

## BPS UPGRADES STUDY EVALUATION

### CONSULTANT EVALUATION – JUNE 2016

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

NAME OF APPLICANT/FIRM: \_\_\_\_\_

NAME OF RATER: \_\_\_\_\_

#### EVALUATION OF WRITTEN SOQ / PROPOSAL

Review the firm's Statement of Qualifications / Proposal, and evaluate the following elements, based upon the scoring system described below.

Use the following scoring while evaluating each aspect of the SOQ / proposal:  
 Inadequate = 1, Acceptable = 2, Good = 3, Excellent = 4, Outstanding = 5 (multiply by weighting factor)

**Qualifications and Expertise of Proposed Team Members as Related to the Requirements of THIS Project (Interceptor restoration/rehabilitation/replacement within a stream corridor):**

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| 1 | Project management experience and technical expertise of proposed Project Manager / Team Leader. Weighting factor = 2. (e.g. Good = 3 x 2 = 6)   |  |
| 2 | Design and construction experience of proposed electrical engineer. Weighting factor = 2. (e.g. Good = 3 x 2 = 6)  |  |
| 3 | Design and construction experience of proposed civil engineer. Weighting factor = 1. (e.g. Good = 3 x 1 = 3)   |  |
| 4 | Proposed staff's experience with and knowledge of Federal, Washington State, King County and City of Renton laws, rules and codes as they pertain to this project. Weighting factor = 2. (e.g. Good = 3 x 2 = 6) |  |
| 5 | Planning, design and construction experience of other proposed staff. Weighting factor = 1. (e.g. Good = 3 x 1 = 3)  |  |
| 6 | Quality of work on previous Renton projects; knowledge of Renton standards (if you know of no previous work for Renton, score a 2 on this item). Weighting factor = 1. (e.g. Good = 3 x 1 = 3)                   |  |
|   | SUBTOTAL:  |  |

**Firm's/Team's Resource Availability:** Weighting factor = 1, all items. (e.g. Good = 3 x 1 = 3)

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | Technical materials, specialists (including location of specialists). |  |
| 2 | Time availability of key staff.                                       |  |
|   | SUBTOTAL:   |  |

## BPS UPGRADES STUDY EVALUATION

### CONSULTANT EVALUATION – JUNE 2016

**Project Management:** Weighting factor = 1, all items. (e.g. Good = 3 x 1 = 3)

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | Experience indicates that consultant produces on time and within budget. Verified by contacting references. |  |
| 2 | Structure of team compatible with City, easy to work with.  |  |
| 3 | Overall apparent project management ability.  |  |
|   | <b>SUBTOTAL:</b>  |  |

**Project Approach:** Weighting factor = 1, all items. (e.g. Good = 3 x 1 = 3)

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| 1 | Approach to project is compatible with City practices (preparation of scope of work, breakdown of project into tasks and milestones, adequate field and background research, etc.) |  |
| 2 | Approach to communication with client.   |  |
| 3 | Adequacy of quality control practices (do senior engineers perform quality checks, is there an adequate quality control program described?)  |  |
| 4 | Overall approach to project.   |  |
|   | <b>SUBTOTAL:</b>   |  |

**Special Considerations:** Weighting factor = 1, all items. (e.g. Good = 3 x 1 = 3)

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | Special qualifications outside of previous categories (if there are none, enter a 2).                           |  |
| 2 | Affirmative action, enter a 2 if the firm is a registered MBE, WBE, or DBE firm, and a 0 if not, or if unknown. |  |
|   | <b>TOTAL SCORE, WRITTEN PORTION:</b>  |  |

# BPS UPGRADES STUDY EVALUATION

## CONSULTANT EVALUATION – JUNE 2016

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

NAME OF APPLICANT/FIRM: \_\_\_\_\_

NAME OF RATER: \_\_\_\_\_

### **ORAL PRESENTATION EVALUATION – IF USED**

Evaluate the following elements, based upon the scoring system described below.

Use the following scoring while evaluating each aspect of the oral presentation:

Inadequate = 1, Acceptable = 2, Good = 3, Excellent = 4, Outstanding = 5

#### **Key Personnel Skills and Abilities**

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| 1 | Judgment and insight.                          |  |
| 2 | Technical skills and knowledge.                |  |
| 3 | Leadership.                                    |  |
| 4 | Communication skills (listening and speaking). |  |
| 5 | Overall skills and abilities of key personnel  |  |
|   | SUBTOTAL                                       |  |

#### **Qualifications and Expertise of the Firm / Team:**

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| 1 | Applicable work experience demonstrated and discussed.   |  |
| 2 | Demonstrated technical experience of staff proposed, (familiarity & experience with methodologies, technologies).  |  |
| 3 | Knowledge of regulatory environment (SEPA, ESA, WDFW, Army Corp, pertinent RCW & WAC, King County SWM and others). |  |
| 4 | Interest in work, willingness to accommodate the City.   |  |
| 5 | Project experience matches City's needs.   |  |
| 6 | Overall qualifications and expertise of the firm / team  |  |
|   | SUBTOTAL:  |  |

**BPS UPGRADES STUDY EVALUATION**

**CONSULTANT EVALUATION – JUNE 2016**

**Firm's/Team's Resource Availability:**

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | Confirmed time availability of key staff proposed.      |  |
| 2 | Key proposed staff appears to be easy to work with.     |  |
| 3 | Other, and overall resource availability of firm / team |  |
|   | SUBTOTAL:   |  |

**Project Management:**

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| 1 | Appropriate experience and expertise of project manager.                       |  |
| 2 | Team has worked together before.   |  |
| 3 | Structure of team seems easy to work with, capable of working with City staff. |  |
| 4 | Overall apparent project management capabilities.                              |  |
|   | SUBTOTAL:  |  |

**Project Approach:**

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | Approach to project compatible with City practice (preparation of scope of work, breakdown of tasks into goals and milestones, adequate field and background research, etc.). |  |
| 2 | Emphasis on communication with client.  |  |
| 3 | Adequacy of quality control/quality assurance (QC/QA) program (regularly performed by a senior engineer with the firm?)   |  |
| 4 | Overall project approach  |  |
|   | SUBTOTAL:   |  |

|  |                                       |  |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|
|  |                                       |  |
|  | <b>TOTAL SCORE ORAL PRESENTATION:</b> |  |