STATE OF CALIFORNIA • DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
ARCHITECTURAL & ENGINEERING (A&E) CONSULTANT EVALUATION FORM
INITIAL EVALUATION (for Short Listing)
ADM-2027 (Rev 07/14/09)

Contract No: WAYFINDING Consultant GRAPHIC SOLUTIONS

Criteria	(a) Weight	(b) Score (0-10)	(a) x (b) Weighted Score
1. Composition of the proposed team (professional and technical level personnel of the prime and subconsultants) to fulfill the requirements of the Scope of Work in the Request for Qualifications.	3.0	9	27
2. Experience of the Project Manager.	2.0	9	18
3. Education and experience of the key personnel to be assigned.	2.0	9	18
4. • Availability of the Project Manager and the proposed team. • Accessibility to the Department and ability to respond to Department requirements.	1.0	9	9
5. Nature of completed relevant projects. • All relevant experience should include state, federal and local projects. (All projects would be rated equally. Caltrans projects would not be given a higher rate.)	2.0	9	18
		Total	90

Comments (continue on reverse if necessary):
HIGHLY QUALIFIED, JUST UNCLEAR ABOUT THE ROLES OF BOTH GS & KTHA. WHO WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR DIFFERENT COMPONENTS OF THE PROJECT & WHY?

I certify that I have performed an independent evaluation of the above named consultant. I further certify that I have not engaged in discussions within the last year with the above-named consultant regarding my future employment with said consultant.

Signature of Evaluator: MM Date 10-7-11

Printed Name of Evaluator: MATT MARQUEZ

Checked by: _____ Date _____

STATE OF CALIFORNIA • DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
ARCHITECTURAL & ENGINEERING (A&E) CONSULTANT EVALUATION FORM
INITIAL EVALUATION (for Short Listing)
ADM-2027 (Rev 07/14/09)

Contract No: WAYFINDING Consultant SEIBERT PERKINS

Criteria	(a) Weight	(b) Score (0-10)	(a) x (b) Weighted Score
1. Composition of the proposed team (professional and technical level personnel of the prime and subconsultants) to fulfill the requirements of the Scope of Work in the Request for Qualifications.	3.0	8	24
2. Experience of the Project Manager.	2.0	9	18
3. Education and experience of the key personnel to be assigned.	2.0	9	18
4. • Availability of the Project Manager and the proposed team. • Accessibility to the Department and ability to respond to Department requirements.	1.0	8	8
5. Nature of completed relevant projects. • All relevant experience should include state, federal and local projects. (All projects would be rated equally. Caltrans projects would not be given a higher rate.)	2.0	8	16
		Total	84

Comments (continue on reverse if necessary):

2 PERSON TEAM → IS THAT ENOUGH?
RELEVANT PROJECTS, SOLID GOOD PROJECTS, BUT DIDN'T STAND OUT A "GREAT" LOOKING PROJECTS

I certify that I have performed an independent evaluation of the above named consultant. I further certify that I have not engaged in discussions within the last year with the above-named consultant regarding my future employment with said consultant.

Signature of Evaluator: _____ Date 10/25/16

Printed Name of Evaluator: MATT MARQUEZ

Checked by: _____ Date _____

STATE OF CALIFORNIA • DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
ARCHITECTURAL & ENGINEERING (A&E) CONSULTANT EVALUATION FORM
INITIAL EVALUATION (for Short Listing)
ADM-2027 (Rev 07/14/09)

Contract No: WAYFINDING Consultant CALLISON / RTKL

Criteria	(a) Weight	(b) Score (0-10)	(a) x (b) Weighted Score
1. Composition of the proposed team (professional and technical level personnel of the prime and subconsultants) to fulfill the requirements of the Scope of Work in the Request for Qualifications.	3.0	7	21
2. Experience of the Project Manager.	2.0	7	14
3. Education and experience of the key personnel to be assigned.	2.0	7	14
4. • Availability of the Project Manager and the proposed team. • Accessibility to the Department and ability to respond to Department requirements.	1.0	8	8
5. Nature of completed relevant projects. • All relevant experience should include state, federal and local projects. (All projects would be rated equally. Caltrans projects would not be given a higher rate.)	2.0	8	16
		Total	73

Comments (continue on reverse if necessary):
ARCADIA, LV, SANTA ANA
FELT PROPOSAL WAS TOO GENERIC

I certify that I have performed an independent evaluation of the above named consultant. I further certify that I have not engaged in discussions within the last year with the above-named consultant regarding my future employment with said consultant.

Signature of Evaluator: _____ Date 10/27/16

Printed Name of Evaluator: MATT MARQUEZ

Checked by: _____ Date _____

STATE OF CALIFORNIA • DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
ARCHITECTURAL & ENGINEERING (A&E) CONSULTANT EVALUATION FORM
INITIAL EVALUATION (for Short Listing)
ADM-2027 (Rev 07/14/09)

Contract No: WAYFINDING Consultant HUNT DESIGN

Criteria	(a) Weight	(b) Score (0-10)	(a) x (b) Weighted Score
1. Composition of the proposed team (professional and technical level personnel of the prime and subconsultants) to fulfill the requirements of the Scope of Work in the Request for Qualifications.	3.0	8	24
2. Experience of the Project Manager.	2.0	8	16
3. Education and experience of the key personnel to be assigned.	2.0	8	16
4. • Availability of the Project Manager and the proposed team. • Accessibility to the Department and ability to respond to Department requirements.	1.0	6	6
5. Nature of completed relevant projects. • All relevant experience should include state, federal and local projects. (All projects would be rated equally. Caltrans projects would not be given a higher rate.)	2.0	4	8
		Total	70

Comments (continue on reverse if necessary):
MAJORITY OF SIGNAGE HAS SIMILAR LOOK TO IT.

I certify that I have performed an independent evaluation of the above named consultant. I further certify that I have not engaged in discussions within the last year with the above-named consultant regarding my future employment with said consultant.

Signature of Evaluator: _____ Date 10/27/16

Printed Name of Evaluator: MATT MARQUEZ

Checked by: _____ Date _____

STATE OF CALIFORNIA • DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
ARCHITECTURAL & ENGINEERING (A&E) CONSULTANT EVALUATION FORM
INITIAL EVALUATION (for Short Listing)
ADM-2027 (Rev 07/14/09)

Contract No: WAYFINDING Consultant PACE ENGRING

Criteria	(a) Weight	(b) Score (0-10)	(a) x (b) Weighted Score
1. Composition of the proposed team (professional and technical level personnel of the prime and subconsultants) to fulfill the requirements of the Scope of Work in the Request for Qualifications.	3.0	7	21
2. Experience of the Project Manager.	2.0	7	14
3. Education and experience of the key personnel to be assigned.	2.0	7	14
4. • Availability of the Project Manager and the proposed team. • Accessibility to the Department and ability to respond to Department requirements.	1.0	6	6
5. Nature of completed relevant projects. • All relevant experience should include state, federal and local projects. (All projects would be rated equally. Caltrans projects would not be given a higher rate.)	2.0	6	12
		Total	67

Comments (continue on reverse if necessary):
SUBCONTRACT W/ PA. FIRM

I certify that I have performed an independent evaluation of the above named consultant. I further certify that I have not engaged in discussions within the last year with the above-named consultant regarding my future employment with said consultant.

Signature of Evaluator: _____ Date 10/27/16

Printed Name of Evaluator: MATT MARQUEZ

Checked by: _____ Date _____

STATE OF CALIFORNIA • DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
ARCHITECTURAL & ENGINEERING (A&E) CONSULTANT EVALUATION FORM
INITIAL EVALUATION (for Short Listing)
ADM-2027 (Rev 07/14/09)

Contract No: WAYFINDING Consultant LINESPACE

Criteria	(a) Weight	(b) Score (0-10)	(a) x (b) Weighted Score
1. Composition of the proposed team (professional and technical level personnel of the prime and subconsultants) to fulfill the requirements of the Scope of Work in the Request for Qualifications.	3.0	7	21
2. Experience of the Project Manager.	2.0	7	14
3. Education and experience of the key personnel to be assigned.	2.0	7	14
4. • Availability of the Project Manager and the proposed team. • Accessibility to the Department and ability to respond to Department requirements.	1.0	6	6
5. Nature of completed relevant projects. • All relevant experience should include state, federal and local projects. (All projects would be rated equally. Caltrans projects would not be given a higher rate.)	2.0	6	12
		Total	67

Comments (continue on reverse if necessary):
FRESNO, USC, CULVER CITY,
WOULD LIKE TO SEE LARGER SCALE PROJECTS
DO THEY HAVE MORE EXPERIENCE?

I certify that I have performed an independent evaluation of the above named consultant. I further certify that I have not engaged in discussions within the last year with the above-named consultant regarding my future employment with said consultant.

Signature of Evaluator: _____ Date 10/27/16

Printed Name of Evaluator: MATT MARQUEZ

Checked by: _____ Date _____

STATE OF CALIFORNIA • DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
ARCHITECTURAL & ENGINEERING (A&E) CONSULTANT EVALUATION FORM
INITIAL EVALUATION (for Short Listing)
ADM-2027 (Rev 07/14/09)

Contract No: WayFinding Consultant Graphic Solutions

Criteria	(a) Weight	(b) Score (0-10)	(a) x (b) Weighted Score
1. Composition of the proposed team (professional and technical level personnel of the prime and subconsultants) to fulfill the requirements of the Scope of Work in the Request for Qualifications.	3.0	9	27
2. Experience of the Project Manager.	2.0	9	18
3. Education and experience of the key personnel to be assigned.	2.0	9	18
4. • Availability of the Project Manager and the proposed team. • Accessibility to the Department and ability to respond to Department requirements.	1.0	9	9
5. Nature of completed relevant projects. • All relevant experience should include state, federal and local projects. (All projects would be rated equally. Caltrans projects would not be given a higher rate.)	2.0	10	20
		Total	92

Comments (continue on reverse if necessary):
- Primal 40+years
- Is it Graphic Solotions or KTU+A
- Worked in Bell Gardens, El Monte

KTU+A is sub contracted to Graphic Solutions.

I certify that I have performed an independent evaluation of the above named consultant. I further certify that I have not engaged in discussions within the last year with the above-named consultant regarding my future employment with said consultant.

Signature of Evaluator: _____ Date 10/25/16

Printed Name of Evaluator: Jose D. Jimenez

Checked by: _____ Date _____

STATE OF CALIFORNIA • DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
ARCHITECTURAL & ENGINEERING (A&E) CONSULTANT EVALUATION FORM
INITIAL EVALUATION (for Short Listing)
ADM-2027 (Rev 07/14/09)

Contract No: Wayfinding Consultant Selbert Perkins Design

Criteria	(a) Weight	(b) Score (0-10)	(a) x (b) Weighted Score
1. Composition of the proposed team (professional and technical level personnel of the prime and subconsultants) to fulfill the requirements of the Scope of Work in the Request for Qualifications.	3.0	8	24
2. Experience of the Project Manager.	2.0	9	18
3. Education and experience of the key personnel to be assigned.	2.0	9	18
4. • Availability of the Project Manager and the proposed team. • Accessibility to the Department and ability to respond to Department requirements.	1.0	9	9
5. Nature of completed relevant projects. • All relevant experience should include state, federal and local projects. (All projects would be rated equally. Caltrans projects would not be given a higher rate.)	2.0	8	16
		Total	85

Comments (continue on reverse if necessary):
Worked for Cities of Long Beach, Manhattan Beach, Santa Monica, Anaheim, Temple City
No subcontractors 31% and 25yrs experience

I certify that I have performed an independent evaluation of the above named consultant. I further certify that I have not engaged in discussions within the last year with the above-named consultant regarding my future employment with said consultant.

Signature of Evaluator: _____ Date 10/26/18

Printed Name of Evaluator: Jose Jimenez

Checked by: _____ Date _____

STATE OF CALIFORNIA • DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
ARCHITECTURAL & ENGINEERING (A&E) CONSULTANT EVALUATION FORM
INITIAL EVALUATION (for Short Listing)
ADM-2027 (Rev 07/14/09)

Contract No: Way Finding Consultant Callison/RTKL

Criteria	(a) Weight	(b) Score (0-10)	(a) x (b) Weighted Score
1. Composition of the proposed team (professional and technical level personnel of the prime and subconsultants) to fulfill the requirements of the Scope of Work in the Request for Qualifications.	3.0	7	21
2. Experience of the Project Manager.	2.0	7	14
3. Education and experience of the key personnel to be assigned.	2.0	8	16
4. • Availability of the Project Manager and the proposed team. • Accessibility to the Department and ability to respond to Department requirements.	1.0	8	8
5. Nature of completed relevant projects. • All relevant experience should include state, federal and local projects. (All projects would be rated equally. Caltrans projects would not be given a higher rate.)	2.0	8	16
		Total	75

Comments (continue on reverse if necessary):

- Callison/RTKL
- Did Work in City of Arcadia, Brea, Santa Ana, Las Vegas
- limited number of projects in area

I certify that I have performed an independent evaluation of the above named consultant. I further certify that I have not engaged in discussions within the last year with the above-named consultant regarding my future employment with said consultant.

Signature of Evaluator: _____ Date 10/26/16

Printed Name of Evaluator: Jose Jimenez

Checked by: _____ Date _____

STATE OF CALIFORNIA • DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
ARCHITECTURAL & ENGINEERING (A&E) CONSULTANT EVALUATION FORM
INITIAL EVALUATION (for Short Listing)
ADM-2027 (Rev 07/14/09)

Contract No: Wayfinding Consultant Hunt Design

Criteria	(a) Weight	(b) Score (0-10)	(a) x (b) Weighted Score
1. Composition of the proposed team (professional and technical level personnel of the prime and subconsultants) to fulfill the requirements of the Scope of Work in the Request for Qualifications.	3.0	8	24
2. Experience of the Project Manager.	2.0	8	16
3. Education and experience of the key personnel to be assigned.	2.0	8	16
4. • Availability of the Project Manager and the proposed team. • Accessibility to the Department and ability to respond to Department requirements.	1.0	6	6
5. Nature of completed relevant projects. • All relevant experience should include state, federal and local projects. (All projects would be rated equally. Caltrans projects would not be given a higher rate.)	2.0	5	10
		Total	72

Comments (continue on reverse if necessary):
Located in Pasadena
Worked on Pasadena's Santa Barbara, Westwood Village.
No sub-contractors, 42 years experience
Signage appears to be generic

I certify that I have performed an independent evaluation of the above named consultant. I further certify that I have not engaged in discussions within the last year with the above-named consultant regarding my future employment with said consultant.

Signature of Evaluator: _____ Date 10/26/16

Printed Name of Evaluator: Jose Jimenez

Checked by: _____ Date _____

STATE OF CALIFORNIA • DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
ARCHITECTURAL & ENGINEERING (A&E) CONSULTANT EVALUATION FORM
INITIAL EVALUATION (for Short Listing)
ADM-2027 (Rev 07/14/09)

Contract No: Wayfinding Rick Engineering Consultant Rick Engineering

Criteria	(a) Weight	(b) Score (0-10)	(a) x (b) Weighted Score
1. Composition of the proposed team (professional and technical level personnel of the prime and subconsultants) to fulfill the requirements of the Scope of Work in the Request for Qualifications.	3.0	7	21
2. Experience of the Project Manager.	2.0	7	14
3. Education and experience of the key personnel to be assigned.	2.0	7	14
4. • Availability of the Project Manager and the proposed team. • Accessibility to the Department and ability to respond to Department requirements.	1.0	7	7
5. Nature of completed relevant projects. • All relevant experience should include state, federal and local projects. (All projects would be rated equally. Caltrans projects would not be given a higher rate.)	2.0	6	12
		Total	68

Comments (continue on reverse if necessary):
Merge to be sub-contracted to do work. → Based out of Pennsylvania.
Worked on Downtown plan for SD, Novato, Not many California examples

I certify that I have performed an independent evaluation of the above named consultant. I further certify that I have not engaged in discussions within the last year with the above-named consultant regarding my future employment with said consultant.

Signature of Evaluator: _____ Date 10/26/14

Printed Name of Evaluator: Jose Jimenez

Checked by: _____ Date _____

STATE OF CALIFORNIA • DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
ARCHITECTURAL & ENGINEERING (A&E) CONSULTANT EVALUATION FORM
INITIAL EVALUATION (for Short Listing)
ADM-2027 (Rev 07/14/09)

Contract No: Wayfinding Consultant_____ Linespace_____

Criteria	(a) Weight	(b) Score (0-10)	(a) x (b) Weighted Score
1. Composition of the proposed team (professional and technical level personnel of the prime and subconsultants) to fulfill the requirements of the Scope of Work in the Request for Qualifications.	3.0	8	24
2. Experience of the Project Manager.	2.0	7	14
3. Education and experience of the key personnel to be assigned.	2.0	7	14
4. • Availability of the Project Manager and the proposed team. • Accessibility to the Department and ability to respond to Department requirements.	1.0	7	7
5. Nature of completed relevant projects. • All relevant experience should include state, federal and local projects. (All projects would be rated equally. Caltrans projects would not be given a higher rate.)	2.0	3	6
		Total	65

Comments (continue on reverse if necessary):

19+ year experience
- Handle smaller, project specific programs.
- Directional signage only.

I certify that I have performed an independent evaluation of the above named consultant. I further certify that I have not engaged in discussions within the last year with the above-named consultant regarding my future employment with said consultant.

Signature of Evaluator: _____ Date 10/26/16

Printed Name of Evaluator: Jose Jimenez

Checked by: _____ Date_____

STATE OF CALIFORNIA • DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
ARCHITECTURAL & ENGINEERING (A&E) CONSULTANT EVALUATION FORM
INITIAL EVALUATION (for Short Listing)
ADM-2027 (Rev 07/14/09)

Contract No: Wayfinding Consultant Graphic C Solutions

Criteria	(a) Weight	(b) Score (0-10)	(a) x (b) Weighted Score
1. Composition of the proposed team (professional and technical level personnel of the prime and subconsultants) to fulfill the requirements of the Scope of Work in the Request for Qualifications.	3.0	8	24
2. Experience of the Project Manager.	2.0	9	18
3. Education and experience of the key personnel to be assigned.	2.0	8	16
4. • Availability of the Project Manager and the proposed team. • Accessibility to the Department and ability to respond to Department requirements.	1.0	8	8
5. Nature of completed relevant projects. • All relevant experience should include state, federal and local projects. (All projects would be rated equally. Caltrans projects would not be given a higher rate.)	2.0	9	18
		Total	84

Comments (continue on reverse if necessary):
Nice Concise Proposal. Recognized Bougainvillea as City Flower. Experience w/ 5 ELA Cities

I certify that I have performed an independent evaluation of the above named consultant. I further certify that I have not engaged in discussions within the last year with the above-named consultant regarding my future employment with said consultant.

Signature of Evaluator: _____ Date_____

Printed Name of Evaluator: _____

Checked by: _____ Date_____

STATE OF CALIFORNIA • DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
ARCHITECTURAL & ENGINEERING (A&E) CONSULTANT EVALUATION FORM
INITIAL EVALUATION (for Short Listing)
ADM-2027 (Rev 07/14/09)

Contract No: Way Fidy Consultant Selbert Perkins

Criteria	(a) Weight	(b) Score (0-10)	(a) x (b) Weighted Score
1. Composition of the proposed team (professional and technical level personnel of the prime and subconsultants) to fulfill the requirements of the Scope of Work in the Request for Qualifications.	3.0	8	24
2. Experience of the Project Manager.	2.0	9	18
3. Education and experience of the key personnel to be assigned.	2.0	8	16
4. • Availability of the Project Manager and the proposed team. • Accessibility to the Department and ability to respond to Department requirements.	1.0	7	7
5. Nature of completed relevant projects. • All relevant experience should include state, federal and local projects. (All projects would be rated equally. Caltrans projects would not be given a higher rate.)	2.0	6	12
		Total	77

Comments (continue on reverse if necessary):
Proposal Professional - but 2 persons only?

I certify that I have performed an independent evaluation of the above named consultant. I further certify that I have not engaged in discussions within the last year with the above-named consultant regarding my future employment with said consultant.

Signature of Evaluator: _____ Date_____

Printed Name of Evaluator: _____

Checked by: _____ Date_____

STATE OF CALIFORNIA • DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
ARCHITECTURAL & ENGINEERING (A&E) CONSULTANT EVALUATION FORM
INITIAL EVALUATION (for Short Listing)
ADM-2027 (Rev 07/14/09)

Contract No: Work finding Consultant CALLISON RTKL

Criteria	(a) Weight	(b) Score (0-10)	(a) x (b) Weighted Score
1. Composition of the proposed team (professional and technical level personnel of the prime and subconsultants) to fulfill the requirements of the Scope of Work in the Request for Qualifications.	3.0	8	24
2. Experience of the Project Manager.	2.0	9	18
3. Education and experience of the key personnel to be assigned.	2.0	8	16
4. • Availability of the Project Manager and the proposed team. • Accessibility to the Department and ability to respond to Department requirements.	1.0	7	7
5. Nature of completed relevant projects. • All relevant experience should include state, federal and local projects. (All projects would be rated equally. Caltrans projects would not be given a higher rate.)	2.0	7	14
		Total	79

Comments (continue on reverse if necessary):

clean, easy proposal but a bit too general.

I certify that I have performed an independent evaluation of the above named consultant. I further certify that I have not engaged in discussions within the last year with the above-named consultant regarding my future employment with said consultant.

Signature of Evaluator: _____ Date_____

Printed Name of Evaluator: _____

Checked by: _____ Date_____

STATE OF CALIFORNIA • DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
ARCHITECTURAL & ENGINEERING (A&E) CONSULTANT EVALUATION FORM
INITIAL EVALUATION (for Short Listing)
ADM-2027 (Rev 07/14/09)

Contract No: Way Finding Consultant Hunt Design

Criteria	(a) Weight	(b) Score (0-10)	(a) x (b) Weighted Score
1. Composition of the proposed team (professional and technical level personnel of the prime and subconsultants) to fulfill the requirements of the Scope of Work in the Request for Qualifications.	3.0	7	21
2. Experience of the Project Manager.	2.0	8	16
3. Education and experience of the key personnel to be assigned.	2.0	8	16
4. • Availability of the Project Manager and the proposed team. • Accessibility to the Department and ability to respond to Department requirements.	1.0	7	7
5. Nature of completed relevant projects. • All relevant experience should include state, federal and local projects. (All projects would be rated equally. Caltrans projects would not be given a higher rate.)	2.0	6	12
		Total	72

Comments (continue on reverse if necessary):
Good way finding Projects but not many East LA Cities.

I certify that I have performed an independent evaluation of the above named consultant. I further certify that I have not engaged in discussions within the last year with the above-named consultant regarding my future employment with said consultant.

Signature of Evaluator: _____ Date_____

Printed Name of Evaluator: _____

Checked by: _____ Date_____

STATE OF CALIFORNIA • DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
ARCHITECTURAL & ENGINEERING (A&E) CONSULTANT EVALUATION FORM
INITIAL EVALUATION (for Short Listing)
ADM-2027 (Rev 07/14/09)

Contract No: Wray Finding Consultant Rick Engrg

Criteria	(a) Weight	(b) Score (0-10)	(a) x (b) Weighted Score
1. Composition of the proposed team (professional and technical level personnel of the prime and subconsultants) to fulfill the requirements of the Scope of Work in the Request for Qualifications.	3.0	6	18
2. Experience of the Project Manager.	2.0	6	12
3. Education and experience of the key personnel to be assigned.	2.0	6	12
4. • Availability of the Project Manager and the proposed team. • Accessibility to the Department and ability to respond to Department requirements.	1.0	6	6
5. Nature of completed relevant projects. • All relevant experience should include state, federal and local projects. (All projects would be rated equally. Caltrans projects would not be given a higher rate.)	2.0	5	10
		Total	58

Comments (continue on reverse if necessary):
Not much in the proposal to judge abilities

I certify that I have performed an independent evaluation of the above named consultant. I further certify that I have not engaged in discussions within the last year with the above-named consultant regarding my future employment with said consultant.

Signature of Evaluator: _____ Date_____

Printed Name of Evaluator: _____

Checked by: _____ Date_____

STATE OF CALIFORNIA • DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
ARCHITECTURAL & ENGINEERING (A&E) CONSULTANT EVALUATION FORM
INITIAL EVALUATION (for Short Listing)
ADM-2027 (Rev 07/14/09)

Contract No: ~~wayfinding~~ Consultant Linespace

Criteria	(a) Weight	(b) Score (0-10)	(a) x (b) Weighted Score
1. Composition of the proposed team (professional and technical level personnel of the prime and subconsultants) to fulfill the requirements of the Scope of Work in the Request for Qualifications.	3.0	7	21
2. Experience of the Project Manager.	2.0	8	16
3. Education and experience of the key personnel to be assigned.	2.0	~~8~~ 7	14
4. • Availability of the Project Manager and the proposed team. • Accessibility to the Department and ability to respond to Department requirements.	1.0	7	7
5. Nature of completed relevant projects. • All relevant experience should include state, federal and local projects. (All projects would be rated equally. Caltrans projects would not be given a higher rate.)	2.0	6	12
		Total	70

Comments (continue on reverse if necessary):

nice Pictures but not much narrative and Project approach.

I certify that I have performed an independent evaluation of the above named consultant. I further certify that I have not engaged in discussions within the last year with the above-named consultant regarding my future employment with said consultant.

Signature of Evaluator: _____ Date_____

Printed Name of Evaluator: _____

Checked by: _____ Date_____