RFP-000920 Committee Meeting April 8, 2013 Minutes

Evaluation Committee for Electronic FON Documentation; Contract No. 000920, held a duly noticed meeting on Monday, April 8, 2013, commencing at 9:31 A.M. in the Pelican Conference Room at the OOCEA Administrative Bldg, Orlando, Florida.

Committee Members Present:
Corey Quinn, Director of Expressway Operations
Joe Berenis, Deputy Executive Director of Engineering and Operations
Glenn Pressimone, Director of Engineering
I ranetta Dennis, Director of Business Development
Rick Morrow, FDOT District 5 Representative

Other Attendees:
Robert Johnson, Manager of Procurement

Interviews:
Robert collected the Disclosure Forms from each of the committee members. Robert commenced each of interviews with an outline of the interview process. Robert stated the interview portion of the meeting is closed to the public and is being recorded in accordance with Florida Statute.

Advanced Cabling Solutions, Inc. 09:35 A.M. to 10:06 A.M.
Precision Contracting Services, Inc. 10:14 A.M. to 10:45 A.M.

Upon completion of the last interview the recorder was stopped and the meeting was considered no longer closed to the public.

Evaluation Portion:

Technical
The committee members individually scored the technical proposals and interviews and submitted them to Robert for tallying. Robert Johnson tallied the score sheets utilizing the raw scores assigned by each committee member and averaged the raw scores for each Proposal received. Below are the results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposer</th>
<th>Total Raw Points</th>
<th>Average Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Cabling Solutions, Inc.</td>
<td>265.00</td>
<td>53.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precision Contracting Services, Inc.</td>
<td>274.00</td>
<td>54.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pricing
Upon completion of the evaluation of the technical portion, Robert opened the pricing proposals and scored the pricing proposals in accordance with the RFP requirements utilizing the attached scenario for each Proposer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposer</th>
<th>Total Price</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Cabling Solutions, Inc.</td>
<td>$703,945.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precision Contracting Services, Inc.</td>
<td>$1,383,900.00</td>
<td>20.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Points and Rankings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposer</th>
<th>Tech. Points</th>
<th>Pricing Points</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Cabling Solutions, Inc.</td>
<td>53.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>93.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precision Contracting Services, Inc.</td>
<td>54.80</td>
<td>20.35</td>
<td>75.15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Committee recommends the Board approve ranking and recommend award of the Agreement to the top ranked Proposer, Advanced Cabling Solutions, Inc..
There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 11:30 A.M. These minutes are considered to be the official minutes of the interview, acceptance of the technical proposal and opening of the Price Proposals by the Evaluation Committee at its meeting held Monday, April 8, 2013.

Submitted by:  
Robert Johnson, Manager of Procurement

On behalf of the Evaluation Committee these minutes have been review and approved by:

Corey Quinn, Director of Expressway Operations
Disclosure Form for Evaluation Committee Members

For this purpose, the term “relative” includes the following: father, mother, son, daughter, brother, sister, uncle, aunt, first cousin, nephew, niece, husband, wife, father-in-law, mother-in-law, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, brother-in-law, sister-in-law, stepfather, stepmother, stepson, stepdaughter, stepbrother, stepsister, half brother, or half sister or any person having the same legal residence as the employee.

The term “principal” means anyone who shares in the profits of the entity or whose compensation might vary based on the award or performance of the project.

The term “employed by” includes any receipt of compensation for services.

“May submit a proposal,” includes planning to submit, or considering submission. If you don’t know, ask.

Persons serving on a selection committee in a solicitation process should be able to answer all the following questions in the negative. If the answer is affirmative, please explain below:

1. Are you, your spouse, child or anyone living in your household currently
   employed by any entity that may submit a proposal?
   Yes ☐ No ☐

2. Are you, or any relative, an officer, director, principal, or project team participant of, any entity that may submit a proposal?
   Yes ☐ No ☐

3. Do you, or does any relative, own more than 5% of any entity that may submit a proposal?
   Yes ☐ No ☐

4. Within the preceding 12 months have you, your spouse, child or anyone living in your household been offered employment or future employment or, had any discussion involving future employment with any entity that may submit a proposal?
   Yes ☐ No ☐

5. Within the preceding 12 months, have you, your spouse, child or anyone living in your household accepted a gift valued at over $100 from any entity, or a principal of any entity that may submit a proposal?
   Yes ☐ No ☐

6. Could the award of this contract result in any pecuniary gain to you, any relative, any business associate, or any entity that has employed or retained you within the past 12 months?
   Yes ☐ No ☑

7. Do you know of any reason that would impact your impartiality with respect to this solicitation?
   Yes ☐ No ☐

If you answer yes to any of these questions, please explain below
Additional comments

If the answer to any of the foregoing questions is “yes,” then your participation on the selection committee must be approved by the Executive Director after a review of all relevant facts.

I, [Name], hereby certify that I have read and understand the Orlando-Orange County Expressway Authority Ethics Policy and I agree to be bound by the applicable laws and policies.

[Signature]
Disclosure Form for Evaluation Committee Members

For this purpose, the term “relative” includes the following: father, mother, son, daughter, brother, sister, uncle, aunt, first cousin, nephew, niece, husband, wife, father-in-law, mother-in-law, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, brother-in-law, sister-in-law, stepfather, stepmother, stepson, stepdaughter, stepbrother, stepsister, half brother, or half sister or any person having the same legal residence as the employee.

The term “principal” means anyone who shares in the profits of the entity or whose compensation might vary based on the award or performance of the project.

The term “employed by” includes any receipt of compensation for services.

“May submit a proposal,” means planning to submit, or considering submission. If you don’t know, ask.

Persons serving on a selection committee in a solicitation process should be able to answer all the following questions in the negative. If the answer is affirmative, please explain below:

1. Are you, your spouse, child or anyone living in your household currently
   Employed by any entity that may submit a proposal? □ Yes □ No

2. Are you, or any relative, an officer, director, principal, or project team participant
   of, any entity that may submit a proposal? □ Yes □ No

3. Do you, or does any relative, own more than 5% of any entity that may submit a
   proposal? □ Yes □ No

4. Within the preceding 12 months have you, your spouse, child or anyone living in your
   household been offered employment or future employment or, had any discussion
   involving future employment with any entity that may submit a proposal? □ Yes □ No

5. Within the preceding 12 months, have you, your spouse, child or anyone living in your
   household accepted a gift valued at over $100 from any entity, or a principal of any
   entity that may submit a proposal? □ Yes □ No

6. Could the award of this contract result in any pecuniary gain to you, any relative, any
   business associate, or any entity that has employed or retained you within the past
   12 months? □ Yes □ No

7. Do you know of any reason that would impact your impartiality with respect to this
   solicitation? □ Yes □ No

If you answer yes to any of these questions, please explain below
Additional comments__________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

If the answer to any of the foregoing questions is “yes,” then your participation on the selection committee
must be approved by the Executive Director after a review of all relevant facts.

I, [Signature], hereby certify that I have read and understand the Orlando-Orange County
Expressway Authority Ethics Policy and I agree to be bound by the applicable laws and policies.

(Name)

(Signature)
Disclosure Form for Evaluation Committee Members

For this purpose, the term “relative” includes the following: father, mother, son, daughter, brother, sister, uncle, aunt, first cousin, nephew, niece, husband, wife, father-in-law, mother-in-law, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, brother-in-law, sister-in-law, stepfather, stepmother, stepson, stepdaughter, stepbrother, stepsister, half brother, or half sister or any person having the same legal residence as the employee.

The term “principal” means anyone who shares in the profits of the entity or whose compensation might vary based on the award or performance of the project.

The term “employed by” includes any receipt of compensation for services.

“May submit a proposal,” means planning to submit, or considering submission. If you don’t know, ask.

Persons serving on a selection committee in a solicitation process should be able to answer all the following questions in the negative. If the answer is affirmative, please explain below:

1. Are you, your spouse, child or anyone living in your household currently employed by any entity that may submit a proposal? □ Yes □ No

2. Are you, or any relative, an officer, director, principal, or project team participant of, any entity that may submit a proposal? □ Yes □ No

3. Do you, or does any relative, own more than 5% of any entity that may submit a proposal? □ Yes □ No

4. Within the preceding 12 months have you, your spouse, child or anyone living in your household been offered employment or future employment or, had any discussion involving future employment with any entity that may submit a proposal? □ Yes □ No

5. Within the preceding 12 months, have you, your spouse, child or anyone living in your household accepted a gift valued at over $100 from any entity, or a principal of any entity that may submit a proposal? □ Yes □ No

6. Could the award of this contract result in any pecuniary gain to you, any relative, any business associate, or any entity that has employed or retained you within the past 12 months? □ Yes □ No

7. Do you know of any reason that would impact your impartiality with respect to this solicitation? □ Yes □ No

If you answer yes to any of these questions, please explain below

Additional comments: NA

If the answer to any of the foregoing questions is “yes,” then your participation on the selection committee must be approved by the Executive Director after a review of all relevant facts.

I, _______ , hereby certify that I have read and understand the Orlando-Orange County Expressway Authority Ethics Policy and I agree to be bound by the applicable laws and policies.

(Signature)
Disclosure Form for Evaluation Committee Members

For this purpose, the term “relative” includes the following: father, mother, son, daughter, brother, sister, uncle, aunt, first cousin, nephew, niece, husband, wife, father-in-law, mother-in-law, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, brother-in-law, sister-in-law, stepfather, stepmother, stepson, stepdaughter, stepbrother, stepsister, half brother, or half sister or any person having the same legal residence as the employee.

The term “principal” means anyone who shares in the profits of the entity or whose compensation might vary based on the award or performance of the project.

The term “employed by” includes any receipt of compensation for services.

“May submit a proposal,” includes planning to submit, or considering submission. If you don’t know, ask.

Persons serving on a selection committee in a solicitation process should be able to answer all the following questions in the negative. If the answer is affirmative, please explain below:

1. Are you, your spouse, child or anyone living in your household currently
   Employed by any entity that may submit a proposal? ☐ ☑

2. Are you, or any relative, an officer, director, principal, or project team participant
   of, any entity that may submit a proposal? ☐ ☑

3. Do you, or does any relative, own more than 5% of any entity that may submit a proposal? ☐ ☑

4. Within the preceding 12 months have you, your spouse, child or anyone living in your
   household been offered employment or future employment or, had any discussion
   involving future employment with any entity that may submit a proposal? ☐ ☑

5. Within the preceding 12 months, have you, your spouse, child or anyone living in your
   household accepted a gift valued at over $100 from any entity, or a principal of any
   entity that may submit a proposal? ☐ ☑

6. Could the award of this contract result in any pecuniary gain to you, any relative, any
   business associate, or any entity that has employed or retained you within the past
   12 months? ☐ ☑

7. Do you know of any reason that would impact your impartiality with respect to this
   solicitation? ☐ ☑

If you answer yes to any of these questions, please explain below

Additional comments: ____________________________________________

If the answer to any of the foregoing questions is “yes,” then your participation on the selection committee
must be approved by the Executive Director after a review of all relevant facts.

I, [Name], hereby certify that I have read and understand the Orlando-Orange County
Expressway Authority Ethics Policy and I agree to be bound by the applicable laws and policies.

[Signature]
Disclosure Form for Evaluation Committee Members

For this purpose, the term “relative” includes the following: father, mother, son, daughter, brother, sister, uncle, aunt, first cousin, nephew, niece, husband, wife, father-in-law, mother-in-law, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, brother-in-law, sister-in-law, stepfather, stepmother, steps, stepdaughter, stepbrother, stepsister, half brother, or half sister or any person having the same legal residence as the employee.

The term “principal” means anyone who shares in the profits of the entity or whose compensation might vary based on the award or performance of the project.

The term “employed by” includes any receipt of compensation for services.

“May submit a proposal,” means planning to submit, or considering submission. If you don’t know, ask.

Persons serving on a selection committee in a solicitation process should be able to answer all the following questions in the negative. If the answer is affirmative, please explain below:

1. Are you, your spouse, child or anyone living in your household currently
   Employed by any entity that may submit a proposal?

2. Are you, or any relative, an officer, director, principal, or project team participant
   of, any entity that may submit a proposal?

3. Do you, or does any relative, own more than 5% of any entity that may submit a
   proposal?

4. Within the preceding 12 months have you, your spouse, child or anyone living in your
   household been offered employment or future employment or, had any discussion
   involving future employment with any entity that may submit a proposal?

5. Within the preceding 12 months, have you, your spouse, child or anyone living in your
   household accepted a gift valued at over $100 from any entity, or a principal of any
   entity that may submit a proposal?

6. Could the award of this contract result in any pecuniary gain to you, any relative, any
   business associate, or any entity that has employed or retained you within the past
   12 months?

7. Do you know of any reason that would impact your impartiality with respect to this
   solicitation?

If you answer yes to any of these questions, please explain below
Additional comments________________________________________

________________________________________________________

If the answer to any of the foregoing questions is “yes,” then your participation on the selection committee must be approved by the Executive Director after a review of all relevant facts.

I, ___________________________, hereby certify that I have read and understand the Orlando-Orange County
Expressway Authority Ethics Policy and I agree to be bound by the applicable laws and policies.

______________________________
(Signature)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPANY NAME</th>
<th>REPRESENTATIVE</th>
<th>CONTACT #</th>
<th>FAX #</th>
<th>EMAIL ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>Robert Loyer</td>
<td>407-466-2041</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>Joseph Muniz</td>
<td>407-466-2042</td>
<td>407 339 3822</td>
<td>Joe @ acstraffic.net</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>R. Ford</td>
<td>407-883-8818</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPANY NAME</td>
<td>REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td>CONTACT #</td>
<td>FAX #</td>
<td>EMAIL ADDRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS</td>
<td>Juan Oro</td>
<td>561 685 7836</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:joro@pcsfiber.com">joro@pcsfiber.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS</td>
<td>Mark Nixon</td>
<td>561 531 4800</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:mhnikon@pcsfiber.com">mhnikon@pcsfiber.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS</td>
<td>Bruce Boyd</td>
<td>561 742 0001</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:bboyd@pcsfiber.com">bboyd@pcsfiber.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ORLANDO-ORANGE COUNTY EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY

**TECHNICAL AND PRICE PROPOSAL SCORING SUMMARY**

Electronic FON Documentation, Contract No. 000920 Project 589-519

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATOR</th>
<th>Advanced Cabling Solutions, Inc.</th>
<th>Precision Contracting Services, Inc.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TECHNICAL</td>
<td>PRICE</td>
<td>TECHNICAL</td>
<td>PRICE</td>
<td>TECHNICAL</td>
<td>PRICE</td>
<td>TECHNICAL</td>
<td>PRICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Quinn</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Benenti</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Pressimone</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Dennis</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Monroe</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>265</strong></td>
<td><strong>274</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVG. TECH. POINTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>53.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>54.80</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PRICE PROPOSAL SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSER</th>
<th>PROPOSAL AMOUNT</th>
<th>POINT VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Cabling Solutions, Inc.</td>
<td>$703,945.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precision Contracting Services, Inc.</td>
<td>$1,383,000.00</td>
<td>20.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POINT TOTALS AND FINAL RANKING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSER</th>
<th>TECHNICAL POINTS</th>
<th>PRICE POINTS</th>
<th>TOTAL POINTS</th>
<th>FINAL RANKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Cabling Solutions, Inc.</td>
<td>53.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>93.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precision Contracting Services, Inc.</td>
<td>54.80</td>
<td>20.35</td>
<td>75.15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee Members:

[Signatures]

[Signatures]
The Evaluation Committee will consider the following areas in ranking the Proposers through information provided by each Proposer in the Technical Proposal.

The Committee members should strive to provide objective evaluations during all phases and for all parts of the review/evaluation process. Each proposal shall be evaluated on its own merit without comparison to the proposals submitted by other Proposers. Additionally, the evaluations must be done individually by each Committee member. Evaluations should not be done in a meeting type environment where a consensus is determined.

Each Committee member should provide a narrative explanation for his or her score. All individual evaluations shall be signed and dated by the Committee member.

When a Committee member has completed evaluation of each proposal, the scores shall be transmitted to the Chairman of the Committee who will calculate the average score for each proposal.

Each member of the Committee must base his/her evaluation on the same criteria so that value uniformity can be established. The following considerations have been established as the review/evaluation criteria. These criteria have been provided to the Proposers in the RFP package.

The three (3) firms with the highest point total after evaluation of the first three (3) criteria in Article 4.2 of the Proposal Submittal Requirements will be shortlisted and required to sit for an interview with the Committee. More than 3 firms may be shortlisted at the Committee’s option. If less that 3 firms submit responses, the Authority, at its sole discretion, may elect to continue the selection process or re-advertise the project.
**Understanding and Approach** - (20 points out of 100)

Did the Proposer demonstrate its understanding of the project objectives and shall discuss the means by which these objectives will be attained?

Did the Proposer provide a tentative schedule for performing the key phases of this project?

Did the Proposer demonstrate soundness and clarity of its approach to the attainment of project objectives presented in the Special Provisions, SP1 - Scope of Services, making specific references to work encompassed, including a discussion of potential difficulties and methods for solution and probable effectiveness of the approach with respect to objectives?

**Understanding and Approach**  **16** points

Evaluation Committee Member Initials  **CO**

Review Comments:  **PROPOSER PROVIDED A SCHEDULE**

AND APPROACH TO WORK FROM THE SOUTH TO THE NORTH. PROPOSER DID NOT PROVIDE A DETAILED SCHEDULE IN THE PROPOSAL.
Experience of Firm and Ability of Staff - (20 points out of 100)

Did the Proposer list the most significant projects (maximum of 3) performed in the last five years that are similar to the project described in this Request for Proposals? Did the Proposer indicate the scope of work, date, engagement partners, and the name and telephone number of the principal client contact?

Did the Proposer demonstrate adequacy of experience of its firm and staff and in projects of similar scope and requirements; proven ability of Proposer’s staff to provide required services; time commitment of Proposer’s staff to the project?

Did the Proposer furnish resumes of the Project Manager (or equivalent classification) and other key personnel presently employed by the Proposer who will be assigned to the project? Does the Project Manager have a minimum of three (3) years of specific experience in the services required by the Special Provisions, SP-1, Scope of Services. Did the Proposer identify staff and the past experience of each, as it specifically relates to services required?

Did the Proposer provide information on the size of the firm, the size of the firm’s ITS/FON staff, the location of the office from which the work on this project is to be performed, the number and classification of the professional staff to be employed in this engagement on both a full-time and part-time basis? Additionally, did the Proposer provide a brief job description of each employee classification set forth above along with experience requirements (if any) for each classification?

Did the Proposer submit a copy of the Proposer’s current Certificate of Qualification in Intelligent Transportation Systems and any subcontractors Certificate of Qualification as applicable? Did the Proposer submit a copy(s) of individual’s current Certified Fiber Optic Technician Certificate?

Is the office located in the Orange County Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (Orange, Lake, Osceola and Seminole Counties)? Did the Proposer provide the address of the office?

Experience of Firm and Ability of Staff 18 points

Evaluation Committee Member Initials CQ

Review Comments: Proposer will manage this project out of their Casselberry office.
**Organization and Management** - (10 points out of 100)

Did the Proposer describe its organization and management policies and their application to ensure accomplishment of the Project requirements? Did the Proposer provide organizational charts which show the entire proposed organizational structure? Did the Proposer provide a description of the Proposer's internal lines of responsibility and authority, and the interface relationships with the Authority and any subcontractors?

Did the Proposer submit a staffing plan which clearly illustrates the key elements of the organizational structure proposed to accomplish the services required? Did the Proposer identify Project management and key staff? Did the Proposer address subcontractor services on the Project? Where subcontractor services are proposed, is the staffing plan furnished for the subcontractor firm(s)?

Did the Proposer describe the expected participation and contribution of the Proposer's top officials in the proposed activities? Did the Proposer provide a definition of responsibility and accountability for specific tasks and functions of key individuals within the Proposer's organization?

Does the Proposer address its quality control program, namely the policies followed to assure a complete, accurate and quality service as it relates to the services required? The program shall specify the method by which project related information is received and processed by the Proposer.

**Organization and Management** 6 points

Evaluation Committee Member Initials  CQ

Review Comments: Proposer will evaluate resources during the project to stay ahead of schedule
Interview - (10 points out of 100)

Only shortlisted firms will be interviewed.

Were the Committee’s questions answered clearly and specifically to enable the Committee to evaluate the technical capability of the Proposer and key staff to provide the desired services?

Interview ___ points

Evaluation Committee Member Initials CD

Review Comments: ALS understands the scope and has offered to seal splice enclosed as required.
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORING RECAP

Understanding and Approach (20 points max.)  
Firm/Team Qualifications and Experience (20 points max.)  
Organization and Management (10 points max.)  
Subtotal  
Interview (10 points max.)  

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL TOTAL SCORE  48 Points

Evaluation Committee Member Signature
The Evaluation Committee will consider the following areas in ranking the Proposers through information provided by each Proposer in the Technical Proposal.

The Committee members should strive to provide objective evaluations during all phases and for all parts of the review/evaluation process. Each proposal shall be evaluated on its own merit without comparison to the proposals submitted by other Proposers. Additionally, the evaluations must be done individually by each Committee member. Evaluations should not be done in a meeting type environment where a consensus is determined.

Each Committee member should provide a narrative explanation for his or her score. All individual evaluations shall be signed and dated by the Committee member.

When a Committee member has completed evaluation of each proposal, the scores shall be transmitted to the Chairman of the Committee who will calculate the average score for each proposal.

Each member of the Committee must base his/her evaluation on the same criteria so that value uniformity can be established. The following considerations have been established as the review/evaluation criteria. These criteria have been provided to the Proposers in the RFP package.

The three (3) firms with the highest point total after evaluation of the first three (3) criteria in Article 4.2 of the Proposal Submittal Requirements will be shortlisted and required to sit for an interview with the Committee. More than 3 firms may be shortlisted at the Committee’s option. If less than 3 firms submit responses, the Authority, at its sole discretion, may elect to continue the selection process or re-advertise the project.
Understanding and Approach - (20 points out of 100)

Did the Proposer demonstrate its understanding of the project objectives and shall discuss the means by which these objectives will be attained?

Did the Proposer provide a tentative schedule for performing the key phases of this project?

Did the Proposer demonstrate soundness and clarity of its approach to the attainment of project objectives presented in the Special Provisions, SP1 - Scope of Services, making specific references to work encompassed, including a discussion of potential difficulties and methods for solution and probable effectiveness of the approach with respect to objectives?

Understanding and Approach  20 points

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Experience of Firm and Ability of Staff - (20 points out of 100)

Did the Proposer list the most significant projects (maximum of 3) performed in the last five years that are similar to the project described in this Request for Proposals? Did the Proposer indicate the scope of work, date, engagement partners, and the name and telephone number of the principal client contact?

Did the Proposer demonstrate adequacy of experience of its firm and staff and in projects of similar scope and requirements; proven ability of Proposer’s staff to provide required services; time commitment of Proposer’s staff to the project?

Did the Proposer furnish resumes of the Project Manager (or equivalent classification) and other key personnel presently employed by the Proposer who will be assigned to the project? Does the Project Manager have a minimum of three (3) years of specific experience in the services required by the Special Provisions, SP-1, Scope of Services. Did the Proposer identify staff and the past experience of each, as it specifically relates to services required?

Did the Proposer provide information on the size of the firm, the size of the firm’s ITS/FON staff, the location of the office from which the work on this project is to be performed, the number and classification of the professional staff to be employed in this engagement on both a full-time and part-time basis? Additionally, did the Proposer provide a brief job description of each employee classification set forth above along with experience requirements (if any) for each classification?

Did the Proposer submit a copy of the Proposer’s current Certificate of Qualification in Intelligent Transportation Systems and any subcontractors Certificate of Qualification as applicable? Did the Proposer submit a copy(s) of individual’s current Certified Fiber Optic Technician Certificate?

Is the office located in the Orange County Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (Orange, Lake, Osceola and Seminole Counties)? Did the Proposer provide the address of the office?

Experience of Firm and Ability of Staff 20 points

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments:

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

3
**Organization and Management** - (10 points out of 100)

Did the Proposer describe its organization and management policies and their application to ensure accomplishment of the Project requirements? Did the Proposer provide organizational charts which show the entire proposed organizational structure? Did the Proposer provide a description of the Proposer's internal lines of responsibility and authority, and the interface relationships with the Authority and any subcontractors?

Did the Proposer submit a staffing plan which clearly illustrates the key elements of the organizational structure proposed to accomplish the services required? Did the Proposer identify Project management and key staff? Did the Proposer address subcontractor services on the Project? Where subcontractor services are proposed, is the staffing plan furnished for the subcontractor firm(s)?

Did the Proposer describe the expected participation and contribution of the Proposer's top officials in the proposed activities? Did the Proposer provide a definition of responsibility and accountability for specific tasks and functions of key individuals within the Proposer's organization?

Does the Proposer address its quality control program, namely the policies followed to assure a complete, accurate and quality service as it relates to the services required? The program shall specify the method by which project related information is received and processed by the Proposer.

**Organization and Management** /10 points

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
**Interview** - (10 points out of 100)

Only shortlisted firms will be interviewed.

Were the Committee’s questions answered clearly and specifically to enable the Committee to evaluate the technical capability of the Proposer and key staff to provide the desired services?

Interview ______ points

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments: 

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORING RECAP

Understanding and Approach (20 points max.) 20
Firm/Team Qualifications and Experience (20 points max.) 20
Organization and Management (10 points max.) 10
Subtotal 50
Interview (10 points max.) 7

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL TOTAL SCORE 57 Points

Evaluation Committee Member Signature
The Evaluation Committee will consider the following areas in ranking the Proposers through information provided by each Proposer in the Technical Proposal.

The Committee members should strive to provide objective evaluations during all phases and for all parts of the review/evaluation process. Each proposal shall be evaluated on its own merit without comparison to the proposals submitted by other Proposers. Additionally, the evaluations must be done individually by each Committee member. Evaluations should not be done in a meeting type environment where a consensus is determined.

Each Committee member should provide a narrative explanation for his or her score. All individual evaluations shall be signed and dated by the Committee member.

When a Committee member has completed evaluation of each proposal, the scores shall be transmitted to the Chairman of the Committee who will calculate the average score for each proposal.

Each member of the Committee must base his/her evaluation on the same criteria so that value uniformity can be established. The following considerations have been established as the review/evaluation criteria. These criteria have been provided to the Proposers in the RFP package.

The three (3) firms with the highest point total after evaluation of the first three (3) criteria in Article 4.2 of the Proposal Submittal Requirements will be shortlisted and required to sit for an interview with the Committee. More than 3 firms may be shortlisted at the Committee’s option. If less than 3 firms submit responses, the Authority, at its sole discretion, may elect to continue the selection process or re-advertise the project.
**Understanding and Approach** - (20 points out of 100)

✓ Did the Proposer demonstrate its understanding of the project objectives and shall discuss the means by which these objectives will be attained?

✓ Did the Proposer provide a tentative schedule for performing the key phases of this project?

✓ Did the Proposer demonstrate soundness and clarity of its approach to the attainment of project objectives presented in the Special Provisions, SP1 - Scope of Services, making specific references to work encompassed, including a discussion of potential difficulties and methods for solution and probable effectiveness of the approach with respect to objectives?


Understanding and Approach  68 points

Evaluation Committee Member Initials  

Review Comments: __________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________
Experience of Firm and Ability of Staff - (20 points out of 100)

Did the Proposer list the most significant projects (maximum of 3) performed in the last five years that are similar to the project described in this Request for Proposals? Did the Proposer indicate the scope of work, date, engagement partners, and the name and telephone number of the principal client contact?

Did the Proposer demonstrate adequacy of experience of its firm and staff and in projects of similar scope and requirements; proven ability of Proposer's staff to provide required services; time commitment of Proposer’s staff to the project?

Did the Proposer furnish resumes of the Project Manager (or equivalent classification) and other key personnel presently employed by the Proposer who will be assigned to the project? Does the Project Manager have a minimum of three (3) years of specific experience in the services required by the Special Provisions, SP-1, Scope of Services. Did the Proposer identify staff and the past experience of each, as it specifically relates to services required?

Did the Proposer provide information on the size of the firm, the size of the firm's ITS/FON staff, the location of the office from which the work on this project is to be performed, the number and classification of the professional staff to be employed in this engagement on both a full-time and part-time basis? Additionally, did the Proposer provide a brief job description of each employee classification set forth above along with experience requirements (if any) for each classification?

Did the Proposer submit a copy of the Proposer’s current Certificate of Qualification in Intelligent Transportation Systems and any subcontractors Certificate of Qualification as applicable? Did the Proposer submit a copy(s) of individual’s current Certified Fiber Optic Technician Certificate?

Is the office located in the Orange County Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (Orange, Lake, Osceola and Seminole Counties)? Did the Proposer provide the address of the office?

Experience of Firm and Ability of Staff 18 points

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments:

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________
**Organization and Management** - (10 points out of 100)

Did the Proposer describe its organization and management policies and their application to ensure accomplishment of the Project requirements? Did the Proposer provide organizational charts which show the entire proposed organizational structure? Did the Proposer provide a description of the Proposer's internal lines of responsibility and authority, and the interface relationships with the Authority and any subcontractors?

Did the Proposer submit a staffing plan which clearly illustrates the key elements of the organizational structure proposed to accomplish the services required? Did the Proposer identify Project management and key staff? Did the Proposer address subcontractor services on the Project? Where subcontractor services are proposed, is the staffing plan furnished for the subcontractor firm(s)?

Did the Proposer describe the expected participation and contribution of the Proposer’s top officials in the proposed activities? Did the Proposer provide a definition of responsibility and accountability for specific tasks and functions of key individuals within the Proposer’s organization?

Does the Proposer address its quality control program, namely the policies followed to assure a complete, accurate and quality service as it relates to the services required? The program shall specify the method by which project related information is received and processed by the Proposer.

**Organization and Management** [9 points]

Evaluation Committee Member Initials [Signature]

Review Comments: __________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________
**Interview** - (10 points out of 100)

Only shortlisted firms will be interviewed.

Were the Committee’s questions answered clearly and specifically to enable the Committee to evaluate the technical capability of the Proposer and key staff to provide the desired services?

\[\text{Interview} \quad \text{10 points}\]

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORING RECAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding and Approach (20 points max.)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm/Team Qualifications and Experience (20 points max.)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization and Management (10 points max.)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview (10 points max.)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL TOTAL SCORE  55 Points

Evaluation Committee Member Signature
Committee Member: Juanita J. Dennis

PROPOSER: Advanced Cabling Solutions

ORLANDO-ORANGE COUNTY EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY

EVALUATION COMMITTEE SCORING SHEET FOR TECHNICAL PROPOSALS FOR

SYSTEMWIDE ELECTRONIC FON DOCUMENTATION
PROJECT NO. 599-519, CONTRACT NO. 000920

The Evaluation Committee will consider the following areas in ranking the Proposers through information provided by each Proposer in the Technical Proposal.

The Committee members should strive to provide objective evaluations during all phases and for all parts of the review/evaluation process. Each proposal shall be evaluated on its own merit without comparison to the proposals submitted by other Proposers. Additionally, the evaluations must be done individually by each Committee member. Evaluations should not be done in a meeting type environment where a consensus is determined.

Each Committee member should provide a narrative explanation for his or her score. All individual evaluations shall be signed and dated by the Committee member.

When a Committee member has completed evaluation of each proposal, the scores shall be transmitted to the Chairman of the Committee who will calculate the average score for each proposal.

Each member of the Committee must base his/her evaluation on the same criteria so that value uniformity can be established. The following considerations have been established as the review/evaluation criteria. These criteria have been provided to the Proposers in the RFP package.

The three (3) firms with the highest point total after evaluation of the first three (3) criteria in Article 4.2 of the Proposal Submittal Requirements will be shortlisted and required to sit for an interview with the Committee. More than 3 firms may be shortlisted at the Committee's option. If less that 3 firms submit responses, the Authority, at its sole discretion, may elect to continue the selection process or re-advertise the project.
Understanding and Approach - (20 points out of 100)

Did the Proposer demonstrate its understanding of the project objectives and shall discuss the means by which these objectives will be attained?

Did the Proposer provide a tentative schedule for performing the key phases of this project?

Did the Proposer demonstrate soundness and clarity of its approach to the attainment of project objectives presented in the Special Provisions, SP1 - Scope of Services, making specific references to work encompassed, including a discussion of potential difficulties and methods for solution and probable effectiveness of the approach with respect to objectives?

Understanding and Approach  13 points

Evaluation Committee Member Initials  

Review Comments: __________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________
Experience of Firm and Ability of Staff - (20 points out of 100)

Did the Proposer list the most significant projects (maximum of 3) performed in the last five years that are similar to the project described in this Request for Proposals? Did the Proposer indicate the scope of work, date, engagement partners, and the name and telephone number of the principal client contact?

Did the Proposer demonstrate adequacy of experience of its firm and staff and in projects of similar scope and requirements; proven ability of Proposer’s staff to provide required services; time commitment of Proposer’s staff to the project?

Did the Proposer furnish resumes of the Project Manager (or equivalent classification) and other key personnel presently employed by the Proposer who will be assigned to the project? Does the Project Manager have a minimum of three (3) years of specific experience in the services required by the Special Provisions, SP-1, Scope of Services. Did the Proposer identify staff and the past experience of each, as it specifically relates to services required?

Did the Proposer provide information on the size of the firm, the size of the firm’s ITS/FON staff, the location of the office from which the work on this project is to be performed, the number and classification of the professional staff to be employed in this engagement on both a full-time and part-time basis? Additionally, did the Proposer provide a brief job description of each employee classification set forth above along with experience requirements (if any) for each classification?

Did the Proposer submit a copy of the Proposer’s current Certificate of Qualification in Intelligent Transportation Systems and any subcontractors Certificate of Qualification as applicable? Did the Proposer submit a copy(s) of individual’s current Certified Fiber Optic Technician Certificate?

Is the office located in the Orange County Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (Orange, Lake, Osceola and Seminole Counties)? Did the Proposer provide the address of the office?

Experience of Firm and Ability of Staff  

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments: 

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________
**Organization and Management** - (10 points out of 100)

Did the Proposer describe its organization and management policies and their application to ensure accomplishment of the Project requirements? Did the Proposer provide organizational charts which show the entire proposed organizational structure? Did the Proposer provide a description of the Proposer's internal lines of responsibility and authority, and the interface relationships with the Authority and any subcontractors?

Did the Proposer submit a staffing plan which clearly illustrates the key elements of the organizational structure proposed to accomplish the services required? Did the Proposer identify Project management and key staff? Did the Proposer address subcontractor services on the Project? Where subcontractor services are proposed, is the staffing plan furnished for the subcontractor firm(s)?

Did the Proposer describe the expected participation and contribution of the Proposer’s top officials in the proposed activities? Did the Proposer provide a definition of responsibility and accountability for specific tasks and functions of key individuals within the Proposer’s organization?

Does the Proposer address its quality control program, namely the policies followed to assure a complete, accurate and quality service as it relates to the services required? The program shall specify the method by which project related information is received and processed by the Proposer.

**Organization and Management** ______ points

Evaluation Committee Member Initials: __________________________

Review Comments: ____________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________
Interview - (10 points out of 100)

Only shortlisted firms will be interviewed.

Were the Committee’s questions answered clearly and specifically to enable the Committee to evaluate the technical capability of the Proposer and key staff to provide the desired services?

Interview 9 points

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORING RECAP

Understanding and Approach (20 points max.)
Firm/Team Qualifications and Experience (20 points max.)
Organization and Management (10 points max.)

Subtotal

Interview (10 points max.)

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL TOTAL SCORE

53 Points

Evaluation Committee Member Signature
Committee Member Rick Morrow

PROPOSER: Advanced Cabling Solutions

ORLANDO-ORANGE COUNTY EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY

EVALUATION COMMITTEE SCORING SHEET FOR TECHNICAL PROPOSALS FOR

SYSTEMWIDE ELECTRONIC FON DOCUMENTATION
PROJECT NO. 599-519, CONTRACT NO. 000920

The Evaluation Committee will consider the following areas in ranking the Proposers through information provided by each Proposer in the Technical Proposal.

The Committee members should strive to provide objective evaluations during all phases and for all parts of the review/evaluation process. Each proposal shall be evaluated on its own merit without comparison to the proposals submitted by other Proposers. Additionally, the evaluations must be done individually by each Committee member. Evaluations should not be done in a meeting type environment where a consensus is determined.

Each Committee member should provide a narrative explanation for his or her score. All individual evaluations shall be signed and dated by the Committee member.

When a Committee member has completed evaluation of each proposal, the scores shall be transmitted to the Chairman of the Committee who will calculate the average score for each proposal.

Each member of the Committee must base his/her evaluation on the same criteria so that value uniformity can be established. The following considerations have been established as the review/evaluation criteria. These criteria have been provided to the Proposers in the RFP package.

The three (3) firms with the highest point total after evaluation of the first three (3) criteria in Article 4.2 of the Proposal Submittal Requirements will be shortlisted and required to sit for an interview with the Committee. More than 3 firms may be shortlisted at the Committee’s option. If less that 3 firms submit responses, the Authority, at its sole discretion, may elect to continue the selection process or re-advertise the project.
**Understanding and Approach** - (20 points out of 100)

Did the Proposer demonstrate its understanding of the project objectives and shall discuss the means by which these objectives will be attained?

Did the Proposer provide a tentative schedule for performing the key phases of this project?

Did the Proposer demonstrate soundness and clarity of its approach to the attainment of project objectives presented in the Special Provisions, SP1 - Scope of Services, making specific references to work encompassed, including a discussion of potential difficulties and methods for solution and probable effectiveness of the approach with respect to objectives?

**Understanding and Approach**  18  points

Evaluation Committee Member Initials  RRH

Review Comments: Proposer offered an overview of how project would be specifically. 365 day schedule. Offered a sound approach to completing the project. Noted a variety of difficulties and how they would overcome.
Experience of Firm and Ability of Staff - (20 points out of 100)

Did the Proposer list the most significant projects (maximum of 3) performed in the last five years that are similar to the project described in this Request for Proposals? Did the Proposer indicate the scope of work, date, engagement partners, and the name and telephone number of the principal client contact?

Did the Proposer demonstrate adequacy of experience of its firm and staff and in projects of similar scope and requirements; proven ability of Proposer's staff to provide required services; time commitment of Proposer's staff to the project?

Did the Proposer furnish resumes of the Project Manager (or equivalent classification) and other key personnel presently employed by the Proposer who will be assigned to the project? Does the Project Manager have a minimum of three (3) years of specific experience in the services required by the Special Provisions, SP-1, Scope of Services. Did the Proposer identify staff and the past experience of each, as it specifically relates to services required?

Did the Proposer provide information on the size of the firm, the size of the firm’s ITS/FON staff, the location of the office from which the work on this project is to be performed, the number and classification of the professional staff to be employed in this engagement on both a full-time and part-time basis? Additionally, did the Proposer provide a brief job description of each employee classification set forth above along with experience requirements (if any) for each classification?

Did the Proposer submit a copy of the Proposer’s current Certificate of Qualification in Intelligent Transportation Systems and any subcontractors Certificate of Qualification as applicable? Did the Proposer submit a copy(s) of individual’s current Certified Fiber Optic Technician Certificate?

Is the office located in the Orange County Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (Orange, Lake, Osceola and Seminole Counties)? Did the Proposer provide the address of the office?

Experience of Firm and Ability of Staff 17 points

Evaluation Committee Member Initials R3M

Review Comments: Proposer listed staff and expertise for project.
Staffing and resources are identified. Uses local teams.
Organization and Management - (10 points out of 100)

Did the Proposer describe its organization and management policies and their application to ensure accomplishment of the Project requirements? Did the Proposer provide organizational charts which show the entire proposed organizational structure? Did the Proposer provide a description of the Proposer's internal lines of responsibility and authority, and the interface relationships with the Authority and any subcontractors?

Did the Proposer submit a staffing plan which clearly illustrates the key elements of the organizational structure proposed to accomplish the services required? Did the Proposer identify Project management and key staff? Did the Proposer address subcontractor services on the Project? Where subcontractor services are proposed, is the staffing plan furnished for the subcontractor firm(s)?

Did the Proposer describe the expected participation and contribution of the Proposer's top officials in the proposed activities? Did the Proposer provide a definition of responsibility and accountability for specific tasks and functions of key individuals within the Proposer's organization?

Does the Proposer address its quality control program, namely the policies followed to assure a complete, accurate and quality service as it relates to the services required? The program shall specify the method by which project related information is received and processed by the Proposer.

Organization and Management 8 points

Evaluation Committee Member Initials  

Review Comments:
Management and staffing plan are identified.

Common knowledge of FDOT inventory is a bonus, however

uses some of the same staff.

Quality Control identified.
**Interview** - (10 points out of 100)

Only shortlisted firms will be interviewed.

Were the Committee’s questions answered clearly and specifically to enable the Committee to evaluate the technical capability of the Proposer and key staff to provide the desired services?

**Interview**  9  points

Evaluation Committee Member Initials  **RBM**

Review Comments:  Generally answered questions with technical specifics. Some of the managerial specifics were vague. Specific questions related to schedule milestones were not answers but rather with - we'll handle it - type responses.
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORING RECAP

Understanding and Approach (20 points max.)  
Firm/Team Qualifications and Experience (20 points max.)  
Organization and Management (10 points max.)  

Subtotal  

Interview (10 points max.)  

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL TOTAL SCORE  52 Points

Evaluation Committee Member Signature  

6
Committee Member QUINN

PROPOSER: PCS

ORLANDO-ORANGE COUNTY EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY

EVALUATION COMMITTEE SCORING SHEET FOR TECHNICAL PROPOSALS FOR

SYSTEMWIDE ELECTRONIC FON DOCUMENTATION
PROJECT NO. 599-519, CONTRACT NO. 000920

The Evaluation Committee will consider the following areas in ranking the Proposers through information provided by each Proposer in the Technical Proposal.

The Committee members should strive to provide objective evaluations during all phases and for all parts of the review/evaluation process. Each proposal shall be evaluated on its own merit without comparison to the proposals submitted by other Proposers. Additionally, the evaluations must be done individually by each Committee member. Evaluations should not be done in a meeting type environment where a consensus is determined.

Each Committee member should provide a narrative explanation for his or her score. All individual evaluations shall be signed and dated by the Committee member.

When a Committee member has completed evaluation of each proposal, the scores shall be transmitted to the Chairman of the Committee who will calculate the average score for each proposal.

Each member of the Committee must base his/her evaluation on the same criteria so that value uniformity can be established. The following considerations have been established as the review/evaluation criteria. These criteria have been provided to the Proposers in the RFP package.

The three (3) firms with the highest point total after evaluation of the first three (3) criteria in Article 4.2 of the Proposal Submittal Requirements will be shortlisted and required to sit for an interview with the Committee. More than 3 firms may be shortlisted at the Committee’s option. If less than 3 firms submit responses, the Authority, at its sole discretion, may elect to continue the selection process or re-advertise the project.
**Understanding and Approach** - (20 points out of 100)

Did the Proposer demonstrate its understanding of the project objectives and shall discuss the means by which these objectives will be attained?

Did the Proposer provide a tentative schedule for performing the key phases of this project?

Did the Proposer demonstrate soundness and clarity of its approach to the attainment of project objectives presented in the Special Provisions, SP1 - Scope of Services, making specific references to work encompassed, including a discussion of potential difficulties and methods for solution and probable effectiveness of the approach with respect to objectives?

**Understanding and Approach**  

18 points

Evaluation Committee Member Initials  

Review Comments:  

- Proposer understands scope of work  
- Has experiences with project challenges  
- And recommended solutions.
Experience of Firm and Ability of Staff - (20 points out of 100)

Did the Proposer list the most significant projects (maximum of 3) performed in the last five years that are similar to the project described in this Request for Proposals? Did the Proposer indicate the scope of work, date, engagement partners, and the name and telephone number of the principal client contact?

Did the Proposer demonstrate adequacy of experience of its firm and staff and in projects of similar scope and requirements; proven ability of Proposer’s staff to provide required services; time commitment of Proposer’s staff to the project?

Did the Proposer furnish resumes of the Project Manager (or equivalent classification) and other key personnel presently employed by the Proposer who will be assigned to the project? Does the Project Manager have a minimum of three (3) years of specific experience in the services required by the Special Provisions, SP-1, Scope of Services. Did the Proposer identify staff and the past experience of each, as it specifically relates to services required?

Did the Proposer provide information on the size of the firm, the size of the firm’s ITS/FON staff, the location of the office from which the work on this project is to be performed, the number and classification of the professional staff to be employed in this engagement on both a full-time and part-time basis? Additionally, did the Proposer provide a brief job description of each employee classification set forth above along with experience requirements (if any) for each classification?

Did the Proposer submit a copy of the Proposer’s current Certificate of Qualification in Intelligent Transportation Systems and any subcontractors Certificate of Qualification as applicable? Did the Proposer submit a copy(s) of individual’s current Certified Fiber Optic Technician Certificate?

Is the office located in the Orange County Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (Orange, Lake, Osceola and Seminole Counties)? Did the Proposer provide the address of the office?

Experience of Firm and Ability of Staff 18 points

Evaluation Committee Member Initials CQ

Review Comments: Proposer's Office in Winter Garden will be the Headquarters for this project. Proposer staff is qualified to perform the scope.
Organization and Management - (10 points out of 100)

Did the Proposer describe its organization and management policies and their application to ensure accomplishment of the Project requirements? Did the Proposer provide organizational charts which show the entire proposed organizational structure? Did the Proposer provide a description of the Proposer’s internal lines of responsibility and authority, and the interface relationships with the Authority and any subcontractors?

Did the Proposer submit a staffing plan which clearly illustrates the key elements of the organizational structure proposed to accomplish the services required? Did the Proposer identify Project management and key staff? Did the Proposer address subcontractor services on the Project? Where subcontractor services are proposed, is the staffing plan furnished for the subcontractor firm(s)?

Did the Proposer describe the expected participation and contribution of the Proposer’s top officials in the proposed activities? Did the Proposer provide a definition of responsibility and accountability for specific tasks and functions of key individuals within the Proposer’s organization?

Does the Proposer address its quality control program, namely the policies followed to assure a complete, accurate and quality service as it relates to the services required? The program shall specify the method by which project related information is received and processed by the Proposer.

Organization and Management  88  points

Evaluation Committee Member Initials  CQ

Review Comments:  PROPOSED DESCRIBED INTERFACE

CENTURY LINE UNDERSTANDS OUR ORGANIZATION AND OUR

SYSTEM
**Interview** - (10 points out of 100)

Only shortlisted firms will be interviewed.

Were the Committee’s questions answered clearly and specifically to enable the Committee to evaluate the technical capability of the Proposer and key staff to provide the desired services?

Interview    8    points

Evaluation Committee Member Initials  CQ

Review Comments:  PROPOSER CLEARLY DETAILED

IS A PROCESS AND THE TEAM LIKES

EXPERIENCE W/ MULTIPLE SOFTWARE INTEGRATIONS
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORING RECAP

Understanding and Approach (20 points max.)  

Firm/Team Qualifications and Experience (20 points max.)  

Organization and Management (10 points max.)  

Subtotal  

Interview (10 points max.)  

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL TOTAL SCORE  

Evaluation Committee Member Signature

52 Points
Committee Member: \[\text{JA} \text{B} \text{er} \text{v} \text{e} \text{n}\]

PROPOSER: \[\text{P} \text{e} \text{s}\]

ORLANDO-ORANGE COUNTY EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY

EVALUATION COMMITTEE SCORING SHEET FOR TECHNICAL PROPOSALS FOR

SYSTEMWIDE ELECTRONIC FON DOCUMENTATION
PROJECT NO. 599-519, CONTRACT NO. 000920

The Evaluation Committee will consider the following areas in ranking the Proposers through information provided by each Proposer in the Technical Proposal.

The Committee members should strive to provide objective evaluations during all phases and for all parts of the review/evaluation process. Each proposal shall be evaluated on its own merit without comparison to the proposals submitted by other Proposers. Additionally, the evaluations must be done individually by each Committee member. Evaluations should not be done in a meeting type environment where a consensus is determined.

Each Committee member should provide a narrative explanation for his or her score. All individual evaluations shall be signed and dated by the Committee member.

When a Committee member has completed evaluation of each proposal, the scores shall be transmitted to the Chairman of the Committee who will calculate the average score for each proposal.

Each member of the Committee must base his/her evaluation on the same criteria so that value uniformity can be established. The following considerations have been established as the review/evaluation criteria. These criteria have been provided to the Proposers in the RFP package.

The three (3) firms with the highest point total after evaluation of the first three (3) criteria in Article 4.2 of the Proposal Submittal Requirements will be shortlisted and required to sit for an interview with the Committee. More than 3 firms may be shortlisted at the Committee’s option. If less than 3 firms submit responses, the Authority, at its sole discretion, may elect to continue the selection process or re-advertise the project.
**Understanding and Approach** - (20 points out of 100)

Did the Proposer demonstrate its understanding of the project objectives and shall discuss the means by which these objectives will be attained?

Did the Proposer provide a tentative schedule for performing the key phases of this project?

Did the Proposer demonstrate soundness and clarity of its approach to the attainment of project objectives presented in the Special Provisions, SP1 - Scope of Services, making specific references to work encompassed, including a discussion of potential difficulties and methods for solution and probable effectiveness of the approach with respect to objectives?

**Understanding and Approach**  \(\text{20 points}\)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials  

Review Comments:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Experience of Firm and Ability of Staff - (20 points out of 100)

Did the Proposer list the most significant projects (maximum of 3) performed in the last five years that are similar to the project described in this Request for Proposals? Did the Proposer indicate the scope of work, date, engagement partners, and the name and telephone number of the principal client contact?

Did the Proposer demonstrate adequacy of experience of its firm and staff and in projects of similar scope and requirements; proven ability of Proposer’s staff to provide required services; time commitment of Proposer’s staff to the project?

Did the Proposer furnish resumes of the Project Manager (or equivalent classification) and other key personnel presently employed by the Proposer who will be assigned to the project? Does the Project Manager have a minimum of three (3) years of specific experience in the services required by the Special Provisions, SP-1, Scope of Services. Did the Proposer identify staff and the past experience of each, as it specifically relates to services required?

Did the Proposer provide information on the size of the firm, the size of the firm’s ITS/FON staff, the location of the office from which the work on this project is to be performed, the number and classification of the professional staff to be employed in this engagement on both a full-time and part-time basis? Additionally, did the Proposer provide a brief job description of each employee classification set forth above along with experience requirements (if any) for each classification?

Did the Proposer submit a copy of the Proposer’s current Certificate of Qualification in Intelligent Transportation Systems and any subcontractors Certificate of Qualification as applicable? Did the Proposer submit a copy(s) of individual’s current Certified Fiber Optic Technician Certificate?

Is the office located in the Orange County Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (Orange, Lake, Osceola and Seminole Counties)? Did the Proposer provide the address of the office?

Experience of Firm and Ability of Staff 20 points

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Organization and Management - (10 points out of 100)

Did the Proposer describe its organization and management policies and their application to ensure accomplishment of the Project requirements? Did the Proposer provide organizational charts which show the entire proposed organizational structure? Did the Proposer provide a description of the Proposer’s internal lines of responsibility and authority, and the interface relationships with the Authority and any subcontractors?

Did the Proposer submit a staffing plan which clearly illustrates the key elements of the organizational structure proposed to accomplish the services required? Did the Proposer identify Project management and key staff? Did the Proposer address subcontractor services on the Project? Where subcontractor services are proposed, is the staffing plan furnished for the subcontractor firm(s)?

Did the Proposer describe the expected participation and contribution of the Proposer’s top officials in the proposed activities? Did the Proposer provide a definition of responsibility and accountability for specific tasks and functions of key individuals within the Proposer’s organization?

Does the Proposer address its quality control program, namely the policies followed to assure a complete, accurate and quality service as it relates to the services required? The program shall specify the method by which project related information is received and processed by the Proposer.

Organization and Management 10 points

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Interview - (10 points out of 100)

Only shortlisted firms will be interviewed.

Were the Committee’s questions answered clearly and specifically to enable the Committee to evaluate the technical capability of the Proposer and key staff to provide the desired services?

Interview ______ points

Evaluation Committee Member Initials ______

Review Comments: ______________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORING RECAP

Understanding and Approach (20 points max.)  
Firm/Team Qualifications and Experience (20 points max.)  
Organization and Management (10 points max.)  
  Subtotal  
Interview (10 points max.)  

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL TOTAL SCORE 59 Points

Evaluation Committee Member Signature  

6
The Evaluation Committee will consider the following areas in ranking the Proposers through information provided by each Proposer in the Technical Proposal.

The Committee members should strive to provide objective evaluations during all phases and for all parts of the review/evaluation process. Each proposal shall be evaluated on its own merit without comparison to the proposals submitted by other Proposers. Additionally, the evaluations must be done individually by each Committee member. Evaluations should not be done in a meeting type environment where a consensus is determined.

Each Committee member should provide a narrative explanation for his or her score. All individual evaluations shall be signed and dated by the Committee member.

When a Committee member has completed evaluation of each proposal, the scores shall be transmitted to the Chairman of the Committee who will calculate the average score for each proposal.

Each member of the Committee must base his/her evaluation on the same criteria so that value uniformity can be established. The following considerations have been established as the review/evaluation criteria. These criteria have been provided to the Proposers in the RFP package.

The three (3) firms with the highest point total after evaluation of the first three (3) criteria in Article 4.2 of the Proposal Submittal Requirements will be shortlisted and required to sit for an interview with the Committee. More than 3 firms may be shortlisted at the Committee’s option. If less that 3 firms submit responses, the Authority, at its sole discretion, may elect to continue the selection process or re-advertise the project.
**Understanding and Approach** - (20 points out of 100)

Did the Proposer demonstrate its understanding of the project objectives and shall discuss the means by which these objectives will be attained?

Did the Proposer provide a tentative schedule for performing the key phases of this project?

Did the Proposer demonstrate soundness and clarity of its approach to the attainment of project objectives presented in the Special Provisions, SP1 - Scope of Services, making specific references to work encompassed, including a discussion of potential difficulties and methods for solution and probable effectiveness of the approach with respect to objectives?

**Understanding and Approach** 18 points

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments: ____________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Experience of Firm and Ability of Staff - (20 points out of 100)

Did the Proposer list the most significant projects (maximum of 3) performed in the last five years that are similar to the project described in this Request for Proposals? Did the Proposer indicate the scope of work, date, engagement partners, and the name and telephone number of the principal client contact?

Did the Proposer demonstrate adequacy of experience of its firm and staff and in projects of similar scope and requirements; proven ability of Proposer’s staff to provide required services; time commitment of Proposer’s staff to the project?

Did the Proposer furnish resumes of the Project Manager (or equivalent classification) and other key personnel presently employed by the Proposer who will be assigned to the project? Does the Project Manager have a minimum of three (3) years of specific experience in the services required by the Special Provisions, SP-1, Scope of Services. Did the Proposer identify staff and the past experience of each, as it specifically relates to services required?

Did the Proposer provide information on the size of the firm, the size of the firm’s ITS/FON staff, the location of the office from which the work on this project is to be performed, the number and classification of the professional staff to be employed in this engagement on both a full-time and part-time basis? Additionally, did the Proposer provide a brief job description of each employee classification set forth above along with experience requirements (if any) for each classification?

Did the Proposer submit a copy of the Proposer’s current Certificate of Qualification in Intelligent Transportation Systems and any subcontractors Certificate of Qualification as applicable? Did the Proposer submit a copy(s) of individual’s current Certified Fiber Optic Technician Certificate?

Is the office located in the Orange County Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (Orange, Lake, Osceola and Seminole Counties)? Did the Proposer provide the address of the office?

Experience of Firm and Ability of Staff: [Score] points

Evaluation Committee Member Initials: [Signature]

Review Comments:

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
**Organization and Management**  - (10 points out of 100)

Did the Proposer describe its organization and management policies and their application to ensure accomplishment of the Project requirements? Did the Proposer provide organizational charts which show the entire proposed organizational structure? Did the Proposer provide a description of the Proposer’s internal lines of responsibility and authority, and the interface relationships with the Authority and any subcontractors?

Did the Proposer submit a staffing plan which clearly illustrates the key elements of the organizational structure proposed to accomplish the services required? Did the Proposer identify Project management and key staff? Did the Proposer address subcontractor services on the Project? Where subcontractor services are proposed, is the staffing plan furnished for the subcontractor firm(s)?

Did the Proposer describe the expected participation and contribution of the Proposer’s top officials in the proposed activities? Did the Proposer provide a definition of responsibility and accountability for specific tasks and functions of key individuals within the Proposer’s organization?

Does the Proposer address its quality control program, namely the policies followed to assure a complete, accurate and quality service as it relates to the services required? The program shall specify the method by which project related information is received and processed by the Proposer.

**Organization and Management**  
9 points

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments: 

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
**Interview** - (10 points out of 100)

Only shortlisted firms will be interviewed.

Were the Committee's questions answered clearly and specifically to enable the Committee to evaluate the technical capability of the Proposer and key staff to provide the desired services?

\[ \text{Interview} \quad \underline{9} \quad \text{points} \]

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments: 

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
# TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORING RECAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding and Approach (20 points max.)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm/Team Qualifications and Experience (20 points max.)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization and Management (10 points max.)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview (10 points max.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TECHNICAL PROPOSAL TOTAL SCORE</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation Committee Member Signature: [Signature]
The Evaluation Committee will consider the following areas in ranking the Proposers through information provided by each Proposer in the Technical Proposal.

The Committee members should strive to provide objective evaluations during all phases and for all parts of the review/evaluation process. Each proposal shall be evaluated on its own merit without comparison to the proposals submitted by other Proposers. Additionally, the evaluations must be done individually by each Committee member. Evaluations should not be done in a meeting type environment where a consensus is determined.

Each Committee member should provide a narrative explanation for his or her score. All individual evaluations shall be signed and dated by the Committee member.

When a Committee member has completed evaluation of each proposal, the scores shall be transmitted to the Chairman of the Committee who will calculate the average score for each proposal.

Each member of the Committee must base his/her evaluation on the same criteria so that value uniformity can be established. The following considerations have been established as the review/evaluation criteria. These criteria have been provided to the Proposers in the RFP package.

The three (3) firms with the highest point total after evaluation of the first three (3) criteria in Article 4.2 of the Proposal Submittal Requirements will be shortlisted and required to sit for an interview with the Committee. More than 3 firms may be shortlisted at the Committee’s option. If less than 3 firms submit responses, the Authority, at its sole discretion, may elect to continue the selection process or re-advertise the project.
Understanding and Approach - (20 points out of 100)

Did the Proposer demonstrate its understanding of the project objectives and shall discuss the means by which these objectives will be attained?

Did the Proposer provide a tentative schedule for performing the key phases of this project?

Did the Proposer demonstrate soundness and clarity of its approach to the attainment of project objectives presented in the Special Provisions, SP1 - Scope of Services, making specific references to work encompassed, including a discussion of potential difficulties and methods for solution and probable effectiveness of the approach with respect to objectives?

Understanding and Approach 19 points

Evaluation Committee Member Initials [Signature]

Review Comments:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Experience of Firm and Ability of Staff - (20 points out of 100)

Did the Proposer list the most significant projects (maximum of 3) performed in the last five years that are similar to the project described in this Request for Proposals? Did the Proposer indicate the scope of work, date, engagement partners, and the name and telephone number of the principal client contact?

Did the Proposer demonstrate adequacy of experience of its firm and staff and in projects of similar scope and requirements; proven ability of Proposer’s staff to provide required services; time commitment of Proposer’s staff to the project?

Did the Proposer furnish resumes of the Project Manager (or equivalent classification) and other key personnel presently employed by the Proposer who will be assigned to the project? Does the Project Manager have a minimum of three (3) years of specific experience in the services required by the Special Provisions, SP-1, Scope of Services. Did the Proposer identify staff and the past experience of each, as it specifically relates to services required?

Did the Proposer provide information on the size of the firm, the size of the firm’s ITS/FON staff, the location of the office from which the work on this project is to be performed, the number and classification of the professional staff to be employed in this engagement on both a full-time and part-time basis? Additionally, did the Proposer provide a brief job description of each employee classification set forth above along with experience requirements (if any) for each classification?

Did the Proposer submit a copy of the Proposer’s current Certificate of Qualification in Intelligent Transportation Systems and any subcontractors Certificate of Qualification as applicable? Did the Proposer submit a copy(s) of individual’s current Certified Fiber Optic Technician Certificate?

Is the office located in the Orange County Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (Orange, Lake, Osceola and Seminole Counties)? Did the Proposer provide the address of the office?

Experience of Firm and Ability of Staff 19 points

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments: ____________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

3
Organization and Management - (10 points out of 100)

Did the Proposer describe its organization and management policies and their application to ensure accomplishment of the Project requirements? Did the Proposer provide organizational charts which show the entire proposed organizational structure? Did the Proposer provide a description of the Proposer’s internal lines of responsibility and authority, and the interface relationships with the Authority and any subcontractors?

Did the Proposer submit a staffing plan which clearly illustrates the key elements of the organizational structure proposed to accomplish the services required? Did the Proposer identify Project management and key staff? Did the Proposer address subcontractor services on the Project? Where subcontractor services are proposed, is the staffing plan furnished for the subcontractor firm(s)?

Did the Proposer describe the expected participation and contribution of the Proposer’s top officials in the proposed activities? Did the Proposer provide a definition of responsibility and accountability for specific tasks and functions of key individuals within the Proposer’s organization?

Does the Proposer address its quality control program, namely the policies followed to assure a complete, accurate and quality service as it relates to the services required? The program shall specify the method by which project related information is received and processed by the Proposer.

Organization and Management ______ points

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments: ___________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________
**Interview** - (10 points out of 100)

Only shortlisted firms will be interviewed.

Were the Committee’s questions answered clearly and specifically to enable the Committee to evaluate the technical capability of the Proposer and key staff to provide the desired services?

Interview **10** points

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORING RECAP

Understanding and Approach (20 points max.)  19
Firm/Team Qualifications and Experience (20 points max.)  19
Organization and Management (10 points max.)  9

Subtotal  57

Interview (10 points max.)  10

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL TOTAL SCORE  59 Points

Evaluation Committee Member Signature
PROPOSER: Precision Contracting Services

ORLANDO-ORANGE COUNTY EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY

EVALUATION COMMITTEE SCORING SHEET FOR TECHNICAL PROPOSALS FOR

SYSTEMWIDE ELECTRONIC FON DOCUMENTATION
PROJECT NO. 599-519, CONTRACT NO. 000920

The Evaluation Committee will consider the following areas in ranking the Proposers through information provided by each Proposer in the Technical Proposal.

The Committee members should strive to provide objective evaluations during all phases and for all parts of the review/evaluation process. Each proposal shall be evaluated on its own merit without comparison to the proposals submitted by other Proposers. Additionally, the evaluations must be done individually by each Committee member. Evaluations should not be done in a meeting type environment where a consensus is determined.

Each Committee member should provide a narrative explanation for his or her score. All individual evaluations shall be signed and dated by the Committee member.

When a Committee member has completed evaluation of each proposal, the scores shall be transmitted to the Chairman of the Committee who will calculate the average score for each proposal.

Each member of the Committee must base his/her evaluation on the same criteria so that value uniformity can be established. The following considerations have been established as the review/evaluation criteria. These criteria have been provided to the Proposers in the RFP package.

The three (3) firms with the highest point total after evaluation of the first three (3) criteria in Article 4.2 of the Proposal Submittal Requirements will be shortlisted and required to sit for an interview with the Committee. More than 3 firms may be shortlisted at the Committee’s option. If less than 3 firms submit responses, the Authority, at its sole discretion, may elect to continue the selection process or re-advertise the project.
**Understanding and Approach** - (20 points out of 100)

Did the Proposer demonstrate its understanding of the project objectives and shall discuss the means by which these objectives will be attained?

Did the Proposer provide a tentative schedule for performing the key phases of this project?

Did the Proposer demonstrate soundness and clarity of its approach to the attainment of project objectives presented in the Special Provisions, SP1 - Scope of Services, making specific references to work encompassed, including a discussion of potential difficulties and methods for solution and probable effectiveness of the approach with respect to objectives?

**Understanding and Approach** __17__ points

Evaluation Committee Member Initials __RBN__

Review Comments:

- Proposed multiple ways to complete project.
- Offered to negotiate add-on solutions.
- Team understands needs and offered sound solutions for implementation.

__________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________
Experience of Firm and Ability of Staff - (20 points out of 100)

Did the Proposer list the most significant projects (maximum of 3) performed in the last five years that are similar to the project described in this Request for Proposals? Did the Proposer indicate the scope of work, date, engagement partners, and the name and telephone number of the principal client contact?

Did the Proposer demonstrate adequacy of experience of its firm and staff and in projects of similar scope and requirements; proven ability of Proposer’s staff to provide required services; time commitment of Proposer’s staff to the project?

Did the Proposer furnish resumes of the Project Manager (or equivalent classification) and other key personnel presently employed by the Proposer who will be assigned to the project? Does the Project Manager have a minimum of three (3) years of specific experience in the services required by the Special Provisions, SP-1, Scope of Services. Did the Proposer identify staff and the past experience of each, as it specifically relates to services required?

Did the Proposer provide information on the size of the firm, the size of the firm’s ITS/FON staff, the location of the office from which the work on this project is to be performed, the number and classification of the professional staff to be employed in this engagement on both a full-time and part-time basis? Additionally, did the Proposer provide a brief job description of each employee classification set forth above along with experience requirements (if any) for each classification?

Did the Proposer submit a copy of the Proposer’s current Certificate of Qualification in Intelligent Transportation Systems and any subcontractors Certificate of Qualification as applicable? Did the Proposer submit a copy(s) of individual’s current Certified Fiber Optic Technician Certificate?

Is the office located in the Orange County Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (Orange, Lake, Osceola and Seminole Counties)? Did the Proposer provide the address of the office?

Experience of Firm and Ability of Staff 18 points

Evaluation Committee Member Initials RCM

Review Comments: Proposer is local and has local staff to complete the work. States they have ample capacity and experience to be successful.
**Organization and Management** - (10 points out of 100)

Did the Proposer describe its organization and management policies and their application to ensure accomplishment of the Project requirements? Did the Proposer provide organizational charts which show the entire proposed organizational structure? Did the Proposer provide a description of the Proposer's internal lines of responsibility and authority, and the interface relationships with the Authority and any subcontractors?

Did the Proposer submit a staffing plan which clearly illustrates the key elements of the organizational structure proposed to accomplish the services required? Did the Proposer identify Project management and key staff? Did the Proposer address subcontractor services on the Project? Where subcontractor services are proposed, is the staffing plan furnished for the subcontractor firm(s)?

Did the Proposer describe the expected participation and contribution of the Proposer's top officials in the proposed activities? Did the Proposer provide a definition of responsibility and accountability for specific tasks and functions of key individuals within the Proposer's organization?

Does the Proposer address its quality control program, namely the policies followed to assure a complete, accurate and quality service as it relates to the services required? The program shall specify the method by which project related information is received and processed by the Proposer.

**Organization and Management** 89 points

Evaluation Committee Member Initials RBM

Review Comments:  
Organisation and management is shown.  
Staffing plan is provided identifying key staff.
**Interview** - (10 points out of 100)

Only shortlisted firms will be interviewed.

Were the Committee’s questions answered clearly and specifically to enable the Committee to evaluate the technical capability of the Proposer and key staff to provide the desired services?

**Interview** 8 points

Evaluation Committee Member Initials RBM

Review Comments: Questions were responded to thoroughly. Not all areas were able to be asked - we ran out of time in part to long answers.
# TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORING RECAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding and Approach (20 points max.)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm/Team Qualifications and Experience (20 points max.)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization and Management (10 points max.)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview (10 points max.)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TECHNICAL PROPOSAL TOTAL SCORE**

52 Points

Evaluation Committee Member Signature

[Signature]

6