100.00		Max Score = 500