

RFQ 22-RG0013/PH - CONSENSUS SCORE SHEET

Cardno, Inc.

	<u>EVALUATION CRITERIA</u>	<u>TOTAL POINTS</u>	<u>TOTAL AVERAGE</u>
1	Project Understanding and Approach	15	5.0
2	Project Team and Firm's Qualifications	116	38.67
3	Firm's Current and Projected Workload, Past Experience, Client References and Ability to Respond Timely	60	20.00
4	Quality/Cost Controls	22	7.33
		213	71.00

CHA Consulting, Inc.

	<u>EVALUATION CRITERIA</u>	<u>TOTAL POINTS</u>	<u>TOTAL AVERAGE</u>
1	Project Understanding and Approach	24	8.00
2	Project Team and Firm's Qualifications	103	34.33
3	Firm's Current and Projected Workload, Past Experience, Client References and Ability to Respond Timely	58	19.33
4	Quality/Cost Controls	51	17.00
		236	78.67

CivilSurv Design Group, Inc.

	<u>EVALUATION CRITERIA</u>	<u>TOTAL POINTS</u>	<u>TOTAL AVERAGE</u>
1	Project Understanding and Approach	11	3.67
2	Project Team and Firm's Qualifications	111	37.00
3	Firm's Current and Projected Workload, Past Experience, Client References and Ability to Respond Timely	49	16.33
4	Quality/Cost Controls	48	16.00
		219	73.00

Half Associates, Inc.

	<u>EVALUATION CRITERIA</u>	<u>TOTAL POINTS</u>	<u>TOTAL AVERAGE</u>
1	Project Understanding and Approach	20	6.67
2	Project Team and Firm's Qualifications	90	30.00
3	Firm's Current and Projected Workload, Past Experience, Client References and Ability to Respond Timely	52	17.33
4	Quality/Cost Controls	52	17.33
		214	71.33

Hazen and Sawyer

	<u>EVALUATION CRITERIA</u>	<u>TOTAL POINTS</u>	<u>TOTAL AVERAGE</u>
1	Project Understanding and Approach	18	6.00
2	Project Team and Firm's Qualifications	114	38.00
3	Firm's Current and Projected Workload, Past Experience, Client References and Ability to Respond Timely	57	19.00
4	Quality/Cost Controls	50	16.67
		239	79.67

HDR Engineering, Inc.

	<u>EVALUATION CRITERIA</u>	<u>TOTAL POINTS</u>	<u>TOTAL AVERAGE</u>
1	Project Understanding and Approach	18	6.00
2	Project Team and Firm's Qualifications	98	32.67
3	Firm's Current and Projected Workload, Past Experience, Client References and Ability to Respond Timely	62	20.67
4	Quality/Cost Controls	27	9.00
		205	68.33

McKim & Creed, Inc.

	<u>EVALUATION CRITERIA</u>	<u>TOTAL POINTS</u>	<u>TOTAL AVERAGE</u>
1	Project Understanding and Approach	23	7.67
2	Project Team and Firm's Qualifications	119	39.67
3	Firm's Current and Projected Workload, Past Experience, Client References and Ability to Respond Timely	64	21.33
4	Quality/Cost Controls	51	17.00
		257	85.67

Mead & Hunt, Inc.

	<u>EVALUATION CRITERIA</u>	<u>TOTAL POINTS</u>	<u>TOTAL AVERAGE</u>
1	Project Understanding and Approach	30	10.00
2	Project Team and Firm's Qualifications	128	42.67
3	Firm's Current and Projected Workload, Past Experience, Client References and Ability to Respond Timely	70	23.33
4	Quality/Cost Controls	50	16.67
		278	92.67

Rick Kirby Richard Kirby

Scott Herring J. Scott Herring

Grace Sheppard Grace Sheppard