EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-26-20 Continuing Contract for Structural Engineering Services

Proposer: Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

Line	Criteria	Point Range	Score
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-15	12
2	Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-15	15
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	13
4	Current and Projected Workload Rating is to reflect the workload (both current and projected) of the firm, staff assigned, and the percentage availability of the staff member assigned. Respondents which fail to note both existing and projected workload conditions and percentage of availability of staff assigned shall receive zero (0) points	0-15	0
5	Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Time Respondents will be evaluated on information provided regarding the firm's experience in the successful completion and steadfast conformance to similar project schedules. Provide an example of successful approaches utilized to achieve a timely project completion. Respondents who demonstrate the ability to complete projects on time shall receive more points.	0-15	0
6	Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Budget Proposers will be evaluated on their ability to adhere to initial design budgets. Examples provided should show a comparison between initial negotiated task costs and final completion costs. Respondents should explain in detail any budgetary overruns due to scope modifications. Respondents which fail to provide schedule and budget information as requested will receive zero (0) points.	0-15	0
7	Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10	0
	TOTAL		40

*0-5% Tier1/Tier2 Local Business will be calculated on combined scoring totals of each company.

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Had some litigation

COMMENTS-2: Staff is qualified with experience and licensed

COMMENTS-3: West Palm Beach, Fl.

COMMENTS-4: Mentioned current work load but did not demonstrate a percentage

COMMENTS-5: Provided general information and a sample project schedule but did not provide examples of completing projects on time

COMMENTS-6: Mentioned budget control but did not show ability to complete projects on budget

Notes: Presentation was good and had extensive information on project scope, experience, City related work and staff experience.

IMPORTANT NOTE:
I have reviewed the Proposal using the Evaluation Criteria stated in the RLI and outlined above. By Typing my name below, I certify that this information is correct and will serve as my "signature" for purposes of confirming my evaluation below.

11/16/2020	Hector R. Gandia
Date	Printed Name

Hector R. Gandia

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-26-20 Continuing Contract for Structural Engineering Services

Proposer: Lakdas / Yohalem Engineering, Inc.

Line	Criteria	Point Range	Score
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-15	12
2	Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-15	15
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	14
4	Current and Projected Workload Rating is to reflect the workload (both current and projected) of the firm, staff assigned, and the percentage availability of the staff member assigned. Respondents which fail to note both existing and projected workload conditions and percentage of availability of staff assigned shall receive zero (0) points	0-15	15
5	Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Time Respondents will be evaluated on information provided regarding the firm's experience in the successful completion and steadfast conformance to similar project schedules. Provide an example of successful approaches utilized to achieve a timely project completion. Respondents who demonstrate the ability to complete projects on time shall receive more points.	0-15	0
6	Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Budget Proposers will be evaluated on their ability to adhere to initial design budgets. Examples provided should show a comparison between initial negotiated task costs and final completion costs. Respondents should explain in detail any budgetary overruns due to scope modifications. Respondents which fail to provide schedule and budget information as requested will receive zero (0) points.	0-15	0
7	Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10	5
	TOTAL		61

*0-5% Tier1/Tier2 Local Business will be calculated on combined scoring totals of each company.

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Has some litigation

COMMENTS-2: Staff is qualified with experience and licensed

COMMENTS-3: Ft. Lauderdale, Fl.

COMMENTS-4: Showed current work load

COMMENTS-5: Did not show ability to complete projects on time

COMMENTS-6: Mentioned budget control but did not show ability to complete projects on budget

Notes: Presentation lacked information but showed projects with the City and has experience of City process.

IMPORTANT NOTE:
I have reviewed the Proposal using the Evaluation Criteria stated in the RLI and outlined above. By Typing my name below, I certify that this information is correct and will serve as my "signature" for purposes of confirming my evaluation below.

11/16/2020	Hector R. Gandia
Date	Printed Name

Hector R. Gandia

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-26-20 Continuing Contract for Structural Engineering Services

Proposer: MCE-Master Consulting Engineers, Inc.

Line	Criteria	Point Range	Score
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-15	9
2	Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-15	15
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	14
4	Current and Projected Workload Rating is to reflect the workload (both current and projected) of the firm, staff assigned, and the percentage availability of the staff member assigned. Respondents which fail to note both existing and projected workload conditions and percentage of availability of staff assigned shall receive zero (0) points	0-15	0
5	Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Time Respondents will be evaluated on information provided regarding the firm's experience in the successful completion and steadfast conformance to similar project schedules. Provide an example of successful approaches utilized to achieve a timely project completion. Respondents who demonstrate the ability to complete projects on time shall receive more points.	0-15	0
6	Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Budget Proposers will be evaluated on their ability to adhere to initial design budgets. Examples provided should show a comparison between initial negotiated task costs and final completion costs. Respondents should explain in detail any budgetary overruns due to scope modifications. Respondents which fail to provide schedule and budget information as requested will receive zero (0) points.	0-15	0
7	Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10	5
	TOTAL		43

*0-5% Tier1/Tier2 Local Business will be calculated on combined scoring totals of each company.

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Did not see any work with the City of Pompano Beach and has had some litigation

COMMENTS-2: Staff is qualified with experience and licensed

COMMENTS-3: Ft. Lauderdale, Fl.

COMMENTS-4: Did not show current project workload

COMMENTS-5: Did not show ability to complete projects on time

COMMENTS-6: Did not show ability to complete projects on budget

Notes: Presentation lacked information but showed projects that are similar to City projects.

IMPORTANT NOTE:
I have reviewed the Proposal using the Evaluation Criteria stated in the RLI and outlined above. By Typing my name below, I certify that this information is correct and will serve as my "signature" for purposes of confirming my evaluation below.

11/16/2020	Hector R. Gandia
Date	Printed Name

Hector R. Gandia

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-26-20 Continuing Contract for Structural Engineering Services

Proposer: WGI, Inc.

Line	Criteria	Point Range	Score
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-15	12
2	Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-15	15
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	13
4	Current and Projected Workload Rating is to reflect the workload (both current and projected) of the firm, staff assigned, and the percentage availability of the staff member assigned. Respondents which fail to note both existing and projected workload conditions and percentage of availability of staff assigned shall receive zero (0) points	0-15	15
5	Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Time Respondents will be evaluated on information provided regarding the firm's experience in the successful completion and steadfast conformance to similar project schedules. Provide an example of successful approaches utilized to achieve a timely project completion. Respondents who demonstrate the ability to complete projects on time shall receive more points.	0-15	15
6	Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Budget Proposers will be evaluated on their ability to adhere to initial design budgets. Examples provided should show a comparison between initial negotiated task costs and final completion costs. Respondents should explain in detail any budgetary overruns due to scope modifications. Respondents which fail to provide schedule and budget information as requested will receive zero (0) points.	0-15	15
7	Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10	1
	TOTAL		86

*0-5% Tier1/Tier2 Local Business will be calculated on combined scoring totals of each company.

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Has some litigation

COMMENTS-2: Staff is qualified with experience and licensed

COMMENTS-3: West Palm Beach, Fl.

COMMENTS-4: Showed current work load

COMMENTS-5: Showed sample projects with dates and ability to complete on time

COMMENTS-6: Showed sample projects completed within budget

Notes: Presentation was extensive and complete. Showed complexity and varied projects completed. Staff qualified, licensed and knowledgeable. Best presentation.

IMPORTANT NOTE:
I have reviewed the Proposal using the Evaluation Criteria stated in the RLI and outlined above. By Typing my name below, I certify that this information is correct and will serve as my "signature" for purposes of confirming my evaluation below.

11/16/2020	Hector R. Gandia
Date	Printed Name

Hector R. Gandia

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-26-20 Continuing Contract for Structural Engineering Services

Proposer: Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

Line	Criteria	Point Range	Score
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-15	15
2	Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-15	12
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	12
4	Current and Projected Workload Rating is to reflect the workload (both current and projected) of the firm, staff assigned, and the percentage availability of the staff member assigned. Respondents which fail to note both existing and projected workload conditions and percentage of availability of staff assigned shall receive zero (0) points	0-15	7
5	Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Time Respondents will be evaluated on information provided regarding the firm's experience in the successful completion and steadfast conformance to similar project schedules. Provide an example of successful approaches utilized to achieve a timely project completion. Respondents who demonstrate the ability to complete projects on time shall receive more points.	0-15	7
6	Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Budget Proposers will be evaluated on their ability to adhere to initial design budgets. Examples provided should show a comparison between initial negotiated task costs and final completion costs. Respondents should explain in detail any budgetary overruns due to scope modifications. Respondents which fail to provide schedule and budget information as requested will receive zero (0) points.	0-15	7
7	Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10	0
	TOTAL		60

*0-5% Tier1/Tier2 Local Business will be calculated on combined scoring totals of each company.

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Bridge 6th, McNab, Atlantic Ave

COMMENTS-2: SE=3

COMMENTS-3: Orlando/West Palm Beach

COMMENTS-4: "Cast-Aheads" Tool noted, PG:64 Key Sub % availability

COMMENTS-5: Sample schedule Gantt

COMMENTS-6: Noted in approach, some cost data

Notes:

IMPORTANT NOTE:
I have reviewed the Proposal using the Evaluation Criteria stated in the RLI and outlined above. By Typing my name below, I certify that this information is correct and will serve as my "signature" for purposes of confirming my evaluation below.

11/16/2020	Matthew Kudrna
Date	Printed Name

Matthew Kudrna

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-26-20 Continuing Contract for Structural Engineering Services

Proposer: Lakdas / Yohalem Engineering

Line	Criteria	Point Range	Score
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-15	15
2	Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-15	12
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	14
4	Current and Projected Workload Rating is to reflect the workload (both current and projected) of the firm, staff assigned, and the percentage availability of the staff member assigned. Respondents which fail to note both existing and projected workload conditions and percentage of availability of staff assigned shall receive zero (0) points	0-15	10
5	Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Time Respondents will be evaluated on information provided regarding the firm's experience in the successful completion and steadfast conformance to similar project schedules. Provide an example of successful approaches utilized to achieve a timely project completion. Respondents who demonstrate the ability to complete projects on time shall receive more points.	0-15	7
6	Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Budget Proposers will be evaluated on their ability to adhere to initial design budgets. Examples provided should show a comparison between initial negotiated task costs and final completion costs. Respondents should explain in detail any budgetary overruns due to scope modifications. Respondents which fail to provide schedule and budget information as requested will receive zero (0) points.	0-15	5
7	Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10	5
	TOTAL		68

*0-5% Tier1/Tier2 Local Business will be calculated on combined scoring totals of each company.

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Amphitheatre, Library, Bridges

COMMENTS-2: SE=2

COMMENTS-3: Ft. Lauderdale

COMMENTS-4: Staff per project PG:20

COMMENTS-5: Noted, some project cost data

COMMENTS-6: General approach

Notes:

IMPORTANT NOTE:
I have reviewed the Proposal using the Evaluation Criteria stated in the RLI and outlined above. By Typing my name below, I certify that this information is correct and will serve as my "signature" for purposes of confirming my evaluation below.

11/16/2020	Matthew Kudrna
Date	Printed Name

Matthew Kudrna

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-26-20 Continuing Contract for Structural Engineering Services

Proposer: Master Consulting Engineers (MCE)

Line	Criteria	Point Range	Score
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-15	10
2	Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-15	14
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	14
4	Current and Projected Workload Rating is to reflect the workload (both current and projected) of the firm, staff assigned, and the percentage availability of the staff member assigned. Respondents which fail to note both existing and projected workload conditions and percentage of availability of staff assigned shall receive zero (0) points	0-15	12
5	Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Time Respondents will be evaluated on information provided regarding the firm's experience in the successful completion and steadfast conformance to similar project schedules. Provide an example of successful approaches utilized to achieve a timely project completion. Respondents who demonstrate the ability to complete projects on time shall receive more points.	0-15	5
6	Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Budget Proposers will be evaluated on their ability to adhere to initial design budgets. Examples provided should show a comparison between initial negotiated task costs and final completion costs. Respondents should explain in detail any budgetary overruns due to scope modifications. Respondents which fail to provide schedule and budget information as requested will receive zero (0) points.	0-15	7
7	Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10	5
	TOTAL		67

*0-5% Tier1/Tier2 Local Business will be calculated on combined scoring totals of each company.

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: No COPB projects to date.

COMMENTS-2: SE=15 total, 5 FTL

COMMENTS-3: Ft. Lauderdale

COMMENTS-4: PG:38: Staff & Month projections

COMMENTS-5: General approach

COMMENTS-6: Detailed approach

Notes:

IMPORTANT NOTE:
I have reviewed the Proposal using the Evaluation Criteria stated in the RLI and outlined above. By Typing my name below, I certify that this information is correct and will serve as my "signature" for purposes of confirming my evaluation below.

11/16/2020	Matthew Kudrna
Date	Printed Name

Matthew Kudrna

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-26-20 Continuing Contract for Structural Engineering Services

Proposer: WGI, Inc.

Line	Criteria	Point Range	Score
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-15	12
2	Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-15	12
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	12
4	Current and Projected Workload Rating is to reflect the workload (both current and projected) of the firm, staff assigned, and the percentage availability of the staff member assigned. Respondents which fail to note both existing and projected workload conditions and percentage of availability of staff assigned shall receive zero (0) points	0-15	10
5	Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Time Respondents will be evaluated on information provided regarding the firm's experience in the successful completion and steadfast conformance to similar project schedules. Provide an example of successful approaches utilized to achieve a timely project completion. Respondents who demonstrate the ability to complete projects on time shall receive more points.	0-15	7
6	Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Budget Proposers will be evaluated on their ability to adhere to initial design budgets. Examples provided should show a comparison between initial negotiated task costs and final completion costs. Respondents should explain in detail any budgetary overruns due to scope modifications. Respondents which fail to provide schedule and budget information as requested will receive zero (0) points.	0-15	7
7	Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10	1
	TOTAL		61

*0-5% Tier1/Tier2 Local Business will be calculated on combined scoring totals of each company.

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: COPB Pier, SE 6th bridge study

COMMENTS-2: SE=1. COPB

COMMENTS-3: West Palm Beach

COMMENTS-4: PG:60-62 Graph total hours, staff availability

COMMENTS-5: Noted, some project cost data

COMMENTS-6: Noted some dates, no comparison

Notes:

IMPORTANT NOTE:
I have reviewed the Proposal using the Evaluation Criteria stated in the RLI and outlined above. By Typing my name below, I certify that this information is correct and will serve as my "signature" for purposes of confirming my evaluation below.

11/16/2020	Matthew Kudrna
Date	Printed Name

Matthew Kudrna

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-26-20 Continuing Contract for Structural Engineering Services

Proposer Kim-Hern'g Assoc.

Line	Criteria	Point Range	Score
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects >>> b. Complexity of similar projects >>> c. References from past projects performed by the firm >>> d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome) 5 discussed, 10 settled, 4 pend.	0-15	14
2	Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-15	13
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	13
4	Current and Projected Workload Rating is to reflect the workload (both current and projected) of the firm, staff assigned, and the percentage availability of the staff member assigned. Respondents which fail to note both existing and projected workload conditions and percentage of availability of staff assigned shall receive zero (0) points	0-15	8
5	Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Time Respondents will be evaluated on information provided regarding the firm's experience in the successful completion and steadfast conformance to similar project schedules. Provide an example of successful approaches utilized to achieve a timely project completion. Respondents who demonstrate the ability to complete projects on time shall receive more points.	0-15	12
6	Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Budget Proposers will be evaluated on their ability to adhere to initial design budgets. Examples provided should show a comparison between initial negotiated task costs and final completion costs. Respondents should explain in detail any budgetary overruns due to scope modifications. Respondents which fail to provide schedule and budget information as requested will receive zero (0) points.	0-15	12
7	Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10	0
	TOTAL		72

*0-5% Tier1/Tier2 Local Business will be calculated on combined scoring totals of each company.

COMMENTS-1: Litigation Pending
Municipal Experience Since 1970 strong references

COMMENTS-2: Adequate Organization Chart
since 1970, ~~showing references~~

COMMENTS-3:
Ft. Land office

COMMENTS-4:
Adequate workload capacity.

COMMENTS-5:
Generally demonstrates projects are on time & w/ budget

COMMENTS-6:
Generally demonstrates projects are on-time & w/ budget

IMPORTANT NOTE:
I have reviewed the Proposal using the Evaluation Criteria stated in the RLI and outlined above. By Typing my name below, I certify that this information is correct and will serve as my "signature" for purposes of confirming my evaluation below.

11-15-2020 Vincent Wooten

Date Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-26-20 Continuing Contract for Structural Engineering Services

Proposer Lakdas Iyohalem & Assoc.

Line	Criteria	Point Range	Score
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-15	10
2	Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-15	13
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	12
4	Current and Projected Workload Rating is to reflect the workload (both current and projected) of the firm, staff assigned, and the percentage availability of the staff member assigned. Respondents which fail to note both existing and projected workload conditions and percentage of availability of staff assigned shall receive zero (0) points	0-15	10
5	Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Time Respondents will be evaluated on information provided regarding the firm's experience in the successful completion and steadfast conformance to similar project schedules. Provide an example of successful approaches utilized to achieve a timely project completion. Respondents who demonstrate the ability to complete projects on time shall receive more points.	0-15	12
6	Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Budget Proposers will be evaluated on their ability to adhere to initial design budgets. Examples provided should show a comparison between initial negotiated task costs and final completion costs. Respondents should explain in detail any budgetary overruns due to scope modifications. Respondents which fail to provide schedule and budget information as requested will receive zero (0) points.	0-15	12
7	Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10	5
	TOTAL		73

*0-5% Tier1/Tier2 Local Business will be calculated on combined scoring totals of each company.

COMMENTS-1:

23 yrs, strong references, SE qualified staff

COMMENTS-2:

demonstrates adequate overall qualifications & organizational chart

COMMENTS-3:

West Palm Beach office

COMMENTS-4: uses "Cast ahead" system to ensure team available

- no details provided on current workload.

COMMENTS-5:

Gen. demonstrates on-time & w/i budget

COMMENTS-6:

Gen. demonstrates on-time & w/i budget.

IMPORTANT NOTE:

I have reviewed the Proposal using the Evaluation Criteria stated in the RLI and outlined above. By Typing my name below, I certify that this information is correct and will serve as my "signature" for purposes of confirming my evaluation below.

11-15-2020 — Vincent Worden

Date — Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-26-20 Continuing Contract for Structural Engineering Services

Proposer M C E

Line	Criteria	Point Range	Score
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-15	10
2	Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-15	14
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	10
4	Current and Projected Workload Rating is to reflect the workload (both current and projected) of the firm, staff assigned, and the percentage availability of the staff member assigned. Respondents which fail to note both existing and projected workload conditions and percentage of availability of staff assigned shall receive zero (0) points	0-15	10
5	Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Time Respondents will be evaluated on information provided regarding the firm's experience in the successful completion and steadfast conformance to similar project schedules. Provide an example of successful approaches utilized to achieve a timely project completion. Respondents who demonstrate the ability to complete projects on time shall receive more points.	0-15	12
6	Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Budget Proposers will be evaluated on their ability to adhere to initial design budgets. Examples provided should show a comparison between initial negotiated task costs and final completion costs. Respondents should explain in detail any budgetary overruns due to scope modifications. Respondents which fail to provide schedule and budget information as requested will receive zero (0) points.	0-15	12
7	Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10	5
	TOTAL		70

*0-5% Tier1/Tier2 Local Business will be calculated on combined scoring totals of each company.

COMMENTS-1:

Est 1999 one open Lit case w/ Hillsborough

COMMENTS-2:

Demonstrates adequate qualifications incl. SE requirement/org. chart

COMMENTS-3:

Ft. Lauderdale, FL office, Municipal experience

COMMENTS-4:

proposal does not reflect workload or staff capacity to carry out new projects.

COMMENTS-5:

No details provided on past projects completion on time or w/i budget

COMMENTS-6:

No details provided on past projects completion on-time, or w/i budget.

IMPORTANT NOTE:

I have reviewed the Proposal using the Evaluation Criteria stated in the RLI and outlined above. By Typing my name below, I certify that this information is correct and will serve as my "signature" for purposes of confirming my evaluation below.

11-15-2024 Vincent Worsham

Date Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-26-20 Continuing Contract for Structural Engineering Services

Proposer WGI, Inc

Line	Criteria	Point Range	Score
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-15	14
2	Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-15	13
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	13
4	Current and Projected Workload Rating is to reflect the workload (both current and projected) of the firm, staff assigned, and the percentage availability of the staff member assigned. Respondents which fail to note both existing and projected workload conditions and percentage of availability of staff assigned shall receive zero (0) points	0-15	8
5	Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Time Respondents will be evaluated on information provided regarding the firm's experience in the successful completion and steadfast conformance to similar project schedules. Provide an example of successful approaches utilized to achieve a timely project completion. Respondents who demonstrate the ability to complete projects on time shall receive more points.	0-15	12
6	Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Budget Proposers will be evaluated on their ability to adhere to initial design budgets. Examples provided should show a comparison between initial negotiated task costs and final completion costs. Respondents should explain in detail any budgetary overruns due to scope modifications. Respondents which fail to provide schedule and budget information as requested will receive zero (0) points.	0-15	12
7	Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10	1
	TOTAL		73

*0-5% Tier1/Tier2 Local Business will be calculated on combined scoring totals of each company.

COMMENTS-1:
150 continuing service contracts, adaquate range of similar municipal projects

COMMENTS-2:
Adaquate organizational chart & qualifications incl. SE

COMMENTS-3:
West Palm Beach office, Municipal experience & local staff

COMMENTS-4:
staff capacity exceeds current workload.

COMMENTS-5:
Demonstrates past projects completed on time.

COMMENTS-6:
Demonstrates past projects completed w/in budget

IMPORTANT NOTE:
I have reviewed the Proposal using the Evaluation Criteria stated in the RLI and outlined above. By Typing my name below, I certify that this information is correct and will serve as my "signature" for purposes of confirming my evaluation below.

11-15-2010 Vincent Wasta

Date Printed Name