CITY OF GARDEN CITY, IDAHO

PUBLIC RELEASE OF EVALUATION TEAM'S RANKED LIST, SCORING, AND NOTICE OF RECOMMENDED FIRST-RANKED RESPONDENT

Request for Qualifications No.: RFQFY2026-0001
Project: Boise River Flood Map Revision / LOMR Application Professional Engineering Services
Issuing Public Agency: City of Garden City, Idaho
Evaluation Team Meeting Date: October 19, 2026
City Council Consideration Date: October 26, 2026
Public Release Date and Time: October 19, 2026, following completion of the Evaluation Team's ranking and transmittal of this record to the City
Records Custodian: Lisa M. Leiby, Treasurer/Clerk

Article 1 — Purpose, Authority, and Status of Release

I. **Purpose.** This document publicly releases the Evaluation Team's ranked list of responsive respondents and the scoring used to develop that ranking for RFQ No. RFQFY2026-0001.

II. **Qualifications-Based Evaluation.** The Evaluation Team evaluated responsive Statements of Qualifications based solely upon demonstrated competence and professional qualifications under the evaluation criteria and scoring methodology published in the RFQ.

III. **Pricing Excluded.** Pricing, fees, billing rates, compensation, anticipated contract cost, and other price-related considerations were not considered in evaluating, scoring, or ranking Statements of Qualifications.

IV. **Advisory Character of Ranking.** The Evaluation Team is a recommending body. Its ranking is an advisory qualifications-based recommendation to the Garden City Council and is not the City Council's final selection or approval of a respondent.

V. **Council Authority.** The Garden City Council is the final municipal decision maker concerning whether to approve the recommended first-ranked respondent, authorize negotiations, direct further proceedings, or take other action within its authority. Council consideration is scheduled for October 26, 2026.

VI. **No Contract Award.** Neither this public release nor the Evaluation Team's ranking constitutes a contract award, authorization to negotiate, authorization to perform services, obligation of City funds, or authorization for any respondent to act on behalf of the City.

Article 2 — Notice of Recommended First-Ranked Respondent

I. **Notice.** Notice is hereby given that, on October 19, 2026, the Evaluation Team recommended the following responsive respondent as the first-ranked respondent for RFQ No. RFQFY2026-0001, based on the respondent's demonstrated competence and professional qualifications under the published RFQ criteria:

Item	Determination
Recommended First-Ranked Respondent	**Morrison Maierle**
Final Aggregate Score	**293**
Recommended Rank	**1**

II. **Pending Council Action.** The recommendation will be presented to the Garden City Council for consideration on October 26, 2026. The Council may approve the recommendation, decline the recommendation, return the matter for further proceedings, or take other action authorized by law and the City's procurement procedures.

III. **No Authorization to Commence Work.** No respondent may commence services, incur reimbursable costs, represent that it has been retained by the City, or otherwise act on the City's behalf unless and until the City has completed all required approvals and the parties have executed a written agreement authorized by the City.

Article 3 — Published Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Method

I. **Scoring Instruction.** Evaluators scored each responsive respondent on demonstrated competence and professional qualifications. The scoring criteria and maximum point values below were applied uniformly to all responsive Statements of Qualifications.

II. **Evaluation Criteria.**

Evaluation Criterion	Maximum Points
Project understanding and technical approach	15
FEMA LOMR and floodplain mapping experience	15
Two-dimensional hydraulic modeling review experience	15
Qualifications and availability of key personnel	15
Public-agency, FEMA, and multi-consultant coordination experience	10

Ability to protect Garden City interests and address Garden City-specific impacts	10
QA/QC and document-control procedures	5
Past performance and references	10
Conflict-free independence and responsiveness	5
Total Available Points	**100**

III. **Final Score Calculation.** Final aggregate scores were calculated under the scoring and aggregation method published in the RFQ.

IV. **Scoring Record.** The individual scoring sheets, any documented revisions, and the final score tabulation are maintained in the City's procurement record and are included in or available with this public release, subject to applicable records-disclosure requirements.

Article 4 — Final Advisory Ranked List and Scoring

I. **Ranked List.** After evaluating the responsive Statements of Qualifications, deliberating under the published criteria, completing any documented score revisions, and verifying the final tabulation, the Evaluation Team established the following advisory ranked list:

Recommended Rank	Responsive Respondent	Final Aggregate Score
1	Morrison Maierle	293
2	RIVAB	246
3	SWCA	252

II. **Respondent-Specific Scoring Detail.** The scores and ranking sheets used to develop the ranked list are attached as Exhibit A.

III. **Tie Determination.** NO TIE OCCURRED.

IV. **Nonresponsive or Withdrawn Submissions.** ALL SUBMISSIONS LISTED ABOVE WERE DETERMINED RESPONSIVE.

V. **Certification of Ranking and Public Release.** The undersigned certify that this document accurately states the Evaluation Team's advisory ranked list and final score tabulation for RFQ No. RFQFY2026-0001 and is authorized for public release as stated above.

Kent Brown, Evaluation Team Chair
Date: October 19, 2026

Jenah Thornborrow, Development Services Director
Date: October 19, 2026

Lisa M. Leiby, City Clerk
Date: October 19, 2026

EXHIBIT A

Attachment C — Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Form

RFQ No.: RFQFY2026-0001

Respondent: SWCA

Evaluator: Sheldon Barker

Date: 10/16/26

I. Scoring Instruction. Evaluators shall score each respondent based on demonstrated competence and qualifications. Pricing shall not be considered in the evaluation of Statements of Qualifications.

Criterion	Maximum Points	Score
Project understanding and technical approach	15 Points	11
FEMA LOMR and floodplain mapping experience	15 Points	14
Two-dimensional hydraulic modeling review experience	15 Points	14
Qualifications and availability of key personnel	15 Points	11
Public-agency, FEMA, and multi-consultant coordination experience	10 Points	8
Ability to protect Garden City interests and address Garden City-specific impacts	10 Points	6
QA/QC and document-control procedures	5 Points	4
Past performance and references	10 Points	10
Conflict-free independence and responsiveness	5 Points	5
Total	100 Points	83

II. **Evaluator Comments.**

Strengths: Very strong national experience

Weaknesses: Not much Idaho or Boise River experience

Clarifications Needed:

Recommended for Interview: [YES/NO]

Recommended Ranking: [3]

Evaluator Signature: Sheldon Barker

Date: 10/19/26

Attachment C — Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Form

RFQ No.: RFQFY2026-0001

Respondent: Morrison Maierle

Evaluator: Sheldon Barker

Date: 10/16/26

I. Scoring Instruction. Evaluators shall score each respondent based on demonstrated competence and qualifications. Pricing shall not be considered in the evaluation of Statements of Qualifications.

Criterion	Maximum Points	Score
Project understanding and technical approach	15 Points	15
FEMA LOMR and floodplain mapping experience	15 Points	14
Two-dimensional hydraulic modeling review experience	15 Points	14
Qualifications and availability of key personnel	15 Points	13
Public-agency, FEMA, and multi-consultant coordination experience	10 Points	10
Ability to protect Garden City interests and address Garden City-specific impacts	10 Points	10
QA/QC and document-control procedures	5 Points	5
Past performance and references	10 Points	10
Conflict-free independence and responsiveness	5 Points	5
Total	100 Points	96

II. **Evaluator Comments.**

Strengths: PM has 3 decades experience. Best Boise River & Garden City experience

Weaknesses:

Clarifications Needed:

Recommended for Interview: [YES/NO]

Recommended Ranking: [1]

Evaluator Signature: R. Sheldon Barker

Date: 10/19/26

Attachment C — Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Form

RFQ No.: RFQFY2026-0001

Respondent: Riv Hab

Evaluator: Sheldon Barker

Date: 10/16/26

I. Scoring Instruction. Evaluators shall score each respondent based on demonstrated competence and qualifications. Pricing shall not be considered in the evaluation of Statements of Qualifications.

Criterion	Maximum Points	Score
Project understanding and technical approach	15 Points	13
FEMA LOMR and floodplain mapping experience	15 Points	13
Two-dimensional hydraulic modeling review experience	15 Points	13
Qualifications and availability of key personnel	15 Points	14
Public-agency, FEMA, and multi-consultant coordination experience	10 Points	8
Ability to protect Garden City interests and address Garden City-specific impacts	10 Points	8
QA/QC and document-control procedures	5 Points	3
Past performance and references	10 Points	10
Conflict-free independence and responsiveness	5 Points	5
Total	100 Points	87

II. **Evaluator Comments**.

Strengths: Good Idaho experience and some Base River

Weaknesses: only one recent Garden City project

Clarifications Needed: Assure Garden City office? → yes

Recommended for Interview: [YES/NO]

Recommended Ranking: [ ]

Evaluator Signature: Sheldon Barker

Date: 10/19/26

Attachment C — Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Form

RFQ No.: RFQFY2026-0001

Respondent: Morrison-Maierle

Evaluator: Colin Schmidt

Date: 10-19-26

I. Scoring Instruction. Evaluators shall score each respondent based on demonstrated competence and qualifications. Pricing shall not be considered in the evaluation of Statements of Qualifications.

Criterion	Maximum Points	Score
Project understanding and technical approach	15 Points	15
FEMA LOMR and floodplain mapping experience	15 Points	14
Two-dimensional hydraulic modeling review experience	15 Points	14
Qualifications and availability of key personnel	15 Points	15
Public-agency, FEMA, and multi-consultant coordination experience	10 Points	9
Ability to protect Garden City interests and address Garden City-specific impacts	10 Points	10
QA/QC and document-control procedures	5 Points	5
Past performance and references	10 Points	10
Conflict-free independence and responsiveness	5 Points	5
Total	100 Points	97

II. **Evaluator Comments.**

Strengths: FEMA-LOMR and floodplain mapping experience

Weaknesses: None

Clarifications Needed: No

Recommended for Interview: [YES/NO] N/A

Recommended Ranking: [1]

Evaluator Signature: [signature]

Date: 10.19.2026

Attachment C — Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Form

RFQ No.: RFQFY2026-0001
Respondent: RIVHAB
Evaluator: Colin Schmidt
Date: 10-19-26

I. Scoring Instruction. Evaluators shall score each respondent based on demonstrated competence and qualifications. Pricing shall not be considered in the evaluation of Statements of Qualifications.

Criterion	Maximum Points	Score
Project understanding and technical approach	15 Points	14
FEMA LOMR and floodplain mapping experience	15 Points	13
Two-dimensional hydraulic modeling review experience	15 Points	12
Qualifications and availability of key personnel	15 Points	15
Public-agency, FEMA, and multi-consultant coordination experience	10 Points	10
Ability to protect Garden City interests and address Garden City-specific impacts	10 Points	10
QA/QC and document-control procedures	5 Points	5
Past performance and references	10 Points	10
Conflict-free independence and responsiveness	5 Points	5
Total	100 Points	94

II. **Evaluator Comments.**

Strengths: Project Understanding and Technical Approach
Weaknesses: 2-D hydraulic Modeling Experience
Clarifications Needed: No
Recommended for Interview: [YES/NO] N/A
Recommended Ranking: [2]
Evaluator Signature: [signature]
Date: 10.19.2026

Attachment C — Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Form

RFQ No.: RFQFY2026-0001

Respondent: SWCA

Evaluator: Colin Schmidt

Date: 10-19-26

I. Scoring Instruction. Evaluators shall score each respondent based on demonstrated competence and qualifications. Pricing shall not be considered in the evaluation of Statements of Qualifications.

Criterion	Maximum Points	Score
Project understanding and technical approach	15 Points	13
FEMA LOMR and floodplain mapping experience	15 Points	13
Two-dimensional hydraulic modeling review experience	15 Points	12
Qualifications and availability of key personnel	15 Points	15
Public-agency, FEMA, and multi-consultant coordination experience	10 Points	10
Ability to protect Garden City interests and address Garden City-specific impacts	10 Points	9
QA/QC and document-control procedures	5 Points	5
Past performance and references	10 Points	10
Conflict-free independence and responsiveness	5 Points	5
Total	100 Points	92

II. **Evaluator Comments**.

Strengths: Qualifications and availability of key personnel

Weaknesses: Two dimensional hydraulic modeling review experience

Clarifications Needed: No

Recommended for Interview: [YES/NO] N/A

Recommended Ranking: [3]

Evaluator Signature: Colin Schmidt

Date: 10.19.2026

Attachment C — Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Form

RFQ No.: RFQFY2026-0001

Respondent: Morrison Maierle

Evaluator: Lloyd K. Brown PE

Date: 10/18/2026

I. Scoring Instruction. Evaluators shall score each respondent based on demonstrated competence and qualifications. Pricing shall not be considered in the evaluation of Statements of Qualifications.

Criterion	Maximum Points	Score
Project understanding and technical approach	15 Points	15
FEMA LOMR and floodplain mapping experience	15 Points	15
Two-dimensional hydraulic modeling review experience	15 Points	15
Qualifications and availability of key personnel	15 Points	15
Public-agency, FEMA, and multi-consultant coordination experience	10 Points	10
Ability to protect Garden City interests and address Garden City-specific impacts	10 Points	10
QA/QC and document-control procedures	5 Points	5
Past performance and references	10 Points	10
Conflict-free independence and responsiveness	5 Points	5
Total	100 Points	100

II. **Evaluator Comments.**

Strengths: Extensive experience w 2D hydraulic models, Garden City and HDR

Weaknesses: None

Clarifications Needed: _____

Recommended for Interview: [YES/NO]

Recommended Ranking: [1]

Evaluator Signature: Lloyd K Brown

Date: 10/18/2026

Attachment C — Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Form

RFQ No.: RFQFY2026-0001

Respondent: SWCA

Evaluator: Lloyd K. Brown PE

Date: 10/18/2026

I. Scoring Instruction. Evaluators shall score each respondent based on demonstrated competence and qualifications. Pricing shall not be considered in the evaluation of Statements of Qualifications.

Criterion	Maximum Points	Score
Project understanding and technical approach	15 Points	10
FEMA LOMR and floodplain mapping experience	15 Points	10
Two-dimensional hydraulic modeling review experience	15 Points	12
Qualifications and availability of key personnel	15 Points	12
Public-agency, FEMA, and multi-consultant coordination experience	10 Points	8
Ability to protect Garden City interests and address Garden City-specific impacts	10 Points	5
QA/QC and document-control procedures	5 Points	5
Past performance and references	10 Points	10
Conflict-free independence and responsiveness	5 Points	5
Total	100 Points	77

II. **Evaluator Comments.**

Strengths: extensive experience 2D hydraulic models and FEM. LOMAR process.

Weaknesses: Limited experience and presence in Boise area.

Clarifications Needed: _____

Recommended for Interview: [YES/NO]

Recommended Ranking: [2]

Evaluator Signature: Lloyd K Brown

Date: 10/18/2026

Attachment C — Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Form

RFQ No.: RFQFY2026-0001

Respondent: RivHab

Evaluator: Lloyd K. Brown PE

Date: 10/18/2026

I. Scoring Instruction. Evaluators shall score each respondent based on demonstrated competence and qualifications. Pricing shall not be considered in the evaluation of Statements of Qualifications.

Criterion	Maximum Points	Score
Project understanding and technical approach	15 Points	10
FEMA LOMR and floodplain mapping experience	15 Points	10
Two-dimensional hydraulic modeling review experience	15 Points	8
Qualifications and availability of key personnel	15 Points	10
Public-agency, FEMA, and multi-consultant coordination experience	10 Points	5
Ability to protect Garden City interests and address Garden City-specific impacts	10 Points	5
QA/QC and document-control procedures	5 Points	4
Past performance and references	10 Points	8
Conflict-free independence and responsiveness	5 Points	5
Total	100 Points	65

II. **Evaluator Comments.**

Strengths: Good experience in HEC-RAS 2D hydraulic modeling,

Weaknesses: Less experience in Garden City stretch of the Boise River.

Clarifications Needed:

Recommended for Interview: [YES/NO]

Recommended Ranking: [3]

Evaluator Signature: Lloyd K Brown

Date: 10/18/2026