

## 2016-23 RLI Evaluation Form

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

|                         |                             |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>Project:</b>         | <b>SWWWTF Design Review</b> |
| <b>RLI No.:</b>         | <b>2017-04</b>              |
| <b>Date of Ranking:</b> | <b>12/6/2016</b>            |

### Hazen and Sawyer

| <i>Evaluation Criteria</i>             | <i>Value</i> | <i>JD</i> | <i>MV</i> | <i>AD</i> | <i>MS</i> | <i>WV</i> | <i>Score</i> |
|--|--------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------------|
| Understanding of Project/Deliverables  | 0-5          | 3         | 2         | 3         | 0         | 3         | <b>11</b>    |
| Expertise/Qualifications of Personnel  | 0-5          | 5         | 4         | 4         | 3         | 5         | <b>21</b>    |
| Availability of Personnel/Timeline     | 0-5          | 3         | 3         | 4         | 1         | 3         | <b>14</b>    |
| Evaluations/Experience on NPU projects | 0-5          | 3         | 4         | 4         | 3         | 3         | <b>17</b>    |
| Proposed Cost Saving Measures          | 0-5          | 4         | 3         | 3         | 3         | 3         | <b>16</b>    |
| Quality of Proposal                    | 0-5          | 2         | 2         | 2         | 1         | 2         | <b>9</b>     |
| References                             | 0-5          | 4         | 4         | 5         | 3         | 4         | <b>20</b>    |
|  |              | 24        | 22        | 25        | 14        | 23        | <b>108</b>   |

### CDM Smith - No Response

| <i>Evaluation Criteria</i>             | <i>Value</i> | <i>JD</i> | <i>MV</i> | <i>AD</i> | <i>MS</i> | <i>WV</i> | <i>Score</i> |
|--|--------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------------|
| Understanding of Project/Deliverables  | 0-5          |           |           |           |           |           | <b>0</b>     |
| Expertise/Qualifications of Personnel  | 0-5          |           |           |           |           |           | <b>0</b>     |
| Availability of Personnel/Timeline     | 0-5          |           |           |           |           |           | <b>0</b>     |
| Evaluations/Experience on NPU projects | 0-5          |           |           |           |           |           | <b>0</b>     |
| Proposed Cost Saving Measures          | 0-5          |           |           |           |           |           | <b>0</b>     |
| Quality of Proposal                    |              |           |           |           |           |           | <b>0</b>     |
| References                             | 0-5          |           |           |           |           |           | <b>0</b>     |
|  |              | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         | <b>0</b>     |

### Stantec Consulting - No Response

| <i>Evaluation Criteria</i>             | <i>Value</i> | <i>JD</i> | <i>MV</i> | <i>AD</i> | <i>MS</i> | <i>WV</i> | <i>Score</i> |
|--|--------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------------|
| Understanding of Project/Deliverables  | 0-5          |           |           |           |           |           | <b>0</b>     |
| Expertise/Qualifications of Personnel  | 0-5          |           |           |           |           |           | <b>0</b>     |
| Availability of Personnel/Timeline     | 0-5          |           |           |           |           |           | <b>0</b>     |
| Evaluations/Experience on NPU projects | 0-5          |           |           |           |           |           | <b>0</b>     |
| Proposed Cost Saving Measures          | 0-5          |           |           |           |           |           | <b>0</b>     |
| Quality of Proposal                    | 0-5          |           |           |           |           |           | <b>0</b>     |
| References                             | 0-5          |           |           |           |           |           | <b>0</b>     |
|  |              | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         | <b>0</b>     |

### TKW

| <i>Evaluation Criteria</i>             | <i>Value</i> | <i>JD</i> | <i>MV</i> | <i>AD</i> | <i>MS</i> | <i>WV</i> | <i>Score</i> |
|--|--------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------------|
| Understanding of Project/Deliverables  | 0-5          | 5         | 4         | 5         | 5         | 5         | <b>24</b>    |
| Expertise/Qualifications of Personnel  | 0-5          | 5         | 4         | 5         | 4         | 5         | <b>23</b>    |
| Availability of Personnel/Timeline     | 0-5          | 4         | 4         | 5         | 5         | 3         | <b>21</b>    |
| Evaluations/Experience on NPU projects | 0-5          | 4         | 4         | 4         | 3         | 3         | <b>18</b>    |
| Proposed Cost Saving Measures          | 0-5          | 4         | 4         | 4         | 3         | 4         | <b>19</b>    |
| Quality of Proposal                    | 0-5          | 5         | 5         | 4         | 5         | 5         | <b>24</b>    |
| References                             | 0-5          | 4         | 4         | 5         | 4         | 4         | <b>21</b>    |
|  |              | 31        | 29        | 32        | 29        | 29        | <b>150</b>   |