

| RFQ# 937553 Gibson Creek Rehabilitation-Area 1- Dupont Avenue |  |                              |                    |                       |
|---|--|------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Evaluation Criteria (Max Points)                              | American Infrastructure Technologies Corporation | Insituform Technologies, LLC | Layne Inliner, LLC | SBW Constructors, LLC |
| Project Approach and Business Plan (20 Points)                | 8  | 18                           | 15                 | 15                    |
| Capacity and Scheduling (15 Points)                           | 11   | 15                           | 13                 | 13                    |
| Firm Qualifications (10 Points)                               | 7  | 8                            | 8                  | 6                     |
| Team Qualifications (5 Points)                                | 5  | 5                            | 4                  | 4                     |
| Cost (50 Points)  | 44.21  | 50                           | 44.85              | 49.85                 |
| <b>Total (100 Points)</b>                                     | <b>75.21</b>                                     | <b>96.00</b>                 | <b>84.85</b>       | <b>87.85</b>          |

**Strengths & Weaknesses**

**American Infrastructure Technologies Corporation (75.21 Points)**

**Strengths:** Detailed traffic control plan; projects of similar size; relevant project experience of key individuals.

**Weaknesses:** Narrative demonstrating firm's understanding of the project lacked detail; firm's delineation of the management plan for the project lacked detail; failed to address cost overrun risks associated with the project; firm's project scheduling plan lacked detail; failed to identify contract duration concerns regarding the project; failed to address the Jocelyn Hollow area of the project; failed to address firm's current workload; failed to provide projects of similar scope and complexity.

**Insituform Technologies, LLC (96.00 Points)**

**Strengths:** Detailed narrative demonstrating the firm's understanding of the project and how to accomplish desired deliverables; detailed traffic control plan; detailed risk mitigation plan; detailed Quality Assurance Plan; detailed schedule demonstrating firm's understanding of contract delivery requirements; detailed contract duration concerns and considerations for adjusting on time for scope of work; detailed narrative for ensuring a timely delivery on services and/ or products for the project; projects of similar scope and complexity; detailed explanation on how the specialized knowledge and experience of individuals will be utilized on project; relevant project experience of key individuals.

**Weaknesses:** Failed to provide project of similar size; litigation; failed to address the Jocelyn Hollow area of the project.

**Layne Inliner, LLC (84.85 Points)**

**Strengths:** Projects of similar size, scope, and complexity; detailed demonstration of firm's plan to manage CIPP lining.

**Weaknesses:** Narrative demonstrating firm's understanding of the project lacked detail; firm's delineation of the management plan for the project lacked detail; failed to address the Jocelyn Hollow area of the project; litigation; project management team provided for project differs from project management team shown on previous projects; firm's contract duration concerns and considerations for adjusting on time for scope of work lacked detail; firm's explanation on how the specialized knowledge and experience of individuals will be utilized on project lacked detail; firm's explanation of key personnel's involvement in the scope of work lacked detail.

**SBW Constructors, LLC (87.85 Points)**

**Strength:** Detailed demonstration regarding the firm's understanding of the Jocelyn Hollow area of the project.

**Weaknesses:** Narrative demonstrating firm's understanding of the project lacked detail; organizational chart lacked detail; failed to provide a Quality Assurance Plan; risk mitigation plan lacked detail; firm's contract duration concerns and considerations for adjusting on time for scope of work lacked detail (did not address sequence of work); firm's explanation of delivery concerns regarding the scope of work lacked detail; failed to provide projects of similar size and scope; failed to provide the number of change orders on previous sample projects; firm's explanation on how the specialized knowledge and experience of individuals will be utilized on project lacked detail (rehabilitation work not specified); resumes for subcontractors lacked detail.

Enter Solicitation Title & Number Below

Gibson Creek Rehabilitation -Area 1-Dupont Avenue

**50**

Offeror's Name

Bids

RFP Cost  
Points

Insituform Technologies, LLC

\$5,013,060.00

**50.00**

SBW Constructors, LLC

\$5,028,350.00

**49.85**

Layne Inliner, LLC

\$5,589,308.50

**44.85**

American Infrastructure Technologies Corporation

\$5,669,015.00

**44.21**

## PNP Compliance Results Form

**Department Name: Water**  
**RFP/ITB Number: 937553**  
**Procurement Name: Gibson Creek Rehabilitation - Area 1 - Dupont Avenue**

| Primary Contractor           | PNP Compliant (Yes/No) | Determination Comments/% of Participation Proposed or Bid   |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---|
| Insituform Technologies, LLC | Yes                    | Insituform Technologies, LLC successfully completed the GFE outreach to three certified MWBEs: Pipe Works Plus (Declined), Underground Eyes - 10% (Accepted) and Pavement Restoration (Declined). |

\*Denotes Contractor with whom follow up was required

Date: 07/15/16

Metro Buyer: Genario Pittman

BAO Rep: Tina R. Burt

BAO SBE Assessment Sheet

**BAO Specialist: Tina R. Burt**  
**Contract Specialist: Genario Pittman**

**Department Name: Water**  
**RFP/ITB Number: 937553**

**Project Name: Gibson Creek Rehabilitation - Area 1 - Dupont Avenue**

| <b>Primary Contractor*</b>   | <b>Prime Bid Amount</b> | <b>Total Offered SBE (\$)</b> | <b>SBEs approved?</b> | <b>Total Approved SBE (\$)</b> | <b>SBE (%)</b> | <b>Comments</b>  |
|------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|--|
| Insituform Technologies, LLC | \$5,013,060.00          | \$1,858,790                   | Yes                   | \$1,858,790                    | 37.1%          | Insituform Technologies, LLC proposed to use approved SBEs Underground Eyes (\$500,575/10%), Craftco (\$999,675/19.9%), and CK Masonry (\$358,540/7.2%). |

**Column Headings**

Shaded cells in columns E and G are formula driven and should not be changed

White cells with text are fields that you can edit.

**Gray cells with bold text contain formulas that can not be changed.**