Administration Professional Services Rating Sheet

Grant Recipient CITY OF SWEENY Name of Respondent GRANTWORKS

Evaluator's Name L. KOSKINIEMI Date of Rating MAY 07, 2024

Rate the Respondent of the Request For Proposal (RFP) by awarding points up to the maximum listed for each factor. Information necessary to assess the Respondent on these criteria may be gathered either from past experience with the Respondent and/or by contacting past/current clients of the Respondent. Respondents proposing to offer specific services (environmental or buyout only) will be scored only on those services.

Experience

	Factors	Max.Pts.	Score
1.	Related Experience / Background with federally funded, CDBG projects	15	15
2.	Related Experience / Background with grant-funded comprehensive planning	15	12 - Not too sure which are specifically geared toward planning
3.	Related experience/background with specific services:		
	a. Grant Administration and coordination with GLO	10	10
	b. Disaster Recovery and Mitigation Project Management	10	10
4.	References from current/past clients p. 26 - 27	5	
	Subtotal, Experience	55	52

Work Performance

	Factors	Max.Pts.	Score
1.	Submits requests to client/GLO in a timely manner	5	5
2.	Responds to client/GLO requests in a timely manner	5	5
3.	Past client/GLO projects completed on schedule	5	5
4.	Work product is consistently of high quality with low level of errors	5	5
5.	Past client/GLO projects have low level of monitoring findings/concerns	5	5
6.	Manages projects within budgetary constraints	5	5
	Subtotal, Performance	30	30

Capacity to Perform

	Factors	Max.Pts.	Score
1.	Qualifications / Experience of Staff		
	a. Grant Administrative	3	3
	b. Comprehensive Planning	3	3
2.	Present and Projected Workloads	2	2
3.	Demonstrated understanding of scope of the RCP Project	2	2
	Subtotal, Capacity to Perform	10	10

Proposed Cost

Factors	Max.Pts.	Score
Proposed cost is in line with independent estimate and compared with all cost proposals received	5	5
A = Lowest Proposal $ 300,000 A ÷ B X 5 = Respondent's Score B = Respondent's Proposal $ 300,000	5	5

$39K for GW

$261K for RCP Plan Development

TOTAL SCORE

	Factors	Max.Pts.	Score
☐	Experience	55	52
☐	Work Performance	30	30
☐	Capacity to Perform	10	10
☐	Proposed Cost	5	5
	Total Score	100	97

- City of Nash Jennifer - "They have done a great job for us!"
- City of Wharton

- Awarded. Nash chose GW. All projects completed

Administration Professional Services Rating Sheet

Grant Recipient CITY OF SWEENY Name of Respondent LANGFORD CMS

Evaluator's Name L. KOSKINIEMI Date of Rating MAY 07, 2024

Rate the Respondent of the Request For Proposal (RFP) by awarding points up to the maximum listed for each factor. Information necessary to assess the Respondent on these criteria may be gathered either from past experience with the Respondent and/or by contacting past/current clients of the Respondent. Respondents proposing to offer specific services (environmental or buyout only) will be scored only on those services.

Experience

	Factors	Max.Pts.	Score
1.	Related Experience / Background with federally funded, CDBG projects	15	15
2.	Related Experience / Background with grant-funded comprehensive planning	15	14
3.	Related experience/background with specific services:		
	a. Grant Administration and coordination with GLO	10	8
	b. Disaster Recovery and Mitigation Project Management	10	10
4.	References from current/past clients	5	5
	Subtotal, Experience	55	52

Work Performance

- No contact info for some references. - City of Lyford. 956-347-3512

	Factors	Max.Pts.	Score
1.	Submits requests to client/GLO in a timely manner	5	5
2.	Responds to client/GLO requests in a timely manner	5	5
3.	Past client/GLO projects completed on schedule	5	5
4.	Work product is consistently of high quality with low level of errors	5	5
5.	Past client/GLO projects have low level of monitoring findings/concerns	5	5
6.	Manages projects within budgetary constraints	5	
	Subtotal, Performance	30	30

Capacity to Perform

	Factors	Max.Pts.	Score
1.	Qualifications / Experience of Staff		
	a. Grant Administrative	3	3
	b. Comprehensive Planning	3	3
2.	Present and Projected Workloads	2	0
3.	Demonstrated understanding of scope of the RCP Project	2	1
	Subtotal, Capacity to Perform	10	7

- No info on capacity fund in submittal

Proposed Cost

Factors	Max.Pts.	Score
Proposed cost is in line with independent estimate and compared with all cost proposals received	5	2
A = Lowest Proposal $300,000.00 A ÷ B X 5 = Respondent's Score B = Respondent's Proposal $300,000.	5	2

TOTAL SCORE

	Factors	Max.Pts.	Score
☐	Experience	55	52
☐	Work Performance	30	30
☐	Capacity to Perform	10	7
☐	Proposed Cost	5	2
	Total Score	100	91

Administration Professional Services Rating Sheet

Grant Recipient CITY OF SWEENY Name of Respondent PUBLIC MANAGEMENT

Evaluator's Name L. KOSKINIEMI Date of Rating MAY 07, 2024

Rate the Respondent of the Request For Proposal (RFP) by awarding points up to the maximum listed for each factor. Information necessary to assess the Respondent on these criteria may be gathered either from past experience with the Respondent and/or by contacting past/current clients of the Respondent. Respondents proposing to offer specific services (environmental or buyout only) will be scored only on those services.

Experience

	Factors	Max.Pts.	Score	
1.	Related Experience / Background with federally funded, CDBG projects	15	15	
2.	Related Experience / Background with grant-funded comprehensive planning	15	13	
3.	Related experience/background with specific services:			
	a. Grant Administration and coordination with GLO	10	5	- Did not provide specific project info
	b. Disaster Recovery and Mitigation Project Management	10	5	
4.	References from current/past clients	5	5	
	Subtotal, Experience	55	43	

Work Performance

	Factors	Max.Pts.	Score	
1.	Submits requests to client/GLO in a timely manner	5	3	
2.	Responds to client/GLO requests in a timely manner	5	4	- Cold called refs.
3.	Past client/GLO projects completed on schedule	5	5	
4.	Work product is consistently of high quality with low level of errors	5	2	← While minor to some, there were several grammatical mistakes that made me question attention to detail.
5.	Past client/GLO projects have low level of monitoring findings/concerns	5	5	
6.	Manages projects within budgetary constraints	5	5	
	Subtotal, Performance	30	24	

Capacity to Perform

	Factors	Max.Pts.	Score	
1.	Qualifications / Experience of Staff			
	a. Grant Administrative	3	2	
	b. Comprehensive Planning	3	2	
2.	Present and Projected Workloads	2	0	- Saw no detail on this.
3.	Demonstrated understanding of scope of the RCP Project	2	2	
	Subtotal, Capacity to Perform	10	6	

Proposed Cost

Factors	Max.Pts.	Score
Proposed cost is in line with independent estimate and compared with all cost proposals received	5	5
A = Lowest Proposal $_____ A ÷ B X 5 = Respondent's Score B = Respondent's Proposal $ 100,000.00	5	

TOTAL SCORE * Fee certified for 90 days from date on letter 4/23/2024.

	Factors	Max.Pts.	Score
☐	Experience	55	43
☐	Work Performance	30	24
☐	Capacity to Perform	10	6
☐	Proposed Cost	5	5
	Total Score	100	78