#### INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

FROM:	Dan J. Hanket	
RE:	Selection of Consultant to Perform	Asbestos Surveys for DPU
DATE:	June 2, 2008	
sheet and eva	aluation of proposals used in the sel e department.  Nirmal Sinha and To	n Committee's summary report, project score lection of the consultant to perform asbestos om Finnegan also participated in the review as
workload, and	l local work force. The Evaluation C	quality, project team experience, project team committee recommends Resource International for the department and requests your signature
Please contac	ct me should you have questions.	
Sincerely, Dan J. Hanke	Hanket Bally	, Evaluation Committee Member , Evaluation Committee Member
See Attache Robert VanEv		, Evaluation Committee Member
Carey Gooch	y ESocl	, Evaluation Committee Member
See Attache Thomas H. St		, Evaluation Committee Member
	ation Committee Members	
100001/55		

Tanya Arsh, Director, P.E.

TO:

Tanya Arsh, Director, P.E.

TO:

Tanya Arsh, Director, P.E.

### INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

	FROM:	Dan J. Hanket							
	RE:	Selection of Consultant to Perform	Selection of Consultant to Perform Asbestos Surveys for DPU						
	DATE:	June 2, 2008							
	sheet and eva	aluation of proposals used in the se e department. Nirmal Sinha and To	on Committee's summary report, project score lection of the consultant to perform asbestos om Finnegan also participated in the review as						
	workload, and	local work force. The Evaluation C	quality, project team experience, project team committee recommends Resource International for the department and requests your signature						
	Please, contac	t me should you have questions.							
	Sincerely,								
	Dan J. Hankel	ţ .	, Evaluation Committee Member						
	Lynn Kelly		, Evaluation Committee Member						
	Robert VanEv		, Evaluation Committee Member						
			, Evaluation Committee Member						
<	Carey Gooch Thomas H. Ste	ephens	, Evaluation Committee Member						
	C: Evalua	tion Committee Members							
	APPROVED:								
	Tanya Arsh, D	lirector, P.E.							

Fax sent by : 6146455644

treatment engineerin

06/02/08 09:40

Pg: 1/

TO:

Tanya Arsh, Director, P.E.

FROM:

Dan J. Hanket

RE:

Selection of Consultant to Perform Asbestos Surveys for DPU

DATE:

Sincerely

May 29, 2008

Attached for your consideration are the Evaluation Committee's summary report, project score sheet and evaluation of proposals used in the selection of the consultant to perform asbestos surveys for the department. Nirmal Sinha and Tom Finnegan also participated in the review as non-voting members.

Five offerors were ranked based upon proposal quality, project team experience, project team workload, and local work force. The Evaluation Committee recommends Resource International Inc. as the firm to perform the asbestos surveys for the department.

Please contact me should you have questions.

<b>,</b>	
	, Evaluation Committee Member
Dan J. Hanket	•
	, Evaluation Committee Member
Lynn Kelly	
pholista.	, Evaluation Committee Member
Robert VanEvra	
	, Evaluation Committee Member
Carey Gooch	
	, Evaluation Committee Member
Nirmal Sinha	-

C: Evaluation Committee Members

		ment of Public Utilit Summary Report	lles	
Division: Director's Office				
Project: Department Asbestos Survey	Estimated Co		Date of Notice To City Council: RFSQ Due Date: Date of Report:	
Committee's Ranking of Technica Offeror:	al Proposals			Total Points:
Resource International, Inc.				348
Stantec				329
URS			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	302
Environmental Compliance Services m.a.c. Paran Consulting Services				273 263
Committee Members Name: Dan J. Hanket Lynn Kelly Robert VanEvra Carey Gooch Thomas Stephens		Classification: Assistant Director Water Superintend Treatment Enginee DPU Industrial Hyg EBO Specialist		or .
Offerors Not Invited to Submit Tea	chnical Proposal	Total Points:	Explain:	
Offerors whose SOQ's were not e	valuated			
Offeror:		Explain:		

20	3								
	A.4. Project Approach assures Environmental Compliance while minimizing adverse environmental impacts								
	Project Approach assures Environne Compliance while minimizing adverse environmental impacts								
	t Approach assures En ance while minimizing a environmental impacts		TS	8.0	8.0	9.0	8.0	8.0	
	ach as hilo mi	10.0	K	7.0	5.0	9.0 10.0 7.0	6.0	6.0	
	t Appro ance w enviro		Н	0.6	0.0	10.0	0.6	9.0	
	Project		95	8.0	7.0		9.0	8.0	
			RE	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	2.0	
	A.3. Project Schedule is realistic yet meets Department needs								
	listic ye		TS	0	0.9	9	9	2.0	
	Schedule is realist Department needs	10.0	LK	0.9 0.		8.0 10.0	0.9.0	8.0	
	heduk	92		0.7.0	0 2.0		9		
\\	ject Sc De		CG DH	0.9 0.	9.0 7.0 6.0	9.0 8.0	8.0 10.0 6.0	5.0	
OUA	3. Pro		REC	5.0 8.0	0 7.	6		8.0	
OSAI			R	ιά	oi .	8.0	8.0	3.0	
PROPOSAL QUALITY	A.2. Project Approach meets needs of the Project								
A	needs		L			0			
	meets		TS	0 12.	12.	0 15.	0 14.	14.	
	proach m Project	15.0	그	12.	0 7.0	0 12.	0 10.	9.6	
	ect Ap		H	5.0 12.0 8.0 12.0 12.0	3.0 10.0 15.0 7.0 12.0	10.0 13.0 15.0 12.0 15.0	5.0 12.0 15.0 10.0 14.0	5.0 12.0 15.0 8.0 14.0	
	2. Proj		ဗ္ဗ	12.	10.	0 13.0	12.	12.	
			R	5.0	3.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	
	well- ncise								
	tation v							HALLIA SOMILLIA	
	Presen		TS	12.0	13.0	15.0	14.0	14.0	
	roach	15.0	Ę	11.0	8.0	12.0	10.0	8.0	
	ct App		H	12.0	11.0	15.0	14.0	10.0	
	A.1. Project Approach Presentation well- structured, easy to understand, and concise		95	5.0 12.0 12.0 11.0 12.0	3.0 10.0 11.0 8.0 13.0	8.0 13.0 15.0 12.0 15.0	5.0 14.0 14.0 10.0 14.0	5.0 12.0 10.0 8.0 14.0	
	A.1.		믮	5.0	3.0		5.0	5.0	
	<u> </u>	= anje,	Review Committee =	lices	seo	Resource International			
	riteria	Max Point Value =	v Comr.	Serv	aran Servi	ırnat	og .		
	tion C	Max	Reviev	onm	m.a.c. Paran sulting Servi	> Inte	Stantec	URS	
	Evaluation Criteria =			Environmental Compliance Services	m.a.c. Paran Consulting Services	ource	Ó		
	ш			Con	Cor	Resc			

C. PROJECT TEAM WORKLOAD  C.1. Proposal demonstrates the availability of the project team to complete the project expeditiously	5.0	RE CG DH LK TS	1.0 3.0 3.0 2.0 3.0	5.0 2.0 5.0 2.0 3.0	5.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0	4.0 4.0 5.0 2.0 2.0	1.0 3.0 5.0 4.0 4.0	
22								
B.3. Project Toam Assignments represent the best mix of talent for the assigned tasks	5.0	RE CG DH LK TS	2.0 3.0 5.0 3.0 4.0	1.0 2.0 5.0 3.0 4.0	5.0 4.0 5.0 4.0 5.0	3.0 3.0 5.0 3.0 4.0	4.0 3.0 5.0 4.0 4.0	
B. PROJECT TEAM EXPERIENCE B.2. Experience on similar Projects completed in the past 3 years for this Department, other City Departments, or other government and business entities	10.0	RE CG DH LK TS	2.0 5.0 7.0 8.0 7.0	3.0 5.0 8.0 8.0 8.0	5.0 8.0 10.0 8.0 8.0	7.0 9.0 10.0 8.0 9.0	8.0 8.0 8.0 9.0	
B.1. Education and Training fits the Project's needs	10.0	RE CG DH LK TS	2.0 10.0 7.0 8.0 8.0	3.0 10.0 10.0 8.0 9.0	6.0 10.0 10.0 8.0 10.0	5.0 9.0 10.0 7.0 9.0	9.0 9.0 10.0 8.0 10.0	
Evaluation Criteria =	Max Point Value =	Review Committee =	Environmental Compliance Services	m.a.c. Paran Consulting Services	Resource International	Stantec	URS	

	и 📍 .	0 0 <del>a</del>		
		ces   ces		
Evaluation Criteria				
	ex Point Va lew Commi	servi Servi		
	ାଜାତା ଅନ୍	ce ser		
Ū Ū	IXIÕLE	re S   S		
<b>.</b>	Max P Review t	8   그 호   토	URS	
valuation		E   7 5   6		
멸	Envir	일   전 전   일	0	
7				
	W	E   5   8		
		<ul> <li>ASSESS OF A SECURE AND A SECURE ASSESSMENT AND A SECURITION AND A SECURITION AND ADDRESS AND ADDRESS</li></ul>		
		ے ا∪ا ر		1   1

	The second secon		Totals			273.0	263.0	348.0	329.0	302.0	
,	20	E.4. 50% in Columbus	At least 50% of the Team's project labor costs are assignable to employees paying city of Columbus income tax on the date the proposal is submitted	10.0							
	uly one]	E.3. 90% inside Franklin County	At least 90% of the Team's labor will be performed in an office location within Franklin Country but outside of the Columbus Corporate limits on the date the proposal is submitted	10.0	[Assigned by group/per document]	10.0	0.0	10.0	20.0	10.0	
	D. Local Workforce [select only one]	E.2. 75% in Columbus	At least 75% of the Team's project labor costs are assignable to employees paying City of Columbus income tax on the date the proposal is submitted	15.0	[Assigned by g						
	D. (	E.1. 90% in Columbus	At least 90% of the Team's project labor costs are assignable to employees paying City of Columbus income tax on the date the proposal is submitted	20.0							
			Evaluation Criteria =	Max Point Value =	Review Committee =	Environmental Compliance Services	m.a.c. Paran Consulting Services	Resource International	Stantec	URS	

	Evaluation of Proposal
A.	A. Project Approach  1. Presentation well-structured, easy to understand, and concise
Max. # pts. Avg. pts. Possible Received 15	Offeror: Environmental Compliance Services  Proposed Subcontractors:  Major Concerns: Explanation of Points Provided  Satisfactory
Max. # pts. Avg. pts. Possible Received 15 9	Offeror: m.a.c. Paran Consulting Services  Proposed Subcontractors:  Major Concerns: Explanation of Points Provided  While concise, the proposal lacked sufficient detail to evaluate how the consultant intended to implement the work for such a large project.
Max.#pts. Avg. pts. Possible Received 15 13	Offeror: Resource International, Inc.  Proposed Subcontractors: Safex, Gandee  Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided  Thorough yet easy to follow explanations on how work would proceed.
Max. # pts. Avg. pts. Possible Received 15 10	Offeror: URS  Proposed Subcontractors:  Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided  Satisfactory.
Max. # pts. Avg. pts. Possible Received 15 11	Offeror: Stantec Proposed Subcontractors:  Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided Satisfactory

	Evaluation of Proposal A.2 Project Approach Meets Needs of Project
Max. # pts. Avg. pts. Possible Received 15 10	Offeror: Environmental Compliance Services  Proposed Subcontractors:  Maior Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided  Satisfactory
Max. # pts. Avg. pts. Possible Received 15 9	Offeror: m.a.c.Paran Consulting Services  Proposed Subcontractors:  Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided  Concern over sufficient staff and distance from work location
Max. # pts. Avg. pts. Possible Received 15 13	Offeror: Resource International, Inc.  Proposed Subcontractors: Safex, Gandee  Major Concerns: Explanation of Points Provided  Well planned and staffed with sufficient resources to tackle a department-wide effort.
Max. # pts. Avg. pts. Possible Received 15 11	Offeror: URS  Proposed Subcontractors:  Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided  Satisfactory.
Max. # pts. Avg. pts. Possible Received 15 11	Offeror: Stantec Proposed Subcontractors:  Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided Satisfactory.

	Evaluation of Proposals
	A. Proposal Quality A.3 Project Schedule is Realistic
Max. # pts. Avg. pts. Possible Received 10 6	Offeror: Environmental Compliance Services  Proposed Subcontractors:  Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided  Schedule needed more specificity.
Max. # pts. Avg. pts. Possible Received 7	Offeror: m.a.c.Paran Consulting Services  Proposed Subcontractors:  Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided  Proposal appeared unrealistic given the mimimal number of manhours proposed.
Max. # pts. Avg. pts. Possible Received 10 9	Offeror: Resource International, Inc.  Proposed Subcontractors: Safex, Gandee  Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided  While proposing a somewhat elongated schedule, staffing and project development is robust.
Max. # pts. Avg. pts. Possible Received 10 6	Offeror: URS  Proposed Subcontractors:  Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided  While discussing how it would go about segregating the sites for survey work, URS did not provide detail on a proposed schedule.
Max. # pts. Avg. pts. Possible Received 10 8	Offeror: Stantec Proposed Subcontractors:  Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided Satisfactory

Max. # pts. Avg. pts. Possible Received 10 7	Evaluation of Proposals A.Proposal Quality A.4 Environmental Compliance  Offeror: Environmental Compliance Services Proposed Subcontractors:  Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided  Satisfactory
Max. # pts. Avg. pts. Possible Received 10 7	Offeror: m.a.c.Paran Consulting Services Proposed Subcontractors:  Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided Satisfactory
Max. # pts. Avg. pts. Possible Received 10 8	Offeror: Resource International, Inc. Proposed Subcontractors: Safex, Gandee  Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided  Most detailed explanation regarding handling of friable material
Max. # pts. Avg. pts. Possible Received 10 7	Offeror: URS Proposed Subcontractors:  Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided  Satisfactory
Max. # pts. Avg. pts. Possible Received 10 7	Offeror: Stantec Proposed Subcontractors:  Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided Satisfactory

## **Evaluation of Proposals**

# B. Project team experience B.1. Education and training fits the project's needs

		-	Environmental Com	pliance Services
Man Hada		Proposed	Subcontractors:	F1
Max. # pts.	Avg. pts.	Major Con	omo: Evalonation	of Bointo Broyidad
Possible 10	r =	Satisfactory	erns; Explanation o	or Points Provided
10	7	Salistacioty		
		Offeror: I	m.a.c.Paran Consul	ting Services
		_	Subcontractors:	ung dervices
Max. # pts.	Avg. pts.	i Toposcu (	Jupeonitactors.	
Possible		Major Cond	erns; Explanation	of Points Provided
10	8	Satisfactory		
·				
		Offeror:	Resource Internatio	nal, Inc.
		Proposed 5	Subcontractors:	Safex, Gandee
Max. # pts.	Avg. pts.	•		
<u>Possible</u>	Received	Major Cond	erns; Explanation of	of Points Provided
10	9	Strong back	ground in asbestos w	vork exhibited.
		Official	une	
		_	URS Subcontractors:	
Max. # pts.	Avg. pts.	rioposea 3	Subcontractors:	
Possible		Major Cond	erns; Explanation o	of Dointe Drovided
10	9		ground in asbestos w	
		otrong back	iground in assestes in	ork exhibited.
		Offeror:	Stantec	
		_	Subcontractors:	• • • •
Max. # pts.	Avg. pts.			
Possible		Major Cond	erns; Explanation o	of Points Provided
10	6	Many of sta background	ff, while having stron , lacked level of asbe	g environmental
		experience.		

## Evaluation of Proposals B.2 Experience on similar projects

		Official Environmental Compliance Services
		Proposed Subcontractors:
Max. # pts.	Ava. pts.	
-		Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided
10	5	Firm reported asbestos work for two city utilities, both out of state.
		Offeror: m.a.c.Paran Consulting Services
		Proposed Subcontractors:
* *		Proposed Subcontractors.
Max. # pts.		
<u>Possible</u>	Received	Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided
10	6	While asbestos work conducted for in-state govenmental entities, none was
		reported for city utilities.
		reported for city dillities.
		Offeror: Resource International, Inc.
		Proposed Subcontractors: Safex, Gandee
Max. # pts.	Ava. ots.	
Max. # pts.		Major Concerns: Evolunation of Points Provided
<u>Possible</u>	Received	Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided
		Firms reported numerous asbestos related projects for City of Columbus and
<u>Possible</u>	Received	
<u>Possible</u>	Received	Firms reported numerous asbestos related projects for City of Columbus and
<u>Possible</u>	Received	Firms reported numerous asbestos related projects for City of Columbus and
<u>Possible</u>	Received	Firms reported numerous asbestos related projects for City of Columbus and
<u>Possible</u>	Received	Firms reported numerous asbestos related projects for City of Columbus and
<u>Possible</u>	Received	Firms reported numerous asbestos related projects for City of Columbus and
<u>Possible</u>	Received	Firms reported numerous asbestos related projects for City of Columbus and
<u>Possible</u>	Received	Firms reported numerous asbestos related projects for City of Columbus and other governmental agencies.
<u>Possible</u>	Received	Firms reported numerous asbestos related projects for City of Columbus and other governmental agencies.  Offeror: URS
Possible 10	Received 8	Firms reported numerous asbestos related projects for City of Columbus and other governmental agencies.
Possible 10 Max. # pts.	Received 8 Avg. pts.	Firms reported numerous asbestos related projects for City of Columbus and other governmental agencies.  Offeror: URS Proposed Subcontractors:
Possible 10 Max. # pts.	Received 8 Avg. pts.	Firms reported numerous asbestos related projects for City of Columbus and other governmental agencies.  Offeror: URS
Possible 10 Max. # pts.	Received 8 Avg. pts.	Firms reported numerous asbestos related projects for City of Columbus and other governmental agencies.  Offeror: URS Proposed Subcontractors:  Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided
Possible 10 Max. # pts. Possible	Received 8 Avg. pts. Received	Firms reported numerous asbestos related projects for City of Columbus and other governmental agencies.  Offeror: URS Proposed Subcontractors:  Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided One prior project involved asbestos related work for a city utility although
Possible 10 Max. # pts. Possible	Received 8 Avg. pts. Received	Firms reported numerous asbestos related projects for City of Columbus and other governmental agencies.  Offeror: URS Proposed Subcontractors:  Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided
Possible 10 Max. # pts. Possible	Received 8 Avg. pts. Received	Firms reported numerous asbestos related projects for City of Columbus and other governmental agencies.  Offeror: URS Proposed Subcontractors:  Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided One prior project involved asbestos related work for a city utility although
Possible 10  Max. # pts. Possible	Received 8 Avg. pts. Received	Firms reported numerous asbestos related projects for City of Columbus and other governmental agencies.  Offeror: URS Proposed Subcontractors:  Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided One prior project involved asbestos related work for a city utility although
Possible 10  Max. # pts. Possible	Received 8 Avg. pts. Received	Firms reported numerous asbestos related projects for City of Columbus and other governmental agencies.  Offeror: URS Proposed Subcontractors:  Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided One prior project involved asbestos related work for a city utility although
Possible 10  Max. # pts. Possible	Received 8 Avg. pts. Received	Firms reported numerous asbestos related projects for City of Columbus and other governmental agencies.  Offeror: URS Proposed Subcontractors:  Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided  One prior project involved asbestos related work for a city utility although none for this City conducted to date.  Offeror: Stantec
Max. # pts. Possible 10	Avg. pts. Received 7	Firms reported numerous asbestos related projects for City of Columbus and other governmental agencies.  Offeror: URS Proposed Subcontractors:  Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided  One prior project involved asbestos related work for a city utility although none for this City conducted to date.
Max. # pts. Possible 10  Max. # pts.	Avg. pts. Received 7  Avg. pts.	Firms reported numerous asbestos related projects for City of Columbus and other governmental agencies.  Offeror: URS Proposed Subcontractors:  Major Concerns: Explanation of Points Provided  One prior project involved asbestos related work for a city utility although none for this City conducted to date.  Offeror: Stantec Proposed Subcontractors:
Max. # pts. Possible 10  Max. # pts. Possible Nax. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received 7  Avg. pts.	Firms reported numerous asbestos related projects for City of Columbus and other governmental agencies.  Offeror: URS Proposed Subcontractors:  Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided  One prior project involved asbestos related work for a city utility although none for this City conducted to date.  Offeror: Stantec Proposed Subcontractors:  Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided
Max. # pts. Possible 10  Max. # pts.	Avg. pts. Received 7  Avg. pts.	Firms reported numerous asbestos related projects for City of Columbus and other governmental agencies.  Offeror: URS Proposed Subcontractors:  Major Concerns: Explanation of Points Provided  One prior project involved asbestos related work for a city utility although none for this City conducted to date.  Offeror: Stantec Proposed Subcontractors:
Max. # pts. Possible 10  Max. # pts. Possible Nax. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received 7  Avg. pts. Received	Firms reported numerous asbestos related projects for City of Columbus and other governmental agencies.  Offeror: URS Proposed Subcontractors:  Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided One prior project involved asbestos related work for a city utility although none for this City conducted to date.  Offeror: Stantec Proposed Subcontractors:  Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided Extensive government asbestos survey work including work performed for
Max. # pts. Possible 10  Max. # pts. Possible Nax. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received 7  Avg. pts. Received	Firms reported numerous asbestos related projects for City of Columbus and other governmental agencies.  Offeror: URS Proposed Subcontractors:  Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided  One prior project involved asbestos related work for a city utility although none for this City conducted to date.  Offeror: Stantec Proposed Subcontractors:  Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

Evaluation of Proposals  B. Project Team Experience				
B.3 Team assignments represent the best mix of talent for the assigned task				
Max. # pts. Possible 5		Offeror: Environmental Compliance Services Proposed Subcontractors:  Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided Satisfactory		
Max. # pts. Possible 5		Offeror: m.a.c.Paran Consulting Services Proposed Subcontractors:  Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided Satisfactory		
Max. # pts.	Ava nte	Offeror: Resource International, Inc. Proposed Subcontractors: Safex, Gandee		
Possible		Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided		
[ 5 ]	4	Utilization of talent from three firms impressive.		
Max. # pts. Possible 5		Offeror: URS Proposed Subcontractors:  Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided  Assignments and projected manhours for completion of work well thought out.		
Max. # pts.	Avg. pts.	Offeror: Stantec Proposed Subcontractors:		
Possible		Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided		
5	4	Extensive government asbestos survey work including work performed for DPU.		

Evaluation of Proposals C. Project team workload				
C.1. Pro	posal dem	nonstrates availability of project team to complete project expeditiously Offeror: Environmental Compliance Services		
		Proposed Subcontractors:		
Max. # pts.	Avg. pts.			
_		Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided		
5	2	Many out-of-state resources creates concerns over availability, scheduling,		
		and accessing support.		
		Offeror: m.a.c.Paran Consulting Services		
		Proposed Subcontractors:		
Max. # pts.				
		Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided		
5	3	Satisfactory		
		Offeror: Resource International, Inc.		
		Proposed Subcontractors: Safex, Gandee		
Max. # pts.	Ava nte	Proposed Supcontractors. Sales, Salues		
_		Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided		
5 T	4	well documented availability of team staff for project.		
	•	Work documented detailed by today of the project.		
		or		
		Offeror: URS Proposed Subcontractors:		
Max. # pts.	Ava nte	Proposed Subconfidetors.		
•		Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided		
5	3	Satisfactory		
1		Cationation		
		Offeror: Stantec		
		Proposed Subcontractors:		
Max. # pts.	Avg. pts.	***************************************		
		Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided		
5	3	Extensive government asbestos survey work including work performed for		
		DPU.		