

**Project - RFQ-Professional Services-Old Salisbury Road Repair**

MWBE Commitment	Points
<b>Certified MWBE Compliance-Primary Vendor</b> (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
<b>Not Qualified.</b> 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	Points
Within Forsyth County	5
Within North Carolina	3
Outside of North Carolina	0

Work Experience	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	Points
Superior <sup>1</sup>	5
Above Average <sup>2</sup>	4
Average <sup>3</sup>	3
Below Average <sup>4</sup>	2
Poor <sup>5</sup>	1

Past Performance	Points
Superior <sup>1</sup>	5
Above Average <sup>2</sup>	4
Average <sup>3</sup>	3
Below Average <sup>4</sup>	2
Poor <sup>5</sup>	1

Firm Name: KCI Associates of NC			
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	4.25	63.75
Past Performance	20.00	3.75	75.00
<b>Final Score</b>			<b>423.8</b>
			100.00 <b>Max Score = 500</b>

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	3.75	56.25
Past Performance	20.00	3.75	75.00
<b>Final Score</b>			<b>416.3</b>
			100.00 <b>Max Score = 500</b>

Firm Name: Parrish and Partners of North Carolina, PLLC			
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	4.50	67.50
Past Performance	20.00	3.50	70.00
<b>Final Score</b>			<b>397.5</b>
			100.00 <b>Max Score = 500</b>

Firm Name: Kisinger, Campo and 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	5.00	125.00
Understanding of Project	15.00	4.75	71.25
Past Performance	20.00	4.75	95.00
<b>Final Score</b>			<b>391.3</b>
			100.00 <b>Max Score = 500</b>

Understanding of Project
<sup>1</sup> Superior: Proposer fully addresses all aspects of the criterion, convincingly demonstrates that it will meet the project's performance requirements, and demonstrates no weaknesses
<sup>2</sup> 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
<sup>3</sup> 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.
<sup>4</sup> 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
<sup>5</sup> 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

Past Performance
<sup>1</sup> 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 or ahead of schedule, within budget, and how they said it looked/turned out in the proposal.
<sup>2</sup> Above Average: proposer maintained a high working relationship with the City's project managers and/or private entities project managers. They communicated issues with all parties as problems arose. The project got completed on or ahead of schedule, remained within the budget, and looked/turned out how it was intended in the proposal.
<sup>3</sup> Average: proposer maintained normal working relationship the City's project managers and/or private entities project managers. They communicated issues with all parties monthly. The project got completed on time, remained within the budget, and looked/turned out how it was intended in the proposal.
<sup>4</sup> Below Average: proposer maintained subpar working relationship the City's project managers and/or private entities project managers. They only communicated issues when asked. The project got completed weeks after schedule, went over budget, and didn't turn out how it was intended in the proposal.
<sup>5</sup> Poor: proposer maintained inferior working relationship the City's project managers and/or private entities project managers. They never communicated issues or had no response as to why project had problems. The project got completed weeks and/or months after schedule, went over budget, and didn't turn out how it was intended in the proposal.

## Project - RFQ-Professional Services-Old Salisbury Road Repair

MWBE Commitment	Points
<b>Certified MWBE Compliance-Primary Vendor</b> (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
<b>Not Qualified</b> 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	Points
Within Forsyth County	5
Within North Carolina	3
Outside of North Carolina	0

Work Experience	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	Points
Superior <sup>1</sup>	5
Above Average <sup>2</sup>	4
Average <sup>3</sup>	3
Below Average <sup>4</sup>	2
Poor <sup>5</sup>	1

Past Performance	Points
Superior <sup>1</sup>	5
Above Average <sup>2</sup>	4
Average <sup>3</sup>	3
Below Average <sup>4</sup>	2
Poor <sup>5</sup>	1

Firm Name: Wetherill Engineering 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	3.00	75.00
Understanding of Project	15.00	3.50	52.50
Past Performance	20.00	3.25	65.00
<b>Final Score</b>			<b>352.5</b>
			100.00 <b>Max Score = 500</b>

Firm Name: Rummel, Klepper, and Kahl, LLP			
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	4.25	63.75
Past Performance	20.00	4.00	80.00
<b>Final Score</b>			<b>343.8</b>
			100.00 <b>Max Score = 500</b>

Firm Name: TGS Engineers			
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	3.00	75.00
Understanding of Project	15.00	2.25	33.75
Past Performance	20.00	3.25	65.00
<b>Final Score</b>			<b>273.8</b>
			100.00 <b>Max Score = 500</b>

Firm Name: Nova			
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	2.00	50.00
Understanding of Project	15.00	2.50	37.50
Past Performance	20.00	2.75	55.00
<b>Final Score</b>			<b>242.5</b>
			100.00 <b>Max Score = 500</b>

Understanding of Project
<sup>1</sup> Superior: Proposer fully addresses all aspects of the criterion, convincingly demonstrates that it will meet the project's performance requirements, and demonstrates no weaknesses
<sup>2</sup> 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
<sup>3</sup> 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.
<sup>4</sup> 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
<sup>5</sup> 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

Past Performance
<sup>1</sup> 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 or ahead of schedule, within budget, and how they said it looked/turned out in the proposal.
<sup>2</sup> Above Average: proposer maintained a high working relationship with the City's project managers and/or private entities project managers. They communicated issues with all parties as problems arose. The project got completed on or ahead of schedule, remained within the budget, and looked/turned out how it was intended in the proposal.
<sup>3</sup> Average: proposer maintained normal working relationship the City's project managers and/or private entities project managers. They communicated issues with all parties monthly. The project got completed on time, remained within the budget, and looked/turned out how it was intended in the proposal.
<sup>4</sup> Below Average: proposer maintained subpar working relationship the City's project managers and/or private entities project managers. They only communicated issues when asked. The project got completed weeks after schedule, went over budget, and didn't turn out how it was intended in the proposal.
<sup>5</sup> Poor: proposer maintained inferior working relationship the City's project managers and/or private entities project managers. They never communicated issues or had no response as to why project had problems. The project got completed weeks and/or months after schedule, went over budget, and didn't turn out how it was intended in the proposal.