

City of Forest Park Procurement

_ _

745 Forest Parkway, Forest Park, GA 30297

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2024-RFP-005

Geotechnical Environmental Services (Annual Contract)

RESPONSE DEADLINE: March 5, 2025 at 2:00 pm Report Generated: Friday, June 6, 2025

VENDOR QUESTIONNAIRE PASS/FAIL

Question Title	Falcon Design Consultants	United Consulting Group, Ltd.
Proposal Submittal Letter Form	Pass	Pass
Proponent's Technical Proposal	Pass	Pass
Upload Cost Proposal separate from the technical proposal. DO NOT include any cost in the Technical Proposal.		
Illegal Immigration Reform and Enforcement Act	Pass	Pass
Contractor's Statement of Legal Status and Financial Capability	Pass	Fail
Acknowledgement of Insurance and Bonding Requirements	Pass	Pass
Proponent's Contact Directory	Pass	Pass
List of Clients	Pass	Pass
Non-Collusion Affidavit	Pass	Pass
Certificate Regarding Debarment, Suspension and other Matters	Pass	Pass
Local, Small Business, Diversity Program (Forms 1-4)	Pass	Pass
Georgia General Contractor's License(s)	Pass	Fail
State of Georgia Certificate of Existence	Pass	Pass

Question Title		Falcon Design Consultants	United Consulting Group, Ltd.	
	W-9	Pass	Pass	

PHASE 2

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)	
Experience and Qualifications	Points Based	25 (21.7% of Total)	

Description:

Demonstrate the firm's capacity to complete the project based upon education, training and experience within the last seven (7) years. The Proponent must provide a detailed understanding of project requirements & procedures to include information describing the firm's experience that pertains to the discipline described in the scope of work for this RFP, including examples past performance of similar work for municipalities. Provide three (3) examples of deliverables the firm has provided for other municipalities, within the last five (5) years.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)	
Organizational Structures and Resumes	Points Based	25 (21.7% of Total)	

Description:

Provide an organizational chart that lists key team and their titles and describe the position roles in the organization. In the event there is a need to replace key team members during the term of any contract awarded, if any, the proponent must describe its back-up personnel, identify the individual(s) and role(s). Provide a resume for all staff to be used on the project. Submit a resume not exceeding two (2) pages for each person, organized as follows:

- Name and title
- Professional background
- Current and past relevant employment

EVALUATION TABULATION

Request For Proposal - Geotechnical Environmental Services (Annual Contract)

- Education
- Certifications

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)	
Management Plan	Points Based	20 (17.4% of Total)	

Description:

Provide information on how the firm plans to perform tasks and execute the work. A person must be designated as the principal contact for the tasks associated with the scope. Provide information on the experience of the principal contact person on similar projects. The proponent must submit an executive level plan describing the management process the proponent will implement to ensure all work and services performed are of the highest quality. The approach should include a description of the proponent's process as it pertains to equipment, methods, techniques, and procedures used to ensure accurate and comprehensive services. The proponent should describe its means and methods of reporting levels of service, etc. Describe the proponent's corrective action plan. Describe how the proponent's organizational structure supports this plan and clearly identify responsible and accountable parties. Describe what information you would expect the city to supply or be responsible for.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)	
References and Financial Stability	Points Based	10 (8.7% of Total)	

Description:

Provide a minimum of three (3) specific references of examples of relevant and similar experience of providing similar size, scope, and complexity to include the municipality, contact person, address, phone number and email.

Provide history of the company and financial responsibility to include financial statements for the last three (3) years.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)		
Cost Proposal	Points Based	20 (17.4% of Total)		

EVALUATION TABULATION

Description:

DO NOT INCLUDE COST IN TECHNICIAL PROPOSAL.

Provide a detailed fee schedule, including hourly rates for professional services, construction management, surveying services and all costs (labor, material, overhead, administration, profit, travel, etc.) associated with providing the services listed in the scope of work. The City anticipates ordering all tasks; however, it reserves the right to modify the tasks described.

Proposed fees should be listed by phase and task as well as a total for all phases and tasks. The City of Forest Park reserves the right to request a specific breakdown of item costs within each task. Costs shall be inclusive and be itemized to show the number of hours of direct labor for each task.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Local, Small Business, and Diversity Program (LSBD Outreach Plan) (5 Bonus Points)	Points Based	5 (4.3% of Total)

Description:

This section should include Local Labor/Employees and/or demonstrates Good Faith Efforts (GFE) / Outreach.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)	
Interview/Presentation (10 Bonus Points)	Points Based	10 (8.7% of Total)	

Description:

Any Proponent who submits a proposal may be required to make an oral presentation of its capability to perform as described in its proposal to the City. The Key Personnel, or some group thereof, as identified in the Proponent's proposal must be active participants in the oral presentation. The Proponent's presentation should focus on an understanding of the capabilities of the proposed solution. The City will notify responsive proponents of the date, time and location for the presentation, and will supply an agenda or topics for discussion.

Such a presentation will be at the Proponent's expense.

AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY

Vendor	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Total Score (Max Score 115)
Falcon Design Consultants	106	105	105	105.33
United Consulting Group, Ltd.	105	105	105	105
UES Excluded	73	78	83	78
ECS Southeast, LLC Excluded	67	75	75	72.33
Geo-Hydro Engineers Excluded	54	59	59	57.33

VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA

Vendor	Experience and Qualifications Points Based 25 Points (21.7%)	Organizational Structures and Resumes Points Based 25 Points (21.7%)	Management Plan Points Based 20 Points (17.4%)	References and Financial Stability Points Based 10 Points (8.7%)	Cost Proposal Points Based 20 Points (17.4%)	Local, Small Business, and Diversity Program (LSBD Outreach Plan) (5 Bonus Points) Points Based 5 Points (4.3%)	Interview/Presentation (10 Bonus Points) Points Based 10 Points (8.7%)	Total Score (Max Score 115)
Falcon Design Consultants	25	25	10.3	10	20	5	10	105.33
United Consulting Group, Ltd.	25	25	20	6	16	5	8	105
UES Excluded	25	21.7	13.3	10	8	0	0	78

Vendor	Experience and Qualifications Points Based 25 Points (21.7%)	Organizational Structures and Resumes Points Based 25 Points (21.7%)	Management Plan Points Based 20 Points (17.4%)	References and Financial Stability Points Based 10 Points (8.7%)	Cost Proposal Points Based 20 Points (17.4%)	Local, Small Business, and Diversity Program (LSBD Outreach Plan) (5 Bonus Points) Points Based 5 Points (4.3%)	Interview/Presentation (10 Bonus Points) Points Based 10 Points (8.7%)	Total Score (Max Score 115)
ECS Southeast, LLC Excluded	18.3	18.3	15.7	8	12	0	0	72.33
Geo-Hydro Engineers Excluded	15	15	13.3	10	4	0	0	57.33

INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES

Falcon Design Consultants		
Experience and Qualifications Points Based 25 Points (21.7%)		
Evaluator 1: 25		
Met the requirement		
Evaluator 2: 25		
Evaluator 3: 25		
Demonstrates the firm's qualifications relevant experience, and understanding of the project Include	laa ayamamlaa af aimailam maymiaimal	

Demonstrates the firm's qualifications, relevant experience, and understanding of the project. Includes examples of similar municipal work and deliverables from the past five years.

Organizational Structures and Resumes P	Points Based	25 Points (21.7%)
---	--------------	-------------------

Evaluator 1: 25

EVALUATION TABULATION

Request For Proposal - Geotechnical Environmental Services (Annual Contract)

Page 6

Included landscaping as requested.

Evaluator 2: 25

Evaluator 3: 25

Includes a clear organizational chart, detailed role descriptions, identified backup personnel, and complete, well-organized resumes for all team members, demonstrating strong preparation and staffing.

Management Plan | Points Based | 20 Points (17.4%)

Evaluator 1: 11

I didn't see a plan. But met other things in the scope.

Evaluator 2: 10

Not provided in proposal

Evaluator 3: 10

management plan not provided. Left blank and not uploaded

References and Financial Stability | Points Based | 10 Points (8.7%)

Evaluator 1: 10

References scored 10

Evaluator 2: 10

Not provided in proposal

Evaluator 3: 10

Requested info provided.

Cost Proposal | Points Based | 20 Points (17.4%)

Evaluator 1: 20

Provided lowest hourly rates for all positions except soil/erosion.

EVALUATION TABULATION

Request For Proposal - Geotechnical Environmental Services (Annual Contract)

	Evaluator 2: 20
Not provided in proposal	
	Evaluator 3: 20

Provided the lowest hourly rates for all positions except for soil/erosion.

Local, Small Business, and Diversity Program (LSBD Outreach Plan) (5 Bonus Points) Points Based 5 Points (4.3%)
Evaluator 1: 5
Evaluator 2: 5
Evaluator 3: 5
Interview/Presentation (10 Bonus Points) Points Based 10 Points (8.7%)
interview/iresentation (10 bonds i onits) Fonits based 10 Fonits (0.770)
Evaluator 1: 10
Evaluator 2: 10
Evaluator 3: 10

United Consulting Group, Ltd.		
Experience and Qualifications Points Based 25 Points (21.7%)		
Evaluator 1: 25		
Meets min. qualifications and has landscaping.		
Evaluator 2: 25		
Evaluator 3: 25		

clear organizational chart, detailed role descriptions, identified backup personnel, and complete, well-organized two-page resumes for all team members, demonstrating strong preparation and staffing.

Organizational Structures and Resumes | Points Based | 25 Points (21.7%)

Evaluator 1: 25

Has an landscaping team. An multiple staff options listed.

Evaluator 2: 25

Evaluator 3: 25

Clear organizational chart, detailed role descriptions, identified backup personnel, and complete, well-organized resumes for all team members, demonstrating strong preparation and staffing.

Management Plan | Points Based | 20 Points (17.4%)

Evaluator 1: 20

They did have a management plan.

Evaluator 2: 20

Evaluator 3: 20

Provided a clear management plan with defined roles, proven experience, quality assurance methods, reporting processes, and corrective actions. It also outlines needed city input, ensuring alignment and accountability to foster communication and expectation.

References and Financial Stability | Points Based | 10 Points (8.7%)

Evaluator 1: 6

References scores were not good did not provide financial information.

Evaluator 2: 6

Evaluator 3: 6

did not provide required docs regarding financial stability and references were not clear

Cost Proposal | Points Based | 20 Points (17.4%)

Evaluator 1: 16

Provided 2nd lowest hourly rates for all positions except soil/erosion. The cost for soil/erosion is the highest out of all proposals.

Evaluator 2: 16

Evaluator 3: 16

Provided the second-lowest hourly rates for all positions except for soil/erosion, which has the highest cost among all proposals.

Local, Small Business, and Diversity Program (LSBD Outreach Plan) (5 Bonus Points) Points Based 5 Points (4.3%)
Evaluator 1: 5
Evaluator 2: 5
Evaluator 3: 5

Interview/Presentation (10 Bonus Points) Points Based 10 Points (8.7%)
Evaluator 1: 8
Evaluator 2: 8
Evaluator 3: 8

ECS Southeast, LLC (Excluded)

Experience and Qualifications | Points Based | 25 Points (21.7%)

Evaluator 1: 15

Missing LA.

Evaluator 2: 20

Evaluator 3: 20

does not have landscape qualification and or partnership to attain a member that would have it at the time of proposal.

EVALUATION TABULATION

Request For Proposal - Geotechnical Environmental Services (Annual Contract)

Page 10

	Organizational Structures and Resumes Points Based 25 Points (21.7%)
	Evaluator 1: 15
No Landscaping included.	
	Evaluator 2: 20
	Evaluator 3: 20
P. L. C.P. C.L. L.	

did not list landscaper

Manag	ement Plan Points Based 20 Points (17.4%)	
	Evaluator 1: 17	
Appeared to be generic.		
	Evaluator 2: 15	
	Evaluator 3: 15	

not clear on who will do what when at the time

References and Financial Stability Points Based 10 Points (8.7%)
Evaluator 1: 8
Evaluator 2: 8
No Financial statements provided
Evaluator 3: 8
reference for home, equation and ideal adjugates expenses against a thorough a 10 hut HC gave an 0

reference for henry county provided a ding for customer service. others gave a 10 but HC gave an 8

Cost Proposal | Points Based | 20 Points (17.4%)

Evaluator 1: 12

Provided 3 lowest hourly rate for all position's except soil/erosion. The cost for soil/erosion is the lowest of all proposals.

Evaluator 2: 12

Cost proposal not included

Evaluator 3: 12

Provided the third-lowest hourly rates for all positions except for soil/erosion, which has the lowest cost among all proposals.

Local, Small Business, and Diversity Program	(LSBD Outreach Plan) (5 Bonus Points)	Points Based 5 Points (4.3%)

Evaluator 1: 0

Evaluator 2: 0

Evaluator 3: 0

Interview/Presentation (10 Bonus Points) | Points Based | 10 Points (8.7%)

Evaluator 1: 0

Evaluator 2: 0

Evaluator 3: 0

Geo-Hydro Engineers (Excluded)

Experience and Qualifications | Points Based | 25 Points (21.7%)

Evaluator 1: 15

No Landscaping included

Evaluator 2: 15

Evaluator 3: 15

no landscaping qualifications

Organizational Structures and Resumes	Points Based	25 Points	21 7%)
Organizational Structures and resulties	I I OIIICO DUSCU		C 1.//U/

Evaluator 1: 15

No landscaping no mention of it.

Evaluator 2: 15

Only 2 people

Evaluator 3: 15

no landscaping qualifications listed or partnered

Management Plan | Points Based | 20 Points (17.4%)

Evaluator 1: 10

Management plan does not aline with current service request.

Evaluator 2: 15

Has management plan but specific to this project

Evaluator 3: 15

has a management plan but not specific to the project currently bidding on.

References and Financial Stability | Points Based | 10 Points (8.7%)

Evaluator 1: 10

Their projects did are not similar to requested services.

Evaluator 2: 10

Evaluator 3: 10

All 3 references provided a 10 but not in relationship to this project.

Cost Proposal | Points Based | 20 Points (17.4%)

Evaluator 1: 4

Only provided pricing for two out of five positions needed for this contract.

Evaluator 2: 4

Evaluator 3: 4

Only provided pricing for 2 out of 5 positions needed for this contract.

Local, Small Business, and Diversity Program (LSBD Outreach Plan) (5 Bonus Points) | Points Based | 5 Points (4.3%)

Evaluator 1:0

Evaluator 2: 0

Evaluator 3: 0

Interview/Presentation (10 Bonus Points) | Points Based | 10 Points (8.7%)

Evaluator 1: 0

Evaluator 2: 0

Evaluator 3: 0

UES

(Excluded)

Experience and Qualifications | Points Based | 25 Points (21.7%)

Evaluator 1: 25

Met the requirements

Evaluator 2: 25

Evaluator 3: 25

Clearly demonstrates the firm's qualifications, relevant experience, and understanding of the project. It includes strong examples of similar municipal work and deliverables from the past five years, showing proven capability.

Evaluator 1: 20

There was no back up personnel for the LA.

Evaluator 2: 20

Evaluator 3: 25

Included a clear organizational chart, detailed role descriptions, identified backup personnel, and complete, well-organized resumes for all team members, demonstrating strong preparation and staffing.

Management Plan | Points Based | 20 Points (17.4%)

Evaluator 1: 10

No specific management plan, mentions deficiencies tracking

Evaluator 2: 15

Not a preconcise management plan

Evaluator 3: 15

have a management plan but not concise of who does what and when

References and Financial Stability | Points Based | 10 Points (8.7%)

Evaluator 1: 10

Received scores of 10's from references.

Evaluator 2: 10

Evaluator 3: 10

Includes three detailed, relevant references with full contact info, plus a clear company history and three years of financial statements, demonstrating reliability, experience, and financial stability.

EVALUATION TABULATION

Request For Proposal - Geotechnical Environmental Services (Annual Contract)

Page 15

Cost Proposal	Points Rased	20 Points (17.4%)	
COST LICHOSAL	I PUIILS Daseu	ZU FUIILS (1/.4/0/	

Evaluator 1: 8

Provided highest hourly rate for all positions except soil/erosion

Evaluator 2: 8

Evaluator 3: 8

Provided highest hourly rates for all positions except soil/erosion.

Local Small Business and	d Divorcity Program	(LSBD Outreach Plan) (5 Bonu	ic Dointe Dointe Bacoc	1 5 Daints // 20/1
LUCAL SITIALI DUSILIESS, ALI	u Diversity Frogram	(LSDD Outreach Flair (S BOIL	is collica i collica dasec	1 1 3 PUIIILS (4.3 <i>%)</i>

Evaluator 1: 0

Evaluator 2: 0

Evaluator 3: 0

Interview/Presentation (10 Bonus Points) | Points Based | 10 Points (8.7%)

Evaluator 1: 0

Evaluator 2: 0

Evaluator 3: 0

PHASE 1

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Experience and Qualifications	Points Based	25 (25% of Total)

Description:

EVALUATION TABULATION

Request For Proposal - Geotechnical Environmental Services (Annual Contract)

Demonstrate the firm's capacity to complete the project based upon education, training and experience within the last seven (7) years. The Proponent must provide a detailed understanding of project requirements & procedures to include information describing the firm's experience that pertains to the discipline described in the scope of work for this RFP, including examples past performance of similar work for municipalities. Provide three (3) examples of deliverables the firm has provided for other municipalities, within the last five (5) years.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Organizational Structures and Resumes	Points Based	25 (25% of Total)

Description:

Provide an organizational chart that lists key team and their titles and describe the position roles in the organization. In the event there is a need to replace key team members during the term of any contract awarded, if any, the proponent must describe its back-up personnel, identify the individual(s) and role(s). Provide a resume for all staff to be used on the project. Submit a resume not exceeding two (2) pages for each person, organized as follows:

- Name and title
- Professional background
- Current and past relevant employment
- Education
- Certifications

Criteria Scoring Method		Weight (Points)	
Management Plan	Points Based	20 (20% of Total)	

Description:

Provide information on how the firm plans to perform tasks and execute the work. A person must be designated as the principal contact for the tasks associated with the scope. Provide information on the experience of the principal contact person on similar projects. The proponent must submit an executive level plan describing the management process the proponent will implement to ensure all work and services performed are of the highest quality. The approach should include a description of the proponent's process as it pertains to equipment, methods, techniques, and procedures used to ensure accurate and comprehensive

EVALUATION TABULATION

services. The proponent should describe its means and methods of reporting levels of service, etc. Describe the proponent's corrective action plan. Describe how the proponent's organizational structure supports this plan and clearly identify responsible and accountable parties. Describe what information you would expect the city to supply or be responsible for.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
References and Financial Stability	Points Based	10 (10% of Total)

Description:

Provide a minimum of three (3) specific references of examples of relevant and similar experience of providing similar size, scope, and complexity to include the municipality, contact person, address, phone number and email.

Provide history of the company and financial responsibility to include financial statements for the last three (3) years.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Cost Proposal	Points Based	20 (20% of Total)

Description:

DO NOT INCLUDE COST IN TECHNICIAL PROPOSAL.

Provide a detailed fee schedule, including hourly rates for professional services, construction management, surveying services and all costs (labor, material, overhead, administration, profit, travel, etc.) associated with providing the services listed in the scope of work. The City anticipates ordering all tasks; however, it reserves the right to modify the tasks described.

Proposed fees should be listed by phase and task as well as a total for all phases and tasks. The City of Forest Park reserves the right to request a specific breakdown of item costs within each task. Costs shall be inclusive and be itemized to show the number of hours of direct labor for each task.

AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY

Vendor	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Total Score (Max Score 100)
United Consulting Group, Ltd.	92	92	92	92
Falcon Design Consultants	91	90	90	90.33
UES	73	78	83	78
ECS Southeast, LLC	67	75	75	72.33
Geo-Hydro Engineers	54	59	59	57.33

VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA

Vendor	Experience and Qualifications Points Based 25 Points (25%)	Organizational Structures and Resumes Points Based 25 Points (25%)	Management Plan Points Based 20 Points (20%)	References and Financial Stability Points Based 10 Points (10%)	Cost Proposal Points Based 20 Points (20%)	Total Score (Max Score 100)
United Consulting Group, Ltd.	25	25	20	6	16	92
Falcon Design Consultants	25	25	10.3	10	20	90.33
UES	25	21.7	13.3	10	8	78
ECS Southeast, LLC	18.3	18.3	15.7	8	12	72.33
Geo-Hydro Engineers	15	15	13.3	10	4	57.33

INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES

				 . ~
ECS	CO	uth	A a ct	 1 ()
ГСЭ	ക		easi	 1 (.

Experience and Qualifications | Points Based | 25 Points (21.7%)

Evaluator 1: 15

EVALUATION TABULATION

Request For Proposal - Geotechnical Environmental Services (Annual Contract)

Missing LA.

Evaluator 2: 20

Evaluator 3: 20

does not have landscape qualification and or partnership to attain a member that would have it at the time of proposal.

Organizational Structures and Resumes Points Based 25 Points (21.7%)				
	Evaluator 1: 15			
No Landscaping included.				
	Evaluator 2: 20			
	Evaluator 3: 20			

did not list landscaper

	Management Plan Points Based 20 Points (17.4%)	
	Evaluator 1: 17	
Appeared to be generic.		
	Evaluator 2: 15	
	Evaluator 3: 15	

not clear on who will do what when at the time

References and Financial Stability Points Based 10 Points (8.7%)
Evaluator 1: 8
Evaluator 2: 8
No Financial statements provided
Evaluator 3: 8
reference for henry county provided a ding for customer service. others gave a 10 but HC gave an 8

EVALUATION TABULATION

Request For Proposal - Geotechnical Environmental Services (Annual Contract)

Cost Proposal |

Evaluator 1: 12

Points Based | 20 Points (17.4%)

Provided 3 lowest hourly rate for all position's except soil/erosion. The cost for soil/erosion is the lowest of all proposals.

Evaluator 2: 12

Cost proposal not included

Evaluator 3: 12

Provided the third-lowest hourly rates for all positions except for soil/erosion, which has the lowest cost among all proposals.

Falcon	Design	Consu	ltants

Experience and Qualifications	Points Based	25 Points (21.7%)
-------------------------------	--------------	-------------------

Evaluator 1: 25

Met the requirement

Evaluator 2: 25

Evaluator 3: 25

Demonstrates the firm's qualifications, relevant experience, and understanding of the project. Includes examples of similar municipal work and deliverables from the past five years.

Organizational Structures and Nesumes Frontis based F25 Folitis (21.7/	Organizational Structures and Resume	I Points Based	25 Points (21.7%)
--	--------------------------------------	----------------	-------------------

Evaluator 1: 25

Included landscaping as requested.

Evaluator 2: 25

Evaluator 3: 25

Includes a clear organizational chart, detailed role descriptions, identified backup personnel, and complete, well-organized resumes for all team members, demonstrating strong preparation and staffing.

Management Plan F	Points Based 20 Points (17.4%)
Ev	aluator 1: 11
I didn't see a plan. But met other things in the scope.	
Ev	aluator 2: 10
Not provided in proposal	
Ev	aluator 3: 10

management plan not provided. Left blank and not uploaded

	References and Financial Stability Points Based 10 Points (8.7%)
	Evaluator 1: 10
References scored 10	
	Evaluator 2: 10
Not provided in proposal	
	Evaluator 3: 10
Requested info provided.	

Cost Proposal Points Based 20 Points (17.4%)	
Evaluator 1: 20	
Provided lowest hourly rates for all positions except soil/erosion.	
Evaluator 2: 20	
Not provided in proposal	
Evaluator 3: 20	
Provided the lowest hourly rates for all positions except for soil/erosion.	

EVALUATION TABULATION

Request For Proposal - Geotechnical Environmental Services (Annual Contract)

Page 22

	Geo-Hydro Engineers	
	Experience and Qualifications Points Based 25 Points (21.7%)	
	Evaluator 1: 15	
No Landscaping included		
	Evaluator 2: 15	
	Evaluator 3: 15	

Organizational Structu	res and Resumes Points Based 25 Points (21.7%)
	Evaluator 1: 15
No landscaping no mention of it.	
	Evaluator 2: 15
Only 2 people	
	Evaluator 3: 15
no landscaping qualifications listed or partnered	

Management Plan Points Based 20 Points (17.4%)
Evaluator 1: 10
Management plan does not aline with current service request.
Evaluator 2: 15
Has management plan but specific to this project
Evaluator 3: 15
has a management plan but not specific to the project currently bidding on.

no landscaping qualifications

References and Financial Stability | Points Based | 10 Points (8.7%)

Evaluator 1: 10

Their projects did are not similar to requested services.

Evaluator 2: 10

Evaluator 3: 10

All 3 references provided a 10 but not in relationship to this project.

Cost Proposal | Points Based | 20 Points (17.4%)

Evaluator 1: 4

Only provided pricing for two out of five positions needed for this contract.

Evaluator 2: 4

Evaluator 3: 4

Only provided pricing for 2 out of 5 positions needed for this contract.

UES

Experience and Qualifications | Points Based | 25 Points (21.7%)

Evaluator 1: 25

Met the requirements

Evaluator 2: 25

Evaluator 3: 25

Clearly demonstrates the firm's qualifications, relevant experience, and understanding of the project. It includes strong examples of similar municipal work and deliverables from the past five years, showing proven capability.

Evaluator 1: 20

There was no back up personnel for the LA.

Evaluator 2: 20

Evaluator 3: 25

Included a clear organizational chart, detailed role descriptions, identified backup personnel, and complete, well-organized resumes for all team members, demonstrating strong preparation and staffing.

Management Plan | Points Based | 20 Points (17.4%)

Evaluator 1: 10

No specific management plan, mentions deficiencies tracking

Evaluator 2: 15

Not a preconcise management plan

Evaluator 3: 15

have a management plan but not concise of who does what and when

References and Financial Stability | Points Based | 10 Points (8.7%)

Evaluator 1: 10

Received scores of 10's from references.

Evaluator 2: 10

Evaluator 3: 10

Includes three detailed, relevant references with full contact info, plus a clear company history and three years of financial statements, demonstrating reliability, experience, and financial stability.

Cost Proposal | Points Based | 20 Points (17.4%)

Evaluator 1:8

Provided highest hourly rate for all positions except soil/erosion

Evaluator 2: 8

Evaluator 3: 8

Provided highest hourly rates for all positions except soil/erosion.

United Consulting Group, Ltd.

Experience and Qualifications | Points Based | 25 Points (21.7%)

Evaluator 1: 25

Meets min. qualifications and has landscaping.

Evaluator 2: 25

Evaluator 3: 25

clear organizational chart, detailed role descriptions, identified backup personnel, and complete, well-organized two-page resumes for all team members, demonstrating strong preparation and staffing.

Organizational Structures and Resumes | Points Based | 25 Points (21.7%)

Evaluator 1: 25

Has an landscaping team. An multiple staff options listed.

Evaluator 2: 25

Evaluator 3: 25

Clear organizational chart, detailed role descriptions, identified backup personnel, and complete, well-organized resumes for all team members, demonstrating strong preparation and staffing.

Management Plan | Points Based | 20 Points (17.4%)

Evaluator 1: 20

They did have a management plan.

Evaluator 2: 20

Evaluator 3: 20

Provided a clear management plan with defined roles, proven experience, quality assurance methods, reporting processes, and corrective actions. It also outlines needed city input, ensuring alignment and accountability to foster communication and expectation.

References and Financial Stability | Points Based | 10 Points (8.7%)

Evaluator 1: 6

References scores were not good did not provide financial information.

Evaluator 2: 6

Evaluator 3: 6

did not provide required docs regarding financial stability and references were not clear

Cost Proposal | Points Based | 20 Points (17.4%)

Evaluator 1: 16

Provided 2nd lowest hourly rates for all positions except soil/erosion. The cost for soil/erosion is the highest out of all proposals.

Evaluator 2: 16

Evaluator 3: 16

Provided the second-lowest hourly rates for all positions except for soil/erosion, which has the highest cost among all proposals.