AYRES See Cost Summary on Backside of Page

EXHIBIT IV Selection Rating System

Project Coordinator/Lead's ExperienceA. 3 or more years of experience with CDBG or other federal/state programsB. 2 years of experience	Maximum 20 Points 20 Points 15 Points
C. 1 year of experienceD. Less than 1 year of experienceE. No experience	10 Points 5 Points 0 Points
A. Completion of 3 or more previous, similar type projects within	<u>Maximum 20 Points</u> 20 Points
 B. Completion of 2 similar projects C. Completion of 1 similar project D. Working on 1 similar project; not completed E. No work on a similar project 	15 Points 10 Points 5 Points 0 Points
A. Respondent lists 3 previous clients with similar projects	<u>Maximum 10 Points</u> 10 Points
 B. Respondent lists at least 1 previous client C. Respondent lists no previous references 	5 Points 0 Points
A. Firm is thoroughly familiar with community(ies) with similar population and characteristics to	<u>Maximum 20 Points</u> <mark>20 Points</mark>
B. Firm is somewhat familiar with community(ies) with similar population and characteristics to	10 Points
C. Firm is unfamiliar with community(ies) with similar population and characteristics to Village of Lone Rock	0 Points
 Responsiveness to Specifications of Project/RFP A. Needs of project are fully addressed in Proposal B. Needs of project are somewhat addressed in Proposal C. Needs of project are not addressed/resolved in Proposal 	<u>Maximum 20 Points</u> <mark>20 Points</mark> 10 Points 0 Points
Cost Effectiveness A. Budget/proposal includes 3 or more cost effectiveness Components	<u>Maximum 10 Points</u> <mark>10 Points</mark>
 B. Budget/proposal includes 1-2 cost effectiveness components C. Budget/proposal does not include cost effectiveness components 	5 Points 0 Points
A. Budget within Village of Lone Rock Park Project	<u>Maximum 10 Points</u> 10 Points
	 programs B. 2 years of experience C. 1 year of experience D. Less than 1 year of experience E. No experience Firm's Project Completion Background A. Completion of 3 or more previous, similar type projects within proposed time frame & budget B. Completion of 2 similar projects C. Completion of 1 similar project, not completed E. No work on a similar project References from Similar Projects A. Respondent lists 3 previous clients with similar projects and all references give excellent response on quality of service B. Respondent lists at least 1 previous client C. Respondent lists no previous references Firm is thoroughly familiar with community(ies) with similar population and characteristics to Village of Lone Rock B. Firm is unfamiliar with community(ies) with similar population and characteristics to Village of Lone Rock C. Firm is unfamiliar with community(ies) with similar population and characteristics to Village of Lone Rock C. Firm is unfamiliar with community(ies) with similar population and characteristics to Village of Lone Rock C. Firm is unfamiliar with community(ies) with similar population and characteristics to Village of Lone Rock C. Firm is unfamiliar with community(ies) with similar population and characteristics to Village of Lone Rock C. Needs of project are fully addressed in Proposal B. Needs of project are not addressed in Proposal C. Needs of project are not addressed/resolved in Proposal C. Needs of project are not addressed/resolved in Proposal Cost Effectiveness A. Budget/proposal includes 3 or more cost effectiveness components B. Budget/proposal includes 1-2 cost effectiveness components B. Budget/proposal includes 1-2 cost effectiveness components

	 Budget slightly above Village of Lone Rock Park Project capacity as proposed; potentially feasible with modest adjustment 	5 Points
	 Budget not reasonably within Village of Lone Rock Park Project capacity as proposed; would require extensi adjustment to be feasible 	0 Points ive
8.	Minority or Women Business Enterprise, Disadvantaged Business Enterprise, or Section 3/LMI Firm*	Maximum 5 Points
	A. Firm is MBE, WBE, DBE or Section 3/LMI firm	5 Points
	B. Firm is not MBE, WBE, DBE or Section 3/LMI firm	<mark>0 Points</mark>
9.	Small Business Firm	Maximum 5 Points
	A. Firm is a small business	5 Points
	B. Firm is not a small business	<mark>0 Points</mark>
(Scoring element was not addressed in proposal	
MA	XIMUM TOTAL POINTS: 120 POINTS	POINTS SCORED = 110
No	e to Responders of RFP:	

Proposal submittals are to be organized to address the submittal specifications listed in the RFP and the evaluation criteria listed above.

Task 1 - Lead Paint & Hazardous Materials AssessmentTask 2 - Demolition Specs and Bidding Package Prep.Task 3 – Building Demo, Asbestos Abatement and Site	<mark>\$ 8,600</mark> \$ 23,000 \$ 14,300
Restoration	\$45,900
With a Deduct of Task 1 which was not a required proposal element	\$37,300

- Firm included proposal element for Hazardous Materials Assessment as Task 1 This was not a required or requested element of the RFP. On 5/25/21 ED Director Glasbrenner spoke with Bill Honea who indicated that this line could be struck and all elements of the RFP could still be fulfilled. To equally compare all proposals a deduct of \$8,600 is made from this proposal. With the deduction the proposal total is \$37,300. This represents the low proposal amount of this RFP Process
- There was a pricing error on page 19 of their proposal Proposal amount is \$45,900
- Firm clearly listed Cost Effectiveness Elements within their proposal where the other firms did not. In addition, their
 proposal amount per the required elements of the RFP represents the best price point which in itself is a cost
 effectiveness element

DELTA 3

See Cost Summary on Backside of Page

EXHIBIT IV

Selection Rating System

1.	Project Coordinator/Lead's Experience A. 3 or more years of experience with CDBG or other federal/state programs	<u>Maximum 20 Points</u> <mark>20 Points</mark>
	 B. 2 years of experience C. 1 year of experience D. Less than 1 year of experience E. No experience 	15 Points 10 Points 5 Points 0 Points
2.	Firm's Project Completion Background A. Completion of 3 or more previous, similar type projects within	<u>Maximum 20 Points</u> <mark>20 Points</mark>
	proposed time frame & budgetB. Completion of 2 similar projectsC. Completion of 1 similar projectD. Working on 1 similar project; not completedE. No work on a similar project	15 Points 10 Points 5 Points 0 Points
3.	References from Similar Projects A. Respondent lists 3 previous clients with similar projects and all references give excellent response on quality of service	<u>Maximum 10 Points</u> <mark>10 Points</mark>
	 B. Respondent lists at least 1 previous client C. Respondent lists no previous references 	5 Points 0 Points
4.	Firm's Familiarity with Community's Needs A. Firm is thoroughly familiar with community(ies) with similar population and characteristics to Village of Lone Rock	<u>Maximum 20 Points</u> <mark>20 Points</mark>
	 B. Firm is somewhat familiar with community(ies) with similar population and characteristics to Village of Lone Rock 	10 Points
	 C. Firm is unfamiliar with community(ies) with similar population and characteristics to Village of Lone Rock 	0 Points
5.	 Responsiveness to Specifications of Project/RFP A. Needs of project are fully addressed in Proposal B. Needs of project are somewhat addressed in Proposal C. Needs of project are not addressed/resolved in Proposal 	<u>Maximum 20 Points</u> <mark>20 Points</mark> 10 Points 0 Points
6.	Cost Effectiveness A. Budget/proposal includes 3 or more cost effectiveness	<u>Maximum 10 Points</u> 10 Points
	Components B. Budget/proposal includes 1-2 cost effectiveness components C. Budget/proposal does not include cost effectiveness components	5 Points <mark>0 Points</mark>
7.	Budget - (See Exhibit I) A. Budget within Village of Lone Rock Park Project capacity as proposed	<u>Maximum 10 Points</u> 10 Points

	В.	Budget slightly above Village of Lone Rock Park Project capacity as proposed; potentially feasible with modest adjustment	5 Points
	C.	Budget not reasonably within Village of Lone Rock Park Project capacity as proposed; would require extensive adjustment to be feasible	0 Points
8.		nority or Women Business Enterprise, Disadvantaged siness Enterprise, or Section 3/LMI Firm*	<u>Maximum 5 Points</u>
		Firm is MBE, WBE, DBE or Section 3/LMI firm	5 Points
	В.	Firm is not MBE, WBE, DBE or Section 3/LMI firm	<mark>0 Points</mark>
9.	Sm	all Business Firm	<u>Maximum 5 Points</u>
		Firm is a small business	5 Points
	В.	Firm is not a small business	0 Points
MA	\XIN	IUM TOTAL POINTS: 120 POINTS	

Note to Responders of RFP:

Proposal submittals are to be organized to address the submittal specifications listed in the RFP and the evaluation criteria listed above.

POINTS SCORED = 105

Design Eng. Services	\$ 23,950
Bid Process / Construction Contract	\$ 1,000
Construction Engineering Services	\$ 21,500
	\$46,450

- Proposal did not have a formal cover letter
- I called Bart of Delta 3 to try to determine if there was an allowance for hazardous testing in his Design and Engineering Services line item. The RFP did not specify that there should be an allowance included, Delta 3's proposal did not identify an amount for testing, and the phone conversation did not reveal a specific amount that was included for testing. As a result of these findings it is believed that testing was not included in the proposal.
- Cost Effectiveness was not directly addressed and the proposal total is \$9,150 more than the low proposal of \$37,300

GENERAL

See Cost Summary on Backside of Page

EXHIBIT IV

Selection Rating System

1.	Project Coordinator/Lead's Experience A. 3 or more years of experience with CDBG or other federal/state programs	<u>Maximum 20 Points</u> <mark>20 Points</mark>
	 B. 2 years of experience C. 1 year of experience D. Less than 1 year of experience E. No experience 	15 Points 10 Points 5 Points 0 Points
2.	Firm's Project Completion Background A. Completion of 3 or more previous, similar type projects within	<u>Maximum 20 Points</u> 20 Points
	proposed time frame & budgetB. Completion of 2 similar projectsC. Completion of 1 similar projectD. Working on 1 similar project; not completedE. No work on a similar project	15 Points 10 Points 5 Points 0 Points
3.	References from Similar Projects A. Respondent lists 3 previous clients with similar projects	<u>Maximum 10 Points</u> <mark>10 Points</mark>
	and all references give excellent response on quality of serviceB. Respondent lists at least 1 previous clientC. Respondent lists no previous references	5 Points 0 Points
4.	 Firm's Familiarity with Community's Needs A. Firm is thoroughly familiar with community(ies) with similar population and characteristics to Village of Long Back 	<u>Maximum 20 Points</u> <mark>20 Points</mark>
	Village of Lone RockB. Firm is somewhat familiar with community(ies) with similar population and characteristics to	10 Points
	 Village of Lone Rock C. Firm is unfamiliar with community(ies) with similar population and characteristics to Village of Lone Rock 	0 Points
5.	 Responsiveness to Specifications of Project/RFP A. Needs of project are fully addressed in Proposal B. Needs of project are somewhat addressed in Proposal C. Needs of project are not addressed/resolved in Proposal 	<u>Maximum 20 Points</u> 20 Points <mark>10 Points</mark> 0 Points
6.	Cost Effectiveness A. Budget/proposal includes 3 or more cost effectiveness	<u>Maximum 10 Points</u> 10 Points
	Components B. Budget/proposal includes 1-2 cost effectiveness components C. Budget/proposal does not include cost effectiveness components	5 Points <mark>0 Points</mark>
7.	Budget - (See Exhibit I)A. Budget within Village of Lone Rock Park Project capacity as proposed	<u>Maximum 10 Points</u> 10 Points

		Budget slightly above Village of Lone Rock Park Project capacity as proposed; potentially feasible with modest adjustment Budget not reasonably within Village of Lone Rock Park Project capacity as proposed; would require extensive	5 Points 0 Points
8.	Bu A.	adjustment to be feasible nority or Women Business Enterprise, Disadvantaged siness Enterprise, or Section 3/LMI Firm* Firm is MBE, WBE, DBE or Section 3/LMI firm Firm is not MBE, WBE, DBE or Section 3/LMI firm	<u>Maximum 5 Points</u> 5 Points <mark>0 Points</mark>
9.	A.	nall Business Firm Firm is a small business Firm is not a small business	<u>Maximum 5 Points</u> <mark>5 Points</mark> 0 Points

MAXIMUM TOTAL POINTS: 120 POINTS

POINTS SCORED = 95

Note to Responders of RFP:

Proposal submittals are to be organized to address the submittal specifications listed in the RFP and the evaluation criteria listed above.

*MBE/WBE/DBE and Section 3/LMI Firms are Defined As Follows:

Minority Business Enterprise (MBE) – Business with at least 51% ownership and control held by minority person(s).

Woman Business Enterprise (WBE) – Business with at least 51% ownership and control held by a woman or women.

Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (MBE) – Small business with at least 51% ownership and control held by person(s) classified as "disadvantaged" individual(s) according to the Wisconsin Department of Transportation standards (https://wisconsindot.gov/Documents/doing-bus/civil-rights/dbe/dbe-program-brochure.pdf)

Section 3/LMI Firm – Firm with at least 51% ownership interest and control held by low-to-moderate income (LMI) Wisconsin resident(s) (LMI according to HUD LMI limits for the County in which the owner resides); *or* at least 30% of the firm's full-time permanent employees are Wisconsin LMI residents (LMI based on the HUD LMI income limits for the County in which they live); *or* the owner(s) of the firm commit(s) to awarding at least 25% of its subcontracting dollar amount (i.e., 25% of subcontracting, based on the total amount of subcontracts awarded) to Section 3/LMI firms for the CDBG project.

Small Business will be defined as less than \$16,500,000 in annual revenue as established by the SBA

Design Plans and Specifications Bidding Services General Administration of Construction	\$ 18,000 \$ 6,000 \$ 14,000	
	\$38,000	

- Responsiveness to the RFP scored lower as a result of elements of the proposal not specifically addressing what
 was asked for
- Cost Effectiveness was not directly addressed