

Hidalgo County - Urban County Program
Hidalgo County Precinct No. 1
Engineering Professional Services
Street Improvement Project
Grading Grid

CRITERIA	TEDSI Infrastructure Inc.			Rodriguez Engineering			Melden & Hunt Inc.		
	Grader Pct. #1	Grader UCP	Grader P. Dept.	Grader Pct. #1	Grader UCP	Grader P. Dept.	Grader Pct. #1	Grader UCP	Grader P. Dept.
Selection Criteria	20	20	19	20	20	17	20	20	17
Experience of Project Team	22	23	23	24	24	20	25	24	24
Experience/Availability of Project Manager	19	18	19	20	19	18	18	18	19
Understanding Projects	23	23	24	24	24	21	17	23	21
Familiarity w/Applicable Rules & Regulations	10	10	10	10	10	8	10	10	9
TOTALS	94	94	95	98	97	84	90	95	90
AVERAGES		94.34%			93%			91.67	
RANKING		1			2			3	

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

Project Description: Precinct No. 1 Street Improvements- (FY 22)

Department: Hidalgo County Urban County Program

Name of Firm: Rodriguez Engineering

Date of Evaluation: 09/30/2009

Evaluator's Name: Juan J. Ybarra Jr.

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

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

Comments/Rationale for Points: Professional qualifications are extensive and combined with staff professionalism indicates a high level of quality.

2. Experience of Project Team	25	<u>24</u>
-------------------------------	----	-----------

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

Comments/Rationale for Points: Project team is highly qualified in the field of road construction and personal customer services to all projects. The firm takes pride in completed projects on time and within all allowable parameters.

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

Comments/Rationale for Points: Mr. Rodriguez provides professional and personal services to all projects. Mr. Rodriguez is very hands on and makes himself readily accessible to questions or clarifications.

4. Understanding of Project	25	<u>24</u>
-----------------------------	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: Experience of project type equates to successful project completion.

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

Comments/Rationale for Points: Has numerous projects which directly reflect a clear and applicable understanding of the rules and regulations which govern CDBG.

	Total Score	<u>98</u>
--	--------------------	-----------

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

Project Description: Precinct No. 1 Street Improvements- (FY 22)

Department: Hidalgo County Urban County Program

Name of Firm: RODRIGUEZ ENGINEERING

Date of Evaluation: Oct. 1, 2009

Evaluator's Name: Tony Balco - WCP

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

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

Comments/Rationale for Points: Mr. Rodriguez is highly qualified as well as his STAFF with 20 yrs. of working in Hidalgo County projects

2. Experience of Project Team	25	<u>24</u>
-------------------------------	----	-----------

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

Comments/Rationale for Points: Rodriguez Engineering vast experience designing County Roads, has allowed him better understanding of the County of Hidalgo needs as it relates to streets.

3. Experience/Availability of Project Manager	20	<u>19</u>
---	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: Rodriguez Engineering is a small firm subsequently Mr. Rodriguez and his STAFF are a hands on company readily available to assist their clients.

4. Understanding of Project	25	<u>24</u>
-----------------------------	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: Firm would have no problem understanding this project because Mr. Rodriguez has completed at least 20 street projects for the County of Hidalgo

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

Comments/Rationale for Points: Very familiar with Rules and Regulations as they pertain to this subject.

Total Score	<u>97</u>
-------------	-----------

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

Project Description: Precinct No. 1 Street Improvements- (FY 22)

Department: Hidalgo County Urban County Program

Name of Firm: Rodriguez Engineering

Date of Evaluation: October 02, 2009

Evaluator's Name: Yvette Islas

<u>Selection Criteria</u>	<u>Point</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Professional Qualifications of Team	20	<u>17</u>

Comments/Rationale for Points: page 2 & 5 (Statement of Qualifications)

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: other than Leo Rodriguez, unclear of team

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

Comments/Rationale for Points: SOQ p5

4. Understanding of Project	25	<u>21</u>
-----------------------------	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: most recent experience listed is 2003

5. Familiarity with Applicable Rules and Regulations	10	<u>8</u>
--	----	----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: experience indicates familiarity with rules & regulations

Total Score 84

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

Project Description: Precinct No. 1 Street Improvements- (FY 22)

Department: Hidalgo County Urban County Program

Name of Firm: TEDSI Infrastructure Inc.

Date of Evaluation: 09/30/2009

Evaluator's Name: Juan J. Ybarra Jr.

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

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

Comments/Rationale for Points: Professional qualifications of team meet all levels required under the CDBG program and the Co. of Hidalgo

2. Experience of Project Team	25	<u>22</u>
-------------------------------	----	-----------

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

Comments/Rationale for Points: Firm has proven track record of providing high quality service and professionalism through its experienced project team.

3. Experience/Availability of Project Manager	20	<u>19</u>
---	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: Project manager has direct overseeing duties and participates in all aspects of the day-to-day activities of projects.

4. Understanding of Project	25	<u>23</u>
-----------------------------	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: Firm exhibits knowledge of project road construction and reconstruction.

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

Comments/Rationale for Points: Having worked on past CDBG projects the firm has demonstrated a clear understanding of CDBG rules and regulations.

	Total Score	<u>94</u>
--	--------------------	------------------

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

Project Description: Precinct No. 1 Street Improvements- (FY 22)

Department: Hidalgo County Urban County Program

Name of Firm: TEDSI INFRASTRUCTURE GROUP

Date of Evaluation: Oct. 1, 2009

Evaluator's Name: Tony Barco - UCP

Selection Criteria **Point** **Score**

1. Professional Qualifications of Team 20 20

Comments/Rationale for Points: Firm has highly qualified staff and lead engineer has 10 yrs. experience in roadway designs

2. Experience of Project Team 25 23

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

Comments/Rationale for Points: Firm has many years of experience in streets designs and construction oversight in Hidalgo County

3. Experience/Availability of Project Manager 20 18

Comments/Rationale for Points: Project Manager (Eric Dietrich) has 10 yrs. experience as an engineer and is currently working on County Hiddos street improvements and would dedicate 85%-100% of time to this project.

4. Understanding of Project 25 23

Comments/Rationale for Points: Firm is qualified and experienced and would no problem understanding the project (street improvements)

5. Familiarity with Applicable Rules and Regulations 10 10

Comments/Rationale for Points: Firm is familiar with Applicable Rules and Regulations and would have no problem with this project.

Total Score 94

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

Project Description: Precinct No. 1 Street Improvements- (FY 22)

Department: Hidalgo County Urban County Program

Name of Firm: TEDSI Infrastructure Group

Date of Evaluation: October 02, 2009

Evaluator's Name: Yvette Islas

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

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

Comments/Rationale for Points: resume

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: section 3, pg 1

4. Understanding of Project	25	<u>24</u>
-----------------------------	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: section 2 pg2

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

Comments/Rationale for Points: section 3, pg1

	Total Score	<u>95</u>
--	--------------------	------------------

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

Project Description: Precinct No. 1 Street Improvements- (FY 22)

Department: Hidalgo County Urban County Program

Name of Firm: MELEDEN AND HUNT, INC.

Date of Evaluation: 09/29/2009

Evaluator's Name: JUAN J. YBARRA

<u>Selection Criteria</u>	<u>Point</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Professional Qualifications of Team	20	<u>20</u>

Comments/Rationale for Points: The firm has a very professional team which it has gained through the 59 years of providing an array of services to this area.

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: With combined staff of 60 qualified engineers, environmentalist, surveyors, CADD techs and support personnel the project team's experience is vast.

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

Comments/Rationale for Points: Project Manager/Engineer is highly experienced with engineering design and construction management experience

4. Understanding of Project	25	<u>17</u>
-----------------------------	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: Phase III construction is detailed and follows CDBG outline to project construction.

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

Comments/Rationale for Points: With years of experience, familiarity with applicable rules and regulations is evident.

Total Score	<u>90</u>
--------------------	------------------

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

Project Description: Precinct No. 1 Street Improvements- (FY 22)

Department: Hidalgo County Urban County Program

Name of Firm: MELDEN & HUNT, INC.

Date of Evaluation: Oct. 1, 2009

Evaluator's Name: Tony Barco UCP

Selection Criteria **Point** **Score**

1. Professional Qualifications of Team 20 20

Comments/Rationale for Points: Highly qualified STAFF working for a firm who was founded in 1947. Offering a variety of Engineering services throughout the Rio Grande Valley.

2. Experience of Project Team 25 24

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

Comments/Rationale for Points: Melden + Hunt proposes to assign two engineers for this project with over 50 yrs. of experience.

3. Experience/Availability of Project Manager 20 18

Comments/Rationale for Points: Two experienced engineers will be assigned to this project and should have no problem availing themselves

4. Understanding of Project 25 23

Comments/Rationale for Points: This firm will have no problem understanding this project because two experienced engineers are being assigned to this project

5. Familiarity with Applicable Rules and Regulations 10 10

Comments/Rationale for Points: Firm/Team will have no problem understanding Applicable Rules & Regulations as they Apply to this project

Total Score 95

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

Project Description: Precinct No. 1 Street Improvements- (FY 22)

Department: Hidalgo County Urban County Program

Name of Firm: Melden & Hunt , Inc

Date of Evaluation: October 02, 2009

Evaluator's Name: Yvette Islas

<u>Selection Criteria</u>	<u>Point</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Professional Qualifications of Team	20	<u>17</u>

Comments/Rationale for Points: resume

2. Experience of Project Team	25	<u>24</u>
-------------------------------	----	-----------

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

Comments/Rationale for Points: section 4, page 2

3. Experience/Availability of Project Manager	20	<u>19</u>
---	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: section 4, page 2, 3

4. Understanding of Project	25	<u>21</u>
-----------------------------	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: similar work noted, indicating understanding of this type of project

5. Familiarity with Applicable Rules and Regulations	10	<u>9</u>
--	----	----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: similar work noted, indicating understanding of this type of project

Total Score 90