

US Geological Survey  
Broad Agency Announcement for 3D Elevation Program (3DEP)  
G16PS00711 / G16AS00121  
Validation of Proposed Funding Partners

Required for Proposal Submission

<b>Applicant Information</b>	First Name:	Last Name:
	Organization: Williamson County	
	Project Title: FY 17 LiDAR	

<b>Proposed Funding Partner Information</b>	First Name: Jordan	Last Name: Thomas
	Organization: TWBD - Central Texas	
	This form acknowledges that our organization is a full and willing partner in the project referenced above. If accepted for award, our agency has proposed a good faith contribution of \$ <u>100,127.44</u> towards said project.	
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Acknowledgement required; please read and check box</i>	In addition to the acquisition cost, applicants utilizing the GPSC contracts will be subject to a 5% assessment on the value of their contribution. This assessment covers the cost of contract management. The total cost of the project will include the acquisition cost plus the assessment.	
	<b>As stated in the proposal this contribution is:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Guaranteed <input type="checkbox"/> Pending, with a final funding decision expected on _____ (Use: <u>MMM YYYY</u> )

Signature of Funding Partner \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

# StratMap Team Evaluation Summary

---

## High Resolution Lidar for TWDB Solicitation 580170805

### Evaluation Criteria

The three-member evaluation team independently scored the four respondents. Scoring criteria were based on information requested in the StratMap solicitation. The evaluation criteria included the following:

- Project Plan (50 pts total)
  - Process Description – 20
  - Contingency Plan – 10
  - Reporting and Expectations – 10
  - Schedule – 10
- Product Sample (20 pts total)
  - Quality – 10
  - Relevance – 10
- Pricing (30 pts total)
  - Total Project – 10
  - Value – 20

### Lidar and Orthoimagery

The team independently scored each respondent according to the established criteria. The scores were combined, summarized and ranked. The top ranked company was **Fugro Geospatial, Inc.**

**Recommendation** - Following a compilation of the results, the team determined that the Fugro proposal offers the best overall value based on a combination of technical merit, proposed communication plan and low relative cost. The proposal includes a well-defined project plan, detailed descriptions of the processes, and an accommodating schedule that specifically address requirements for this project. Data samples also contributed to the total score.

### Evaluation Team

- Kevin Smith, COA
- Joey Thomas, TWDB/TNRIS
- Jason Hinojosa, SARA

## Total Team Scores

StratMap #580170805 Central Texas Lidar										
Complete Tabulation						Technical Tabulation			Cost Tabulation	
Vendor	Total Scores			Group Total Score		Vendor	Group SubTotal		Total Cost	
	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Total Score	Rank		SubTotal	Rank		
Sanborn	77	58	61	196	4	Sanborn	134	4	\$1,026,525.30	1
Fugro	92	93	86	271	1	Fugro	190	1	\$1,051,688.00	2
Harris	73	48	77	198	3	Harris	139	3	\$1,213,200.00	3
Dewberry	81	70	79	230	2	Dewberry	173	2	\$1,490,074.80	4
Points Given	323	269	303	895			636			
Average Score	81	67	76	224			159			

# StratMap Team Evaluation Summary

---

## QA/QC for High Resolution Lidar for

### TWDB Solicitation 580170806

#### Evaluation Criteria

The three-member evaluation team independently scored each of the 4 respondents. Scoring criteria were based on information requested in the StratMap solicitation. The evaluation criteria included the following:

- Project Plan (50 pts total)
  - Process Description – 20
  - Contingency Plan – 10
  - Reporting and Expectations – 10
  - Schedule – 10
- Product Sample (20 pts total)
  - Quality – 10
  - Relevance – 10
- Pricing (30 pts total)
  - Total Project – 10
  - Value – 20

#### QAQC

The team independently scored each respondent according to the established criteria. The scores were combined, summarized and ranked. The top ranked company was **AECOM Technical Services, Inc.**

**Recommendation** - Following a compilation of the results, the team determined that the AECOM proposal offers the best overall value based on a combination of technical merit, proposed communication plan and low relative cost. The proposal includes a well-defined project plan, detailed descriptions of the processes, and an accommodating schedule that specifically address requirements for this project. Data samples also contributed to the total score. AECOM ranked first for technical merit and first for price which resulted in the highest overall score among the three respondents.

## Evaluation Team

- Kevin Smith, COA
- Joey Thomas, TWDB/TNRIS
- Jason Hinojosa, SARA

## Total Team Scores

StratMap #580160719		RRC Lidar/Ortho								
Complete Tabulation						Technical Tabulation			Cost Tabulation	
Vendor	Total Scores			Group Total Score		Vendor	Group SubTotal		Total Cost	
	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Total Score	Rank		SubTotal	Rank		
AECOM	94	91	89	274	1	AECOM	193	1	\$131,278.97	2
Dewberry	91	80	82	253	2	Dewberry	175	2	\$122,092.21	1
Tessellations	21	19	10	50	3	Tessellations	36	4	\$317,358.40	4
Geophex	62	48	51	161	3	Geophex	107	3	\$133,107.89	3
Points Given	206	190	181	577			404			
Average Score	69	63	60	192			135			
Standard Deviation	41	39	44	124			86			