Contractor		Scoring Criteria for RFP	Possible Pts Total	Dennis Dickerson	Rick Schomaker	Bill Weiler	Keena Smith	Kevin Campanella	AVERAGE FOR FIRM
Silicon Alley Group									
	actors Expe	rience							
		Overall Experience	15	15	5		5	5	7.5
		Experience with Electri, Water, and Waste Water Utilities	10	0	0		0	3	0.8
		Experience with a CMMS	15	8	8		5	5	6.5
		Experience with WAM	20	10	8		7	5	7.5
	Proposal Q	uality				Γ			
		Clarity and organization of proposal	10	6	8		5	5	6.0
		Quality of presentation	10	6	7		5	5	5.8
	Demonstra	ited knowledge and understanding of the project							
		Feasibility of proposal approach	5	3	3		4	3	3.3
	Local Work	rforce				∏ ଚ୍ଚା			
		Administrators based in Columbus	7	4	0	attached)	0	0	1.0
		Administrators based in Ohio	3	1	0	ttac	0	0	0.3
	Environme	ntal				ונס			
		Demonstated sensitivity to environmental impacts	5	3	0	(se	0	0	0.8
						email (
	Total		100	56	39	e	31	31	39.3
						Wieler			
TEK Systems									
Contra	actors Expe	rience				per			
		Overall Experience	15	15	8	ed	5	5	8.3
		Experience with Electri, Water, and Waste Water Utilities	10	9	10	ğ	10	10	9.8
		Experience with a CMMS	15	8	10	inc	5	5	7.0
		Experience with WAM	20	10	14	je 📗	5	5	8.5
	Proposal Q	uality				es L			
		Clarity and organization of proposal	10	8	9	Scores not included	10	9	9.0
		Quality of presentation	10	8	8	S	10	8	8.5
		ted knowledge and understanding of the project				<u>l</u>			
		Feasibility of proposal approach	5	3	2		3	2	2.5
	Local Work					<u>l</u>			
		Administrators based in Columbus	7	7	7		0	0	3.5
		Administrators based in Ohio	3	3	3		3	3	3.0
	Environme	ntal							
		Demonstated sensitivity to environmental impacts	5	5	3	<u> </u>	0	0	2.0
						<u>l</u>			
	Total		100	76	74		51	47	62.0

Contractor		Scoring Criteria for RFP	Possible Pts Total	Dennis Dickerson	Rick Schomaker	Bill Weiler	Keena Smith	Kevin Campanella	AVERAGE FOR FIRM
AXIA Consulting									
Cont	ractors Expe	rience							
		Overall Experience	15	15	5		5	5	7.5
		Experience with Electri, Water, and Waste Water Utilities	10	5	5		5	5	5.0
		Experience with a CMMS	15	10	12		10	12	11.0
		Experience with WAM	20	15	11		10	11	11.8
	Proposal Q	uality							
		Clarity and organization of proposal	10	9	4		10	9	8.0
		Quality of presentation	10	9	3		10	4	6.5
	Demonstra	ited knowledge and understanding of the project							
		Feasibility of proposal approach	5	2	2		5	2	2.8
	Local Work	rforce				∐ ଚ୍ଚ[
		Administrators based in Columbus	7	7	5	attached)	7	5	6.0
		Administrators based in Ohio	3	3	3	ttac	3	3	3.0
	Environme	ntal				e a			
		Demonstated sensitivity to environmental impacts	5	5	5	(see	4	5	4.8
						email (
	Total		100	80	55	e l	69	61	66.3
						Wieler			
Rianbow Data Systems, Inc.						Ĭ			
Cont	ractors Expe	rience				per			
		Overall Experience	15	15	10	pa _	10	10	11.3
		Experience with Electri, Water, and Waste Water Utilities	10	7	0	pn	0	0	1.8
		Experience with a CMMS	15	0	0	Scores not included	0	0	0.0
		Experience with WAM	20	0	0	ng _	0	0	0.0
	Proposal Q					es			
		Clarity and organization of proposal	10	9	4	Ş	7	8	7.0
		Quality of presentation	10	7	5	0,	2	5	4.8
	Demonstra	ited knowledge and understanding of the project							
		Feasibility of proposal approach	5	3	3		3	3	3.0
	Local Work								
		Administrators based in Columbus	7	7	4	<u> </u>	7	4	5.5
		Administrators based in Ohio	3	3	3	<u> </u>	3	3	3.0
	Environme					<u> </u>			
		Demonstated sensitivity to environmental impacts	5	3	0	-	0	0	0.8
	Total		100	54	29		32	33	37.0

Contractor		Scoring Criteria for RFP	Possible Pts Total	Dennis Dickerson	Rick Schomaker	Bill Weiler	Keena Smith	Kevin Campanella	AVERAGE FOR FIRM
Goldtech									
Contr	actors Expe	rience							
		Overall Experience	15	15	12		10	12	12.3
		Experience with Electri, Water, and Waste Water Utilities	10	5	0		0	0	1.3
		Experience with a CMMS	15	5	5		5	5	5.0
		Experience with WAM	20	5	5		5	5	5.0
	Proposal C	uality				ΠΓ			
		Clarity and organization of proposal	10	10	4		8	8	7.5
		Quality of presentation	10	10	2		6	5	5.8
	Demonstra	ited knowledge and understanding of the project				ΠΓ			
		Feasibility of proposal approach	5	4	3		3	3	3.3
	Local Worl	rforce				ਿਛ			
		Administrators based in Columbus	7	7	3	attached)	7	7	6.0
		Administrators based in Ohio	3	3	3	ttac	3	3	3.0
	Environme	ntal				e			
		Demonstated sensitivity to environmental impacts	5	4	0	(see	0	0	1.0
						email			
	Total		100	68	37	eu	47	48	50.0
						Wieler			
Savepoint Consulting						Š			
Contr	actors Expe	rience				per			
		Overall Experience	15	15	5		10	10	10.0
		Experience with Electri, Water, and Waste Water Utilities	10	6	5	not included	6	5	5.5
		Experience with a CMMS	15	8	5	i.	11	8	8.0
		Experience with WAM	20	0	3	ے اور	10	3	4.0
	Proposal C	· ·				esr			
		Clarity and organization of proposal	10	9	3	Scores	7	8	6.8
		Quality of presentation	10	9	3	S	7	6	6.3
	Demonstra	ited knowledge and understanding of the project				Ħ			
		Feasibility of proposal approach	5	4	4		5	4	4.3
	Local Worl					† †			
		Administrators based in Columbus	7	7	0	<u> </u>	7	4	4.5
		Administrators based in Ohio	3	3	3	t i	3	3	3.0
	Environme					† †			
		Demonstated sensitivity to environmental impacts	5	5	2	t t	3	3	3.3
		,				† †			
	Total		100	66	33		69	54	55.5
	'								
							1		

Contractor		Scoring Criteria for RFP	Possible Pts Total	Dennis Dickerson	Rick Schomaker	Bill Weiler	Keena Smith	Kevin Campanella	AVERAGE FOR FIRM
Resource International, Inc.									
Cont	ractors Expe	rience							
		Overall Experience	15	15	13		10	13	12.8
		Experience with Electri, Water, and Waste Water Utilities	10	10	10		10	10	10.0
		Experience with a CMMS	15	15	15		10	15	13.8
		Experience with WAM	20	5	1		3	5	3.5
	Proposal C	Quality							
		Clarity and organization of proposal	10	10	9		8	9	9.0
		Quality of presentation	10	10	10		8	10	9.5
	Demonstra	ated knowledge and understanding of the project							
		Feasibility of proposal approach	5	5	5		5	5	5.0
	Local Work	xforce				ਰ [
		Administrators based in Columbus	7	7	7	attached)	7	7	7.0
		Administrators based in Ohio	3	3	3	tta	3	3	3.0
	Environme	ental							
		Demonstated sensitivity to environmental impacts	5	5	5	(see	5	5	5.0
						email			
	Total		100	85	78	je l	69	82	78.5
						Wieler			
Marlabs Innovation									
Cont	ractors Expe	rience				per			
		Overall Experience	15	15	10	ed ed	10	10	11.3
		Experience with Electri, Water,and Waste Water Utilities	10	0	5	not included	5	5	3.8
		Experience with a CMMS	15	8	5	Ŀ.	5	5	5.8
		Experience with WAM	20	10	10	or L	0	0	5.0
	Proposal C					res			
		Clarity and organization of proposal	10	9	8	Scores	5	8	7.5
		Quality of presentation	10	9	7	_ ` _	5	7	7.0
	Demonstra	ated knowledge and understanding of the project							
		Feasibility of proposal approach	5	3	2		3	2	2.5
	Local Work								
		Administrators based in Columbus	7	0	0	<u> </u>	0	0	0.0
		Administrators based in Ohio	3	0	0	Į L	0	0	0.0
	Environme					<u>l</u>			
		Demonstated sensitivity to environmental impacts	5	5	0	ļ ļ	0	0	1.3
	Total		100	59	47		33	37	44.0

Contractor		Scoring Criteria for RFP	Possible Pts Total	Dennis Dickerson	Rick Schomaker	Bill Weiler	Keena Smith	Kevin Campanella	AVERAGE FOR FIRM
Centric		<u> </u>							
	Contractors Expe	rience							
		Overall Experience	15	15	14		13	10	13.0
		Experience with Electri, Water, and Waste Water Utilities	10	7	10	1 1	10	10	9.3
		Experience with a CMMS	15	12	15	1 1	13	12	13.0
		Experience with WAM	20	15	18	1 1	18	15	16.5
	Proposal Q	quality				Ī			
		Clarity and organization of proposal	10	10	9		10	8	9.3
		Quality of presentation	10	10	8	1 1	10	5	8.3
	Demonstra	ated knowledge and understanding of the project				Ī			
		Feasibility of proposal approach	5	5	5		5	5	5.0
	Local Work								
		Administrators based in Columbus	7	0	0	attached)	0	0	0.0
		Administrators based in Ohio	3	3	3	tacl	0	3	2.3
	Environme					e at			_
		Demonstated sensitivity to environmental impacts	5	5	5	(see	5	5	5.0
		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				ai -			
	Total		100	82	87	email	84	73	81.5
				_		Wieler	_	_	
SHI International Corp.						Ĭ Š I			
	Contractors Expe	rience				ber			
		Overall Experience	15	15	10		10	10	11.3
		Experience with Electri, Water, and Waste Water Utilities	10	0	0	included	5	2	1.8
		Experience with a CMMS	15	0	0	2	5	5	2.5
		Experience with WAM	20	0	0	g i	0	0	0.0
	Proposal Q					Scores not			
		Clarity and organization of proposal	10	7	1	, S	5	5	4.5
		Quality of presentation	10	7	0	Š	5	5	4.3
	Demonstra	ated knowledge and understanding of the project				† r			
		Feasibility of proposal approach	5	3	1		3	2	2.3
	Local Work					t r			
		Administrators based in Columbus	7	0	0	† †	0	0	0.0
		Administrators based in Ohio	3	0	1	t t	3	3	1.8
	Environme					† †			
		Demonstated sensitivity to environmental impacts	5	3	0	<u> </u>	0	0	0.8
		, i				† †			
	Total		100	35	13		36	32	29.0

- -

.

- :

- 2

Ĵ

.