

BID REGISTER

RFQ
CDBG-MIT-MOD

Opening Date: 10/27/2022 @ 3:00PM

Vendor Name	Date Rec'd	Time Rec'd	Rec'd Via By mail, Fed Ex, in person, or other	Person Rec'd	Register #
Walter P. Moore & Associates	10/26/22	10:15am	UPS	Kelly A. Bender	01
KSA Engineers	10/26/22	1:03pm	FedEx	Kelly A. Bender	02
Amani Engineering Inc	10/26/22	3:49pm	in-person	Kelly A. Bender	03
Centerline Engineering	10/27/22	8:19am	Fed-Ex	Kelly A. Bender	04
IDS Engineering Group	10/27/22	10:10am	Houston Express	Kelly A. Bender	05
SCHIEBE Consulting	10/27/22	1:47pm	In-person	Kelly A. Bender	06
A&S Engineers, Inc.	10/27/22	2:09pm	In-person	Kelly A. Bender	07
					08
					09
					10
					11
					12

KOG -
KOG -
No SAMS *
networks id not *
networks id not *
Sams to Gov but no work

Do not Review SAMS
Do Not Review SAMS
Do Not Review SAMS
Do Not Review SAMS

*Received unsealed
*incomplete - no Sams verification

Engineer/Architect Rating Sheet

Grant Recipient City of Texas City
 Name of Respondent Amani
 Evaluator's Name D. Johnson

CDBG MIT-MOD

Date of Rating _____

Rate the Respondent of the Request For Qualifications (RFQ) 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 -- Rate the respondent for experience in the following areas: Comments

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Has previously designed _____ type of projects	20	<u>20</u>
2. Has worked on federally funded construction projects	15	<u>15</u>
3. Has worked on projects that were located in this general region.	10	<u>10</u>
Note: Location for A/E (Architect/Engineer) may be a selection criterion provided its application leaves an appropriate number of qualified firms, given the nature and size of the project, to compete for the contract. 2 CFR 200.321(b)(3)		
4. Extent of experience in project construction management	15	<u>15</u>
Subtotal, Experience	60	<u>58</u>

Work Performance

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Past projects completed on schedule	10	<u>10</u>
2. Manages projects within budgetary constraints	5	<u>4</u>
3. Work product is of high quality	10	<u>10</u>
Subtotal, Performance	25	<u>24</u>

Capacity to Perform

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Staff Level / Experience of Staff	5	<u>5</u>
2. Adequacy of Resources	5	<u>4</u>
3. Professional liability insurance is in force	5	<u>5</u>
Subtotal, Capacity to Perform	15	<u>14</u>

TOTAL SCORE

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Experience	60	<u>58</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Work Performance	25	<u>24</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Capacity to Perform	15	<u>14</u>
Total Score	100	<u>96</u>

Handwritten text at the top of the page, possibly a title or header, including the word "Café".

Handwritten text in the middle of the page, appearing to be a list or series of notes.

Engineer/Architect Rating Sheet

#2

Grant Recipient COTC
 Name of Respondent AMANI Engineering
 Evaluator's Name Kim Golden

CDBG MIT-MOD

Date of Rating 11/10/2022

Rate the Respondent of the Request For Qualifications (RFQ) 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 -- Rate the respondent for experience in the following areas:

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Comments</u>
1. Has previously designed _____ type of projects	20	<u>10</u>	mostly sheet, NO A/E CDBG only
2. Has worked on federally funded construction projects	15	<u>10</u>	
3. Has worked on projects that were located in this general region.	10	<u>10</u>	
<p>Note: Location for A/E (Architect/Engineer) may be a selection criterion provided its application leaves an appropriate number of qualified firms, given the nature and size of the project, to compete for the contract. 2 CFR 200.321(b)(3)</p>			
4. Extent of experience in project construction management	15	<u>8</u> <u>5</u>	-mostly summary - NO CE&I slms
Subtotal, Experience	60	<u>33</u>	

Work Performance

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>	
1. Past projects completed on schedule	10	<u>10</u>	
2. Manages projects within budgetary constraints	5	<u>3</u>	
3. Work product is of high quality	10	<u>8</u>	
Subtotal, Performance	25	<u>21</u>	

Capacity to Perform

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>	
1. Staff Level / Experience of Staff	5	<u>4</u>	4PE.
2. Adequacy of Resources	5	<u>3</u>	
3. Professional liability insurance is in force <u>5/2023</u>	5	<u>5</u>	
Subtotal, Capacity to Perform	15	<u>12</u>	

TOTAL SCORE

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Experience	60	<u>33</u>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Work Performance	25	<u>21</u>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Capacity to Perform	15	<u>12</u>	
Total Score	100	<u>66</u>	

COH MBE
TEXAS HUB
POH SBE

31 EE's

23 - PE, PLS, CFM

Brown, PE - ~~43y~~ 43y See Company Profel

Dutta, PE, CFM 23

4 - PE's

Lewis, PE 7y 11

1 EIT

Werner, RPLS - 9y

1 GRADUATE

2 RPLS

1 PLS IT

~~RPLS - 9y~~

23 yr hunting

Street projects

Lift station

SS

FM

~~(no drainage projects)~~

Waterline

Besant Place - sunny services

- SUE

Drainage Projects - one completed Detention Basin 2.5M, 2015

- Channel Rehab 332,000 MAR 2016

430,000 Aug 2018

- E Little York Outfall - Brown, PE. 11.2M construction cost - complete?

- Alledale in Brown Oaks Area

Engineer/Architect Rating Sheet

Grant Recipient City of Texas City

CDBG MIT-MOD

Name of Respondent Amani Engineering

Evaluator's Name Jack Haralson

Date of Rating November 10, 2022

Rate the Respondent of the Request For Qualifications (RFQ) 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 -- Rate the respondent for experience in the following areas:

Factor	Max.Pts.	Score	Comments
1. Has previously designed _____ type of projects	20	<u>20</u>	
2. Has worked on federally funded construction projects	15	<u>15</u>	
3. Has worked on projects that were located in this general region.	10		
Note: Location for A/E (Architect/Engineer) may be a selection criterion provided its application leaves an appropriate number of qualified firms, given the nature and size of the project, to compete for the contract. 2 CFR 200.321(b)(3)			
4. Extent of experience in project construction management	15	<u>10</u>	
Subtotal, Experience	60	<u>55</u>	

Work Performance

Factor	Max.Pts.	Score
1. Past projects completed on schedule	10	<u>9</u>
2. Manages projects within budgetary constraints	5	<u>4</u>
3. Work product is of high quality	10	<u>10</u>
Subtotal, Performance	25	<u>23</u>

Capacity to Perform

Factor	Max.Pts.	Score
1. Staff Level / Experience of Staff	5	<u>5</u>
2. Adequacy of Resources	5	<u>5</u>
3. Professional liability insurance is in force	5	<u>5</u>
Subtotal, Capacity to Perform	15	<u>15</u>

TOTAL SCORE

Factor	Max.Pts.	Score
<input type="checkbox"/> Experience	60	<u>55</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Work Performance	25	<u>23</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Capacity to Perform	15	<u>15</u>
Total Score	100	<u>93</u>

- Houston area company
 - lots of experience in same style of projects
 - grant experience

Engineer/Architect Rating Sheet

Grant Recipient City of Texas City CDBG MIT-MOD
 Name of Respondent Amani Engineering Inc.
 Evaluator's Name Hilary Smith Date of Rating _____

Rate the Respondent of the Request For Qualifications (RFQ) 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 -- Rate the respondent for experience in the following areas:

Factor	Max.Pts.	Score	Comments
1. Has previously designed <u>Drainage/Roadways</u> type of projects	20	<u>15</u>	
2. Has worked on federally funded construction projects	15	<u>13</u>	
3. Has worked on projects that were located in this general region.	10		
Note: Location for A/E (Architect/Engineer) may be a selection criterion provided its application leaves an appropriate number of qualified firms, given the nature and size of the project, to compete for the contract. 2 CFR 200.321(b)(3)			
4. Extent of experience in project construction management	15	<u>8</u>	
Subtotal, Experience	60	<u>47</u>	

Work Performance

Factor	Max.Pts.	Score
1. Past projects completed on schedule	10	<u>10</u>
2. Manages projects within budgetary constraints	5	<u>4</u>
3. Work product is of high quality	10	<u>10</u>
Subtotal, Performance	25	<u>24</u>

Capacity to Perform

Factor	Max.Pts.	Score
1. Staff Level / Experience of Staff	5	<u>4</u>
2. Adequacy of Resources	5	<u>4</u>
3. Professional liability insurance is in force	5	<u>5</u>
Subtotal, Capacity to Perform	15	<u>13</u>

TOTAL SCORE

Factor	Max.Pts.	Score
<input type="checkbox"/> Experience	60	<u>47</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Work Performance	25	<u>24</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Capacity to Perform	15	<u>13</u>
Total Score	100	<u>85</u>

Engineer/Architect Rating Sheet

Grant Recipient City of Texas City
 Name of Respondent KSA
 Evaluator's Name litilayp Smith

CDBG MIT-MOD

Date of Rating 11/3/22

Rate the Respondent of the Request For Qualifications (RFQ) 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 -- Rate the respondent for experience in the following areas:

Comments

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Has previously designed _____ type of projects	20	<u>18</u>
2. Has worked on federally funded construction projects	15	<u>15</u>
3. Has worked on projects that were located in this general region.	10	<u> </u>
Note: Location for A/E (Architect/Engineer) may be a selection criterion provided its application leaves an appropriate number of qualified firms, given the nature and size of the project, to compete for the contract. 2 CFR 200.321(b)(3)		
4. Extent of experience in project construction management	15	<u>12</u>
Subtotal, Experience	60	<u>30</u>

Work Performance

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Past projects completed on schedule	10	<u>9</u>
2. Manages projects within budgetary constraints	5	<u>5</u>
3. Work product is of high quality	10	<u>9</u>
Subtotal, Performance	25	<u>23</u>

Capacity to Perform

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Staff Level / Experience of Staff	5	<u>5</u>
2. Adequacy of Resources	5	<u>5</u>
3. Professional liability insurance is in force	5	<u>5</u>
Subtotal, Capacity to Perform	15	<u>15</u>

TOTAL SCORE

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Experience	60	<u>50</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Work Performance	25	<u>23</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Capacity to Perform	15	<u>15</u>
Total Score	100	<u>89</u>

Does not have ~~is~~ subs identified.

Architectural & electrical in-house.

Engineer/Architect Rating Sheet

Grant Recipient City of Texas City
 Name of Respondent KSA
 Evaluator's Name _____

CDBG MIT-MOD

Date of Rating _____

Rate the Respondent of the Request For Qualifications (RFQ) 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 -- Rate the respondent for experience in the following areas:

Comments

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Has previously designed _____ type of projects	20	<u>18</u>
2. Has worked on federally funded construction projects	15	<u>14</u>
3. Has worked on projects that were located in this general region.	10	<u>7</u>
Note: Location for A/E (Architect/Engineer) may be a selection criterion provided its application leaves an appropriate number of qualified firms, given the nature and size of the project, to compete for the contract. 2 CFR 200.321(b)(3)		
4. Extent of experience in project construction management	15	<u>14</u>
Subtotal, Experience	60	<u>53</u>

Work Performance

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Past projects completed on schedule	10	<u>10</u>
2. Manages projects within budgetary constraints	5	<u>5</u>
3. Work product is of high quality	10	<u>9</u>
Subtotal, Performance	25	<u>24</u>

Capacity to Perform

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Staff Level / Experience of Staff	5	<u>5</u>
2. Adequacy of Resources	5	<u>4</u>
3. Professional liability insurance is in force	5	<u>5</u>
Subtotal, Capacity to Perform	15	<u>14</u>

TOTAL SCORE

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Experience	60	<u>53</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Work Performance	25	<u>24</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Capacity to Perform	15	<u>14</u>
Total Score	100	<u>91</u>

12/15/2011

12/15/2011
12/15/2011
12/15/2011
12/15/2011
12/15/2011

Engineer/Architect Rating Sheet

#1

Grant Recipient COTC

CDBG MIT-MOD

Name of Respondent KSA

Evaluator's Name Kim Golden

Date of Rating 11/10/2022

Rate the Respondent of the Request For Qualifications (RFQ) 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 -- Rate the respondent for experience in the following areas:

Factor	Max.Pts.	Score	Comments
1. Has previously designed _____ type of projects	20	<u>20</u>	A/E on staff CDBG, CDBG-DR, HMGP
2. Has worked on federally funded construction projects	15	<u>14</u>	
3. Has worked on projects that were located in this general region.	10	<u>8</u>	
Note: Location for A/E (Architect/Engineer) may be a selection criterion provided its application leaves an appropriate number of qualified firms, given the nature and size of the project, to compete for the contract. 2 CFR 200.321(b)(3)			
4. Extent of experience in project construction management	15	<u>15</u>	
Subtotal, Experience	60	<u>57</u>	

Work Performance

Factor	Max.Pts.	Score
1. Past projects completed on schedule	10	<u>10</u>
2. Manages projects within budgetary constraints	5	<u>5</u>
3. Work product is of high quality	10	<u>10</u>
Subtotal, Performance	25	<u>25</u>

Capacity to Perform

Factor	Max.Pts.	Score
1. Staff Level / Experience of Staff	5	<u>5</u>
2. Adequacy of Resources	5	<u>5</u>
3. Professional liability insurance is in force	5	<u>5</u>
Subtotal, Capacity to Perform	15	<u>15</u>

5/29/2023

TOTAL SCORE

Factor	Max.Pts.	Score
<input type="checkbox"/> Experience	60	<u>57</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Work Performance	25	<u>25</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Capacity to Perform	15	<u>15</u>
Total Score	100	<u>97</u>

1978

150cc's

Sugared Ofc

1978
150cc's
Sugared Ofc

1978

1978

1978

1978

Engineer/Architect Rating Sheet

Grant Recipient City of Texas City

CDBG MIT-MOD

Name of Respondent KSA

Evaluator's Name Jack Harabson

Date of Rating November 10, 2022

Rate the Respondent of the Request For Qualifications (RFQ) 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 -- Rate the respondent for experience in the following areas:

Comments

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>	
1. Has previously designed _____ type of projects	20	<u>19</u>	
2. Has worked on federally funded construction projects	15	<u>15</u>	
3. Has worked on projects that were located in this general region.	10		
<small>Note: Location for A/E (Architect/Engineer) may be a selection criterion provided its application leaves an appropriate number of qualified firms, given the nature and size of the project, to compete for the contract. 2 CFR 200.321(b)(3)</small>			
4. Extent of experience in project construction management	15	<u>10</u>	
Subtotal, Experience	60	<u>54</u>	

Work Performance

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>	
1. Past projects completed on schedule	10	<u>9</u>	
2. Manages projects within budgetary constraints	5	<u>4</u>	
3. Work product is of high quality	10	<u>10</u>	
Subtotal, Performance	25	<u>23</u>	

Capacity to Perform

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>	
1. Staff Level / Experience of Staff	5	<u>5</u>	
2. Adequacy of Resources	5	<u>5</u>	
3. Professional liability insurance is in force	5	<u>5</u>	
Subtotal, Capacity to Perform	15	<u>15</u>	

TOTAL SCORE

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Experience	60	<u>54</u>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Work Performance	25	<u>23</u>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Capacity to Perform	15	<u>15</u>	
Total Score	100	<u>92</u>	

** office in Sugarland*
** not very much, if any, experience in our area*

Engineer/Architect Rating Sheet

Grant Recipient City of Texas City

CDBG MIT-MOD

Name of Respondent TLC

Evaluator's Name _____

Date of Rating _____

Rate the Respondent of the Request For Qualifications (RFQ) 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 -- Rate the respondent for experience in the following areas:

Comments

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Has previously designed _____ type of projects	20	<u>18</u>
2. Has worked on federally funded construction projects	15	<u>18</u>
3. Has worked on projects that were located in this general region.	10	<u>7</u>
<p>Note: Location for A/E (Architect/Engineer) may be a selection criterion provided its application leaves an appropriate number of qualified firms, given the nature and size of the project, to compete for the contract. 2 CFR 200.321(b)(3)</p>		
4. Extent of experience in project construction management	15	<u>14</u>
Subtotal, Experience	60	<u>57</u>

Work Performance

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Past projects completed on schedule	10	<u>5</u>
2. Manages projects within budgetary constraints	5	<u>2</u>
3. Work product is of high quality	10	<u>5</u>
Subtotal, Performance	25	<u>12</u>

Capacity to Perform

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Staff Level / Experience of Staff	5	<u>3</u>
2. Adequacy of Resources	5	<u>5</u>
3. Professional liability insurance is in force	5	<u>5</u>
Subtotal, Capacity to Perform	15	<u>13</u>

TOTAL SCORE

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Experience	60	<u>57</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Work Performance	25	<u>12</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Capacity to Perform	15	<u>13</u>
Total Score	100	<u>82</u>

Engineer/Architect Rating Sheet

#5

Grant Recipient COTC

CDBG MIT-MOD

Name of Respondent TLC ENGINEERING

Evaluator's Name KM Golden

Date of Rating 11/10/2022

Rate the Respondent of the Request For Qualifications (RFQ) 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 -- Rate the respondent for experience in the following areas:

Factor	Max.Pts.	Score	Comments
1. Has previously designed _____ type of projects	20	<u>0</u>	- Sub consults for most design & production - CE&I MGR
2. Has worked on federally funded construction projects	15	<u>10</u>	
3. Has worked on projects that were located in this general region. <small>Note: Location for A/E (Architect/Engineer) may be a selection criterion provided its application leaves an appropriate number of qualified firms, given the nature and size of the project, to compete for the contract. 2 CFR 200.321(b)(3)</small>	10	<u>8</u>	
4. Extent of experience in project construction management	15	<u>10 10</u>	- 1 person on staff
Subtotal, Experience	60	<u>28</u>	

Work Performance

Factor	Max.Pts.	Score
1. Past projects completed on schedule	10	<u>—</u>
2. Manages projects within budgetary constraints	5	<u>—</u>
3. Work product is of high quality	10	<u>5</u>
Subtotal, Performance	25	<u>5</u>

Capacity to Perform

Factor	Max.Pts.	Score
1. Staff Level / Experience of Staff	5	<u>2</u>
2. Adequacy of Resources	5	<u>0</u>
3. Professional liability insurance is in force	5	<u>5</u>
Subtotal, Capacity to Perform	15	<u>7</u>

TOTAL SCORE

Factor	Max.Pts.	Score
<input type="checkbox"/> Experience	60	<u>28</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Work Performance	25	<u>5</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Capacity to Perform	15	<u>7</u>
Total Score	100	<u>40</u>

TLC - 1994

Subconsuts Zarinkelk

STOA - A/E

MBCO - Sun

GRANT WMBH & Mgmt - 1 person, 30 hrs. WMBH for citra
FEMA PORTAL

Engineer/Architect Rating Sheet

Grant Recipient City of Texas City CDBG MIT-MOD
 Name of Respondent ILC Engineering
 Evaluator's Name Tithayo Smith Date of Rating _____

Rate the Respondent of the Request For Qualifications (RFQ) 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 -- Rate the respondent for experience in the following areas:

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Comments</u>
1. Has previously designed _____ type of projects	20	<u>10</u>	
2. Has worked on federally funded construction projects	15	<u>17</u>	
3. Has worked on projects that were located in this general region.	10	<u>10</u>	
Note: Location for A/E (Architect/Engineer) may be a selection criterion provided its application leaves an appropriate number of qualified firms, given the nature and size of the project, to compete for the contract. 2 CFR 200.321(b)(3)			
4. Extent of experience in project construction management	15	<u>12</u>	
Subtotal, Experience	60	<u>38</u>	

Work Performance

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>	
1. Past projects completed on schedule	10	<u> </u>	
2. Manages projects within budgetary constraints	5	<u> </u>	
3. Work product is of high quality	10	<u> </u>	
Subtotal, Performance	25	<u> 5</u>	

Capacity to Perform

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>	
1. Staff Level / Experience of Staff	5	<u>4</u>	
2. Adequacy of Resources	5	<u>3</u>	
3. Professional liability insurance is in force	5	<u>5</u>	
Subtotal, Capacity to Perform	15	<u>12</u>	

TOTAL SCORE

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Experience	60	<u>38</u>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Work Performance	25	<u>5</u>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Capacity to Perform	15	<u>12</u>	
Total Score	100	<u>55</u>	

Engineer/Architect Rating Sheet

Grant Recipient City of Texas City

CDBG MIT-MOD

Name of Respondent TLC Engineering

Evaluator's Name Jack Haralson

Date of Rating November 10, 2022

Rate the Respondent of the Request For Qualifications (RFQ) 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 -- Rate the respondent for experience in the following areas:

Comments

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Has previously designed _____ type of projects	20	<u>15</u>
2. Has worked on federally funded construction projects	15	<u>10</u>
3. Has worked on projects that were located in this general region.	10	<u>5</u>
<p style="font-size: small;">Note: Location for A/E (Architect/Engineer) may be a selection criterion provided its application leaves an appropriate number of qualified firms, given the nature and size of the project, to compete for the contract. 2 CFR 200.321(b)(3)</p>		
4. Extent of experience in project construction management	15	<u>10</u>
Subtotal, Experience	60	<u>40</u>

Work Performance

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Past projects completed on schedule	10	<u>5</u>
2. Manages projects within budgetary constraints	5	<u>5</u>
3. Work product is of high quality	10	<u>5</u>
Subtotal, Performance	25	<u>15</u>

Capacity to Perform

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Staff Level / Experience of Staff	5	<u>5</u>
2. Adequacy of Resources	5	<u>5</u>
3. Professional liability insurance is in force	5	<u>5</u>
Subtotal, Capacity to Perform	15	<u>15</u>

TOTAL SCORE

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Experience	60	<u>40</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Work Performance	25	<u>15</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Capacity to Perform	15	<u>15</u>
Total Score	100	<u>70</u>

** confusing : who will be doing the engineering work; looks as if they plan on subbing out the work*

Engineer/Architect Rating Sheet

Grant Recipient City of Texas City
 Name of Respondent Walter P. Moore
 Evaluator's Name D. Johnson

CDBG MIT-MOD

Date of Rating _____

Rate the Respondent of the Request For Qualifications (RFQ) 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 -- Rate the respondent for experience in the following areas:

Comments

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Has previously designed _____ type of projects	20	<u>20</u>
2. Has worked on federally funded construction projects	15	<u>12</u> <i>DF</i>
3. Has worked on projects that were located in this general region.	10	
Note: Location for A/E (Architect/Engineer) may be a selection criterion provided its application leaves an appropriate number of qualified firms, given the nature and size of the project, to compete for the contract. 2 CFR 200.321(b)(3)		
4. Extent of experience in project construction management	15	<u>8</u>
Subtotal, Experience	60	<u>54</u>

Work Performance

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Past projects completed on schedule	10	<u>9</u>
2. Manages projects within budgetary constraints	5	<u>4</u>
3. Work product is of high quality	10	<u>7</u>
Subtotal, Performance	25	<u>20</u>

Capacity to Perform

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Staff Level / Experience of Staff	5	<u>4</u>
2. Adequacy of Resources	5	<u>4</u>
3. Professional liability insurance is in force	5	<u>5</u>
Subtotal, Capacity to Perform	15	<u>13</u>

TOTAL SCORE

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Experience	60	<u>54</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Work Performance	25	<u>20</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Capacity to Perform	15	<u>13</u>
Total Score	100	<u>87</u>

Copy of [unclear]
[unclear] [unclear]
[unclear]

[unclear]

[unclear]

[unclear]

[unclear]

[unclear]

Engineer/Architect Rating Sheet

Grant Recipient City of Texas City

CDBG MIT-MOD

Name of Respondent Walter P. Moore

Evaluator's Name Hilary Smith

Date of Rating 11/4/22

Rate the Respondent of the Request For Qualifications (RFQ) 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 -- Rate the respondent for experience in the following areas:

Comments

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Has previously designed _____ type of projects	20	<u>20</u>
2. Has worked on federally funded construction projects	15	<u>15</u>
3. Has worked on projects that were located in this general region.	10	<u>8</u>
<small>Note: Location for A/E (Architect/Engineer) may be a selection criterion provided its application leaves an appropriate number of qualified firms, given the nature and size of the project, to compete for the contract. 2 CFR 200.321(b)(3)</small>		
4. Extent of experience in project construction management	15	<u>15</u>
Subtotal, Experience	60	<u>58</u>

Work Performance

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Past projects completed on schedule	10	<u>5</u>
2. Manages projects within budgetary constraints	5	<u>4</u>
3. Work product is of high quality	10	<u>10</u>
Subtotal, Performance	25	<u>17</u>

Capacity to Perform

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Staff Level / Experience of Staff	5	<u>5</u>
2. Adequacy of Resources	5	<u>5</u>
3. Professional liability insurance is in force	5	<u>5</u>
Subtotal, Capacity to Perform	15	<u>15</u>

TOTAL SCORE

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Experience	60	<u>58</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Work Performance	25	<u>17</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Capacity to Perform	15	<u>15</u>
Total Score	100	<u>90</u>

Engineer/Architect Rating Sheet

#4

Grant Recipient COTC

CDBG MIT-MOD

Name of Respondent Walter P Moore

Evaluator's Name KM Golden

Date of Rating 11/10/2022

Rate the Respondent of the Request For Qualifications (RFQ) 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 -- Rate the respondent for experience in the following areas:

Factor	Max. Pts.	Score	Comments
1. Has previously designed <u>mostly drainage studies</u> type of projects	20	<u>10</u>	Lots of drainage studies CDBG - DR, ACPA Staff has 1 yr w WPM - 2E exp diverse, not all g/l
2. Has worked on federally funded construction projects	15	<u>10</u>	
3. Has worked on projects that were located in this general region. <small>Note: Location for A/E (Architect/Engineer) may be a selection criterion provided its application leaves an appropriate number of qualified firms, given the nature and size of the project, to compete for the contract. 2 CFR 200.321(b)(3)</small>	10	<u>8</u>	
4. Extent of experience in project construction management	15	<u>10</u>	10 - 1 person on staff
Subtotal, Experience	60	<u>30</u>	

Work Performance

Factor	Max. Pts.	Score	
1. Past projects completed on schedule	10	<u>-</u>	NO INFO
2. Manages projects within budgetary constraints	5	<u>-</u>	NO INFO
3. Work product is of high quality	10	<u>8</u>	
Subtotal, Performance	25	<u>8</u>	

Capacity to Perform

Factor	Max. Pts.	Score	
1. Staff Level / Experience of Staff	5	<u>3</u>	7 PE - but POC has < 1 yr w WPM
2. Adequacy of Resources	5	<u>3</u>	
3. Professional liability insurance is in force	5	<u>5</u>	
Subtotal, Capacity to Perform	15	<u>13</u>	

TOTAL SCORE

Factor	Max. Pts.	Score	
<input type="checkbox"/> Experience	60	<u>30</u>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Work Performance	25	<u>8</u>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Capacity to Perform	15	<u>13</u>	
Total Score	100	<u>59</u>	

1931

725 + ee

24 office

CONSULTANTS MWBE goals

Ally Good Solutions, LLC dba AGS Eng. HUB/MBE

HVS Assoc'd (HUB/MBE) - 36%

CDBG drug treatment 6.3 Mch

Recom 3 Residua drug treat - PES - Desig 2022

Annual Brgm Upm Recal drug treat - H&H study

Project Genom - Econ Dev - 244 Ac tract - Desig 2018, Cont 2019

Regnd detntr - 13.9 Ac 5.5 mch 4.4 mch

Engineer/Architect Rating Sheet

Grant Recipient City of Texas City

CDBG MIT-MOD

Name of Respondent Walter P. Moore

Evaluator's Name Jack Haralson

Date of Rating ~~10-31-22~~ 11-10-22

Rate the Respondent of the Request For Qualifications (RFQ) 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 -- Rate the respondent for experience in the following areas:

Comments

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Has previously designed _____ type of projects	20	<u>15</u>
✓ 2. Has worked on federally funded construction projects	15	<u>15</u>
3. Has worked on projects that were located in this general region.	10	
<p>Note: Location for A/E (Architect/Engineer) may be a selection criterion provided its application leaves an appropriate number of qualified firms, given the nature and size of the project, to compete for the contract. 2 CFR 200.321(b)(3)</p>		
4. Extent of experience in project construction management	15	<u>10</u>
Subtotal, Experience	60	<u>50</u>

Work Performance

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Past projects completed on schedule	10	<u>5</u>
2. Manages projects within budgetary constraints	5	<u>5</u>
3. Work product is of high quality	10	<u>10</u>
Subtotal, Performance	25	<u>20</u>

Capacity to Perform

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Staff Level / Experience of Staff	5	<u>2</u>
2. Adequacy of Resources	5	<u>5</u>
3. Professional liability insurance is in force	5	<u>5</u>
Subtotal, Capacity to Perform	15	<u>12</u>

TOTAL SCORE

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Experience	60	<u>50</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Work Performance	25	<u>20</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Capacity to Perform	15	<u>12</u>
Total Score	100	<u>82</u>

Engineer/Architect Rating Sheet

Grant Recipient City of Texas City CDBG MIT-MOD
 Name of Respondent Scheibe Consulting LLC.
 Evaluator's Name Tiblayo Smith Date of Rating 11/4/22

Rate the Respondent of the Request For Qualifications (RFQ) 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 -- Rate the respondent for experience in the following areas:

Factor	Max.Pts.	Score	Comments
1. Has previously designed _____ type of projects	20	<u>12</u>	
2. Has worked on federally funded construction projects	15	<u>10</u>	
3. Has worked on projects that were located in this general region. Note: Location for A/E (Architect/Engineer) may be a selection criterion provided its application leaves an appropriate number of qualified firms, given the nature and size of the project, to compete for the contract. 2 CFR 200.321(b)(3)	10		
4. Extent of experience in project construction management	15	<u>10</u>	
Subtotal, Experience	60	<u>42</u>	

Work Performance

Factor	Max.Pts.	Score
1. Past projects completed on schedule	10	<u>9</u>
2. Manages projects within budgetary constraints	5	<u>4</u>
3. Work product is of high quality	10	<u>10</u>
Subtotal, Performance	25	<u>23</u>

Capacity to Perform

Factor	Max.Pts.	Score
1. Staff Level / Experience of Staff	5	<u>3</u>
2. Adequacy of Resources	5	<u>3</u>
3. Professional liability insurance is in force	5	<u>5</u>
Subtotal, Capacity to Perform	15	<u>11</u>

TOTAL SCORE

Factor	Max.Pts.	Score
<input type="checkbox"/> Experience	60	<u>42</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Work Performance	25	<u>23</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Capacity to Perform	15	<u>11</u>
Total Score	100	<u>76</u>



Engineer/Architect Rating Sheet

Grant Recipient COTC

CDBG MIT-MOD

Name of Respondent Scheibe

Evaluator's Name _____

Date of Rating _____

Rate the Respondent of the Request For Qualifications (RFQ) 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 -- Rate the respondent for experience in the following areas:

Comments

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Has previously designed _____ type of projects	20	<u>18</u>
2. Has worked on federally funded construction projects	15	<u>15</u>
3. Has worked on projects that were located in this general region. Note: Location for A/E (Architect/Engineer) may be a selection criterion provided its application leaves an appropriate number of qualified firms, given the nature and size of the project, to compete for the contract. 2 CFR 200.321(b)(3)	10	<u>10</u>
4. Extent of experience in project construction management	15	<u>15</u>
Subtotal, Experience	60	<u>58</u>

Work Performance

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Past projects completed on schedule	10	<u>8</u>
2. Manages projects within budgetary constraints	5	<u>3</u>
3. Work product is of high quality	10	<u>8</u>
Subtotal, Performance	25	<u>19</u>

Capacity to Perform

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Staff Level / Experience of Staff	5	<u>4</u>
2. Adequacy of Resources	5	<u>4</u>
3. Professional liability insurance is in force	5	<u>5</u>
Subtotal, Capacity to Perform	15	<u>13</u>

TOTAL SCORE

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Experience	60	<u>58</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Work Performance	25	<u>19</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Capacity to Perform	15	<u>13</u>
Total Score	100	<u>90</u>

Engineer/Architect Rating Sheet

3

Grant Recipient COTC

CDBG MIT-MOD

Name of Respondent Scheibe Consulting, LLC

Evaluator's Name KIM Golden

Date of Rating 11/10/2022

Rate the Respondent of the Request For Qualifications (RFQ) 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 -- Rate the respondent for experience in the following areas:

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max. Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Comments</u>
1. Has previously designed <u>DRAINAGE</u> type of projects	20	<u>10</u>	NO A/E CDBG, FM, HUGP GLO rotation
2. Has worked on federally funded construction projects	15	<u>14</u>	
3. Has worked on projects that were located in this general region.	10	<u>10</u>	
<p style="font-size: 0.8em;">Note: Location for A/E (Architect/Engineer) may be a selection criterion provided its application leaves an appropriate number of qualified firms, given the nature and size of the project, to compete for the contract. 2 CFR 200.321(b)(3)</p>			
4. Extent of experience in project construction management	15	<u>5</u>	Mostly Planner & Design NO CE2I staff NO CE2I consulting dual
Subtotal, Experience	60	<u>39</u>	

Work Performance

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max. Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Past projects completed on schedule	10	<u>6</u>
2. Manages projects within budgetary constraints	5	<u>2</u>
3. Work product is of high quality	10	<u>8</u>
Subtotal, Performance	25	<u>16</u>

Capacity to Perform

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max. Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>	
1. Staff Level / Experience of Staff	5	<u>3</u>	3 PEs
2. Adequacy of Resources	5	<u>2</u>	
3. Professional liability insurance is in force	5	<u>5</u>	12/1/22
Subtotal, Capacity to Perform	15	<u>10</u>	

TOTAL SCORE

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Max. Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Experience	60	<u>39</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Work Performance	25	<u>16</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Capacity to Perform	15	<u>10</u>
Total Score	100	<u>65</u>

11 years
3 PE's

Flood protection study work
Redesign, utility, drainage impm \$15 million - (construction?)
US 59 (I469) Realignment impm \$60K - org
TC Inner Levee impm
Brazoria Orange District - on call

USCOE - Galveston District
COTC Fed Levee
COTC FEMA Certification w/ ARKIC

SMS Bayou
Navigation Projects

2006 - HAFF Associates -

2011 - Firm started
[• General Public Works (mostly w/in the ROW)
• Flood models, detail master drainage plans
• General civil lead development - public works
Schools
Industrial, comm'l, residential

Shelton Architect - a sub consultant - Schools, public
Doing projects w/ Genl Works

Focus -
NO MIT projects - planning only ^{so far} on Wharton & Matagorda County
reconstruction of a waterline & a new water well - MUD district
Periodic inspections (72 hr Notice) - has a contract employee in Beaumont
- COBB Finley - SUE, Samson, const insp

Engineer/Architect Rating Sheet

Grant Recipient City of Texas City

CDBG MIT-MOD

Name of Respondent Scheibe Consulting

Evaluator's Name Jack Harabon

Date of Rating November 10, 2022

Rate the Respondent of the Request For Qualifications (RFQ) 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 -- Rate the respondent for experience in the following areas:

Factor	Max.Pts.	Score	Comments
1. Has previously designed _____ type of projects	20	<u>17</u>	
2. Has worked on federally funded construction projects	15	<u>15</u>	
3. Has worked on projects that were located in this general region.	10		
Note: Location for A/E (Architect/Engineer) may be a selection criterion provided its application leaves an appropriate number of qualified firms, given the nature and size of the project, to compete for the contract. 2 CFR 200.321(b)(3)			
4. Extent of experience in project construction management	15	<u>10</u>	
Subtotal, Experience	60	<u>52</u>	

Work Performance

Factor	Max.Pts.	Score
1. Past projects completed on schedule	10	<u>9</u>
2. Manages projects within budgetary constraints	5	<u>4</u>
3. Work product is of high quality	10	<u>10</u>
Subtotal, Performance	25	<u>23</u>

Capacity to Perform

Factor	Max.Pts.	Score
1. Staff Level / Experience of Staff	5	<u>5</u>
2. Adequacy of Resources	5	<u>5</u>
3. Professional liability insurance is in force	5	<u>5</u>
Subtotal, Capacity to Perform	15	<u>15</u>

TOTAL SCORE

Factor	Max.Pts.	Score
<input type="checkbox"/> Experience	60	<u>52</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Work Performance	25	<u>23</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Capacity to Perform	15	<u>15</u>
Total Score	100	<u>90</u>

** based out of Austin
- has worked for Texas City*

