

CONSULTANT EVALUATION SUMMARY

Firm	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5
MSA	Most expensive, filler hours. Opportunities map is a plus. Good experience with DNR. Not a lot of budget flexibility.	Positive to have DNR experience, the most of all teams. Not experience with county. The maps easy to understand. Qualify and could do a fine job.	Highest price. ESA I or II not included in base amount, great DNR project experience. Challenging to find more funding if needed. Good experience with DNR	Doesn't have experience with the team/firm.	Good project understanding. Strong relationship with DNR. Mostly engineers, historic preservation, wetland delineation, P1 ESA not included, engagement limits?
ISG	Mixed feelings. No hours provided. Proposal looks good, comfortable with them doing a good job. Public engagement important for this project so having more than one option is important. Good grasp of the project. Good visuals. Similar to MSA but more ambiguity.	No expert for culture, no experience with County. QAQC isn't as strong. Wetland delineation included in scope. Missing hours is red flag. Firm recommended by DNR. Worked on segments D and E for Northfield MTST.	Toss up as a #1, proven MTST experience, has worked with the rural communities, planning identification on map of options. Experience in the area since they worked on the MTST.	Doesn't have experience with the team/firm.	Meets project understanding. Current work in area and relationship with DNR and Northfield. Environmental, wetlands delineation, P1 ESA not included
Stantec	Specific and current experience with team. Best price provides budget flexibility, probably underestimated but good fit in terms of hours. Good project understanding given their current project with the LBG. Major things that they have missed in the current project that have affected timeline. Good relationship with team. Experience with the county. Strong public engagement plan. Time for prelim design may not be enough.	Concerned with low budget, may not be enough time considered. Like the plan to engage the townships. Experience with the county is a plus.	Experienced trail/Greenway team [huge list of projects], Could be #1 or close #2 the fee is good and provides a lot of flexibility if we need it. Even with the P1 ESA, good price.	Doesn't have experience with the team/firm.	Meets project understanding. No map, no text explaining corridor. Current work in area. Relationship with MnDOT and understanding of Lake Bylesby Park. Wetland delineation not included?
BMI	Feels similar to ISG, strong project understanding, shows hours, good project team. Worked with Cody in the past. Also experience with Connor and Anna. Experience with MTST Segment.	Pretty complete team, experience with Connor and Anna and have good relationship. Proposal harder to follow.	Complete proposal, quality team, assumptions and alignment from Randolph to Harry Ave may need a little refinement as Design map does not show alts using new County 88 or potential trail alignments further north west of County 56. Experience with several team members. Map is fine, not a lot of creative thinking, mostly existing conditions not solutions. Schedule about the same as other teams which follows the RFP.	Doesn't have experience with the team/firm.	Great project understanding. Current work in area. Current work in area and relationship with DNR and Northfield. Engagement, regional trails, cultural resources, wetlands
KLJ	Second most expensive and the least amount of hours. Important to have good relationship with the PM.	Experience working on the feasibility study but the team is not the same as before. No obligation to give them the project.	Higher price, a lot of environmental work, unsure that much is needed, lead PM mixed reviews. Experience with Kevin and Cari, great designers. Enviro team very strong.	Past experience with team members varies. In other greenway projects, there may be questions about recent progress. Strong designing staff. But there are concerns about the completeness and quality of work based on past performance of some team members.	Good project understanding. Detailed text and past relationship with property owners. Different team now. Previous direct work in the area, good mix of backgrounds. Detailed work plan and wetlands
SEH	Firm with more experience with county for this type of projects. Really good proposal and map, deep understanding of project. Schedule is confusing. Least amount of time for public engagement (key component). Wetland delineation fits under technical report.	Easiest to follow, clear and concise. Unclear if they included wetland delineation. Community engagement flagged, pop-up event and sign, there needs to be more education and listening.	History with DC Greenways, low on public engagement, provided a really quality issues & ops, team knows how to deliver a County project. Unsure about DNR experience. Experience working with Toby and William for years. No experience with Susan. Issues and opportunities map nice that they identified what may be needed. High budget, not cushion for amendments. Public engagement seems light, not a lot of experience with Kristin.	The consultant team appears to bethe same as previous greenway projects, and they have generally been successful in delivering completed projects. At the same time, past work has highlighted concerns, including meeting accessibility standards, ensuring design elements avoid creating safety concerns, and providing final plan details at a level appropriate for a project of this scale.	Great project understanding. Detailed map of corridor. Relationships with DNR, MnDOT, Northfield, and the railroad. Wetland delineation not included?