

RFP-LC-20-30 Ranking Review Criteria	Scorer	Firm 7 A3C	Comments	Scorer
Minimum Mandatory Requirements	NB KE CF JR	P P P P	Never specifically acknowledged items 1.2 (1) through 1.2 (10)	NB KE CF JR
	RS	P	Not organized to respond to RFP, hard to follow	RS
	JW	P	All requirements included except for 3 year financial statements.	JW
Proposal Responses	NB	38	Well qualified, numerous awards/industry recognition; 35 years in business	NB
	KE	40	Meets requirements.	KE
	CF	40		CF
	JR	45	Proposal specifically spelled out site inspections on projects at least once a week. Other did not. Also state that project schedules will be reviewed bi-weekly	JR
	RS	35	ADA; Comparable projects not really comparable reg as needed	RS
	JW	42		JW
		240.00		
Total		40.00		
Company Profile	NB	15	Did not provide audited financial statements, but will if awarded. Other items submitted.	NB
	KE	11	No financials, 2017 W-9 not current.	KE

	CF	15	Missing financials.	CF
	JR	20		JR
	RS	15	Since 1983; No financial statements; Ann Arbor local work - Genoa Township Hall, Howell Chamber	RS
	JW	15		JW
		91.00		
Total		15.17		
References	NB	19	Gov't references provided, 1 for 7+ years (additional project-specific references throughout proposal)	NB
	KE	20	References provide support.	KE
	CF	20		CF
	JR	25	The Building Department has worked with this firm on numerous projects. I don't recall any issues. Numerous projects completed throughout the County	JR
	RS	15	References not on point; Examples of IDIQ?; Awards; POC: not clear	RS
	JW	20	Some gov't work.	JW
		119.00		
Total		19.83		
Overall Total		75.00		

Firm 3 DLZ	Comments	Scorer	Firm 2 Fishbeck	Comments
P	Well organized!	NB	P	
P		KE	P	
P		CF	P	
P	Specifically acknowledged items in 1.2	JR	P	Did not acknowledge section 1.2
P	Excellent - Addresses minimum mandatory requirements	RS	P	Excellent understanding of desired services
P	Missing certificate of insurance.	JW	P	Proposal was complete and very thorough.
44	Very thorough proposal; Industry recognized (ranked top 10 in the Midwest); Large staff	NB	42	Emphasizes client service; 64 years in MI; Significant gov't work/experience.
40	Clear and concise.	KE	40	Demonstrated ability.
40		CF	40	
50	Highly experienced	JR	40	Aesthetically creative designs in proposal
40	Quality management, Methodology, Good technical approach, Good highlight of comparable, family and minority owned, but resumes some female, No ADA attention other than claim of leading ADA consultant, POC: Laurie Frey	RS	45	Good philosophy and mission, Methodology excellent, Capacity 20 - mostly in house but subs available
42	Same as above, not sure why certificate of insurance is missing.	JW	48	Many years of experience.
256.00			255.00	
42.67			42.50	
19	Missing insurance certificate, but "agrees to provide necessary coverage."; All other items submitted.	NB	20	All requested items were provided.
13	2014 W-9 not current, incomplete profile	KE	20	2018 W-9. Complete.

15	Missing current W-9.	CF	20	
25	Large experienced firm. Organized, easy to read proposal. Very comprehensive. Cross out canned language on "Exceptions" page 51 of their proposal, Minority owned with over 700 employees	JR	20	Large employee owned company
20	90% work with public entities since 1916, in MI since 1957, capacity good, 200 projects/year, agrees to provide insurance info, clear understanding of IDIQ good	RS	20	490 employees; since 1965 employee owned corp; ADA - good emphasis; IDIQ ? with cities; 90% of revenue from repeat clients; Facetime own it
20	Talented team (well versed)	JW	23	Received all of the required information
112.00			123.00	
18.67			20.50	
19	3 Gov't references provided, 2 for 5+ years	NB	19	3 Gov't references provided, but no date ranges provided.
20	References meet requirement.	KE	15	No reference start dates.
20		CF	20	
20		JR	18	All references from municipalities. Little or no work performed within Livingston County
20	County references excellent, on point	RS	15	Consulting list -No counties, lots of cities; No annual volume; Ottawa Co facilities director listed as reference; References not for consulting; POC: Lake Finney, less than 1 year with Fishbeck
20		JW	23	Excellent and well rounded references.
119.00			110.00	
19.83			18.33	
81.17			81.33	

Scorer	Firm	Comments	Scorer	Firm	Comments	Scorer
	5			13		
	Hobbs+ Black			Hooker DeJong		
NB	P	Well organized!	NB	P		NB
KE	P		KE	P		KE
CF	P		CF	P		CF
JR	P		JR	P		JR
RS	P	Methodology?; Capacity?	RS	P	Capacity	RS
JW	P	Missing balance sheet for last 3 years.	JW	F	W-9 not completed. Missing page from technical proposal.	JW
NB	42	Well organized proposal and narrative; Significant government specific experience	NB	38	In business since 1936; No local office presence (Muskegon and Grand Rapids)	NB
KE	40	Directly answered all requirements.	KE	35	Directly addressed 1.3 and 1.4. Narrative somewhat satisfies 1.2.	KE
CF	40		CF	40		CF
JR	50	Specifically addressed items in section 1.2	JR	31	Did not address section 1.2 specifically	JR
RS	25	Good reg Min Mandatory Reqs; Design services; No ADA other than verbatim RFP	RS	35	ADA; On call, project specific understanding - good	RS
JW	42	See above.	JW			JW
	239.00			179.00		
	39.83			29.83		
NB	17	Balance Sheet in place of audited financial statements.	NB	14	Missing financial statements.	NB
KE	13	2018 W-9. Had unaudited balance sheets.	KE	10	Blank W-9. No financial statements: If chosen, would provide at interview.	KE

CF	15	Sent balance sheet instead of audited financials.	CF	12	Missing W-9 and financial information.	CF
JR	20		JR	20	Relatively short outcome dates (turn-around)	JR
RS	15	50 profs; Honors and awards nice; Clear understanding of desired services not demonstrated	RS	10	1936; 54 profs; typos on profile page; Blank W-9	RS
JW	22	Seems to be reputable company.	JW			JW
	102.00			66.00		
	17.00			11.00		
NB	17	2 Gov't references provided, 1 for 5+ years within the last 7	NB	19	3 Gov't references provided, date ranges from 2014 and 2015 to present	NB
KE	20	Proven support.	KE	20	All references met the requirements and provide support for award. All government entities.	KE
CF	20		CF	20		CF
JR	20	The building department has worked with this firm in the past on customer's projects within the County	JR	17	No projects listed in Livingston County	JR
RS	15	Not on point; Cover letter poorly drafted and non-responsive; POC: Brian Bagnick	RS	20	Excellent on point references; Looks to provide Oakland with same services sought; POC: Phil Komen, but not included in team resumes?	RS
JW	20		JW			JW
	112.00			96.00		
	18.67			16.00		
	75.50			56.83		

Firm 9	Comments	Scorer	Firm 11	Comments
Hubbell Roth & Clark			JFR Architects	
P		NB	P	
P		KE	P	
P		CF	P	
P		JR	P	
P	Lots of work with City of Howell	RS	P	Typos in sample invoice - so many typos; capacity -?; Narrative: project methology or methodology?
P	Missing page from technical proposal.	JW	P	
42	Good governmental experience, NB including many projects with Liv Co; Substantial awards and industry recognition		36	Thorough narrative, stresses communication; Emphasizes size (small firm, individual attention) as a strength
40	All responses demonstrated ability.	KE	40	
40		CF	40	
35	Did not specifically address items 1.2 (1) through 1.2 (10). All examples of work and 2 of the references were minor renovation work	JR	32	Did not specifically address the items in section 1.2
35	Capacity; Aspire to be in middle and do all the work; ADA; Permitting process; Municipal consulting	RS	10	Quality level questionable, ADA - no
38	Most information included. Somewhat difficult to read.	JW	37	Missing audited financial statements/notarized certificate of compliance
230.00			195.00	
38.33			32.50	
15	Missing financial statements, offers to provide at a venue of our choosing; Other items submitted	NB	14	Didn't provide audited financial statement and states that they are "not required...."; Other items submitted.
13	No financials.	KE	5	No financials, not notarized.

15	Missing financials.	CF	12	Missing financials, not notarized compliance.
25	Firm has done a lot of work for the County's local municipalities. Mostly infrastructure projects	JR	16	Seems to be a 1 architect company but priced in the lower range
10	260+ profs; Professional integrity - good; Overview impressive; Good understanding; No statements	RS	7	Since 2005; No statements
20		JW	20	
98.00			74.00	
16.33			12.33	
20	Gov't references provided, all with 5+ years	NB	19	Gov't references provided, 2 of 3 for 5+ years
20	All provide support.	KE	20	
20		CF	20	
20		JR	20	Extra references supplied
20	Comparable projects truly comparable; Ok references; Nothing very big; POC: Adrianna Melchoir	RS	15	Exceeded # of references; No annual volume; Not on point reg type of service
20		JW	18	References limited.
120.00			112.00	
20.00			18.67	
74.66			63.50	

Scorer	Firm	Comments	Scorer	Firm
	15			1
	John Stewart			Lindhout
	Assoc			Assoc
NB	P		NB	P
KE	P		KE	P
CF	P		CF	P
JR	P		JR	P
RS	F	Current vendor, 4 missing components - financial statements, insurance, W-9, checklist	RS	P
JW	P		JW	P
NB	25	A lot of Liv Co knowledge and experience; Technical proposal missing items; Section 1.4 lacking - Methodology? Capacity?; Not enough information provided	NB	42
KE	40	Demonstrated ability.	KE	40
CF	40		CF	40
JR	20	Did not provide the required information	JR	42
RS		Non-responsive to minimum mandatory requirements.	RS	35
JW	37	Missing several documents.	JW	46
	162.00			245.00
	27.00			40.83
NB	10	Profile submitted, but several requested items are missing: W-9, Financial Statements, Certificate of Insurance	NB	20
KE	5	Pricing proposal included in proposal bid document. Missing financial statements, W-9, proposal checklist.	KE	20

CF	12	Missing many articles of compliance.	CF	20
JR	20	As built docs supplied at end.	JR	20
RS			RS	20
JW	18		JW	22
	65.00			122.00
	10.83			20.33
NB	13	References light on gov't entities; References marked as recent without establishing 5+ years of ACS for gov't entities	NB	20
KE	20	References provide award.	KE	20
CF	20		CF	20
JR	16	Not a lot of clear information. Pictures of projects have no scope description. Pricing is based on percentage based on construction costs.	JR	20
RS		2/3 references Liv Co	RS	20
JW	23	Has experience working with county government.	JW	23
	92.00			123.00
	15.33			20.50
	53.16			81.66

Comments	Scorer	Firm 8 Mitchell & Mouat	Comments	Scorer	Firm 12 Niagara Murano
Complete proposal.	NB KE CF JR	P P P P	Well organized	NB KE CF JR	P P P P
Current vendor.	RS	P	Organized, clear	RS	P
All requirements included.	JW	P	No audited financials.	JW	F
Significant experience in Liv Co, both for the County and for other local governments; Well organized response covering key topics (experience, capacity, comparable projects, methodology)	NB	42	Thorough and well organized proposal	NB	38
Proposal provided clear responses to each section.	KE CF	40 40	Directly addressed sections 1.2, 1.3, and 1.4.	KE CF	40 40
Did not specifically address the items in sections 1.2	JR	44	Specifically addressed the items in section 1.2.	JR	40
Relies heavily on existing knowledge of ability and relationships; Methodology ok; Checklist not responsive to 1.3	RS	40	Methodical reg projects based on MI standard K	RS	40
	JW	35	See above. Not a lot of information about the team.	JW	
		241.00 40.17			198.00 33.00
Provided all requested materials.	NB	14	Missing audited financial statements	NB	11
2018 W-9. Complete profile.	KE	15	2018 W-9. No audited financials.	KE	3

	CF	12	Missing ??? article of compliance.	CF	12
I have extensive experiences with the Lindhout Staff over more than 15 years	JR	22	As built docs supplied at end.	JR	20
64 years; 20 profs; 13 certified architects; Capacity; Subcontractors for services not directly provided?	RS	15	27 years; 7 profs, 4 architects; No ADA, No clear understanding of IDIQ; Experience with projects; Services and subconsultants; Awards	RS	7
	JW	20		JW	
		98.00			53.00
		16.33			8.83
Provided 3 Gov't references all for 5+ years	NB	20	Gov't references provided	NB	19
All references provide support and meet requirements.	KE	11	References had no start/stop service dates.	KE	20
	CF	20		CF	20
Extra references supplied however my name was also used for a reference	JR	25	Extensive work history with many different types of projects	JR	15
Liv Co Ref??; References provide support Ok; POC: Bradley Alvord	RS	15	References not on point; Project oriented; POC: John Mouat or Mark Borys	RS	25
Has done a lot of projects in Livingston County.	JW	18	Government work seemed to be limited.	JW	
		109.00			99.00
		18.17			16.50
		74.67			58.33

Comments	Scorer	Firm 4 NORR	Comments	Scorer	Firm 4 NSA Architecture
	NB	P		NB	P
	KE	P		KE	P
	CF	P		CF	P
	JR	P		JR	P
Cooperative K static	RS	P		RS	P
Several documents missing that are not difficult to include	JW	P	All requirements covered.	JW	P
Nice samples of comparable work	NB	42	Experience includes projects for (Emergency Center) and in (Brighton Mill Pond, Howell Fountain, etc.) Liv Co; Thorough proposal covered all requested items.	NB	42
	KE	40		KE	40
	CF	40		CF	40
Did not comment on the items in section 1.2	JR	37	Did not specifically address items in section 1.2 nor was it clear in their methodology	JR	33
Excellent methodology; Key issues for success - good; Capacity min	RS	31	Ok	RS	35
	JW	47	Excellent job laying out ADA compliance.	JW	45
		237.00			235.00
		39.50			39.17
Profile submitted, missing items: W-9, Financial Statements	NB	20	Provided all requested materials.	NB	20
Missing financials, missing W-9, incomplete pricing proposal.	KE	15	Pricing proposal not separate.	KE	15

Missing information.	CF	20		CF	15
As built docs supplied at end.	JR	22	As built docs supplied at end.	JR	20
20 years; 12 profs; Good subconsultant list; ADA min; Excellent comparables - full spectrum so many; Security	RS	16	14 years in MI; 105 profs; Employee owned; ADA; Global 700+; Capacity - in house services listed, subconsultants with PEA; No clear understanding; On call advising	RS	18
	JW	19		JW	21
		112.00			109.00
		18.67			18.17
Gov't references provided, 2 of 3 for 5+ years	NB	19	Provided gov't references, 2 for 5+ years	NB	20
	KE	20		KE	18
	CF	20		CF	20
Not a lot of clear information. Much of the work not similar to LC projects. Hourly rates on the lower side	JR	20	A lot of work in the County	JR	20
References on point; POC: Delia Rodi	RS	16	Ok; POC: Dan Schneider, 1 year with NORR	RS	20
	JW	20	Most work completed in Wayne County.	JW	22
		115.00			120.00
		19.17			20.00
		77.34			77.34

Comments	Scorer	Firm	Comments	Scorer
		6 Partners in Architecture		
	NB	P	Well organized.	NB
	KE	P		KE
	CF	P		CF
	JR	P		JR
Good emphasis on understanding nature of master services agreement	RS	P	P6 - clear	RS
All required information included.	JW	P		JW
Many projects in Liv Co; Thorough proposal, provided all requested items.	NB	40	Significant gov't experience (98% of work w/ public entities)	NB
Demonstrated ability.	KE	40	Demonstrated ability.	KE
	CF	40		CF
Did not specifically address the items in section 1.2	JR	40	Applicant did specifically address all the items in section 1.2	JR
Partnerships with subs = team ok	RS	31		RS
	JW	42	Missing 3 year statement of operation.	JW
		233.00		
Provided all requested items.	NB	38.83	Statement of Operations for 3 years in place of audited financial statements.	NB
2018 W-9. Financial documents not audited.	KE	12	Missing financials: Provided 3 years of statement unaudited.	KE

Financials not audited and missing 1 year.	CF	13	Missing statement of operations.	CF
As built docs supplied at end.	JR	20	As built docs supplied at end.	JR
60 years; 18 NSA profs; Capacity with subs; No ADA ref; Methodology ok; Good understanding of IDIQ; PEA and MAI total 204; Scope copied	RS	16	30 + 150 profs; ADA min; Lot of subs, capacity unclear	RS
Extensive history with government building projects.	JW	20		JW
		100.00		
		16.67		
Provided 5 gov't references, 3 for 5+ years	NB	20	Gov't references provided, all three for 5+ years	NB
Meets, would have liked 3 separate references, (2) NOVI Entity.	KE	20	References provide recommendation.	KE
	CF	20		CF
Extensive number of County projects in their resume although some were never brought to fruition or done by and employee they were working for another company.	JR	20		JR
Examples of IDIQ Ks; POC: Brooke Smith	RS	16	IDIQ K examples; POC: Project manager unclear	RS
More than 3 references listed.	JW	22		JW
		118.00		
		19.67		
		75.17		

Firm	Comments	Scorer		Comments
14			10	
Straub Petitt			Tower	
Yaste			Pinkster	
P		NB	P	
P		KE	P	
P		CF	P	
P		JR	P	
P	Hard to follow, not clearly responsive	RS	P	
F	Several documents missing.	JW	P	Missing balance sheet and 3 year statement of operation.
39	Detailed narrative; 65 years in business; Wide variety of gov't experience	NB	40	Nice proposal w/ details on specific experience; No local office presence (Grand Rapids, Kalamazoo)
40		KE	40	Demonstrated ability.
40		CF	40	
32	Did not specifically address the items in section 1.2	JR	32	Did not specifically address the items in section 1.2
28	Capacity not clear; No ADA address; Methodology?	RS	40	Capabilities extensive; Methodology; All services in house, but subs available
		JW	45	Well put together proposal.
179.00			237.00	
29.83			39.50	
14	Missing financial statements, other items submitted.	NB	19	Statement of Operations for 3 years and balance sheets in place of audited financial statements.
5	Missing financials, not notarized, incomplete pricing proposal.	KE	5	Incomplete financials, incomplete pricing proposal.

12	Missing notarization.	CF	12	Missing balance sheet and operations 3 year document.
16	Little or no experience with projects located in Livingston County	JR	18	Not many projects in the portfolio located in Livingston County although a lot of municipal projects
7	60; IDIQ Ks? - no clear understanding; Invoice missing; Reimbursement expenses missing; Statements missing	RS	15	150 profs; Good understanding of IDIQ; No ADA section; Consistent and responsive team; Missing reimbursement expenses
		JW	20	Definitely experienced in working with government projects.
54.00			89.00	
9.00			14.83	
14	Gov't references provided, but no time range provided ("multiple projects")	NB	19	2 Gov't references provided, each 5+ years
20		KE	20	
20		CF	20	
20		JR	20	
13	References not on point; No annual volume; POC: not clear	RS	20	References on point; POC unclear, Adam or Eric
		JW	20	
87.00			119.00	
14.50			19.83	
53.33			74.16	