EXHIBIT A

Project - RFQ-Professional Services-Old Salisbury Road Repair

MWBE Commitment	Points	Firm Name:	ŀ	KCI Asso	ciates of NC	
Certified MWBE Compliance-Primary Vendor (1)	- 0.1115		Veight	Grade	Total	
ubmitted their M/WBE certificate in their proposal; OR			20.00	5.00	100.00	
2) Will award required portion of the project to a named		Business Location 2	20.00	3.00	60.00	
//WBE certified subcontractor; OR (3) Has certified	5	Work Experience 2	25.00	5.00	125.00	
ney made a good faith effort to comply but were unable		Understanding of Project 1	15.00	4.25	63.75	
o locate a qualified M/WBE subcontractor.		Past Performance 2	20.00	3.75	75.00	
Not Qualified Vendors proposal indicated that they did		Final Score			423.8	
not qualify for the M/WBE certification nor do they		10	00.00		Max Score = 500	
comply with the M/WBE subcontract participation	0	Firm Name:		LJB	Inc.	
equirement.		Evaluation Criteria W	Veight	Grade	Total	
		MWBE Commitment 2	20.00	5.00	100.00	
Business Location	Points	Business Location 2	20.00	3.00	60.00	
Within Forsyth County	5	Work Experience 2	25.00	5.00	125.00	
Within North Carolina	3	1	15.00	3.75	56.25	
Outside of North Carolina	0	<u> </u>	20.00	3.75	75.00	
		Final Score	20.00	5.75	416.3	
Work Experience	Points		00.00		410.3 Max Score = 500	
>5 Relevant Projects	5					
4-5 Relevant Projects	4				f North Carolina, PLL	
3-4 Relevant Projects	3		Veight	Grade	Total	
1-2 Relevant Projects	2		20.00	5.00	100.00	
0 Relevant Projects	0		20.00	3.00	60.00	
-			25.00	4.00	100.00	
Understanding of Project	Points	Understanding of Project 1	15.00	4.50	67.50	
Superior ¹	5	Past Performance 2	20.00	3.50	70.00	
Above Average ²	4	Final Score			397.5	
Average ³	3		00.00		Max Score = 500	
Below Average ⁴	2	Firm Name:		con Comm	o and Associates	
Poor ⁵						
Poor	1		Veight	Grade	Total	
Dest Desferrer	Delate		20.00	5.00	100.00	
Past Performance	Points		20.00	0.00	0.00	
Superior ¹	5		25.00	5.00	125.00	
Above Average 2	4		15.00	4.75	71.25	
Average 3	3	Past Performance 2	20.00	4.75	95.00	
Below Average 4	2	Final Score			391.3	
Poor 5	1	100.00 Max Score = 50				
		nding of Project				
Superior: Proposer fully addresses all aspects of the crite weaknesses Above Average: Proposer fully addresses all aspects of the ew minor weaknesses						
Average: Proposer addresses all aspects of the criterion a and/or a number of minor weaknesses.	nd demonst	ty to meet the project's performance requirement	nts. May	contain sign	nificant weaknesses	
Below Average: Proposer does not address all aspects of Significant weaknesses are demonstrated and clearly outwo			essfully n	neeting the j	project's requirements.	
5 Poor: Proposer does not address all aspects of the criteri	on and the in	esented indicates a strong likelihood of failure t	to meet t	the project's	requirements	
		Performance				
Superior: proposer maintained an exceptional working re n advance with all parties efficiently, got project complete						
Above Average: proposer maintained a high working related a high working related of a sproblems arose. The project got completed of						
Average: proposer maintained normal working relationsh nonthly. The project got completed on time, remained with			-	nmunicated	issues with all parties	
Below Average: proposer maintained subpar working rel asked. The project got completed weeks after schedule, we	ent over bud	t turn out how it was intended in the proposal.	Ũ	5 5		
5 Poor: proposer maintained inferior working relationship response as to why project had problems. The project got proposal.	2 1	1 1 9 6	-			

Project - RFQ-Professional Services-Old Salisbury Road Repair

MWBE Commitment	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	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
0	

Understanding of Project	Points
Superior ¹	5
Above Average ²	4
Average ³	3
Below Average ⁴	2
Poor ⁵	1

1-2 Relevant Projects 0 Relevant Projects

Past Performance	Points
Superior ¹	5
Above Average 2	4
Average 3	3
Below Average 4	2
Poor 5	1

Firm Name	: We	etherill En	ngineering 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	
Final Score			352.5	
	100.00		Max Score = 50	
Firm Name: Rummel, Klepper, and Kahl, L				
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	
Final Score			343.8	
	100.00		Max Score = 500	
Firm Name:		TGS E	ngineers	
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	
Final Score			273.8	
	100.00		Max Score = 500	
Firm Name:		Nova		
Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Grade	Total	
MWBE Commitment	20.00	5.00	100.00	
Business Location	20.00	0.00	0.00	

Evaluation Criteria	weight	Graue	Totai
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
Final Score			242.5
	100.00		Max Score = 500

Understanding of Project

Superior: Proposer fully addresses all aspects of the criterion, convincingly demonstrates that it will meet the project's performance requirements, and demonstrates no weaknesses

² 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

³ 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.

⁴ 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

5 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

¹ 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.

² 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.

³ 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.

⁴ 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.

5 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.