Grading Criteria	GT Arch in	Burns McDonnell in partnership with Alliance Consulting	Dustin D		Josh S		Gary Z		Aaron P		Josh O				Total Available Score	Description of Grading Criteria
			GT Arch in partnership with Highlands & Prairie	with Alliance	partnership with Highlands &	with Alliance	partnership with Highlands &	with Alliance	partnership with	with Alliance	partnership with	Burns McDonnell in partnership with Alliance Consulting	partnership with Highlands &	Burns McDonnell in partnership with Alliance Consulting		
Ability of Professional Personnel	45	57	7	9	8	9	7	9	8	10	7	10	8	10		An evaluation of the consulting firm/team's ability to meet the needs of the City based on the proposed team's credentials and qualifications. Significant consideration may be given to the level of professional credentials to appropriately address the nature and complexity of the project. Consideration may also be given to the overall size and ability of firm to provide additional professional resources if needed.
Willingness to Meet Time and Budget Requirements  Location	93	107	17	18	15	15	15	19	15	19	15	18	16	18	20	The firm/team's willingness to dedicate appropriate resources (staff, time, equipment, etc.) to meet the City's needs and deadlines. Firms must submit an acceptable project schedule and identify an approach that supports the schedule.  Does the firm have an office in the City; Relative proximity to the project and/or ability to efficiently and economically mobilize resources and staff to manage all site work required.
Project deliverables  Related experience on similar projects	87	107	14	18	10	15 9	15	18	18	18	18	18	12	20	20	How the firm will organize and deliver information during and at the completion of the project.  How familiar the firm/team is with the specific type of work to be assigned, particularly on complicated projects with compressed schedules to ensure milestones are met.
Project understanding & approach Proposal Total	124 <b>447</b>	153 <b>520</b>	20 <b>75</b>	26 <b>88</b>	15 62	25 <b>73</b>	23 <b>76</b>	28 <b>91</b>	20 <b>77</b>	25 <b>89</b>	26 <b>83</b>	24 88	20 <b>74</b>	25 <b>91</b>		A general measure of the research the firm/team has conducted to develop an understanding and approach from initial planning through construction and final deliveries. The firm must demonstrate a thorough understanding of the City's standards and procedures.

Gary's comments: Burns McDonnell have so much more experience with scales and transfer stations and their firm size gives them the advantage over GT. GT is the local firm and Highlands is a good engineering firm but the proposal submittal didn't seem to compare with Burns and McDonnell.

Rachel's comments: GT is a smaller firm, does not have prior experience in transfer stations/solid waste, but does have experience with prior city projects.

Burns and McDonnell is a larger firm with experience specific to transfer facilities and solid waste facilities.

GT has indicated that they have 5 staff members dedicated to the project.

Burns and McDonnell has indicated that they have 10 staff members dedicated to the project as well as a construction firm out of Williston to be on-site GT is located here in the city.

Burns and McDonnell is located in Minnesota, but has a firm in Williston dedicated to on-site monitoring. GT has shown their schedule through a monthly chart, there are no specifics given as to dates for deliverables.

Burns and McDonnell has given specific dates for deliverables. Their timeline is a little more stretched out than GT.

GT has worked on municipal projects and met deadlines but again did not provide specifics on deliverables.

Burns and McDonnell has worked on multiple transfer station projects and has set a timeline with specific

deliverables.
GT provided information on their previous municipal experience.

Burns and McDonnell provided their previous work on the Baler Building Expansion as well as their experience with transfer stations that are similar in nature.

Josh O. comments: That's a tough one. Although GT has done a lot of city projects I'm not sure they know what they are getting into. They have no similar experience whereas B&M have done countless projects related to sw transfer type facilities. As far as coordination and deliverables I think whether its in person or via teams it'll be done in a professional way. The nice thing is B&M has all engineering staff on hand whereas GT uses mechanical and electrical firms for assistance. I think the size of the firm and the past experiences of the firm pushes B&M past GT in this project.

Aaron's comments: Burns McDonnell seems to have directly related experince toward the project the City is looking to complete. They have designed multiple facilities similar to what is being considered. The structure of their schedule seems to fit but the only concern is the bid opening toward the end of the construction season may cause some delays. They do not have local staff through the duration of the project. Gt is a local organization that has complete many projects for the city. They are very familiar with the city's codes and processes. Their schedule seems to be a bit quick, therefore possibly missing some things on the project which in turn would lead to change orders.

Although both firms would be qualified for the project, I believe that Burns McDonnell would be the best fit based on their past experiences in the Solid Waste and Recycling industry. They would be able to provide advice to areas needing extra attention as they have designed similar facilities to what we are seeking.

Dustin: No comments provided	
Josh S: No comments provided	