|          |               | - 1.5  | Service Servic | ices Rating S     | 201                  |     |
|----------|---------------|--|--|-------------------|----------------------|-----|
| Gra      | ant R         | Pariniant Chal.  | COLNA-VARGAS   | rading of         | 1991                 |     |
| Nan      | me o          | f Respondent   | COLINA-VARGAS  | -                 | · /                  |     |
| Eva      | luate         | or's Name Cinder   |  | CCDBG Contract No | 7215409              |     |
| Evno     | rion          | or a Hame CINCEL   | ela Guevora  | ate of Rating 03  | 71 -                 |     |
| listed   | d for         | each factor les  | ident of the Request E   |                   |                      |     |
| eithe    | r fro         | m past experience w  | ation necessary to assess the Respondent   | by awarding point | s up to the maximum  | 1   |
| Expe     | erien         | ce   | ndent of the Request For Proposal (RFP) ation necessary to assess the Responde the the Respondent and/or by contacting   | past/current of   | may be gathered      |     |
|          |               | Factors  |  | r-sourient client | s of the Respondent. |     |
|          | 1.            | Related Experience   | David  | Max.Pts.          |                      |     |
|          | 2.            | Related Experience   | Background with federally funded projects  | 10                | Score                |     |
|          |               | (housing rehabilitation  | Background with federally funded projects  Background with specific project type  acquisition of property, seeming   | 10                | 8                    |     |
|          | J.            | regulatory agency, etc   | c.) Property, coordination with  | 5                 | 達 CG                 |     |
|          | 4.            | Certified Administrato   | of Tychec p  |                   | 110                  |     |
|          | 5.            | References from curre  | ent/past clients   | 5                 |                      |     |
|          |               |  | Subtotal, Experience   | 10                | - a                  |     |
| Work !   | Perfo         | ormance  | Experience   | 30                | 31/                  |     |
|          |               | Factors  |  |                   | -60                  |     |
|          | 1.            | Submits requests to cli  | ent/TDA in a timely manner   | Max.Pts.          | 0                    |     |
| 2        |               | responds to client/ I D/   | requests in a sime   | 5                 | Score                |     |
| 3        |               | THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY O | S COmplete -   | 5                 |                      |     |
| 4        |               | Product is consist   | ently of high  | 5                 | -5                   |     |
| 5        | i. F          | Past client/TDA projects   | s have low level of monitoring   | 5                 | 4                    |     |
|          | T             | indings/concerns   | level of monitoring  | 5                 |                      |     |
| 6.       | . IV          | nanages projects within  | budgetary constraints  |                   | 5                    |     |
|          | Subtotal De s |  | 5  | -2                |                      |     |
| Capacit  | y to          | Perform  | , reformance   | 30                | 520                  |     |
|          | F             | actors   |  |                   | - 28                 |     |
| 1.       | Q             | ualifications of Profess   | ional Administrators / Experience of Staff   | Max.Pts.          | Score                |     |
| 2.       |               |  |  | 5                 | Score                |     |
| 3.       | Q             | uality of Proposal/World   | Plan   | 5                 |                      |     |
| 4.       | D             | emonstrated understar  | ading of scope of the TxCDBG Project   | 5                 |                      |     |
|          |               |  | Subtetal 2   | 5                 | 7                    |     |
| Proposer | d Co          | st   | Subtotal, Capacity to Perform  | 20                | 10                   |     |
|          | Fa            | actors   |  |                   | 19                   |     |
|          |               | = Lowest Proposal  | \$15,000   | Max.Pts.          | C                    |     |
|          | В:            | = Bidder's Proposal  |  |                   | Score                |     |
|          |               |  | \$ 18,550 15,000   | 8                 | 820                  |     |
| TOTAL S  | COR           | E  | A + B X 20 equals Respondent's Score   | 20                | 0.00                 |     |
|          |               | ctors  |  |                   |                      |     |
|          |               | perience   |  | Max.Pts.          | Score                |     |
|          |               | ork Performance  |  | 30                | Score                | 26  |
|          |               | pacity to Perform  |  | 30                | -25                  | Alp |
|          |               | posed Cost   |  | 20                | -26                  | 28  |
|          |               | - Food Cost  |  | 20                | - 19                 | 19  |
|          |               |  | Total Score  | 100               | _20                  | 20  |

|             |  | ^   | rious reading She                | et                |
|-------------|--|---|----------------------------------|-------------------|
| Grant       | Recipient_   | DRESIDIO  |                                  |                   |
|             | of Respondent AC   | 1/000   | TxCDBG Contract No               | 7045400           |
| Evalua      |  | TO THIS GOE GRANT   |                                  |                   |
| Experie     | Pote U. F.   | 170 VASQUE  | MANAGEMENT P) by awarding points | 0                 |
| listed fo   | or each factor Inform  | ndent of the Request For Proposal (RFF ation necessary to assess the Respondent   | The amordina                     | SERVICES          |
| either fr   | rom past experience w  | ndent of the Request For Proposal (RFF<br>ation necessary to assess the Respond<br>ith the Respondent and/or by contactin | ent on these criteria            | up to the maximum |
| Experie     | nce  | ation necessary to assess the Respond<br>ith the Respondent and/or by contactin   | g past/current clients           | of the Respondent |
|             | Factors  |   |                                  | - are respondent. |
| 1.          | . Related Experience   | Background with federally funded project  | Max.Pts.                         | Score             |
| 2,          | Related Experience   | Background with specific project type   | s 10                             | Score             |
|             | regulatory agency, et  | c.)   | 5                                |                   |
| 4.          | Certified Administrate   | or of TxCDBG Program by TDA   |                                  | 4                 |
| 5.          | References from curr   | ent/past clients  | 5                                | 4                 |
|             |  |   | 10                               | -                 |
| Work Per    | rformance  | Subtotal, Experience  | 30                               | - 7               |
|             | Factors  |   |                                  | - 27              |
| 1.          |  | lient/TDA in a timely manner  | Max.Pts.                         | Coor              |
| 2.          | Responds to client/To  | A some a timely manner  | 5                                | Score             |
| 3.          | Past client/TDA project  | A requests in a timely manner   | 5                                | 4                 |
| 4.          | Work product is consis   | ts completed on schedule  | 5                                |                   |
| 5.          | Past client/TDA project  | stently of high quality with low level of error   | s 5                              | 7.                |
|             | findings/concerns  | ts have low level of monitoring   | 5                                | 7.                |
| 6.          |  | in budgetary constraints  |                                  | ce                |
|             | Service Control of the service of th |   | 5                                | 14                |
| Capacity to | 0 Perform  | Subtotal, Performance   | 30                               |                   |
|             | Factors  |   |                                  | 20                |
|             |  | olamat A (C. )  | Max.Pts.                         | C                 |
| 2.          | Present and Projected  | sional Administrators / Experience of Staff   | 5                                | Score             |
| 3.          | Quality of Proposal/Wor  | de Disease  | 5                                |                   |
| 4.          | Demonstrated understa  | KPlan   | 5                                | - 4               |
|             | and along the sta  | nding of scope of the TxCDBG Project  | 5                                | 4                 |
| roposed C   |  | Subtotal, Capacity to Perform   | 20                               | 7                 |
|             |  |   | 2.5                              | 16                |
|             | actors A = Lowest Proposal   | /   | Max.Pts.                         |                   |
|             | B = Bidder's Proposal  | \$ 13,000   | MUA.I IS.                        | <u>Score</u>      |
|             | ,  | 15,500  | 151 market                       | At He a.          |
| OTAL SCO    | RE   | A ÷ B X 20 equals Respondent's Score  | 20                               | 1000              |
|             | actors   |   |                                  | 50                |
|             | xperience  |   | Max.Pts.                         | Score             |
|             | Vork Performance   |   | 30                               | 7 3               |
|             | apacity to Perform   |   | 30                               | 3.0               |
|             | roposed Cost   |   | 20 -                             | 20                |
| = 2 50.5    | , -100 OOSI  |   | 20 -                             | 16                |
|             |  | Total Score   | 100                              | 46                |
|             |  |   |                                  | 7.5               |

| Gr      | ant F  | Recipient Presio   | lin C.   |                     |                        |
|---------|--------|--|--|---------------------|------------------------|
| Na      | ıme (  | of Respondent Con  | Town I I   | TxCDBG Contract     | No. 7215409            |
| Ev      | aluat  | tor's Name   | 2 2010   | Date of Rating      | 3-21-16                |
| Exp     | erier  | nce Rate the Resno   | / STRAIN   |                     |                        |
| liste   | d fo   | reach factor. Inform   | ndent of the Request For Proposal (RFI<br>ation necessary to assess the Respond<br>ith the Respondent and/or by contacting | ) by awarding poi   | nts up to the maximum  |
| eiui    | er tro | om past experience w   | ith the Respondent and/or by contacting  | ient on these crite | ria may be gathered    |
| EXP     | erier  | ice  | ation necessary to assess the Responding the Respondent and/or by contacting   | g pasucurrent clie  | nts of the Respondent. |
|         |        | ractors  |  |                     | Trip.                  |
|         | 2      | Related Experience   | Background with federally funded project   | Max.Pts.            | Score                  |
|         | No.    | (housing rehabilitation regulatory agency, et  | n, acquisition of property, coordination with  | 5                   | 5                      |
|         | 4.     | Certified Administrato   | or of TxCDBG Program by TDA  |                     | 5                      |
|         | 5.     | References from curre  | ent/past clients   | 5                   | 5                      |
|         |        |  | Subtotal, Experience   | 10                  |                        |
| Work    | Perf   | ormance  |  | 30                  | 200                    |
|         |        | Factors  |  |                     | -00                    |
|         | 1.     | Submits requests to cl   | ient/TDA in a timely manner  | Max.Pts.            | Score                  |
|         | 2.     | Responds to client/TD,   | A requests in a timely manner  | 5                   | 3                      |
|         |        | . dot offerto the project  | is completed on school   | 5                   | 3                      |
| 98      | -      | viola product is consis  | tently of high quality in  | 5                   | 3                      |
|         | 5.     | Past client/TDA project  | s have low level of monitoring   | s 5                 | 7                      |
|         |        | the second secon |  | 5                   |                        |
|         | 3. 1   | Manages projects within  | n budgetary constraints  | _                   | 2                      |
|         |        |  | Subtotal, Performance  | 5                   | 2                      |
| Capaci  |        | Perform  | - Tronding   | 30                  | 15                     |
|         |        | actors   |  |                     |                        |
|         | . С    | Qualifications of Profess  | sional Administrators / Experience of Staff  | Max.Pts.            | Score                  |
| 2       |        | THE LAGGERTON &  | VOIKIDADS  |                     | _ 2                    |
| 3.      | . Q    | luality of Proposal/World  | k Plan   | 5                   | 3                      |
| 4.      | D      | emonstrated understar  | nding of scope of the TxCDBG Project   | 5                   | _ 3                    |
|         |        |  | Subtotal, Capacity to Perform  | 5                   | 2                      |
| Propose |        |  | Posity to Perform  | 20                  | 10                     |
|         |        | actors   | (8)  |                     | 10 -                   |
|         | B      | = Lowest Proposal<br>= Bidder's Proposal   | \$ 15,000  | Max.Pts.            | Score                  |
|         |        |  | A + B X 20 equals Respondent's Score   |                     |                        |
| TOTAL S |        |  | - squais Respondents Score   | 20                  | 20                     |
| _       |        | ctors  |  |                     | 0.0                    |
|         |        | perience   |  | Max.Pts.            | Score                  |
| 0       |        | ork Performance  |  | 30                  | 20                     |
|         |        | pacity to Perform  |  | 30                  | - 15                   |
| 7       | Pro    | posed Cost   |  | 20                  |                        |
|         |        |  | Total Score  | 20                  | 20                     |
|         |        |  | 5  | 100                 | <u></u>                |
|         |        |  | a  |                     | 45                     |
|         |        | 7.5  |  |                     |                        |

|   |        | Respondent Grand  | punty 1   |          | ntract No   | 7215409         |     |  |
|---|--------|---|---|----------|-------------|-----------------|-----|--|
| Evaluator's Name Jim / Jihite Date of Rating  |        |   |   |          |             |                 |     |  |
| Experience Rate the Respondent of the Request For Proposal (RFP) by awarding points up to the maximum listed for each factor. Information necessary to assess the Respondent on these criteria may be gathered either from past experience with the Respondent and/or by contacting past/current clients of the Respondent. |        |   |   |          |             |                 |     |  |
| Expe  | erienc | ce  |   | 31       |             | are respondent. |     |  |
|   |        | Factors   |   | Ma       | ax.Pts.     | Score           |     |  |
|   |        | Related Experience / Bac  | kground with federally funded pro   | jects    | 10          | (0              |     |  |
|   | 2.     | Related Experience / Bac<br>(housing rehabilitation, ac<br>regulatory agency, etc.) | skground with specific project type<br>equisition of property, coordination | with     | 5           | 3               |     |  |
|   | 4.     | Certified Administrator of  | TxCDBG Program by TDA   |          | 5           |                 |     |  |
|   | 5.     | References from current/  |   |          | 10          |                 |     |  |
|   |        |   | Subtotal, Experience  |          | 30          |                 |     |  |
| Worl  | k Perl | formance  |   | -        |             |                 |     |  |
|   |        | Factors   |   | Ma       | x.Pts.      | 0               |     |  |
|   | 1.     | Submits requests to clien   | t/TDA in a timely manner  | ivid     | 5           | Score           |     |  |
|   | 2.     |   | equests in a timely manner  |          | 5           |                 |     |  |
|   | 3.     | Past client/TDA projects of   |   |          | 5           |                 |     |  |
|   | 4.     |   | ntly of high quality with low level of                                      | errors   | 5           |                 |     |  |
|   | 5.     |   | have low level of monitoring  |          | 5           | 3               |     |  |
|   | 6.     | Manages projects within I   | budgetary constraints   |          | 5           | - 3             |     |  |
|   |        |   | Subtotal, Performance   | -        | 30          |                 |     |  |
| Capacity to Perform   |        |   |   | ,        | 30          | _14             |     |  |
|   |        | Factors   |   | Man      | u Die       |                 |     |  |
|   | 1.     | Qualifications of Profession  | onal Administrators / Experience o  | f Staff  | x.Pts.<br>5 | Score           |     |  |
|   | 2.     | Present and Projected W   |   | . Otali  | 5           | _3              |     |  |
|   | 3.     | Quality of Proposal/Work  |   |          | 5           | _3              |     |  |
|   | 4.     |   | ding of scope of the TxCDBG Pro   | iect     | 5           | 2               |     |  |
|   |        |   | Subtotal, Capacity to Perform   |          |             | 2               |     |  |
| Pror  | osed   | Cost  | Capacity to Perform   | Š        | 20          | 10              |     |  |
|   |        | Factors   |   | 5.60     | D.          |                 |     |  |
|   |        | A = Lowest Proposal   | \$ 15,000   | ivia     | x.Pts.      | Score           |     |  |
|   |        | B = Bidder's Proposal   | \$ 15,000   |          |             |                 |     |  |
|   |        |   | A + B X 20 equals Respondent  | 's Score | 20          | 20              |     |  |
| TOT   | AL S   | CORE  |   |          |             | 20              |     |  |
|   |        | Factors   |   | Ma       | x.Pts.      | Score           |     |  |
|   |        | Experience  |   |          | 30          | p 0             | 17  |  |
|   |        | Work Performance  |   |          | 30          | -F-2            | 1.1 |  |
| ic.   |        | Capacity to Perform   |   |          | 20          | 12              | 14  |  |
|   |        | Proposed Cost   |   |          | 20          | -15             | 10  |  |
|   |        |   | Total Score   |          | 100         | _2/0            | 20  |  |
|   |        |   | ा ठाताचा क <b>ा कर्या थ</b> े.  |          | 100         | 65              | -11 |  |
|   |        |   |   |          |             | - 9             | 61  |  |

| ivallie   | Recipient Presidio Countr of Respondent Grants management tor's Name Lorenzo   | TxCDBG Contract No                          | 7215409                    |
|-----------|--|---|----------------------------|
|           |  | Date of Rating                              |                            |
| Experie   | nce - Pato the D   | -   |                            |
| either fr | or each factor. Information necessary to assess the Respondent and/or by contacting  | by awarding points unit on these criteria m | ip to the maximum          |
| Experie   | To the second se | past/current clients                        | of the Respondent          |
|           | ractors  |   |                            |
| 1.        | Related Experience / Background with federally funded projects   | Max.Pts.                                    | Score                      |
| 2.        | Related Experience / Background with specific project type (housing rehabilitation, acquisition of property, coordination with regulatory agency, etc.)  |   | _7                         |
| 4.        |  |   | 2                          |
| 5.        | References from current/past clients   | 5   |                            |
|           |  | 10  |                            |
| Work Par  | Subtotal, Experience   | 30  |                            |
| 31117 61  | Factors  | -   | _20_                       |
| 1.        |  | Max.Pts.                                    | 0.                         |
| 2.        | Submits requests to client/TDA in a timely manner  | 5   | Score                      |
| 3.        | Responds to client/TDA requests in a timely manner   | 5   |                            |
| 4.        | Past client/TDA projects completed on schedule   |   |                            |
| 5.        | Work product is consistently of high quality with low level of errors  | 5   | 3                          |
| 0.        | Past client/TDA projects have low level of monitoring findings/concerns  | 5   |                            |
| 6.        | Manages projects within budgetary constraints  |   | 2                          |
|           | Subtotal, Performance  | 5   | 2                          |
| apacity t | o Perform  | 30  | / 3                        |
|           | Factors  |   |                            |
| 1.        | Qualifications of Professional Administrators / Experience of Staff  | Max.Pts.                                    | Score                      |
| 2.        | Present and Projected Workloads  | 5   | 3                          |
| 3.        | Quality of Proposal/Work Plan  | 5   | 4                          |
| 4.        | Demonstrated understanding of scope of the TxCDBG Project  | 5   | 2                          |
|           | Subtate! Committee TXCDBG Project  | 5   | 4                          |
| oposed    | Subtotal, Capacity to Perform  | 20  | 1'3                        |
|           | Factors  |   | ~                          |
|           | A = Lowest Proposal \$ 15,000  | Max.Pts.                                    | Score                      |
|           | B = Bidder's Proposal \$ 15,000  |   | 20                         |
| TAL SC    | A ÷ B X 20 equals Respondent's Scor  | e 20  | <i>O</i> <b>L</b> <i>O</i> |
|           | Factors  |   |                            |
|           | Experience   | Max.Pts.                                    | Score                      |
|           | Work Performance   | 30  | 20                         |
|           | Capacity to Perform  | 30  |                            |
|           | Proposed Cost  | 20  | 1.2                        |
|           |  | 20  | 22                         |
|           | Total Score  | 100   | 20                         |
|           |  |   | 66                         |