EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-22-20 Continuing Contract for Professional Environmental Testing

Proposer AECOM

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	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	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	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	13
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.

AECOM (2)

COMMENTS-1: Huge "team" listing.

COMMENTS-2: Breakdown of Subs list isn't clear/well organized to me.

COMMENTS-3: Don't list litigation.

COMMENTS-4: Submittal is 157 pgs — Financials 181 pgs. Is goal to inform or inundate?

COMMENTS-5:

COMMENTS-6:

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

11/2/20	CHRIS CLEMENTS
Date	Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-22-20 Continuing Contract for Professional Environmental Testing

Proposer E Sciences

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	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	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	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	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		81

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

ESCIENCES (2)

COMMENTS-1: Quote from Army Corps of Engineers seemed profetic to me as submittal seemed concise & easy to read & follow.

COMMENTS-2: Fuiancials easy to follow.

COMMENTS-3: No litigation past 5 years.

COMMENTS-4: Brownfields experience.

COMMENTS-5: Liked that they listed "cost control/measures."

COMMENTS-6: Offers "turbidity monitoring" in waterways. Haven't seen that in other proposals.

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

11/2/20 — Date

CHRIS CLEMENS — Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-22-20 Continuing Contract for Professional Environmental Testing

Proposer GFA 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	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	12
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	12
4	Current and Projected Workload Rating is to reflect the workload (both current and projected) of the firm, staff assigned, and the percentage availability of the staff member assigned. Respondents which fail to note both existing and projected workload conditions and percentage of availability of staff assigned shall receive zero (0) points	0-15	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	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	13
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		72

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

GFA (2)

COMMENTS-1: Current providers to City — listed previous projects.

COMMENTS-2: offers some drilling services — haven't seen that in other proposals.

COMMENTS-3: "Cost control" mentioned throughout proposal.

COMMENTS-4: Multiple litigations in past 5 years — Ex. 5/6 being "failure to properly inspect building construction."

COMMENTS-5:

COMMENTS-6:

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

11/2/20 — Date

CHRIS CLEMENS — Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-22-20 Continuing Contract for Professional Environmental Testing

Proposer GLE Assoc.

Line	Criteria	Point Range	Score
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-15	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	12
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	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	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	14
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	Ø
	TOTAL		75

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

GLE (2)

COMMENTS-1: Offices in all major FL cities — contracts w/110 govt entities.

COMMENTS-2: Many of their environ reviews seem asbestos related.

COMMENTS-3: 1 lawsuit — was settled.

COMMENTS-4: Proposal easy to follow along — straight forward —

COMMENTS-5:

COMMENTS-6:

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

11/2/20	CHRIS CLEMENS
Date	Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-22-20 Continuing Contract for Professional Environmental Testing

Proposer Terracon

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	11
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	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	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	14
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	3
	TOTAL		76

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

Terracon (2)

COMMENTS-1: 125 continuing service contracts w/90 local govts + currently under contract w/CRA.

COMMENTS-2: 126 pg proposal — not exactly sure of flow w/ subcontractors — iffy.

COMMENTS-3: Financials letter from Merrill Lynch — 20+ yrs - satisfactory rating.

COMMENTS-4: Projects performed for CoPB — landfill reference?

COMMENTS-5: References list numerous CoPB projects

COMMENTS-6: Don't provide litigation listing.

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

11/2/20	CHRIS CLEMENS
Date	Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-22-20 Continuing Contract for Professional Environmental Testing

Proposer AECOM

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	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	13
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	13
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-1: FIRM IS ONE OF THE LARGEST COMPANIES IN THE BUSINESS AND HAS SUPERB EXPERIENCE. NO DATA REGARDING LITIGATION (EXPECT MANY CASES).

COMMENTS-2: STAFF ASSIGNED BRINGS OVER 100 YEARS OF COLLECTIVE EXPERIENCE IN THE FIELD. SUB (GLE) IS ALSO AN APPLICANT.

COMMENTS-3: FIRM REPORTS OFFICE IN MIAMI, BUT FIRM IS HEADQUARTERED IN LOS ANGELES. ALSO OFFICE IN PLANTATION.

COMMENTS-4: FIRM PROVIDED A TABLE THAT REFLECTS ± 60% OF STAFF'S AVAILABILITY. AMPLE DETAILS.

COMMENTS-5: FIRM USES SOPHISTICATED TOOLS TO CONTROL BUDGETS. REPORT INDICATES CONSISTENT DELIVERY ON [redacted] TIME AND ON BUDGET

COMMENTS-6: SEE ITEM 5 (ABOVE). FIRM USES APIC TO MANAGE BUDGETS AND TIME.

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

11/2/2020 — Date

Horacio Danovich — Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-22-20 Continuing Contract for Professional Environmental Testing

Proposer E Science

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-1: FIRM HAS PERFORMED MULTIPLE PROJECTS IN POMPANO, ALL WITH UTMOST PROFESSIONALISM. QUALITY, DELIVERY, SCHEDULING & BUDGET? PERFECT

COMMENTS-2:

STAFF ASSIGNED IS DULY QUALIFIED WITH SUPERB CREDENTIALS AND EXPERIENCE

COMMENTS-3: FOR LOCAL PROJECTS, FIRM OPERATES OUT OF FT. LAUDERDALE (NOT ORLANDO).

COMMENTS-4:

ONLY A GENERIC STATEMENT, NO DATA.

COMMENTS-5: ALL PROJECTS ~~THAT~~ THE FIRM PERFORMED FOR CITY/CRA WERE DELIVERED ON TIME, AND IN SOME CASES, UNDER BUDGET.

COMMENTS-6: ABOVE AVERAGE RESULTS. EXCELLENT SERVICES.

SEE COMMENTS ABOVE. CONSCIOUS ABOUT EXPENSES.

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

11/2/2020 — Date

Horace Ivovich — Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-22-20 Continuing Contract for Professional Environmental Testing

Proposer GFA Int'l

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	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	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		73

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

COMMENTS-1: MULTIPLE PROJECTS OF SIMILAR NATURE FOR VARIOUS ENTITIES DEMONSTRATE FIRM'S ABILITY TO PROVIDE REQUESTED SERVICES.

COMMENTS-2: STAFF ASSIGNED HAS THE PROPER CREDENTIALS AND EXPERIENCE.

COMMENTS-3: FIRM DISMATER OUT OF DELRAY BEACH.

COMMENTS-4: ONLY A GENERIC STATEMENT. NO OTHER DATA.

COMMENTS-5: THE FIRM HAS PERFORMED MULTIPLE ASSIGNMENTS AND DELIVERY HAS BEEN CONSISTENTLY ON TIME.

COMMENTS-6: OTHER THAN OWNER REQUESTED CHANGES, PROJECTS HAVE SHOWN NO CHANGE ORDERS LEADING TO BUDGET ~~CHANGE~~ INCREASE

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

11/2/2020 — Date

Thomas Darnell — Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-22-20 Continuing Contract for Professional Environmental Testing

Proposer GLE

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	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	12
6	Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Budget Proposers will be evaluated on their ability to adhere to initial design budgets. Examples provided should show a comparison between initial negotiated task costs and final completion costs. Respondents should explain in detail any budgetary overruns due to scope modifications. Respondents which fail to provide schedule and budget information as requested will receive zero (0) points.	0-15	12
7	Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10	0
	TOTAL		74

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

COMMENTS-1: PLENTY OF EXPERIENCE IN ALL AREAS SERVICING MULTIPLE GOVERNMENT AGENCIES INCLUDING FAA, BC SCHOOL BOARD, ETC.

COMMENTS-2: STAFF ASSIGNED HAS GREAT CREDENTIALS AND COLLECTIVELY BRING MANY YEARS OF EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE.

COMMENTS-3: OFFICE SERVICING PORTLAND IS LOCATED IN FORT LAUDERDALE ALTHOUGH HEADQUARTERS ARE IN TAMPA.

COMMENTS-4: FIRM PROVIDED GENERIC DESCRIPTION OF AVAILABILITY IN TWO SEPARATE AREAS OF SUBMITTAL. USING "INDUSTRY" STANDARDS BUT ACKNOWLEDGING

COMMENTS-5: ACCORDING TO FIRM, INTERNAL PROCEDURES ~~LESS~~ THAN 25% AVAILABILITY. PROCEDURES ARE GEARED TO DELIVER PROJECTS ON TIME OR AHEAD

COMMENTS-6: OF SCHEDULE. HARD TO PRECISE FROM REPORT.

BUDGETS ARE HANDLED USING COST CONTROL MEASURES (PC/TCK) EFFECTIVELY

IMPORTANT NOTE:

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

11/2/2020 — Date

Franco Arnovich — Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-22-20 Continuing Contract for Professional Environmental Testing

Proposer TERRACON

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	3
	TOTAL		93

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

COMMENTS-1: FIRM POSSESSES TREMENDOUS EXPERIENCE IN THE FIELD BEING RANKED VERY HIGH NATIONALLY AND WITH SUPERB RESOURCES. PERFORMED SUPERBLY FOR CITY.

COMMENTS-2: STAFF ASSIGNED BRINGS DECADES OF EXPERIENCE. SUPERB CREDENTIALS AND QUALIFICATIONS.

COMMENTS-3: FIRM IS LOCATED IN FORT LAUDERDALE

COMMENTS-4: CHART CLEARLY DEFINED STAFFER'S AVAILABILITY WITH AVERAGES OF 50%.

COMMENTS-5: FIRM HAS PERFORMED MULTIPLE PROJECTS FOR THE CITY. ALL PROJECTS WERE DELIVERED ON TIME/BUDGET.

COMMENTS-6: FIRM EXCELS AT KEEPING BUDGETS LOW AND AVOIDS CHANGE ORDERS.

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

11/2/2020
Date

Gino Divizio
Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-22-20 Continuing Contract for Professional Environmental Testing Services

Proposer: AECOM (AECOM Technical Services, Inc.)

Line	Criteria	Point Range	Score
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-15	9
2	Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-15	15
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	14
4	Current and Projected Workload Rating is to reflect the workload (both current and projected) of the firm, staff assigned, and the percentage availability of the staff member assigned. Respondents which fail to note both existing and projected workload conditions and percentage of availability of staff assigned shall receive zero (0) points	0-15	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		85

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Did not see any City projects, some litigation

COMMENTS-2: Qualifications and experience of staff has been met.

COMMENTS-3: Fort Lauderdale

COMMENTS-4: Did show workload %

COMMENTS-5: Demonstrated project completion and ability to expedite

COMMENTS-6: Demonstrated project completion within and under budget

Notes: Presentation showed: project durations, costs, budgets, assistance with grant funding, showed a personnel matrix and a comprehensive project approach.

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

11/2/2020	Hector R. Gandia
Date	Printed Name

Hector R. Gandia

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-22-20 Continuing Contract for Professional Environmental Testing Services

Proposer: E Sciences, Incorporated

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	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		76

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Firm has demonstarted prior experience and project complexity

COMMENTS-2: Qualifications and experience of staff has been met.

COMMENTS-3: Fort Lauderdale

COMMENTS-4: Did not show workload % but noted staff availability

COMMENTS-5: Demonstrated project completion and ability to expedite

COMMENTS-6: Demonstrated project completion within and under budget

Notes: Presentation showed: budgets, funding assistance, response to COVID, Permitting w/agencies knowledge, workload, City experience. Is also part of the current CCNA.

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

11/2/2020	Hector R. Gandia
Date	Printed Name

Hector R. Gandia

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-22-20 Continuing Contract for Professional Environmental Testing Services

Proposer: GFA International, Inc.

Line	Criteria	Point Range	Score
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-15	9
2	Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-15	15
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	14
4	Current and Projected Workload Rating is to reflect the workload (both current and projected) of the firm, staff assigned, and the percentage availability of the staff member assigned. Respondents which fail to note both existing and projected workload conditions and percentage of availability of staff assigned shall receive zero (0) points	0-15	0
5	Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Time Respondents will be evaluated on information provided regarding the firm's experience in the successful completion and steadfast conformance to similar project schedules. Provide an example of successful approaches utilized to achieve a timely project completion. Respondents who demonstrate the ability to complete projects on time shall receive more points.	0-15	0
6	Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Budget Proposers will be evaluated on their ability to adhere to initial design budgets. Examples provided should show a comparison between initial negotiated task costs and final completion costs. Respondents should explain in detail any budgetary overruns due to scope modifications. Respondents which fail to provide schedule and budget information as requested will receive zero (0) points.	0-15	0
7	Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10	1
	TOTAL		39

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Did not see any City projects, some litigation

COMMENTS-2: Qualifications and experience of staff has been met.

COMMENTS-3: Delray Beach

COMMENTS-4: Did not show workload % but noted staff availability

COMMENTS-5: Did not demonstrate project completion, but noted dates of services

COMMENTS-6: Did not show project comparison as it relates to cost vs. budget

Notes: Presentation did show a lot of work with City of Pompano with the subs but not as the prime. Presentation showed limited information on completion ability, project budgets, limited agecy work. Did show ability to control change orders and is also part of the current CCNA.

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

11/2/2020	Hector R. Gandia
Date	Printed Name

Hector R. Gandia

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-22-20 Continuing Contract for Professional Environmental Testing Services

Proposer: GLE 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	9
2	Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-15	15
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	14
4	Current and Projected Workload Rating is to reflect the workload (both current and projected) of the firm, staff assigned, and the percentage availability of the staff member assigned. Respondents which fail to note both existing and projected workload conditions and percentage of availability of staff assigned shall receive zero (0) points	0-15	15
5	Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Time Respondents will be evaluated on information provided regarding the firm's experience in the successful completion and steadfast conformance to similar project schedules. Provide an example of successful approaches utilized to achieve a timely project completion. Respondents who demonstrate the ability to complete projects on time shall receive more points.	0-15	0
6	Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Budget Proposers will be evaluated on their ability to adhere to initial design budgets. Examples provided should show a comparison between initial negotiated task costs and final completion costs. Respondents should explain in detail any budgetary overruns due to scope modifications. Respondents which fail to provide schedule and budget information as requested will receive zero (0) points.	0-15	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		68

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Did not see any City projects, some litigation

COMMENTS-2: Qualifications and experience of staff has been met.

COMMENTS-3: Fort Lauderdale

COMMENTS-4: Did show workload %

COMMENTS-5: Did not show project timelines/completion dates

COMMENTS-6: Demonstrated project completion within and under budget

Notes: Good complete presentation showing comprehensive project approach, budgets, experience w/agency projects, staff knowledge. Did not see samples of project timeline completion.

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

11/2/2020	Hector R. Gandia
Date	Printed Name

Hector R. Gandia

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-22-20 Continuing Contract for Professional Environmental Testing Services

Proposer: Terracon Consultants, Inc.

Line	Criteria	Point Range	Score
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-15	12
2	Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-15	15
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	14
4	Current and Projected Workload Rating is to reflect the workload (both current and projected) of the firm, staff assigned, and the percentage availability of the staff member assigned. Respondents which fail to note both existing and projected workload conditions and percentage of availability of staff assigned shall receive zero (0) points	0-15	15
5	Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Time Respondents will be evaluated on information provided regarding the firm's experience in the successful completion and steadfast conformance to similar project schedules. Provide an example of successful approaches utilized to achieve a timely project completion. Respondents who demonstrate the ability to complete projects on time shall receive more points.	0-15	0
6	Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Budget Proposers will be evaluated on their ability to adhere to initial design budgets. Examples provided should show a comparison between initial negotiated task costs and final completion costs. Respondents should explain in detail any budgetary overruns due to scope modifications. Respondents which fail to provide schedule and budget information as requested will receive zero (0) points.	0-15	0
7	Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10	3
	TOTAL		59

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Has some litigation

COMMENTS-2: Qualifications and experience of staff has been met.

COMMENTS-3: Fort Lauderdale

COMMENTS-4: Did show workload %

COMMENTS-5: Did not show project timelines/completion dates

COMMENTS-6: Did not show project comparison as it relates to cost vs. budget

Notes: Presentation showed: staff availability, extensive statement skills, experience, previous member of service contract, good safety record. Did not see extensive information on project timelines, project comparisons.

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

11/2/2020	Hector R. Gandia
Date	Printed Name

Hector R. Gandia