

EVALUATION MATRIX FOR PROJECT NAME

| PHASE 1 - CRITERIA AND THEIR WEIGHTS | | | | | | | | | | PHASE 2 - VENDOR SCORING | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---------------------------------------|-----|----------------|-----|---------------|-----|------------|-----|-----|-------|-----|-------|-----|-------|-----|-------|-------|
| A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | WEIGHT | | MS Consultants | | White & Smith | | CodeWright | | RAW | FINAL | RAW | FINAL | RAW | FINAL | RAW | FINAL | |
| | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | Base weight of "1" plus actual points | RAW | FINAL | RAW | FINAL | RAW | FINAL | RAW | | | | | | | | | FINAL |
| A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | A = | 10 | 1 | 10 | 2 | 20 | 3 | 30 | | | | | | | | | |
| A | B | B | B | E | B | B | B | B | | B = | 22 | 1 | 22 | 2 | 44 | 3 | 66 | | | | | | | | | |
| | B | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | C | C | E | F | C | C | I | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | C | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | | | C = | 12 | 1 | 12 | 3 | 36 | 2 | 24 | | | | | | | | | |
| | D | E | F | D | D | I | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | D | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | D = | 8 | 1 | 8 | 3 | 24 | 3 | 24 | | | | | | | | | |
| | E | E | E | E | E | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | E | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | E = | 23 | 1 | 23 | 2 | 46 | 3 | 69 | | | | | | | | | |
| | F | F | F | F | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | F | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | | | | F = | 19 | 1 | 19 | 1 | 19 | 1 | 19 | | | | | | | | | |
| | G | G | I | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | G | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | G = | 4 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 8 | | | | | | | | | |
| | H | I | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | H | 3 | | | | | | | | H = | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | | |
| | I | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | I | | | | | | | | | I = | 11 | 1 | 11 | 1 | 11 | 1 | 11 | | | | | | | | | |
| | J | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | J | | | | | | | | | J = | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | Totals | | | 111 | | 210 | | 253 | | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 |

1. Relative weight assigned to each criterion is based on the Committee's comparison of each criterion against all others using the following values.

| | | | |
|---|------------|------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 = Disagreement among committee | 4-3 | 4-4 | 5 member 3-2 4-1 5-0 |
| 2 = Majority of committee in agreement | 5-2 | 5-3 or 6-2 | |
| 3 = Unanimous or almost unanimous agreement | 6-1 or 7-0 | 7-1 or 8-0 | |

A point value of one is included as the initial basic weight for all Evaluation Criteria prior to beginning the analysis. In addition, each criterion's total points are added.

2. Proposers are rated by evaluating each proposal against the RFP requirements using the Evaluation Criteria. Raw score resulting from this evaluation based on the following scale.

| |
|-----------|
| 1 = Below |
| 2 = Meets |
| 3 = Above |

Evaluation Criteria are listed in no particular order. The weighting process will provide relative value.

Evaluation Criteria Actual Criteria are developed by Owner for the specific project to be evaluated.

- A. Clear demonstration of firm's specialized experience and technical competence in management of successful comparable projects.
- B. Qualifications of key personnel who will have direct involvement on this project. Specifically demonstrate the technical competence to manage, write, rewrite, consolidate and implement comparable projects.
- C. Evaluation of past projects in the last 5 years with special attention paid to projects conducted with local government counties and municipalities.
 - Factors evaluated include quality of work, cost control, attention to detail, recommendation from provided references, key personnel, and demonstrated ability to meet scheduled deadlines.
- D. Familiarity with the Piedmont Region and Chatham County, NC. (i.e. geographic conditions, local economy, environment, and experience specific to land use law and North Carolina General Statutes.)
- E. The firm's approach and demonstrated understanding of the project. Although the County has identified the general nature of services required, the consultant is given leeway toward the approach to the methodology to provide the proposed services.
- F. Clear demonstration of capability to develop successful engagement strategy/schedule for county staff, recommending boards, and stakeholder groups.
- G. Project Timeframe
- H. Proposed Budget
- I. Submitted proposal is clear, complete, and contains correct information