

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-24-20 Continuing Contract for Architectural Services

Proposer: Barranco Gonzalez Architecture

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	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	10
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			56

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Firm has no experinece in the City of Pompano

COMMENTS-2: Staff technically capable of handling projects

COMMENTS-3: Fort Lauderdale

COMMENTS-4: Did not show % availability of staff

COMMENTS-5: Did not show relevant projects with completion dates only sample project

COMMENTS-6: Did not show budgets nor costs

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.

10/28/2020

Hector R. Gandia

Date

Printed Name

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Hector R. Gandia". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'H' and 'G'.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-24-20 Continuing Contract for Architectural Services

Proposer: BEA architects, 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	8
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			48

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Firm has no experinece in the City of Pompano

COMMENTS-2: Staff fully capable, licensed and experienced

COMMENTS-3: Miami

COMMENTS-4: Did not show % availability of staff

COMMENTS-5: Did not show relevant projects with completion dates

COMMENTS-6: Did not show budgets nor costs

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.

10/28/2020

Hector R. Gandia

Date

Printed Name

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Hector R. Gandia". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'H' and 'G'.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-24-20 Continuing Contract for Architectural Services

Proposer: Bermello Ajamil & Partners, 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	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	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	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	2
TOTAL			57

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Firm has experience with City of Pompano

COMMENTS-2: Has large staff fully capable and experineced

COMMENTS-3: Fort Lauderdale

COMMENTS-4: Did not show % availability of staff

COMMENTS-5: Did show relevant projects with completion dates and a sample schedule

COMMENTS-6: Did not show budgets nor costs

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.

10/28/2020

Hector R. Gandia

Date

Printed Name

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Hector R. Gandia". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'H' and 'G'.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-24-20 Continuing Contract for Architectural Services

Proposer: Cartaya and Associates Architects

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	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	10
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	8
TOTAL			62

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Firm has experience with City of Pompano

COMMENTS-2: Qualifications and staffing have sufficient experience

COMMENTS-3: Fort Lauderdale

COMMENTS-4: Did not show % availability of staff

COMMENTS-5: Did not show relevant projects with completion dates only sample project

COMMENTS-6: Did not show budgets nor costs

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.

10/28/2020

Hector R. Gandia

Date

Printed Name

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Hector R. Gandia". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'H' and 'G'.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-24-20 Continuing Contract for Architectural Services

Proposer: CPZ Architects, 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	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	9
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	2
TOTAL			55

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Firm has experience with City of Pompano

COMMENTS-2: Qualifications of subs and staff have sufficient experience

COMMENTS-3: Plantation

COMMENTS-4: Did not show % availability of staff

COMMENTS-5: Showed project completion dates but no timeline or examples

COMMENTS-6: Did not show budgets nor costs

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.

10/28/2020

Hector R. Gandia

Date

Printed Name

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Hector R. Gandia". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'H' and 'G'.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-24-20 Continuing Contract for Architectural Services

Proposer: Design Kollaborative Architects Planners, 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	15
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	15
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	9
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			69

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Firm has experience with City of Pompano

COMMENTS-2: Qualifications of subs and staff have sufficient experience

COMMENTS-3: Pompano Beach

COMMENTS-4: Showed worklaod and availability

COMMENTS-5: Showed project completion dates but no timeline or examples

COMMENTS-6: Did not show budgets nor costs

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.

10/28/2020

Hector R. Gandia

Date

Printed Name

Hector R. Gandia

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-24-20 Continuing Contract for Architectural Services

Proposer: Design2Form, LLC

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	13
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	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	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	8
TOTAL			54

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Firm has limited experience with the City of Pompano

COMMENTS-2: Qualifications of subs and staff have sufficient experience, seems to have limited staff

COMMENTS-3: Hollywood

COMMENTS-4: Did not show % availability of staff

COMMENTS-5: Showed projects with limited information

COMMENTS-6: Did not show budgets nor costs

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.

10/28/2020

Hector R. Gandia

Date

Printed Name

Hector R. Gandia

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-24-20 Continuing Contract for Architectural Services

Proposer: Dorsky Yue International

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	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	0
TOTAL			86

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Firm has no experinece in the City of Pompano

COMMENTS-2: Qualifications of subs and staff have sufficient experinece

COMMENTS-3: Fort Lauderdale

COMMENTS-4: Did show % availability of staff

COMMENTS-5: Showed projects with schedule and budgetary information

COMMENTS-6: Did show projects with budgets and relevant information

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.

10/28/2020

Hector R. Gandia

Date

Printed Name

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Hector R. Gandia". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'H' and 'G'.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-24-20 Continuing Contract for Architectural Services

Proposer: Gallo Herbert Architects

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	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	10
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	1
TOTAL			52

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Firm has no experinece in the City of Pompano

COMMENTS-2: Qualifications of subs and staff have sufficient experience

COMMENTS-3: Deerfield Beach

COMMENTS-4: Did not show % availability of staff

COMMENTS-5: Showed projects with limited information, provided a sample schedule

COMMENTS-6: Did not show budgets nor costs

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.

10/28/2020

Hector R. Gandia

Date

Printed Name

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Hector R. Gandia". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'H' and 'G'.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-24-20 Continuing Contract for Architectural Services

Proposer: Jorge A Gutierrez Architect LLC

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	8
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	6
TOTAL			69

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Firm has no experinece in the City of Pompano

COMMENTS-2: Qualifications of subs and staff have sufficient experience

COMMENTS-3: Miami Lakes

COMMENTS-4: Did show % availability of staff

COMMENTS-5: Did not show relevant projects with completion dates

COMMENTS-6: Did not show budgets nor costs

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.

10/28/2020

Hector R. Gandia

Date

Printed Name

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Hector R. Gandia". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'H' and 'G'.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-24-20 Continuing Contract for Architectural Services

Proposer: M.C. Harry & 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	8
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			48

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Firm has no experinece in the City of Pompano

COMMENTS-2: Qualifications of subs and staff have sufficient experience

COMMENTS-3: Miami

COMMENTS-4: Did not show % availability of staff

COMMENTS-5: Did not show relevant projects with completion dates

COMMENTS-6: Did not show budgets nor costs

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.

10/28/2020

Hector R. Gandia

Date

Printed Name

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Hector R. Gandia". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'H' and 'G'.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-24-20 Continuing Contract for Architectural Services

Proposer: Netta Architects, LLC

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	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	9
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			50

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Firm has no experinece in the City of Pompano

COMMENTS-2: Qalifications of subs and sfaaf have sufficient experience

COMMENTS-3: Boca Raton

COMMENTS-4: Did not show % availability of staff

COMMENTS-5: Showed project completion dates but no timeline or examples

COMMENTS-6: Showed cost of sample projects but no schedule or budgets

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.

10/28/2020

Hector R. Gandia

Date

Printed Name

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Hector R. Gandia". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'H' and 'G'.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-24-20 Continuing Contract for Architectural Services

Proposer: Saltz Michelson Architects

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	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	2
TOTAL			88

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Firm has no experinece in the City of Pompano

COMMENTS-2: Qualifications of subs and staff have sufficient experience

COMMENTS-3: Fort Lauderdale

COMMENTS-4: Did show % availability of staff

COMMENTS-5: Showed projects with schedule and budgetary information

COMMENTS-6: Did show projects with budgets and relevant information

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.

10/28/2020

Hector R. Gandia

Date

Printed Name

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Hector R. Gandia". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'H' and 'G'.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-24-20 Continuing Contract for Architectural Services

Proposer: Song + 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	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	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			52

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Firm has experience with the City of Pompano

COMMENTS-2: Qualifications of subs and staff have sufficient experience

COMMENTS-3: West Palm Beach

COMMENTS-4: Did not show % availability of staff

COMMENTS-5: Showed projects with limited information

COMMENTS-6: Showed cost of sample projects but no schedule or budgets

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.

10/28/2020

Hector R. Gandia

Date

Printed Name

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Hector R. Gandia". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'H' and 'G'.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-24-20 Continuing Contract for Architectural Services

Proposer: SYNALOVSKI ROMANIK SAYE, LLC

Line	Criteria	Point Range	Score
1	<p>Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<p>Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects 	0-15	15
3	<p>Proximity of the nearest office to the project location:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office 	0-15	14
4	<p>Current and Projected Workload</p> <p>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</p>	0-15	15
5	<p>Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Time</p> <p>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.</p>	0-15	15
6	<p>Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Budget</p> <p>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.</p>	0-15	15
7	<p>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.)</p>	0-10	5
TOTAL			94

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Firm has experience with the City of Pompano

COMMENTS-2: Qualifications of subs and staff have sufficient experience

COMMENTS-3: Fort Lauderdale

COMMENTS-4: Did show % availability of staff

COMMENTS-5: Showed projects with schedule and budgetary information

COMMENTS-6: Did show projects with budgets and relevant information

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.

10/28/2020

Hector R. Gandia

Date

Printed Name

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Hector R. Gandia". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'H' and 'G'.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-24-20 Continuing Contract for Architectural Services

Proposer: The Tamara Peacock Company Architects of Florida

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	13
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	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	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			51

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Firm has no experinece in the City of Pompano

COMMENTS-2: Qualifications of firm are sufficient but experience of staff light

COMMENTS-3: Fort Lauderdale

COMMENTS-4: Did not show % availability of staff

COMMENTS-5: Showed projects with limited information

COMMENTS-6: Showed cost of sample projects but no schedule or budgets

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.

10/28/2020

Hector R. Gandia

Date

Printed Name

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Hector R. Gandia". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'H' and 'G'.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-24-20 Continuing Contract for Architectural Services

Proposer: Walters Zackria Associates

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	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	10
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	7
TOTAL			91

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Firm has experience with the City of Pompano

COMMENTS-2: Qualifications of subs and staff have sufficient experience

COMMENTS-3: Fort Lauderdale

COMMENTS-4: Showed worklaod and availability

COMMENTS-5: Showed projects with limited information, provided a sample schedule

COMMENTS-6: Did show projects with budgets and relevant information

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.

10/28/2020

Hector R. Gandia

Date

Printed Name

Hector R. Gandia

EVALUATION CRITERIA

E-24-20

Proposer: Barranco Gonzalez Architecture
(bg design studios, 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	10
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	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	6
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			49

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Private project list, some Bro Co references

COMMENTS-2: general but thorough technical approach

COMMENTS-3: tri county area

COMMENTS-4: no mention

COMMENTS-5: provide general schedule

COMMENTS-6:

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.

10/28/2020

Date

Tammy Good

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

E-24-20

Proposer: BEA architects, 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	15
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	8
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	8
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			58

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Extensive project list (government projects)

COMMENTS-2: general but thorough technical approach

COMMENTS-3: tri county area

COMMENTS-4: no mention

COMMENTS-5: provide general schedule

COMMENTS-6:

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.

10/28/2020

Date

Tammy Good

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

E-24-20

Proposer: Bermello Ajamil & Partners, 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	15
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	15
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	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	2
TOTAL			77

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: extensive knowledge, previously performed for Pompano

COMMENTS-2: excellent technical approach

COMMENTS-3: tri county area

COMMENTS-4: no mention

COMMENTS-5: provide general schedule

COMMENTS-6:

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.

10/28/2020

Date

Tammy Good

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

E-24-20

Proposer: Cartaya and Associates Architects,
P.A.

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	13
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	15
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	9
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	8
TOTAL			74

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: extensive knowledge, previously performed for Pompano

COMMENTS-2: good overall technical approach

COMMENTS-3: tri county area

COMMENTS-4: no mention

COMMENTS-5: good overall schedule

COMMENTS-6:

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.

10/28/2020

Date

Tammy Good

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

E-24-20

Proposer: CPZ Architects, 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	13
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	15
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	13
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	8
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	2
TOTAL			65

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: prior experience working for Pompano, detailed technical approach

COMMENTS-2: general technical approach

COMMENTS-3: tri county area

COMMENTS-4: no mention

COMMENTS-5: provided general schedule

COMMENTS-6:

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.

10/28/2020

Date

Tammy Good

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

E-24-20

Proposer: Design Kollaborative Architects
Planners, 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	14
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	15
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	14
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	8
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			80

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: extensive knowledge, previously performed for Pompano

COMMENTS-2: Detailed technical approach

COMMENTS-3: tri county area

COMMENTS-4: listed

COMMENTS-5: provided general schedule

COMMENTS-6:

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.

10/28/2020

Date

Tammy Good

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

E-24-20

Proposer: Design2Form, LLC

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	11
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	15
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	13
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	8
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	8
TOTAL			68

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: general technical approach

COMMENTS-2: general approach

COMMENTS-3: tri county area

COMMENTS-4: no mention

COMMENTS-5: provided general schedule

COMMENTS-6:

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.

10/28/2020

Date

Tammy Good

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

E-24-20

Proposer: Dorsky Yue International

Line	Criteria	Point Range	Score
1	<p>Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	11
2	<p>Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects 	0-15	13
3	<p>Proximity of the nearest office to the project location:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office 	0-15	15
4	<p>Current and Projected Workload</p> <p>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</p>	0-15	15
5	<p>Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Time</p> <p>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.</p>	0-15	10
6	<p>Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Budget</p> <p>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.</p>	0-15	8
7	<p>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.)</p>	0-10	0
TOTAL			72

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: not as many public projects

COMMENTS-2: good overall approach

COMMENTS-3: tri county area

COMMENTS-4: listed

COMMENTS-5: provided general schedule

COMMENTS-6:

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.

10/28/2020

Date

Tammy Good

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

E-24-20

Proposer: Gallo Herbert Architects

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	15
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	15
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	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			76

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: foothold in Pompano, Several LHP projects (FS)

COMMENTS-2: good local subs listed

COMMENTS-3: tri county area

COMMENTS-4: no mention

COMMENTS-5: provided general schedule

COMMENTS-6:

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.

10/28/2020

Date

Tammy Good

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

E-24-20

Proposer: Jorge A Gutierrez Architect LLC

Line	Criteria	Point Range	Score
1	<p>Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	11
2	<p>Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects 	0-15	10
3	<p>Proximity of the nearest office to the project location:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office 	0-15	15
4	<p>Current and Projected Workload</p> <p>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</p>	0-15	15
5	<p>Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Time</p> <p>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.</p>	0-15	10
6	<p>Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Budget</p> <p>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.</p>	0-15	8
7	<p>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.)</p>	0-10	6
TOTAL			75

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: very generic technical approach

COMMENTS-2: good local sub listed

COMMENTS-3: tri county area

COMMENTS-4: presented workload

COMMENTS-5: provided general schedule

COMMENTS-6:

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.

10/28/2020

Date

Tammy Good

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

E-24-20

Proposer: M.C. Harry & 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	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	15
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	10
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	8
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			56

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: little experience but sub designers were extent of proposal

COMMENTS-2: good local sub listed

COMMENTS-3: tri county area

COMMENTS-4: no mention

COMMENTS-5: provided general schedule

COMMENTS-6:

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.

10/28/2020

Date

Tammy Good

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

E-24-20

Proposer: Netta Architects, LLC

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	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	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	10
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	8
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			51

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: little experience, only a few projects listed

COMMENTS-2: good local sub listed

COMMENTS-3: tri county area

COMMENTS-4: no mention

COMMENTS-5: provided general schedule

COMMENTS-6:

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.

10/28/2020

Date

Tammy Good

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

E-24-20

Proposer: Saltz Michelson Architects (Saltz Michelson Architects, 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	13
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	15
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	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	8
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	2
TOTAL			78

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Good solid proposal

COMMENTS-2: good local sub listed

COMMENTS-3: tri county area

COMMENTS-4: included

COMMENTS-5: included durations of projects

COMMENTS-6:

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.

10/28/2020

Date

Tammy Good

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

E-24-20

Proposer: Song + 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	13
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	15
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	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	10
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: extensive knowledge, previously performed for Pompano

COMMENTS-2: good local sub listed

COMMENTS-3: tri county area

COMMENTS-4: no mention

COMMENTS-5: did provide cost data

COMMENTS-6:

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.

10/28/2020

Date

Tammy Good

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

E-24-20

Proposer: SYNALOVSKI ROMANIK SAYE, LLC

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	15
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	15
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	5
TOTAL			95

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: extensive knowledge, previously performed for Pompano

COMMENTS-2: good local sub listed

COMMENTS-3: tri county area

COMMENTS-4: provided chart of workload

COMMENTS-5: initial and actual cost data

COMMENTS-6:

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.

10/28/2020

Date

Tammy Good

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

E-24-20

Proposer: The Tamara Peacock Company
Architects of Florida

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	15
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	10
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	8
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			62

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: young firm of staff

COMMENTS-2: good local sub listed

COMMENTS-3: tri county area

COMMENTS-4: very small projects, not sure if they were prime

COMMENTS-5: provided general schedule

COMMENTS-6:

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.

10/28/2020

Date

Tammy Good

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

E-24-20

Proposer: Walters Zackria Associates
(Walters Zackria Associates PLLC)

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	15
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	15
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	7
TOTAL			97

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: extensive knowledge, previously performed for Pompano

COMMENTS-2: good local sub listed

COMMENTS-3: tri county area

COMMENTS-4: provided workload

COMMENTS-5: provided general schedule

COMMENTS-6:

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.

10/28/2020

Date

Tammy Good

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-24-20 Continuing Contract for Architectural Services

Proposer: Barranco Gonzalez Architecture

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	5
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	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	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	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			46

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: No COPB projects identified, No pending litigation

COMMENTS-2: 3 key employees listed

COMMENTS-3: Fort Lauderdale

COMMENTS-4: P:84 no % listed

COMMENTS-5: General approach with sample Gantt chart.

COMMENTS-6: Noted, general

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.

10/28/2020

Matthew Kudrna

Date

Printed Name

Matthew Kudrna

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-24-20 Continuing Contract for Architectural Services

Proposer: BEA architects, 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	5
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	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	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	10
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	0
TOTAL			43

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: No COPB projects identified as prime. No pending litigation

COMMENTS-2: 25-30 Employees, 6 key employees listed

COMMENTS-3: Miami

COMMENTS-4: PG:8 Noted, no %

COMMENTS-5: Detailed approach, Covid

COMMENTS-6: Noted in approach, general

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.

10/28/2020

Matthew Kudrna

Date

Printed Name

Matthew Kudrna

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-24-20 Continuing Contract for Architectural Services

Proposer: Bermello Ajamil & Partners, 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	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	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	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	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	2
TOTAL			59

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: COPB, CRA, Library, Senior Center. Litigation closed

COMMENTS-2: 116 Employees, 8 Key employees listed

COMMENTS-3: Miami

COMMENTS-4: PG:16 Noted, no %

COMMENTS-5: Detail in approach, sample Gantt chart.

COMMENTS-6: Noted in approach, no cost data, total cost only.

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.

10/28/2020

Matthew Kudrna

Date

Printed Name

Matthew Kudrna

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-24-20 Continuing Contract for Architectural Services

Proposer: Cartaya and Associates Architects

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	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	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	10
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	8
TOTAL			59

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: WTP? Blanche Ely Park, Anne Gillis Park, Air Park main Facility. No litigation in past 5 years

COMMENTS-2: 4 key members identified

COMMENTS-3: Fort Lauderdale

COMMENTS-4: PG:90 Noted, no %

COMMENTS-5: Detail in approach, sample Gantt chart.

COMMENTS-6: Noted in approach, no cost data, total cost only.

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.

10/28/2020

Matthew Kudrna

Date

Printed Name

Matthew Kudrna

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-24-20 Continuing Contract for Architectural Services

Proposer: CPZ Architects, 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	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	12
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	11
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	10
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	2
TOTAL			52

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Lift Station 21, subs with COPB experience. No pending litigation

COMMENTS-2: 4 key members identified, Staff of 15.

COMMENTS-3: Plantation

COMMENTS-4: PF:41, Some project % complete, no workload data

COMMENTS-5: Detail in approach.

COMMENTS-6: Noted in approach, some cost/budget 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.

10/28/2020

Matthew Kudrna

Date

Printed Name

Matthew Kudrna

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-24-20 Continuing Contract for Architectural Services

Proposer: Design Kollaborative Architects Planners, 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	15
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	10
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	10
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			71

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Fire station 114, life guard towers, purchasing dep alterations, No pending litigation

COMMENTS-2: 5 key staff identified.

COMMENTS-3: Pompano Beach

COMMENTS-4: P:14 Employee and project % included, current & projected.

COMMENTS-5: Approach and project schedule status provided

COMMENTS-6: Contract value and additional services cost provided

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.

10/28/2020

Matthew Kudrna

Date

Printed Name

Matthew Kudrna

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-24-20 Continuing Contract for Architectural Services

Proposer: Design2Form, LLC

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	8
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	11
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	10
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	8
TOTAL			56

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: CRA office buildout. No pending litigation.

COMMENTS-2: 8 key staff identified, 9 total.

COMMENTS-3: Hollywood

COMMENTS-4: No information provided

COMMENTS-5: Detailed approach, sample schedule.

COMMENTS-6: 95% or 97% on budget, some construction cost, 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.

10/28/2020

Matthew Kudrna

Date

Printed Name

Matthew Kudrna

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-24-20 Continuing Contract for Architectural Services

Proposer: Dorsky Yue International

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	7
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	5
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	10
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	10
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			58

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: CRA MLK & Harbor Village façade. No pending litigation

COMMENTS-2: 4 Key staff identified.

COMMENTS-3: Fort Lauderdale

COMMENTS-4: P:8 Actual & Projected by month, no staff detail

COMMENTS-5: Discussed in approach, some examples of tight schedule

COMMENTS-6: Discussed in approach, some examples of budgets and cost per SF.

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.

10/28/2020

Matthew Kudrna

Date

Printed Name

Matthew Kudrna

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-24-20 Continuing Contract for Architectural Services

Proposer: Gallo Herbert Architects

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	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	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			52

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: COPB projects not identified, other city work and private work. No pending litigation

COMMENTS-2: 7 key staff identified

COMMENTS-3: Deerfield Beach

COMMENTS-4: NA

COMMENTS-5: General approach with sample Gantt chart.

COMMENTS-6: Noted in approach, some cost and size SF 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.

10/28/2020

Matthew Kudrna

Date

Printed Name

Matthew Kudrna

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-24-20 Continuing Contract for Architectural Services

Proposer: Jorge A Gutierrez Architect LLC

Line	Criteria	Point Range	Score
1	<p>Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	7
2	<p>Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects 	0-15	13
3	<p>Proximity of the nearest office to the project location:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office 	0-15	10
4	<p>Current and Projected Workload</p> <p>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</p>	0-15	10
5	<p>Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Time</p> <p>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.</p>	0-15	5
6	<p>Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Budget</p> <p>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.</p>	0-15	5
7	<p>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.)</p>	0-10	6
TOTAL			56

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: COPB School project, no detail. State farmers market. No pending litigation

COMMENTS-2: 7 key staff identified

COMMENTS-3: Miami Lakes

COMMENTS-4: P:81 Staff current, no projected, some project data, fee remaining

COMMENTS-5: Noted

COMMENTS-6: Noted, no 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.

10/28/2020

Matthew Kudrna

Date

Printed Name

Matthew Kudrna

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-24-20 Continuing Contract for Architectural Services

Proposer: M.C. Harry & 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	5
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	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	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	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	0
TOTAL			39

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: No prior projects in COPB. No pending litigation

COMMENTS-2: 8 key staff identified.

COMMENTS-3: Miami

COMMENTS-4: NA

COMMENTS-5: General approach with sample schedule.

COMMENTS-6: Noted in approach, some construction cost data, no budget 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.

10/28/2020

Matthew Kudrna

Date

Printed Name

Matthew Kudrna

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-24-20 Continuing Contract for Architectural Services

Proposer: Netta Architects, LLC

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	5
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	
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	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	10
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	0
TOTAL			32

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: COPB projects as prime not identified. No pending litigation

COMMENTS-2: 4 key members identified

COMMENTS-3: Mountainside/Boca

COMMENTS-4: NA

COMMENTS-5: Detailed schedule approach. Bim 360

COMMENTS-6: Noted in approach, some construction cost data, no budget 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.

10/28/2020

Matthew Kudrna

Date

Printed Name

Matthew Kudrna

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-24-20 Continuing Contract for Architectural Services

Proposer: Saltz Michelson Architects

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	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	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	10
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	10
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	2
TOTAL			66

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: COPB Fire station 114. No pending litigation

COMMENTS-2: 6 key staff identified, 29 total

COMMENTS-3: Fort Lauderdale

COMMENTS-4: P:34. Project list and staff %

COMMENTS-5: Contract durations, nice approach, sample schedule.

COMMENTS-6: Cost data provided Initial and Final.

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.

10/28/2020

Matthew Kudrna

Date

Printed Name

Matthew Kudrna

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-24-20 Continuing Contract for Architectural Services

Proposer: Song + 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	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	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	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			51

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: City hall needs analysis, Mitchell Moore Park rest rooms. No litigation.

COMMENTS-2: 8 key staff identified, 45 Total

COMMENTS-3: West Palm Beach

COMMENTS-4: NA

COMMENTS-5: General approach

COMMENTS-6: Noted, no cost or budget 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.

10/28/2020

Matthew Kudrna

Date

Printed Name

Matthew Kudrna

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-24-20 Continuing Contract for Architectural Services

Proposer: SYNALOVSKI ROMANIK SAYE, LLC

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	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	10
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	10
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			74

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Charlotte Burrie, Emma Lou. No pending litigation.

COMMENTS-2: 6 key staff identified.

COMMENTS-3: Fort Lauderdale

COMMENTS-4: P:47 Project and Employee

COMMENTS-5: Discussed in approach with detail

COMMENTS-6: Cost data provided Initial and actual.

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.

10/28/2020

Matthew Kudrna

Date

Printed Name

Matthew Kudrna

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-24-20 Continuing Contract for Architectural Services

Proposer: The Tamara Peacock Company Architects of Florida

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	7
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	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	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	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			50

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Atlantic Blvd Improvements, no detail. No pending litigation

COMMENTS-2: 12 key members identified

COMMENTS-3: Fort Lauderdale

COMMENTS-4: NA

COMMENTS-5: General approach, graphic timeline with durations.

COMMENTS-6: Construction cost only.

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.

10/28/2020

Matthew Kudrna

Date

Printed Name

Matthew Kudrna

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-24-20 Continuing Contract for Architectural Services

Proposer: Walters Zackria Associates

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	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	10
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	7
TOTAL			59

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: P:20 several projects listed, no detail as to services provided, mostly subconsultant. No pending litigation

COMMENTS-2: 6 key members listed, 20 employees in FL.

COMMENTS-3: Fort Lauderdale

COMMENTS-4: P:14/35 Notes & Status listed by project, no percentages.

COMMENTS-5: Approach detailed. Sample Gantt provided

COMMENTS-6: Noted, no cost or budget comparison. Bids within 5% of construction budget P:6

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.

10/28/2020

Date

Matthew Kudrna

Printed Name

Matthew Kudrna