

ITEM #61-A

**ADDITIONAL MATERIAL
REGULAR MEETING**

APRIL 14, 2026

**SUBMITTED AT THE REQUEST OF
OFFICE OF THE COUNTY AUDITOR**



OFFICE OF THE COUNTY AUDITOR

115 S. Andrews Avenue, Room 520 • Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301 • 954-357-7590 • FAX 954-357-7592

Advisory No. 407

Date: April 9, 2026
To: Mayor Mark Bogen
From: Robert Melton, County Auditor *RM*
Subject: Analysis of Evaluation Committee Scoring for RFP No. PNC2128931P1, General Planning Consultant Services for Port Everglades

As you requested, my Office conducted an analysis of the scores and proposed rankings of the original Evaluation Committee Meeting and the Reconvened Evaluation Committee Meeting for RFP No. PNC2128931P1, General Planning Consultant Services for Port Everglades. Our analysis focused on various comparisons of the committee scores to each other, and by individual members, and by individual firms. In summary, no improprieties were observed, although certain trends are noted.

Observations:

1. The Original Evaluation Committee members generally scored firms higher than the Reconvened Evaluation Committee members.
2. Moffat and Nichols, Inc., the incumbent firm, was scored the highest and most consistently by both Evaluation Committees.
3. One Reconvened Evaluation Committee member tended to score firms higher than all other members, while two members tended to score firms lower than all other members.
4. One Reconvened Evaluation Committee member scored Hatch Associates Consultants, Inc., significantly lower than other members in some categories; this may have resulted in the lower ranking of this firm by the Reconvened Evaluation Committee.
5. No instances of impropriety in the scoring by Evaluation Committee members are noted.

Suggestions:

To improve the functionality of Evaluation Committees, potentially avoid the need to reconvene committees, and reduce variations in scoring in the future, we suggest management:

1. Research and implement best practice models regarding the evaluation of proposals.
2. Consider alternative evaluation methods, including but not limited to, processes whereby firms are ranked based on their responses to each criterion.
3. Provide additional training for EC members, including the provision of enhanced reference material for use when participating in committees. Material can include guidelines on scoring proposals which exemplify exceeding, meeting, or not meeting criterion expectations; and other areas, as applicable.
4. Survey past committee members to determine areas of ambiguity or other challenges encountered when serving on evaluation committees, and implement improvements, as applicable.

Background:

RFP No. PNC2128931P1, General Planning Consultant Services for Port Everglades, was advertised on January 24, 2025, to engage the services of up to two qualified firms to provide comprehensive port planning services, including planning, studies and analyses to support the implementation of Port Everglades initiatives. The solicitation closed on March 6, 2025, and six firms submitted proposals. An initial meeting of the Evaluation Committee (composed of three members) was held on July 29, 2025; at this meeting, all six firms were found to be responsive and responsible to the solicitation requirements and were shortlisted to advance to the final evaluation.

The Evaluation Committee (Original EC) held its final meeting on August 15, 2025, and following presentations, an initial ranking was established, with Moffat & Nichols, Inc. (Moffat) ranked first. Two firms, Hatch Associates Consulting, Inc. (Hatch) and Volkert, Inc. (Volkert) were tied for second place. Tiebreaker criteria were applied, and ultimately Hatch was ranked second, and Volkert was ranked third. Following the meeting, the proposed ranking was posted by Purchasing Division. A timely objection was filed on August 26, 2025, by Volkert that asserted the potential for a perceived conflict of interest with a single EC member. Purchasing Division states that in collaboration with the County Attorney's Office, four options were assessed to determine the best approach to remedy any perceived conflict of interest and proceed with the procurement. Purchasing Division states that they determined the option with the least risk and best chance to proceed was to replace the EC member. Purchasing Division states that following discussions with County Administration, it was reassessed and the least risk option was determined to replace the EC in its entirety.

On October 3, 2025, correspondence was issued by the Director of Purchasing, acknowledging the potential appearance of a conflict of interest by one committee member and stated that the

Evaluation Committee rankings would be discarded, and a new three-member committee would be appointed to score and rank the proposers.

On January 28, 2026, Reconvened Evaluation Committee (Reconvened EC) held a ‘final evaluation’ meeting. The Reconvened EC viewed the previous recorded presentations by the six proposers and had an additional opportunity for question-and-answer sessions. The Reconvened EC scored and ranked the firms; although Moffat continued to be the first ranked firm, Bowman was now the second ranked firm. The previous second-ranked firm, Hatch, was now ranked sixth. Exhibit 1 displays the ranking orders by both the Original and Reconvened Evaluation Committees.

Ultimately, on March 26, 2026, the Board voted to modify the solicitation to award agreements to three firms; specifically, the first and second ranked vendors of both ECs- Moffat, Bowman and Hatch. During the meeting, each of these three firms verbally waived their rights for future claims against the County regarding this solicitation.

Exhibit 1: The Ranking of Firms by the Original and Reconvened Evaluation Committees

Original EC Ranking	Ranking	Reconvened EC Ranking
Moffatt & Nichol, Inc.	1	Moffatt & Nichol, Inc.
Hatch Associates Consultants, Inc.	2	Bowman Consulting Group, LTD, Inc
Volkert, Inc.	3	Volkert, Inc.
Bowman Consulting Group, LTD, Inc	4	BEA Architects, Inc.
BEA Architects, Inc.	5	GHD Consulting Inc.
GHD Consulting Inc.	6	Hatch Associates Consultants, Inc.

Source: Office of the County Auditor representation of Purchasing Division information.

Analysis and Discussion:

In our analysis of the scores and ranking, we considered the advertised evaluation criteria in the solicitation, including the addendum and tiebreaker criteria, and the overall and individual scores and proposed ranking by the Original EC and the Reconvened EC.

Review of Evaluation Criteria

The evaluation criteria and scoring system used by both the Original and Reconvened ECs was the same. The evaluation criteria categories and maximum available points are shown in Exhibit 2, which also identifies the criteria scored by committee members, and elements scored by Purchasing Division staff. Attachments 1 and 2 to the memorandum include copies of the original Evaluation Criteria advertised with the solicitation, and a copy of Addendum No. 3. This Addendum modified the criterion for “Willingness to Meet Time and

Budget Requirements" to now include identification of the advertised agreement term (three-year initial term, with two one-year renewals) and the project budget (\$750,000 per vendor, for an initial three-year term).

Exhibit 2: Evaluation Criteria Categories and Maximum Points

Item	Category	Maximum Points
Criteria Scored by Evaluation Committee		
1	Ability of Key Personnel	30
2	Project Approach	25
3	Past Performance	30
4	Workload of the Firm	5
Criteria Scored by Purchasing Division		
5	Location	5
6	Willingness to Meet Time and Budget Requirements	2
7	Volume of Previous Work	3
Total		100

Source: Office of the County Auditor representation of evaluation criteria for RFP No. PNC2128931P1.

These evaluation elements, and the points assigned to each item, appear consistent with criteria and weighting (assigned points) utilized in other solicitations for consultant services to be delivered through continuing term agreements.

Analysis of Overall Scoring and Ranking

Exhibit 3 displays the Original EC scores and ranking for each vendor, in the order of the original ranking. Exhibit 4 displays the Reconvened EC scores and ranking, in the order of the second ranking. For each ranking, the respective Exhibits also display the average of all firms’ scores by EC members (ECM1, ECM2, etc.), and the average score for each firm, across all EC members. Overall, the Original EC members collectively scored the firms more favorably than the Reconvened EC members, with the average individual scores for all members and all vendors, calculated at 87.44 and 82.89, respectively. The average combined scores for the firms were 262.33 and 248.67, by the Original EC and the Reconvened EC, respectively.

It is further noted that the Original EC members’ scores had less variation, with the highest vendor scoring 267, and lowest vendor scoring 254, a span of 13 points. The Reconvened EC members had somewhat more variation in their scoring, with the highest ranked firm having a score of 266, and the lowest ranked firm having a score of 241, resulting in a range of 25 points, nearly double the span of points as compared to the Original EC.

Exhibit 3: Original Evaluation Committee Scores, in Ranking Order

Firm Name	ECM1	ECM2	ECM3	Total	Average Score	Rank
Moffatt & Nichol, Inc.	87	91	89	267	89	1
Hatch Associates Consultants, Inc.	86	90	88	264	88	2
Volkert, Inc.	85	92	87	264	88	3
Bowman Consulting Group, LTD, Inc	86	91	86	263	87.67	4
BEA Architects, Inc.	83	91	88	262	87.33	5
GHD Consulting Inc.	82	88	84	254	84.67	6
Average by EC Member	84.83	90.50	87.00	262.33	87.44	

Source: Office of the County Auditor representation of scores, ranking and calculations of averages. Ranking is shown after application of tie-breaker criteria.

Exhibit 4: Reconvened Evaluation Committee Scores, in Ranking Order

Firm Name	ECM4	ECM5	ECM6	Total	Average Score	Rank
Moffatt & Nichol, Inc.	87	87	92	266	88.67	1
Bowman Consulting Group, LTD, Inc	85	82	83	250	83.33	2
Volkert, Inc.	78	83	87	248	82.67	3
BEA Architects, Inc.	77	80	88	245	81.67	4
GHD Consulting Inc.	81	79	82	242	80.67	5
Hatch Associates Consultants, Inc.	74	81	86	241	80.33	6
Average by EC Member	80.33	82.00	86.33	248.67	82.89	

Source: Office of the County Auditor representation of scores, ranking and calculations of averages. No tiebreaker criteria were needed or applied.

Analysis of Individual Member Scores

To further analyze the differences in the scoring by the two committees, we considered the individual EC members’ scoring. The EC Member with the highest overall average score across all firms (90.5 points) was in the Original EC group (ECM 2), while the EC Member with the lowest overall average score across all firms (80.33 points) was in the Reconvened EC group (ECM 4).

In considering each EC member’s total average scores for all firms, the Original EC had a range of approximately six points (5.67) across its members, from a low average of 84.83 points to a high average of 90.5 points. The Reconvened EC members’ average scores had a similar range of six points, from a low average of 80.33 points to a high average of 86.33 points.

We also considered the high and low scores for each firm, by each EC Member (ECM), across the two committees. Exhibit 5 displays the highest scores for each firm in blue, and the lowest scores for each firm in purple. One member (ECM 2) consistently scored the firms high, while two members (ECM 4 and ECM 5) consistently scored the firms low. This may be indicative of subjective differences in individual scoring approaches. It is noted that each of the highlighted members’ approach -either generally high or generally low scoring- was consistently applied by

the members, across all vendors. One potential material instance of low scores by an EC member for the firm Hatch is considered later in this memorandum.

Exhibit 5: Some EC members consistently scored firms highest, while other EC members consistently scored firms lowest.

Firm Name	ECM1	ECM2	ECM3	ECM4	ECM5	ECM6
BEA Architects, Inc.	83	91	88	77	80	88
Bowman Consulting Group, LTD, Inc	86	91	86	85	82	83
GHD Consulting Inc.	82	88	84	81	79	82
Hatch Associates Consultants, Inc.	86	90	88	74	81	86
Moffatt & Nichol, Inc.	87	91	89	87	87	92
Volkert, Inc.	85	92	87	78	83	87
Average by EC Member	84.83	90.50	87	80.33	82	86.33

Source: Office of the County Auditor representation of scores, identifying highest scores for each firm in blue, and the lowest score for each firm in purple.

Analysis of Scoring of Individual Firms

As part of our study, we considered the specific scores and ranking for three firms, based on the material importance of the scores and/or ranking. These three firms are Moffat and Nichol, Inc. (ranked 1st by both ECs), Hatch Associates Consulting, Inc (ranked 2nd and 6th by the Original and Reconvened ECs, respectively) and Bowman Consulting Group, LTD., Inc. (ranked 4th and 2nd by the Original and Reconvened ECs, respectively). The changes to the second-ranked firms across the ECs are important, as the original solicitation was advertised with an intent to award agreements to the two top-ranked firms.

Moffat & Nichol, Inc.

Moffat & Nichol, Inc. (Moffat), the entity which scored highest and was recommended for 1st place ranking by both evaluation committees, had very similar scores from both the Original EC and the Reconvened EC, receiving 267 and 266 points, respectively. Attachment 3 to this memorandum displays Moffat’s scoring for each criterion, by each EC member. In reviewing individual member scoring, it is noted that both committees, and their individual members, similarly scored this firm, awarding the maximum, or nearly maximum, points for all questions. While some outlier high or low scores are noted, no specific trends or concerns are identified. Moffat received the highest total score from five of six, or 83%, of all committee members. Moffat is the current vendor providing these services; therefore, it is reasonable that they were consistently viewed as most experienced firm and scored well in both evaluations.

It is noted that an Original EC member had a potential conflict of interest with the vendor Moffat, which was the basis for the objection that resulted in the rejection of the original ranking. Although this individual (ECM 1) scored Moffat highest of all six of the proposing firms with a score of 87, the individual also scored Moffat lower than the other two members on the Original EC (89 and 91) and evaluated them comparably to the Reconvened EC members who scored Moffat at 87, 87 and 92.

Hatch Associates Consultants, Inc.

The most significant variation in scoring and ranking was experienced by Hatch Associates Consultants, Inc., (Hatch) who went from a score of 264 and Ranking Order No. 2 by the Original EC, down to a score of 241 and Ranking Order No. 6. In considering the change in ranking for Hatch, it is also important to recall that Hatch was originally tied for second place with another firm, and after application of the tiebreaker criteria, Hatch retained their second-place rank, while the other firm was then ranked third. Attachment 4 to this memorandum displays Hatch's scoring for each criterion, by each EC member. In considering the individual scores for Hatch, it is noted that ECM 4 of the Reconvened EC had lower scores for Hatch as compared to the Original EC as well as their cohorts on the Reconvened EC. Specifically, three of ECM 4's individual scores for Hatch are lower than the scores of all other EC members. Additionally, ECM 4's overall score for Hatch was 74, which is seven points lower than the next highest score of 81, and is 12 points lower than Hatch's average score of 86.2. It is likely these scores were significant contributing factors to the change in total score and ranking experienced by Hatch between the Original and Reconvened ECs.

Bowman Consulting Group, LTD., Inc.

Bowman Consulting Group, LTD., Inc. (Bowman) also experienced a material change in their ranking, going from a ranking of 4th place in the Original EC to a ranking of 2nd place in the Reconvened EC. It is noted that while Bowman's ranking improved by two places in the Reconvened meeting, conversely, their total score decreased by 13 points from the Original EC (263) to the Reconvened EC (250). Attachment 5 to this memorandum displays Bowman's scoring for each criterion, by each EC member. Consistent with other observations in this memorandum, overall, Bowman was scored higher by the Original EC as compared to the Reconvened EC. Some outlier high and low scores are noted, and it is observed that ECM 2 of the Original EC scored Bowman five to nine points higher than all other EC members.

Potential reasons for outcomes/differences:

As part of our work, we considered potential contributing factors for the differences in scoring observed by the Original EC and the Reconvened EC members. Some possible explanations (applicable to this specific solicitation and potentially others) may include, but are not limited to:

- The format for the Reconvened EC Meeting involved viewing a video of previously recorded presentations, followed by additional optional question and answer sessions. This format may have resulted in a less favorable perception of some firms' presentations and capabilities versus active real time presentations.
- While the Evaluation Criteria items are standardized, with specific maximum scores established for each item, interpretation and scoring can still be subjective.
- Improved training for EC members, including specific instructions, may reduce variation in scoring. For example, some individuals may take an approach to scoring criteria based on each firm relative to the others, while other individuals may score each firm's responses independent of their impressions of other proposers.
- Some variation in scoring may also be dependent on EC members' individual approach to reviewing the material and presentations. Some members may rely more heavily on their impressions of firms based on their presentations, while others may base their scoring on a more detailed review of the written submissions.
- Some individuals tend to score more favorably, while others are less generous with points. Two EC members with the highest overall average scores were in the Original EC, while one was in the Reconvened EC. Conversely, two EC members with the lowest overall average scores were in the Reconvened EC, while one was in the Original EC.
- Both ECs had three members (committee size is typically based on the dollar value of anticipated agreements to be awarded). In smaller committees, any difference in scoring can have a more significant impact compared to larger committees of five members.

Please be advised that the information presented herein is not considered an audit in accordance with Generally Accepted Governmental Auditing Standards. Had we conducted an audit, we may have identified additional findings and concerns.

If you have any questions regarding the information in this memorandum, please feel free to contact my Office.

Attachments: 5

Analysis of Evaluation Committee Scoring for
RFP No. PNC2128931P1, General Planning Consultant Services for Port Everglades
April 9, 2026

cc: Board of County Commissioners
Monica Cepero, County Administrator
Andrew Meyers, County Attorney
Kevin Kelleher, Deputy County Administrator
Stephen Farmer, Deputy Chief Financial Officer
Robert Gleason, Director, Purchasing Division

Attachment 1

Evaluation Criteria

1. Ability of Professional Personnel: (Maximum 30 Points)

a. Describe the qualifications and relevant experience of the Project Manager and all key staff that are intended to be assigned to this project. Include resumes for the Project Manager and all key staff described. Include the qualifications and relevant experience of all subconsultants' key staff to be assigned to this project. Describe knowledge and experience in the maritime business, and port facilities planning. Further identify your firm's role in the project for discipline, expertise, and work element provided.

Points Value: [20]

b. Include an Organizational Chart showing how key staff and subconsultants may be utilized for the scope of work.

Points Value: [10]

2. Project Approach: (Maximum 25 Points)

Describe the prime Vendor's approach to the project. For the following criteria, include how the prime Vendor will use subconsultants in the project.

a. Provide your familiarity with port-specific key issues, conditions, and expected challenges to influence the project approach. Describe experience and provide specific examples of conducting maritime-related market forecasting for the containerized cargo, dry/neo bulk cargo, liquid bulk (petroleum) cargo and cruise business sectors.

Points Value: [8]

b. Describe experience and provide specific examples of developing port-specific economic impact models and conducting maritime-related economic impact analyses. Describe experience and provide specific examples of maritime-related financial feasibility analyses including calculating Return on Investment (ROI) and Net Present Value (NPV).

Points Value: [5]

c. Describe your experience and provide specific examples of a variety of professional maritime planning support services related to the implementation of projects identified within a Master Plan including Facility Planning, Economic/Feasibility Planning, Cost Analysis, Financial/Strategy Development, Market Assessments/Survey Research, Environmental Analysis, Waterway/Landside Simulation Studies, Intermodal Rail Studies, Facilities Infrastructure Analysis and Evaluations, Parking Analysis, and Traffic Analysis.

Points Value: [8]

d. List your experience and success in public/stakeholder outreach as part of a plan development plan process. Describe experience and provide specific examples of creating 3-D computer animated videos and preparing marketing materials, e.g. brochures, boards, etc.

Points Value: [4]

3. Past Performance: (Maximum 30 Points)

Describe prime Vendor's experience on projects of similar nature, scope and duration, along with demonstration of satisfactory completion, both on time and within budget, for the past five years. Provide a minimum of three projects with references. Refer to **Vendor Reference Verification Form** and submit as instructed. Only provide references for non-Broward County Board of County Commissioners contracts. For Broward County contracts, the County will review performance evaluations in its database for vendors with previous or current contracts with the County. The County considers references and performance evaluations in the evaluation of Vendor's past performance.

Points Value: [30]

4. Workload of the Firm: (Maximum 5 Points)

For the prime Vendor only, list all completed and active projects that the Vendor has managed within the past five years. In addition, list all projected projects that the Vendor will be working on in the near future. Projected projects will be defined as a project(s) for which the Vendor is awarded a contract but the Notice to Proceed has not been issued. Identify any projects that the Vendor worked on concurrently. Describe the Vendor's approach to managing these projects. Were there or will there be any challenges for any of the listed projects? If so, describe how the Vendor dealt or will deal with the projects' challenges.

Points Value: [5]

5. Location: (Maximum 5 Points)

Refer to **Location Certification Form** and submit as instructed.

Points shall be allocated as follows based on the vendor's selection of one of the five options in the Location Certification Form: Option 1 (0 points); Option 2 (5 points); Option 3 (3 points); Option 4 (points range from 0-5 depending on the composition of the joint venture); and Option 5 (0 points).

Points Value: [5]

6. Willingness to Meet Time and Budget Requirements: (Maximum 2 Points)

This solicitation is for the award of a continuing contract. The specific projects requiring professional services under the agreement have not yet been identified. However, in general, explain your firm's approach in meeting "project-specific" time and budget

requirements and indicate whether Vendor is committed to meet these requirements when identified under this agreement.

Completion Date Requirement: (TBD) days from NTP

Project Budget: TBD

Points Value: [2]

7. Section Volume of Previous Work: (Maximum 3 Points)

Refer to the **Volume of Previous Work Attestation Form** and the **Volume of Previous Work Attestation Joint Venture Form** and submit as instructed.

The calculation for the Volume of Previous Work is all amounts paid to the prime Vendor by the Broward County Board of County Commissioners at the time of the solicitation opening date within a five-year timeframe. The calculation of Volume of Previous Work for a prime Vendor previously awarded a contract as a member of a Joint Venture firm is based on the actual equity ownership of the Joint Venture firm.

3 Points will be allocated to Vendors paid \$0 - \$3,000,000

2 Points will be allocated to Vendors paid \$3,000,001 - \$7,500,000

1 Point will be allocated to Vendors paid \$7,500,001 - \$10,000,000

0 Points will be allocated to Vendors paid over \$10,000,000).

Payments for prime Vendors will be verified by the Purchasing Division

Points Value: [3]

Attachment 2



PURCHASING DIVISION

broward.org/Purchasing

[BPRO Electronic Procurement System \(bonfirehub.com\)](http://BPRO Electronic Procurement System (bonfirehub.com))

February 25, 2025

Addendum No.: 3
Solicitation No.: PNC2128931P1
Solicitation Title: General Planning Consultant Services for Port Everglades

Attention Vendors:

Note the following changes and clarifications. Any words in ~~striketrough~~ type are deletions from existing text. Words in **bold underlined** type are additions to existing text.

1. The solicitation's closing date has been revised to March 6, 2025, by 2:00 p.m.
2. The RFP-RFQ-RLI Instructions to Vendors in the Supporting Documentation in Bonfire has been deleted and replaced in its entirety. It is attached in the Supporting Documentation section in Bonfire titled, RFP-RFQ-RLI Instructions to Vendors – PNC2128931P1 - Revised 2-19-2025.

The following sections of the document were revised:

- Section B.2 - Enterprise Technology Services (ETS) Vendor Security Questionnaire (VSQ)
- Section B.8 - Office of Economic and Small Business Development Program Requirements
- Section C.1.a. – Vendor Questionnaire and Standard Certifications
- Section E - Procurement Authority

3. Evaluation Criteria, Section 6, Willingness to Meet Time and Budget Requirements: (Maximum 2 Points), has been revised, in part, as follows.

~~Completion Date Requirement: (TBD) days from NTP~~

~~Project Budget: TBD~~

~~Points Value: [2]~~

Completion Date Requirement: Three-year initial term with two, one-year renewals

Project Budget: \$750,000 per vendor for the initial Three-year term

Points Value: [2]

All other terms, conditions and specifications remain unchanged for this solicitation.

Attachment 3: Moffat & Nichol Inc. Scoring

#	Moffat & Nichol, Inc.	Maximum Value	ECM1	ECM2	ECM3	ECM4	ECM5	ECM6
1	Ability of Professional Personnel							
a	Qualifications and Experience of Project Manager and key staff	20	18	19	19	19	19	20
b	Organizational chart showing how staff and subs will be used	10	9	10	8	8	9	9
2	Project Approach							
a	Familiarity with Port specific issues	8	8	7	8	8	8	8
b	Experience in developing Port specific economic models	5	5	4	5	5	4	4
c	Experience in maritime project planning support	8	7	8	8	7	7	8
d	Experience in public/stakeholder outreach and creating 3D animated videos	4	4	4	3	4	4	4
3	Past Performance							
	Experience on projects of similar nature; references and County performance evaluations	30	27	30	28	27	27	30
4	Workload of the firm							
	Prime vendor's other completed and future projects	5	4	4	5	4	4	4
5	Location							
	Location Certification Form	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	Willingness to meet time and budget requirements							
	Agree to advertised term and maximum budget	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
7	Volume of Previous Work							
	Volume of Previous Work Attestation Form	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
	Totals	100	87	91	89	87	87	92

Source: Office of the County Auditor representation of Purchasing Division Score Sheets. Items shown in orange are scored by Purchasing Division, not Evaluation Committee members. High outlier scores are identified in blue; low outlier scores are identified in purple.

Attachment 4: Hatch Associates Consultants, Inc. Scoring

#	Hatch Associates Consultants, Inc.	Maximum Value	ECM1	ECM2	ECM3	ECM4	ECM5	ECM6
1	Ability of Professional Personnel							
a	Qualifications and Experience of Project Mgr and key staff	20	17	19	18	17	17	19
b	Organizational chart showing how staff and subs will be used	10	10	10	9	6	9	8
2	Project Approach							
a	Familiarity with Port specific issues	8	8	7	8	6	7	7
b	Experience in developing Port specific economic models	5	5	3	5	4	3	4
c	Experience in maritime project planning support	8	8	7	7	6	6	7
d	Experience in public/stakeholder outreach and creating 3D animated videos	4	4	4	4	3	3	4
3	Past Performance							
	Experience on projects of similar nature; references and County performance evaluations	30	25	30	27	23	27	28
4	Workload of the firm							
	Prime vendor's other completed and future projects	5	4	5	5	4	4	4
5	Location							
	Location Certification Form	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	Willingness to meet time and budget requirements							
	Agree to advertised term and maximum budget	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
7	Volume of Previous Work							
	Volume of Previous Work Attestation Form	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
	Totals	100	86	90	88	74	81	86

Source: Office of the County Auditor representation of Purchasing Division Score Sheets. Items shown in orange are scored by Purchasing Division, not Evaluation Committee members. High outlier scores are identified in blue; low outlier scores are identified in purple.

Attachment 5: Bowman Consulting Group, LTD., Inc. Scoring

#	Bowman Consulting Group, LTD., Inc.	Maximum Value	ECM1	ECM2	ECM3	ECM4	ECM5	ECM6
1	Ability of Professional Personnel							
a	Qualifications and Experience of Project Mgr and key staff	20	18	19	17	18	18	16
b	Organizational chart showing how staff and subs will be used	10	10	10	8	8	8	8
2	Project Approach							
a	Familiarity with Port specific issues	8	8	8	8	7	7	7
b	Experience in developing Port specific economic models	5	5	4	4	4	4	4
c	Experience in maritime project planning support	8	8	7	7	7	7	7
d	Experience in public/stakeholder outreach and creating 3D animated videos	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
3	Past Performance							
	Experience on projects of similar nature; references and County performance evaluations	30	25	29	28	28	26	28
4	Workload of the firm							
	Prime vendor's other completed and future projects	5	3	4	5	4	3	4
5	Location							
	Location Certification Form	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	Willingness to meet time and budget requirements							
	Agree to advertised term and maximum budget	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
7	Volume of Previous Work							
	Volume of Previous Work Attestation Form	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
	Totals	100	86	91	86	85	82	83

Source: Office of the County Auditor representation of Purchasing Division Score Sheets. Items shown in orange are scored by Purchasing Division, not Evaluation Committee members. High outlier scores are identified in blue; low outlier scores are identified in purple.