

EVALUATION RESULTS

15-04RFQ Miscellaneous Surveying Services

	Weighting Factor	Peloton Land Solutions			Weir Associates			LTR			Cobb, Fendley & Associates								
		Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2							
		Offeror A			Offeror B			Offeror C			Offeror D								
		1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2							
Past Experience of Firm & Team Members on Comparable Projects	25%	2.50	3.00	2.50	2.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	2.50	2.50	3.00	2.50	2.00	3.00	2.38	4.00	3.00		
Qualifications of Firm & Project Team Members	25%	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.25	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.75	4.00	3.50	2.56	2.50	3.00	4.00	2.38	2.75	4.00
Project Approach	25%	1.00	3.00	1.00	1.25	0.50	3.00	3.00	1.63	3.00	3.00	4.00	2.50	3.00	3.00	2.50	2.13	4.00	3.00
Past Project Record With the City of McKinney	10%	2.50	2.50	2.50	0.75	2.50	2.50	2.50	0.75	1.50	1.50	2.00	0.50	2.50	2.50	4.00	0.90	2.50	2.50
Responsiveness of Qualifications	5%	1.00	3.00	1.50	0.28	1.00	3.00	3.00	0.35	3.00	3.00	4.00	0.50	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.45	4.00	3.00
Quality Assurance/Quality Control	10%	0.50	3.00	2.00	0.55	3.00	3.00	3.50	0.95	2.50	3.00	3.00	0.85	3.25	3.00	3.00	0.93	3.50	3.00
TOTAL	100%				2.36				2.73				2.97				3.05		

	Baseline Corporation			BW2 Engineers, Inc.			Nathan D. Maier			Half Associates			North Texas Surveying			Farnsworth Group			VRX, Inc.			Gorrondona and Associates									
	Offeror	Evaluator		Offeror	Evaluator		Offeror	Evaluator		Offeror	Evaluator		Offeror	Evaluator		Offeror	Evaluator		Offeror	Evaluator		Offeror	Evaluator								
or	E	1	2	3	F	1	2	3	G	1	2	3	H	1	2	3	I	1	2	3	J	1	2	3	K	1	2	3	L	1	2
4.80	2.95	3.50	4.00	3.00	2.63	4.00	3.00	3.50	2.63	4.00	3.00	3.00	2.50	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	1.50	2.00	3.50	1.75	3.50	2.00	4.00	2.38	4.00	3.00	4.50	2.88	2.00	3.00
4.00	2.69	3.00	3.00	3.50	2.38	2.00	3.00	3.50	2.13	4.00	4.00	3.00	2.75	4.00	4.00	3.00	2.75	1.50	2.00	2.50	1.50	3.00	2.00	4.00	2.25	4.00	3.00	4.50	2.88	2.00	3.00
4.90	2.98	3.00	3.00	3.50	2.38	3.00	3.00	4.00	2.50	4.00	3.00	4.00	2.75	2.50	4.00	3.00	2.38	1.00	3.00	2.50	1.63	4.00	3.00	4.00	2.75	2.50	3.00	2.50	2.00	2.50	3.00
2.50	0.75	2.75	3.00	2.50	0.83	1.50	3.50	3.50	0.85	3.50	3.50	4.00	1.10	4.50	4.50	4.00	1.30	2.50	2.50	2.50	0.75	2.50	2.50	2.50	0.75	4.50	3.50	4.50	1.25	2.50	2.50
4.50	0.58	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.45	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.45	4.00	3.00	4.00	0.55	2.50	4.00	3.00	0.48	2.50	3.00	3.00	0.43	4.00	3.00	4.50	0.58	3.00	3.00	4.00	0.50	3.00	3.00
4.80	1.13	2.50	3.00	3.50	0.90	2.50	3.00	4.00	0.95	4.50	3.00	3.00	1.05	0.00	4.00	2.50	0.65	2.00	3.00	2.50	0.75	4.00	3.00	4.00	1.10	2.00	3.00	3.00	0.80	2.00	3.00
	3.69				3.18				3.17				3.57				3.52				2.27				3.27				3.43		

Evaluators are urged to use the following guidelines when assessing merits of each offer against each evaluation factor.

5 = Excellent (innovatively exceeds all needs)

4 = Above Average (meets all & exceeds some needs)

3 = Good (meets all needs)

2 = Fair (meets some needs)

1 = Merely Responsive (does not meet needs)

0 = Non-Responsive (fails to meet mandatory requirements)