

**PROPOSED PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CRITERIA MATRIX**

CRITERIA	Maximum Rating	Weighting	Total Possible
Ability of Professional Personnel	5	x4	20
Firm's Experience with Projects of a Similar Type and Size	5	x4	20
Willingness to Meet Schedule and Budget Requirements	5	x1	5
Effect of Firm's Recent, Current and Projected Workload	5	x1	5
Effect of Project Team Location	5	x1	5
Approach	5	x6	30
Minority Business Enterprise Participation	10	x1	10
Local Preference	5	x1	5
Total			100

Points	<b>CRITERIA # 1 - ABILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL</b>
1	Project team personnel do not have appropriate level of experience. Project team does not contain all necessary disciplines. Organization of project team is inappropriate.
2	Most project team personnel have the proper level of experience. Project team contains all but one necessary discipline. Organization of project team is inappropriate.
3	All project team personnel have the proper level of experience. Project team contains all necessary disciplines. Organization of project team is adequate to the project.
4	All project team personnel have the proper level of experience and the project manager is uniquely qualified. Project team contains all necessary disciplines. Organization of project team is adequate to the project.
5	All project team personnel have the proper level of experience and several are uniquely qualified. Project team contains all necessary disciplines. Organization of project team is adequate for the project.
	<b>CRITERIA # 2 - FIRM'S EXPERIENCE WITH PROJECTS OF A SIMILAR TYPE AND SIZE</b>
1	No successful experience with similar type projects.
2	Successful experience with 1 - 2 similar type projects.
3	Successful experience with 3 - 6 similar type projects, at least one of which had been in the past 2-years.
4	Successful experience with more than 5 similar type projects, 1 - 2 of which are the same type and size as the proposed project.
5	Successful experience with more than 5 similar type projects, 3 or more of which are the same size and type as the proposed project.
	<b>CRITERIA # 3 - WILLINGNESS TO MEET SCHEDULE AND BUDGET REQUIREMENTS</b>
1	Submittal does not address either the schedule or budget.
2	Submittal shows a longer schedule than in the RFP.
3	Submittal shows schedule same as in the RFP.
4	Submittal shows same or better schedule than the RFP.
5	Submittal shows an improved schedule over the RFP.
	<b>CRITERIA # 4 - EFFECT OF RECENT, CURRENT AND PROJECTED WORKLOAD</b>
1	Submittal shows that consultant does not have sufficient available personnel to complete project on schedule.
2	Submittal shows that consultant will have to work overtime to complete project on schedule.
3	Submittal shows that consultant has adequate time and available personnel to complete project on schedule.
4	Submittal shows that consultant's project team has adequate time and available personnel to complete project on schedule.
5	Submittal shows that consultant's project team has no or very light current of projected workload. <span style="float: right;">25</span>

	<b><u>CRITERIA # 5 - EFFECT OF PROJECT TEAM LOCATION*</u></b>
	*ONLY THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON RATES THIS AREA
1	Non-local location of most of project team including the Project Manager, may adversely affect work quality and schedule.
2	Non-local location of some of project team (project manager local) may adversely affect work quality and schedule.
3	One or two key elements of project teams are non-local and probably will not affect work quality and schedule.
4	Only minor elements of project team are non-local and probably will not affect work quality of schedule.
5	All of the project team is local. (Local is defined as being in Leon, Jefferson, Gadsden, or Wakulla Counties).
	<b><u>CRITERIA # 6 - APPROACH</u></b>
1	Submittal is lacking in a demonstration of a clear understanding of the most basic requirements of the project or scope of services.
2	Submittal shows some basic understanding of the project or scope of work but provides little clarity as to consultant's understanding of the County's needs; a plan to address the scope of work; the consultant's design philosophy; or possible alternatives and/or cost saving measures.
3	Submittal shows understanding of the project or scope of work and may address in whole or part one or more, but not all of the following: consultant's understanding of the County's needs; a plan to address the scope of work; the consultant's design philosophy; or possible alternatives and/or cost saving measures.
4	Submittal shows that consultant understands the County's needs and has a plan to respond to the project or scope of work. Submittal also addresses firms' proposed design philosophy; possible alternatives; and/or cost savings.
5	Submittal clearly shows that consultant understands the County's needs and has a clear and specific plan to respond to the project or scope of work. The Submittal clearly states firms' proposed design philosophy; possible alternatives; and/or cost savings.
<p><b>NOTE: This document is a guide. The majority of projects will use the criteria above for rating the firm's written response. For some projects, however, it may be necessary to revise the criteria in some areas, for example, but not limited to, projects such as surveying and mapping, guaranteed energy savings (ESCO). In addition, unique architectural projects may require revised criteria. The requesting office must identify alternative criteria when the request is submitted to the Purchasing Division in order for the revisions to be included in the RFP.</b></p>	