EVALUATION CRITERIA

RFP E-34-17

FINANCIAL ADVISORY SERVICES

VENDOR NAME: First Southwest A Division of Hilltop Securities

	Criteria	Point Range	Score
1	**Experience and Expertise of firm** Knowledge and experience in structuring and analyzing complex debt issues, experience in providing services to municipal issuers.	0-20	18
2	**Qualifications of Individuals assigned to the City** Including their experience and understanding of the needs of the City.	0-30	27
3	**Resources and Methodology** General financing approach, strategies for bond issuance.	0-20	18
4	**References** Client references for which similar services have been performed.	0-10	~~10~~ 8 ED 9/29/2017
5	**Cost** The firm providing the lowest price to the City will receive the maximum of 20 points Points will be awarded to other proposers in the following manner: 20 – [20 points X (total cost – lowest total cost) / lowest total cost] Note: If the result is a negative number, the score assigned will be 0 Example: Proposal 1: $100,000 Proposal, 2: $130,000 Proposal 1 being the lowest, would achieve a score of 20 points Proposal 2 would achieve a score of 14 points, calculated as follows: 20 – [20 X ($130,000 – $100,000) / $100,000] = 14 points Including the overall project-task budget and any itemized cost breakdowns.	0-20	20
	Total	**0-100**	~~93~~ 9/29/2017 9 ED

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

Not as detailed Proposal in certain areas, Provide underwriting services. Not very knowledable of Electricity chapter. Very good references.

Signature of Evaluator | 8/30/2017 (Date) | Enjeta Dhamoti (Printed Name)

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RFP E-34-17

FINANCIAL ADVISORY SERVICES

VENDOR NAME: PFM Financial Advisors LLC

	Criteria	Point Range	Score
1	**Experience and Expertise of firm** Knowledge and experience in structuring and analyzing complex debt issues, experience in providing services to municipal issuers.	0-20	20
2	**Qualifications of Individuals assigned to the City** Including their experience and understanding of the needs of the City.	0-30	30
3	**Resources and Methodology** General financing approach, strategies for bond issuance.	0-20	20
4	**References** Client references for which similar services have been performed.	0-10	10
5	**Cost** The firm providing the lowest price to the City will receive the maximum of 20 points Points will be awarded to other proposers in the following manner: 20 – [20 points X (total cost – lowest total cost) / lowest total cost] Note: If the result is a negative number, the score assigned will be 0 Example: Proposal 1: $100,000 Proposal, 2: $130,000 Proposal 1 being the lowest, would achieve a score of 20 points Proposal 2 would achieve a score of 14 points, calculated as follows: 20 – [20 X ($130,000 – $100,000) / $100,000] = 14 points Including the overall project-task budget and any itemized cost breakdowns.	0-20	10
	Total	**0-100**	90

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

Very experienced with debt issues and understood the need of the city. Detailed proposal. Very good references Previous experience with the City and understand the city charter

Signature of Evaluator | 8/30/2017 (Date) | Enjeta Digmarti (Printed Name)

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RFP E-34-17

FINANCIAL ADVISORY SERVICES

VENDOR NAME: First Southwest

	Criteria	Point Range	Score
1	**Experience and Expertise of firm** Knowledge and experience in structuring and analyzing complex debt issues, experience in providing services to municipal issuers.	0-20	15
2	**Qualifications of Individuals assigned to the City** Including their experience and understanding of the needs of the City.	0-30	27
3	**Resources and Methodology** General financing approach, strategies for bond issuance.	0-20	20
4	**References** Client references for which similar services have been performed.	0-10	8
5	**Cost** The firm providing the lowest price to the City will receive the maximum of 20 points Points will be awarded to other proposers in the following manner: 20 – [20 points X (total cost – lowest total cost) / lowest total cost] Note: If the result is a negative number, the score assigned will be 0 Example: Proposal 1: $100,000 Proposal, 2: $130,000 Proposal 1 being the lowest, would achieve a score of 20 points Proposal 2 would achieve a score of 14 points, calculated as follows: 20 – [20 X ($130,000 – $100,000) / $100,000] = 14 points Including the overall project-task budget and any itemized cost breakdowns.	0-20	20
	Total	**0-100**	90

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

First Southwest has an impressive list of clients. Although they don't have as much debt issues as PFM their volume of finacial advisory involvement in debt issues is impressive. Their price is significantly lower than PFM but their experience is pretty close to what PFM has to offer

A. Jean-Pierre 8/30/17 Andrew Jean-Pierre

Signature of Evaluator Date Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RFP E-34-17

FINANCIAL ADVISORY SERVICES

VENDOR NAME: PFM Financial Advisors

	Criteria	Point Range	Score
1	**Experience and Expertise of firm** Knowledge and experience in structuring and analyzing complex debt issues, experience in providing services to municipal issuers.	0-20	20
2	**Qualifications of Individuals assigned to the City** Including their experience and understanding of the needs of the City.	0-30	30
3	**Resources and Methodology** General financing approach, strategies for bond issuance.	0-20	20
4	**References** Client references for which similar services have been performed.	0-10	~~8~~ 10 AS 9/29/17
5	**Cost** The firm providing the lowest price to the City will receive the maximum of 20 points Points will be awarded to other proposers in the following manner: 20 – [20 points X (total cost – lowest total cost) / lowest total cost] Note: If the result is a negative number, the score assigned will be 0 Example: Proposal 1: $100,000 Proposal, 2: $130,000 Proposal 1 being the lowest, would achieve a score of 20 points Proposal 2 would achieve a score of 14 points, calculated as follows: 20 – [20 X ($130,000 – $100,000) / $100,000] = 14 points Including the overall project-task budget and any itemized cost breakdowns.	0-20	10
	Total	**0-100**	~~88~~ 90

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

PFM has issued significantly more debt issues in Florida. They are familiar with the city's charter. They have experience with every type of debt issue including P3's. Their price is higher than what First Southwest is proposing.

A. Jean-pierre	8/30/17	Andrew Jean-pierre
Signature of Evaluator	Date	Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RFP E-34-17

FINANCIAL ADVISORY SERVICES

VENDOR NAME: First Southwest (HilTop Securities)

	Criteria	Point Range	Score
1	**Experience and Expertise of firm** Knowledge and experience in structuring and analyzing complex debt issues, experience in providing services to municipal issuers.	0-20	17
2	**Qualifications of Individuals assigned to the City** Including their experience and understanding of the needs of the City.	0-30	25
3	**Resources and Methodology** General financing approach, strategies for bond issuance.	0-20	17
4	**References** Client references for which similar services have been performed.	0-10	~~10~~ 8 SS 9/29/17
5	**Cost** The firm providing the lowest price to the City will receive the maximum of 20 points Points will be awarded to other proposers in the following manner: 20 – [20 points X (total cost – lowest total cost) / lowest total cost] Note: If the result is a negative number, the score assigned will be 0 Example: Proposal 1: $100,000 Proposal, 2: $130,000 Proposal 1 being the lowest, would achieve a score of 20 points Proposal 2 would achieve a score of 14 points, calculated as follows: 20 – [20 X ($130,000 – $100,000) / $100,000] = 14 points Including the overall project-task budget and any itemized cost breakdowns.	0-20	20
	Total	**0-100**	~~89~~ 87 SS 9/29/17

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

Appears to be an experienced firm, 3rd ranked in terms of PAR value of issue - Smaller clients. As far as understanding the needs of the City, was a little light on their response after reviewing the City's charter. Approach & Methodology not as detailed as PFM. The firm does also provide underwriting services in addition to financial Advisory services which could propose a perceived conflict, but firm represented they would not be involved in any City debt issue in an underwriting capacity. Although not providing brokerage services for the City, the firm provides these services in that capacity on many regulatory disciplinary action/fines in that capacity on

S. Sibble 8/30/17 Suzette Sibble

Signature of Evaluator Date Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RFP E-34-17

FINANCIAL ADVISORY SERVICES

VENDOR NAME: PFM Financial Advisors, LLC

	Criteria	Point Range	Score
1	**Experience and Expertise of firm** Knowledge and experience in structuring and analyzing complex debt issues, experience in providing services to municipal issuers.	0-20	20
2	**Qualifications of Individuals assigned to the City** Including their experience and understanding of the needs of the City.	0-30	30
3	**Resources and Methodology** General financing approach, strategies for bond issuance.	0-20	20
4	**References** Client references for which similar services have been performed.	0-10	10
5	**Cost** The firm providing the lowest price to the City will receive the maximum of 20 points Points will be awarded to other proposers in the following manner: 20 – [20 points X (total cost – lowest total cost) / lowest total cost] Note: If the result is a negative number, the score assigned will be 0 Example: Proposal 1: $100,000 Proposal, 2: $130,000 Proposal 1 being the lowest, would achieve a score of 20 points Proposal 2 would achieve a score of 14 points, calculated as follows: 20 – [20 X ($130,000 – $100,000) / $100,000] = 14 points Including the overall project-task budget and any itemized cost breakdowns.	0-20	10
	Total	**0-100**	90

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

Excellent firm. Has worked with Pompano for 7 years and as such is intimately familiar with our charter restrictions. Top ranked firm in terms of par value issued nationally and in FL. A volume of experience in GO Bonds, COPS, P3's, Revenue Bonds, Bank Loans, Financial Planning etc. NO disciplinary action/fines. No underwriting arm.

S. Sibble 8/30/17 Suzette Sibble

Signature of Evaluator Date Printed Name