



**HIDALGO COUNTY STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATION  
SCORING/EVALUATION SHEET  
ENGINEERING/ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES**

Project Description: City of Weslaco – Flood Drain Improvements

Department: Hidalgo County Urban County Program

Name of Firm: TEDSI Infrastructure Group

Date of Evaluation: 7-10-09

Evaluator's Name: Moises Salazar

<u>Selection Criteria</u>	<u>Point</u>	<u>Score</u>
---------------------------	--------------	--------------

1. Professional Qualifications of Team	20	<u>20</u>
--	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: Many qualified Engineers

2. Experience of Project Team	25	<u>25</u>
-------------------------------	----	-----------

**\*Note\* Information necessary to assess the firm on this criteria should be gathered by contacting past/current clients:**

Comments/Rationale for Points: Has performed several jobs for the county

3. Experience/Availability of Project Manager	20	<u>20</u>
---	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: Available thru direct line with proj mngr. who has obtained plenty of experience with county projects.

4. Understanding of Project	25	<u>25</u>
-----------------------------	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: Very much familiar with county projects

5. Familiarity with Applicable Rules and Regulations	10	<u>10</u>
--	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: Constant involvement with TX-DDT

<b>Total Score</b>	<u>100</u>
--------------------	------------

**HIDALGO COUNTY STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATION  
SCORING/EVALUATION SHEET  
ENGINEERING/ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES**

Project Description: City of Weslaco – Flood Drain Improvements

Department: Hidalgo County Urban County Program

Name of Firm: TEDSI Infrastructure Group

Date of Evaluation: 2/9/09

Evaluator's Name: Tony Barco

<u>Selection Criteria</u>	<u>Point</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Professional Qualifications of Team	20	<u>19</u>
Comments/Rationale for Points: _____		
2. Experience of Project Team	25	<u>21</u>
*Note* Information necessary to assess the firm on this criteria should be gathered by contacting past/current clients:		
Comments/Rationale for Points: _____		
3. Experience/Availability of Project Manager	20	<u>18</u>
Comments/Rationale for Points: _____		
4. Understanding of Project	25	<u>23</u>
Comments/Rationale for Points: _____		
5. Familiarity with Applicable Rules and Regulations	10	<u>10</u>
Comments/Rationale for Points: _____		

Total Score 91

**HIDALGO COUNTY STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATION  
SCORING/EVALUATION SHEET  
ENGINEERING/ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES**

Project Description: 2008 Urban County Projects

Department: Urban County Program (City of Weslaco)

Name of Firm: TEDSI Infrastructure Group

Date of Evaluation: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator's Name: David Salinas, Director of Public Facilities

<u>Selection Criteria</u>	<u>Point</u>	<u>Score</u>
---------------------------	--------------	--------------

1. Professional Qualifications of Team	20	<u>5</u>
--	----	----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

2. Experience of Project Team	25	<u>5</u>
-------------------------------	----	----------

**\*Note\* Information necessary to assess the firm on this criteria should be gathered by contacting past/current clients:**

Comments/Rationale for Points: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

3. Experience/Availability of Project Manager	20	<u>5</u>
---	----	----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

4. Understanding of Project	25	<u>5</u>
-----------------------------	----	----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

5. Familiarity with Applicable Rules and Regulations	10	<u>5</u>
--	----	----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

<b>Total Score</b>	<u>25</u>
--------------------	-----------

# HIDALGO COUNTY STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATION SCORING/EVALUATION SHEET ENGINEERING/ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES

Project Description: City of Weslaco - Flood Drain Improvements

Department: Hidalgo County Urban County Program

Name of Firm: Sigler, Winston Greenwood & Associates

Date of Evaluation: 07/10/09

Evaluator's Name: Michael Salazar

<u>Selection Criteria</u>	<u>Point</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Professional Qualifications of Team	20	<u>18</u>
Comments Rationale for Points: <u>CF A company with a good reputation</u>		
2. Experience of Project Team	25	<u>25</u>
*Note* Information necessary to assess the firm on this criteria should be gathered by contacting past/current clients:		
Comments Rationale for Points: <u>1. All the information was gathered from the client</u>		
3. Experience Availability of Project Manager	20	<u>20</u>
Comments Rationale for Points: <u>2. The project manager has a good reputation</u>		
4. Understanding of Project	25	<u>20</u>
Comments Rationale for Points: <u>1. The project manager has a good reputation</u>		
5. Familiarity with Applicable Rules and Regulations	10	<u>5</u>
Comments Rationale for Points: <u>1. The project manager has a good reputation</u>		

Total Score 78 88 88

**HIDALGO COUNTY STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATION  
SCORING/EVALUATION SHEET  
ENGINEERING/ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES**

Project Description: City of Weslaco – Flood Drain Improvements

Department: Hidalgo County Urban County Program

Name of Firm: Sigler, Winston Greenwood & Associates

Date of Evaluation: 2/9/09

Evaluator's Name: Tony Barco

<u>Selection Criteria</u>	<u>Point</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Professional Qualifications of Team	20	<u>20</u>
Comments/Rationale for Points: _____		
2. Experience of Project Team	25	<u>23</u>
*Note* Information necessary to assess the firm on this criteria should be gathered by contacting past/current clients:		
Comments/Rationale for Points: _____		
3. Experience/Availability of Project Manager	20	<u>19</u>
Comments/Rationale for Points: _____		
4. Understanding of Project	25	<u>24</u>
Comments/Rationale for Points: _____		
5. Familiarity with Applicable Rules and Regulations	10	<u>10</u>
Comments/Rationale for Points: _____		
<b>Total Score</b>		<u>96</u>

**HIDALGO COUNTY STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATION  
SCORING/EVALUATION SHEET  
ENGINEERING/ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES**

Project Description: 2008 Urban County Projects

Department: Urban County Program (City of Weslaco)

Name of Firm: Sigler, Winston, Greenwood & Associates

Date of Evaluation: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator's Name: David Salinas, Director of Public Facilities

<u>Selection Criteria</u>	<u>Point</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Professional Qualifications of Team	20	<u>5</u>
Comments/Rationale for Points: _____		
_____		
2. Experience of Project Team	25	<u>5</u>
<b>*Note* Information necessary to assess the firm on this criteria should be gathered by contacting past/current clients:</b>		
Comments/Rationale for Points: _____		
_____		
3. Experience/Availability of Project Manager	20	<u>4</u>
Comments/Rationale for Points: _____		
_____		
4. Understanding of Project	25	<u>5</u>
Comments/Rationale for Points: _____		
_____		
5. Familiarity with Applicable Rules and Regulations	10	<u>5</u>
Comments/Rationale for Points: _____		
_____		
<b>Total Score</b>		<u>24</u>

**HIDALGO COUNTY STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATION  
SCORING/EVALUATION SHEET  
ENGINEERING/ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES**

Project Description: City of Weslaco – Flood Drain Improvements

Department: Hidalgo County Urban County Program

Name of Firm: Dos Logistic

Date of Evaluation: 2-10-09

Evaluator's Name: Moises Salazar

<u>Selection Criteria</u>	<u>Point</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Professional Qualifications of Team	20	<u>20</u>
Comments/Rationale for Points: <u>Qualified Team</u>		
2. Experience of Project Team	25	<u>25</u>
*Note* Information necessary to assess the firm on this criteria should be gathered by contacting past/current clients:		
Comments/Rationale for Points: <u>Number of years in business</u>		
3. Experience/Availability of Project Manager	20	<u>20</u>
Comments/Rationale for Points: <u>Available to assist</u>		
4. Understanding of Project	25	<u>20 MS</u>
Comments/Rationale for Points: <u>Will prioritize county projects and</u> <u>understands Co.</u>		
5. Familiarity with Applicable Rules and Regulations	10	<u>10</u>
Comments/Rationale for Points: <u>Numerous drainage improvement done</u>		

Total Score

~~105~~ 95 MS

**HIDALGO COUNTY STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATION  
SCORING/EVALUATION SHEET  
ENGINEERING/ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES**

Project Description: City of Weslaco – Flood Drain Improvements

Department: Hidalgo County Urban County Program

Name of Firm: Dos Logistic

Date of Evaluation: 2/9/09

Evaluator's Name: Tony Barco

<u>Selection Criteria</u>	<u>Point</u>	<u>Score</u>
---------------------------	--------------	--------------

1. Professional Qualifications of Team	20	<u>19</u>
--	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: \_\_\_\_\_

2. Experience of Project Team	25	<u>20</u>
-------------------------------	----	-----------

**\*Note\*** Information necessary to assess the firm on this criteria should be gathered by contacting past/current clients:

Comments/Rationale for Points: \_\_\_\_\_

3. Experience/Availability of Project Manager	20	<u>18</u>
---	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: \_\_\_\_\_

4. Understanding of Project	25	<u>22</u>
-----------------------------	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: \_\_\_\_\_

5. Familiarity with Applicable Rules and Regulations	10	<u>10</u>
--	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: \_\_\_\_\_

	Total Score	<u>89</u>
--	-------------	-----------

**HIDALGO COUNTY STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATION  
SCORING/EVALUATION SHEET  
ENGINEERING/ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES**

Project Description: 2008 Urban County Projects

Department: Urban County Program (City of Weslaco)

Name of Firm: DOS Logistics

Date of Evaluation: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator's Name: David Salinas, Director of Public Facilities

<u>Selection Criteria</u>	<u>Point</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Professional Qualifications of Team	20	<u>5</u>
Comments/Rationale for Points: _____		
_____		
2. Experience of Project Team	25	<u>4</u>
<b>*Note* Information necessary to assess the firm on this criteria should be gathered by contacting past/current clients:</b>		
Comments/Rationale for Points: _____		
_____		
3. Experience/Availability of Project Manager	20	<u>4</u>
Comments/Rationale for Points: _____		
_____		
4. Understanding of Project	25	<u>5</u>
Comments/Rationale for Points: _____		
_____		
5. Familiarity with Applicable Rules and Regulations	10	<u>5</u>
Comments/Rationale for Points: _____		
_____		

FEB 4 2009

*Aw*  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Total Score** 23