



## Travis County Commissioners Court Agenda Request

**Meeting Date:** October 1, 2013

**Prepared By/Phone Number:** Jesus Angel Gómez/854-1187; Marvin Brice, CPPB/854-9765

**Elected/Appointed Official/Dept. Head:** Cyd V. Grimes, C.P.M., CPPO

**Commissioners Court Sponsor:** Judge Biscoe

**Agenda Language:** Authorize Purchasing Agent to commence negotiations with the highest-ranked firm, CGL Management Group LLC, in reference to Request for Qualifications (RFQ) No. Q1304-002-AG, Adult Correctional System Needs Analysis and Master Plan Update.

- **Purchasing Recommendation and Comments:** Purchasing concurs with departments and recommends approval of requested action. This procurement action meets the compliance requirements as outlined by the statutes.

On July 9, 2013, the Court authorized issuance of RFQ No. Q1304-002-AG to seek qualification statements from firms to conduct Adult Correctional System Needs Analysis and Master Plan Update services. Phase one of the services to be contracted is to review and analyze our current booking and jail operations, staffing, health care inmate services, program delivery, classification and bed utilization.

The results of this analysis will determine the need for additional and or replacement beds by bed type in the adult correctional system. This analysis will identify cost, staffing and time impacted on the system of inmate transport to and from court proceedings and ways to mitigate the need for transports other than the use of video.

- Subject RFQ was issued electronically to over 7,800 businesses nationwide, with approximately 77 businesses viewing the RFQ before it closed on August 14, 2013. Five (5) responses were received in response to the solicitation. The Evaluation Committee, supervised by the Purchasing Office, and comprised of representatives from Criminal Justice Planning, Facilities Management Department, Criminal Courts, Sheriff's Office and Planning and Budget Office, reviewed and scored the qualification statements based on the established evaluation criteria. The committee then met on September 6, 2013, to short-list the top

AGENDA REQUEST DEADLINE: All agenda requests and supporting materials must be submitted as a pdf to [agenda@co.travis.tx.us](mailto:agenda@co.travis.tx.us) by **Tuesdays at 5:00 p.m.** for the next week's meeting.

three firms resulting from the review and scoring of the qualification statements.

- The Evaluation Committee conducted oral interviews with the three (3) short listed firms on September 13, 2013. The short-listed firms were; Duran-Hollis Rupe Architects, Inc. & Jay Farbstein & Associates, Inc.; CGL Management Group LLC; and MGT of America Inc. After the interviews, the Evaluation Committee met to discuss the oral presentations and determine the final scores based upon the established oral presentation criteria. After deliberation, and final scoring, the Evaluation Committee established a final ranking, selecting CGL Management Group LLC as the highest-ranked firm. Scoring matrixes are attached for the Court's review.
- The Purchasing Agent requests authorization to begin formal negotiations with CGL Management Group LLC, including price, to finalize a contract for the Court's approval. Should negotiations be unsuccessful, the Purchasing Agent request authorization to then commence negotiations with the next highest ranked firm.
- **Funding Information:**
  - Shopping Cart/Funds Reservation in SAP: 300000721
  - Comments:

## REQUIRED ACTION

\_\_\_\_\_ Approved                      \_\_\_\_\_ Disapproved

---

Samuel T. Biscoe  
County Judge

Date

**RFQ 1304-002-AG: Adult Correctional System Needs Analysis and Master Plan Update**  
**STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS (SOQ) AND TECHNICAL PLAN EVALUATION MATRIX**

| NAME OF FIRMS:   | C N A           |           |             | HDR             |           |             | MGT             |           |             | DHR             |           |             | CGL             |           |             |
|--|-----------------|-----------|-------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------|
|  | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score |
| <b>1. CRITERION ONE: Experience of Staff</b>   |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |
| Respondent must have sufficiently experienced current full-time staff, both registered professionals in the applicable field and technical and administrative support staff, to competently and efficiently perform the work. Categories should add up to 40%. |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |
| Managerial Staff: years and relevance of experience  | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        |
| Jail- and Court-specific staff: years and relevance of experience  | 20%             | 5         | 1.00        | 20%             | 3         | 0.60        | 20%             | 4         | 0.80        | 20%             | 4         | 0.80        | 20%             | 4         | 0.80        |
| Other technical staff: years and relevance of experience   | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        |
| <b>2. CRITERION TWO: Prime Firm's Comparable Project Experience</b>  |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |
| The prime firm (or Joint Venture Firm) identified in the Project management chart must have work experience pertinent to the Project under consideration and local conditions.   | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 3         | 0.30        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        |
| <b>3. CRITERION THREE: Sub-Consultant's Comparable Project Experience</b>  |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |
| Demonstrated experience of the firm in providing similar consulting services on comparable projects.   | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 3         | 0.30        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        |
| <b>4. CRITERION FOUR: Written Technical Plan</b>   |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |
| The Technical Plan will be evaluated in four (4) categories, each weighted with the percentage indicated. All four categories add up to 40%.   |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |
| Project Knowledge  | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 3         | 0.30        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        |
| Completeness   | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 3         | 0.30        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        |
| Clarity  | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 3         | 0.30        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 3         | 0.30        | 10%             | 3         | 0.30        |
| Cohesiveness   | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 3         | 0.30        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 3         | 0.30        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        |
| <b>TOTAL SCORE</b>   | 100%            | 44        | 4.90        | 100%            | 30        | 3.30        | 100%            | 39        | 4.30        | 100%            | 34        | 3.80        | 100%            | 40        | 4.40        |
| <b>EVALUATOR #1</b>  |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |

| NAME OF FIRMS:   | C N A           |           |             | HDR             |           |             | MGT             |           |             | DHR             |           |             | CGL             |           |             |
|--|-----------------|-----------|-------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------|
|  | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score |
| <b>1. CRITERION ONE: Experience of Staff</b>   |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |
| Respondent must have sufficiently experienced current full-time staff, both registered professionals in the applicable field and technical and administrative support staff, to competently and efficiently perform the work. Categories should add up to 40%. |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |
| Managerial Staff: years and relevance of experience  | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        |
| Jail- and Court-specific staff: years and relevance of experience  | 20%             | 5         | 1.00        | 20%             | 5         | 1.00        | 20%             | 5         | 1.00        | 20%             | 5         | 1.00        | 20%             | 5         | 1.00        |
| Other technical staff: years and relevance of experience   | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        |
| <b>2. CRITERION TWO: Prime Firm's Comparable Project Experience</b>  |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |
| The prime firm (or Joint Venture Firm) identified in the Project management chart must have work experience pertinent to the Project under consideration and local conditions.   | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 3         | 0.30        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        |
| <b>3. CRITERION THREE: Sub-Consultant's Comparable Project Experience</b>  |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |
| Demonstrated experience of the firm in providing similar consulting services on comparable projects.   | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        |
| <b>4. CRITERION FOUR: Written Technical Plan</b>   |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |
| The Technical Plan will be evaluated in four (4) categories, each weighted with the percentage indicated. All four categories add up to 40%.   |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |
| Project Knowledge  | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        |
| Completeness   | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        |
| Clarity  | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        |
| Cohesiveness   | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        |
| <b>TOTAL SCORE</b>   | 100%            | 45        | 5.00        | 100%            | 38        | 4.30        | 100%            | 45        | 5.00        | 100%            | 44        | 4.90        | 100%            | 43        | 4.80        |
| <b>EVALUATOR #2</b>  |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |

| Criteria   | C N A           |           |             | HDR             |           |             | MGT             |           |             | DHR             |           |             | CGL             |           |             |
|--|-----------------|-----------|-------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------|
|  | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score |
| <b>1. CRITERION ONE: Experience of Staff</b>   |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |
| Respondent must have sufficiently experienced current full-time staff, both registered professionals in the applicable field and technical and administrative support staff, to competently and efficiently perform the work. Categories should add up to 40%. |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |
| Managerial Staff: years and relevance of experience  | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 2.5       | 0.25        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 4.5       | 0.45        |
| Jail- and Court-specific staff: years and relevance of experience  | 20%             | 4         | 0.80        | 20%             | 2         | 0.40        | 20%             | 4         | 0.80        | 20%             | 4.5       | 0.90        | 20%             | 5         | 1.00        |
| Other technical staff: years and relevance of experience   | 10%             | 3         | 0.30        | 10%             | 3         | 0.30        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 4.5       | 0.45        | 10%             | 4.5       | 0.45        |
| <b>2. CRITERION TWO: Prime Firm's Comparable Project Experience</b>  |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |
| The prime firm (or Joint Venture Firm) identified in the Project management chart must have work experience pertinent to the Project under consideration and local conditions.   | 10%             | 3.5       | 0.35        | 10%             | 2.5       | 0.25        | 10%             | 4.5       | 0.45        | 10%             | 3.5       | 0.35        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        |
| <b>3. CRITERION THREE: Sub-Consultant's Comparable Project Experience</b>  |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |
| Demonstrated experience of the firm in providing similar consulting services on comparable projects.   | 10%             | 3.5       | 0.35        | 10%             | 3         | 0.30        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 3.5       | 0.35        |
| <b>4. CRITERION FOUR: Written Technical Plan</b>   |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |
| The Technical Plan will be evaluated in four (4) categories, each weighted with the percentage indicated. All four categories add up to 40%.   |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |
| Project Knowledge  | 10%             | 3         | 0.30        | 10%             | 2         | 0.20        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        |
| Completeness   | 10%             | 3         | 0.30        | 10%             | 2         | 0.20        | 10%             | 4.5       | 0.45        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 4.5       | 0.45        |
| Clarity  | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 2         | 0.20        | 10%             | 4.5       | 0.45        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        |
| Cohesiveness   | 10%             | 3         | 0.30        | 10%             | 2         | 0.20        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 4.5       | 0.45        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        |
| <b>TOTAL SCORE</b>   | 100%            |           | 3.50        | 100%            |           | 2.30        | 100%            |           | 4.25        | 100%            |           | 4.45        | 100%            |           | 4.50        |
| <b>EVALUATOR #3</b>  |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |

pbo

| Criteria   | C N A           |           |             | HDR             |           |             | MGT             |           |             | DHR             |           |             | CGL             |           |             |
|--|-----------------|-----------|-------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------|
|  | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score |
| <b>1. CRITERION ONE: Experience of Staff</b>   |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |
| Respondent must have sufficiently experienced current full-time staff, both registered professionals in the applicable field and technical and administrative support staff, to competently and efficiently perform the work. Categories should add up to 40%. |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |
| Managerial Staff: years and relevance of experience  | 10%             | 3         | 0.30        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        |
| Jail- and Court-specific staff: years and relevance of experience  | 20%             | 3         | 0.60        | 20%             | 5         | 1.00        | 20%             | 4         | 0.80        | 20%             | 5         | 1.00        | 20%             | 4         | 0.80        |
| Other technical staff: years and relevance of experience   | 10%             | 2         | 0.20        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        |
| <b>2. CRITERION TWO: Prime Firm's Comparable Project Experience</b>  |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |
| The prime firm (or Joint Venture Firm) identified in the Project management chart must have work experience pertinent to the Project under consideration and local conditions.   | 10%             | 3         | 0.30        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        |
| <b>3. CRITERION THREE: Sub-Consultant's Comparable Project Experience</b>  |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |
| Demonstrated experience of the firm in providing similar consulting services on comparable projects.   | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        |
| <b>4. CRITERION FOUR: Written Technical Plan</b>   |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |
| The Technical Plan will be evaluated in four (4) categories, each weighted with the percentage indicated. All four categories add up to 40%.   |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |
| Project Knowledge  | 10%             | 3         | 0.30        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 3         | 0.30        |
| Completeness   | 10%             | 3         | 0.30        | 10%             | 3         | 0.30        | 10%             | 3         | 0.30        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        |
| Clarity  | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        |
| Cohesiveness   | 10%             | 1         | 0.10        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        |
| <b>TOTAL SCORE</b>   | 100%            | 27        | 3.00        | 100%            | 41        | 4.60        | 100%            | 41        | 4.50        | 100%            | 44        | 4.90        | 100%            | 40        | 4.40        |
| <b>EVALUATOR #4</b>  |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |

crmcrt

| NAME OF FIRMS:   | C N A           |           |             | HDR             |           |             | MGT             |           |             | DHR             |           |             | CGL             |           |             |
|--|-----------------|-----------|-------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------|
|  | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score |
| <b>1. CRITERION ONE: Experience of Staff</b>   |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |
| Respondent must have sufficiently experienced current full-time staff, both registered professionals in the applicable field and technical and administrative support staff, to competently and efficiently perform the work. Categories should add up to 40%. |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |
| Managerial Staff: years and relevance of experience  | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        |
| Jail- and Court-specific staff: years and relevance of experience  | 20%             | 5         | 1.00        | 20%             | 5         | 1.00        | 20%             | 5         | 1.00        | 20%             | 5         | 1.00        | 20%             | 5         | 1.00        |
| Other technical staff: years and relevance of experience   | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        |
| <b>2. CRITERION TWO: Prime Firm's Comparable Project Experience</b>  |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |
| The prime firm (or Joint Venture Firm) identified in the Project management chart must have work experience pertinent to the Project under consideration and local conditions.   | 10%             | 3.5       | 0.35        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        |
| <b>3. CRITERION THREE: Sub-Consultant's Comparable Project Experience</b>  |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |
| Demonstrated experience of the firm in providing similar consulting services on comparable projects.   | 10%             | 3.5       | 0.35        | 10%             | 3         | 0.30        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        |
| <b>4. CRITERION FOUR: Written Technical Plan</b>   |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |
| The Technical Plan will be evaluated in four (4) categories, each weighted with the percentage indicated. All four categories add up to 40%.   |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |
| Project Knowledge  | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        |
| Completeness   | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        |
| Clarity  | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        |
| Cohesiveness   | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 4         | 0.40        | 10%             | 5         | 0.50        |
| <b>TOTAL SCORE</b>   | <b>100%</b>     | <b>38</b> | <b>4.30</b> | <b>100%</b>     | <b>39</b> | <b>4.40</b> | <b>100%</b>     | <b>43</b> | <b>4.80</b> | <b>100%</b>     | <b>41</b> | <b>4.60</b> | <b>100%</b>     | <b>44</b> | <b>4.90</b> |
| <b>EVALUATOR #5</b>  |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |

| SELECTED FIRMS:  | C N A           |           |             | HDR             |           |             | MGT             |           |             | DHR             |           |             | CGL             |           |             |
|--|-----------------|-----------|-------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------|
|  | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score |
| <b>1. CRITERION ONE: Experience of Staff</b>   |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |
| Respondent must have sufficiently experienced current full-time staff, both registered professionals in the applicable field and technical and administrative support staff, to competently and efficiently perform the work. Categories should add up to 40%. |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |
| Managerial Staff: years and relevance of experience  | 10%             | 4.2       | 0.42        | 10%             | 4.3       | 0.43        | 10%             | 4.8       | 0.48        | 10%             | 4.6       | 0.46        | 10%             | 4.9       | 0.49        |
| Jail- and Court-specific staff: years and relevance of experience  | 20%             | 4.4       | 0.88        | 20%             | 4.0       | 0.80        | 20%             | 4.4       | 0.88        | 20%             | 4.7       | 0.94        | 20%             | 4.6       | 0.92        |
| Other technical staff: years and relevance of experience   | 10%             | 3.8       | 0.38        | 10%             | 4.2       | 0.42        | 10%             | 4.6       | 0.46        | 10%             | 4.9       | 0.49        | 10%             | 4.5       | 0.45        |
| <b>2. CRITERION TWO: Prime Firm's Comparable Project Experience</b>  |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |
| The prime firm (or Joint Venture Firm) identified in the Project management chart must have work experience pertinent to the Project under consideration and local conditions.   | 10%             | 3.8       | 0.38        | 10%             | 3.5       | 0.35        | 10%             | 4.7       | 0.47        | 10%             | 4.1       | 0.41        | 10%             | 4.8       | 0.48        |
| <b>3. CRITERION THREE: Sub-Consultant's Comparable Project Experience</b>  |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |
| Demonstrated experience of the firm in providing similar consulting services on comparable projects.   | 10%             | 4.4       | 0.44        | 10%             | 3.6       | 0.36        | 10%             | 4.6       | 0.46        | 10%             | 4.8       | 0.48        | 10%             | 4.5       | 0.45        |
| <b>4. CRITERION FOUR: Written Technical Plan</b>   |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |
| The Technical Plan will be evaluated in four (4) categories, each weighted with the percentage indicated. All four categories add up to 40%.   |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |
| Project Knowledge  | 10%             | 4.2       | 0.42        | 10%             | 3.8       | 0.38        | 10%             | 4.6       | 0.46        | 10%             | 4.8       | 0.48        | 10%             | 4.6       | 0.46        |
| Completeness   | 10%             | 4.2       | 0.42        | 10%             | 3.4       | 0.34        | 10%             | 4.5       | 0.45        | 10%             | 4.2       | 0.42        | 10%             | 4.7       | 0.47        |
| Clarity  | 10%             | 4.4       | 0.44        | 10%             | 3.6       | 0.36        | 10%             | 4.5       | 0.45        | 10%             | 4.2       | 0.42        | 10%             | 4.0       | 0.40        |
| Cohesiveness   | 10%             | 3.6       | 0.36        | 10%             | 3.4       | 0.34        | 10%             | 4.6       | 0.46        | 10%             | 4.3       | 0.43        | 10%             | 4.8       | 0.48        |
| <b>TOTAL SCORE AVERAGE</b>   | <b>100%</b>     |           | <b>4.14</b> | <b>100%</b>     |           | <b>3.78</b> | <b>100%</b>     |           | <b>4.57</b> | <b>100%</b>     |           | <b>4.53</b> | <b>100%</b>     |           | <b>4.60</b> |
| <b>Evaluation Instructions: Each factor above is worth up to 5 points. Evaluate each proposal against the criteria and assign points (1-5) for each factor, based on the following scale:</b>  |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |
| 5 - Excellent<br>4 - Significant Above Acceptable<br>3 - Slightly Above Acceptable<br>2 - Acceptable<br>1 - Minimally Acceptable<br>e.g. 30% x 4 = 1.2   |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |
| <b>EVALUATION COMMITTEE - SHORT-LIST SELECTION</b>   |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |

| Evaluation Matrix for RFQ No. Q1304-002-AG, Adult Correctional System Needs Analysis and Master Plan Update  |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                  |           |             |
|--|-----------------|-----------|-------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------|------------------|-----------|-------------|
| ORAL PRESENTATION MATRIX -FINAL SCORES   |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                  |           |             |
| Firm Name:   | DHR             |           |             | MGT             |           |             | CGL              |           |             |
| Criteria   | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score | Weighted Factor  | Raw Score | Total Score |
| Project Knowledge of staff   | 25%             | 4         | 1.00        | 25%             | 5         | 1.25        | 25%              | 5         | 1.25        |
| Completeness of answers  | 25%             | 3         | 0.75        | 25%             | 4         | 1.00        | 25%              | 4         | 1.00        |
| Clarity of responses   | 25%             | 2         | 0.50        | 25%             | 3         | 0.75        | 25%              | 5         | 1.25        |
| Cohesiveness of presentation   | 25%             | 1         | 0.25        | 25%             | 4         | 1.00        | 25%              | 5         | 1.25        |
| <b>TOTAL SCORE</b>   | 100%            |           | 2.50        | 100%            |           | 4.00        | 100%             |           | 4.75        |
| <b>EVALUATOR #1</b>  |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                  |           |             |
| Firm Name:   | DHR             |           |             | MGT             |           |             | CGL              |           |             |
| Criteria   | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score | Weighted Factor  | Raw Score | Total Score |
| Project Knowledge of staff   | 25%             | 5         | 1.25        | 25%             | 4         | 1.00        | 25%              | 5         | 1.25        |
| Completeness of answers  | 25%             | 1         | 0.25        | 25%             | 4         | 1.00        | 25%              | 4         | 1.00        |
| Clarity of responses   | 25%             | 1         | 0.25        | 25%             | 2         | 0.50        | 25%              | 5         | 1.25        |
| Cohesiveness of presentation   | 25%             | 1         | 0.25        | 25%             | 3         | 0.75        | 25%              | 5         | 1.25        |
| <b>TOTAL SCORE</b>   | 100%            |           | 2.00        | 100%            |           | 3.25        | 100%             |           | 4.75        |
| <b>EVALUATOR #2</b>  |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                  |           |             |
| Firm Name:   | DHR             |           |             | MGT             |           |             | CGL              |           |             |
| Criteria   | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score | Weighted Factor  | Raw Score | Total Score |
| Project Knowledge of staff   | 25%             | 4         | 1.00        | 25%             | 3         | 0.75        | 25%              | 4         | 1.00        |
| Completeness of answers  | 25%             | 1         | 0.25        | 25%             | 3         | 0.75        | 25%              | 4         | 1.00        |
| Clarity of responses   | 25%             | 1         | 0.25        | 25%             | 1         | 0.25        | 25%              | 4         | 1.00        |
| Cohesiveness of presentation   | 25%             | 1         | 0.25        | 25%             | 2         | 0.50        | 25%              | 4         | 1.00        |
| <b>TOTAL SCORE</b>   | 100%            |           | 1.75        | 100%            |           | 2.25        | 100%             |           | 4.00        |
| <b>EVALUATOR #3</b>  |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                  |           |             |
| Firm Name:   | DHR             |           |             | MGT             |           |             | CGL              |           |             |
| Criteria   | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score | Weighted Factor  | Raw Score | Total Score |
| Project Knowledge of staff   | 25%             | 5         | 1.25        | 25%             | 3         | 0.75        | 25%              | 5         | 1.25        |
| Completeness of answers  | 25%             | 1         | 0.25        | 25%             | 4         | 1.00        | 25%              | 4         | 1.00        |
| Clarity of responses   | 25%             | 1         | 0.25        | 25%             | 1         | 0.25        | 25%              | 5         | 1.25        |
| Cohesiveness of presentation   | 25%             | 1         | 0.25        | 25%             | 2         | 0.50        | 25%              | 5         | 1.25        |
| <b>TOTAL SCORE</b>   | 100%            |           | 2.00        | 100%            |           | 2.50        | 100%             |           | 4.75        |
| <b>EVALUATOR #4</b>  |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                  |           |             |
| Firm Name:   | DHR             |           |             | MGT             |           |             | CGL              |           |             |
| Criteria   | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score | Weighted Factor  | Raw Score | Total Score |
| Project Knowledge of staff   | 25%             | 5         | 1.25        | 25%             | 4         | 1.00        | 25%              | 4         | 1.00        |
| Completeness of answers  | 25%             | 1         | 0.25        | 25%             | 4         | 1.00        | 25%              | 4         | 1.00        |
| Clarity of responses   | 25%             | 2         | 0.50        | 25%             | 2         | 0.50        | 25%              | 5         | 1.25        |
| Cohesiveness of presentation   | 25%             | 1         | 0.25        | 25%             | 3         | 0.75        | 25%              | 5         | 1.25        |
| <b>TOTAL SCORE</b>   | 100%            |           | 2.25        | 100%            |           | 3.25        | 100%             |           | 4.50        |
| <b>EVALUATOR #5</b>  |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                  |           |             |
| Firm Name:   | DHR             |           |             | MGT             |           |             | CGL              |           |             |
| Criteria   | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score | Weighted Factor | Raw Score | Total Score | Weighted Factor  | Raw Score | Total Score |
| Project Knowledge of staff   | 25%             | 4.6       | 1.15        | 25%             | 3.8       | 0.95        | 25%              | 4.6       | 1.15        |
| Completeness of answers  | 25%             | 1.4       | 0.35        | 25%             | 3.8       | 0.95        | 25%              | 4.0       | 1.00        |
| Clarity of responses   | 25%             | 1.4       | 0.35        | 25%             | 1.8       | 0.45        | 25%              | 4.8       | 1.20        |
| Cohesiveness of presentation   | 25%             | 1.0       | 0.25        | 25%             | 2.8       | 0.70        | 25%              | 4.8       | 1.20        |
| <b>TOTAL SCORE AVERAGE</b>   | 100%            |           | 2.10        | 100%            |           | 3.05        | 100%             |           | 4.55        |
| <b>Evaluation Instructions: Each factor above is worth up to 5 points. Evaluate each proposal against the criteria and assign points (1-5) for each factor, based on the</b><br>5 - Excellent<br>4 - Significant Above Acceptable<br>3 - Slightly Above Acceptable<br>2 - Acceptable<br>1 - Minimally Acceptable<br>e.g. 30% x 4 = 1.2 |                 |           |             |                 |           |             |                  |           |             |
| <b>EVALUATION COMMITTEE SELECTION</b>  |                 |           |             |                 |           |             | <b>SELECTION</b> |           |             |