

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer Baxter

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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>15</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	<u>12</u>
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	<u>13</u>
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	<u>13</u>
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	<u>13</u>
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	<u>3</u>
TOTAL			<u>84</u>

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

COMMENTS:

excellent references including 3 city engineers; technical approach very detailed and directly related to the City's

projects; highlights their results from value engineering projects, avg life cycle costs savings equal to 26%

of construction costs and avg rate of return is 59:1; public outreach section was excellent; current work load

and availability-principal in charge 100% of project; chart showing monthly workload and capacity

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.

10/10 /2020

Date



Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer Calvin

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	<u>13</u>
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	<u>14</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	<u>12</u>
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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>13</u>
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	<u>13</u>
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	<u>2</u>
TOTAL			<u>82</u>

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

COMMENTS:

extensive exper and knowledge of Pompano Beach; offices in FTL and WPB; employee workload

percentages provided; ongoing professional services contracts with several municipalities;

370 employees, founded in 1937, serving 60 municipalities; 2 proj is Pompano

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.

10/12/2020

Date



Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer Carollo

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	<u>12</u>
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	<u>14</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	<u>12</u>
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	<u>13</u>
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	<u>14</u>
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	<u>13</u>
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	<u>2</u>
TOTAL			<u>80</u>

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

COMMENTS:

87 years exper; 47 offices nationwide; 7 florida offices including Coral Springs; experience w projects

in Pompano over the last 9 years; Margate, Broward County; Sunrise; Delray Beach; Boynton Beach;

smart data dashboard for master planning, cip, etc.; good tech approach for each type of project, detailed

scheduling and cost control measures; excellent team exper.

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.

10/12/2020

Date

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Z. F. S.', written over a horizontal line.

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer Chen

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	<u>13</u>
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	<u>14</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	<u>12</u>
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	<u>5</u>
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	<u>13</u>
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	<u>13</u>
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	<u>1</u>
TOTAL			<u>71</u>

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

COMMENTS:

five offices in South Florida, founded in 1986; experience with many local municipalities;

a lot of smaller Pompano Beach projects; extensive experience in coastal environments w stormwater

drainage projects: Dania, FTL, Hollywood and Pompano Beach; did not break workload percentages

down by staff assigned; discrepancy in proposal between 42" force main repair and then in narrative


it said 24" force main in the vicinity of Atlantic and intracoastal.

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.

10/12/2020

Date

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Z. F. S.', written over a horizontal line.

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer Connect

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	<u>8</u>
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	<u>12</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	<u>6</u>
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	<u>0 7</u>
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	<u>12</u>
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	<u>12</u>
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	<u>5</u>
TOTAL			<u>55</u>

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

COMMENTS:

Miami firm; SBE, DBE, MBE, FDOT prequalified consultant in Group 3 Highway Design and Group 7

Traffic Operations Design. Felt tech approach was not as detailed and well thought out, extensive as

the others in the higher tier; references were light, pump station rehab project in Pompano, private sector

continuing contracts with developers, FLL water and wastewater master plan. Team had less experience although

highly educated, number of lic staff was less than others; dinged on No. 4 for failurer to provide current and

projected workload percentages.

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.

10/12/2020

Date



Earl F. Bosworth

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer Craig

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	<u>13</u>
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	<u>13</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	<u>13</u>
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	<u>14</u>
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	<u>14</u>
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	<u>14</u>
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	<u>1</u>
TOTAL			<u>82</u>

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

COMMENTS:

Broward office in Deerfield Beach; headquarters in Boca; 40 year civil/utility engineering, locating, surveying

construction mgt. firm..was in Pompano Beach for 25 years. Currently providing the City with continuing prof

engineering services on a wrk auth basis-commits to provide whatever resources are necessary; tech approac

adequate but believe it could have used more specificity w regard to the types enumerated in the letter/solic.

excellent references from multiple munis of similar projects, most within budget and on 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.

10/12/2020

Date

Earl F Bosworth

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer Craven

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	<u>12</u>
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	<u>14</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	<u>12</u>
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	<u>0</u>
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	<u>12</u>
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	<u>12</u>
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	<u>2</u>
TOTAL			<u>64</u>

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

COMMENTS:

Highly qualified firm/ team; failed to provide the current and projected workload for staff

availability; could have had more true reference letters, statement attesting to the firms capability

to complete projects on time and within budget; excellent outreach and engagement focus ; 2 current cases

in litigation.

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.

10/12/20

Date

Earl F. Bosworth

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer Eckler

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	<u>13</u>
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	<u>12</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	<u>12</u>
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	<u>14</u>
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	<u>13</u>
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	<u>13</u>
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	<u>2</u>
TOTAL			<u>79</u>

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

COMMENTS:

located in Coral Springs, core focus public water, wastewater and reclaimed water utility systems

throughout Florida; extensive experience in Coral Springs and Pompano Beach (before 2001); could

not get an idea of ref projects whether completed on time and within budget from refs given, some had

specifics, a lot of repeat work in some locations; smaller team 3 members-principal has 31 yrs exper;

detailed analysis of current and projected workload and staff assignments/percentages

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.

10/12/20

Date

Earl F. Bosworth

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer Engenuity

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	<u>12</u>
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	<u>12</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	<u>13</u>
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	<u>12</u>
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	<u>12</u>
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	<u>12</u>
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	<u>5</u>
TOTAL			<u>78</u>

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

COMMENTS:

42 years in business civil engineering and land surveying; smaller company team 4 FT prof engineers;

located in WPB, but has an office in Deerfield Beach; staff availability less than 30% across the board given

existing workload and conditions; variety of civil projects ; no litigation; no Pompano Beach experience

IMPORTANT NOTE:

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

10/12/2020

Date



Printed Name

Earl F. Bosworth

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer KCI

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	<u>14</u>
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	<u>14</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	<u>14</u>
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	<u>0</u>
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	<u>13</u>
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	<u>13</u>
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	<u>1</u>
TOTAL			<u>69</u>

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

COMMENTS:

well qualified firm , client base of 58 cities, 12 state agencies, inc FDOT, 17 counties and FPL;

strong multi disciplinary team; several members with 30+ years exper and one w 42+ years;

logical flow to tech approach easy to follow, sample scheduling doc detailed, realistic;

10 Pompano projeccts; extensive civil experience with a good variety of projects listed as references

with budget and contract info.; failed to answer No. 4 -did not provide current and projected workload

and staff availability percentages;

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.

10/12/20

Earl F. Bosworth

Date

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer Keith

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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>14</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	<u>15</u>
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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>14</u>
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	<u>14</u>
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	<u>0</u>
TOTAL			<u>87</u>

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

COMMENTS:

Pompano Beach firm since 1998; team of 170 professionals, Kimley-Horn joined team;

hundreds of continuing service contracts; extensive knowledge of and experience in Pompano

Beach,; active community engagement, philanthropic efforts; excellent references; well rounded

firm can provide all the services we need.

IMPORTANT NOTE:

I have reviewed the Proposal using the Evaluation Criteria stated in the RFI 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.

10/12/20

Date

Earl F. Bosworth

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer Kimley Horn

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	<u>14</u>
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	<u>14</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	<u>12</u>
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	<u>0</u>
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	<u>13</u>
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	<u>13</u>
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	<u>4</u>
TOTAL			<u>70</u>

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

COMMENTS:

overall excellent proposal, multi disciplinary firm with extensive local resources ; municipal and cra experience

throughout sofla, references categorized and specific; active litigation but more than 19K projects over the

last five years, acc to proposald the 4 pending cases would not have a material impact on fin stmts/ability

to perform.

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.

10/12/20

Date

Earl F. Bosworth

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer Munson

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	<u>13</u>
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	<u>12</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	<u>13</u>
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	<u>0</u>
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	<u>13</u>
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	<u>13</u>
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	<u>6</u>
TOTAL			<u>70</u>

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

COMMENTS:

Coral Springs, Parkland; did not like the way this proposal was presneted. It included a reference

from Davie that was actually the whole contract for misc. engineering services and landscape

archtiecture services; hard to follow, not enough technical data/info on the projects;

extensive Pompano Beach experience and other municipalities; decent team creds; tech approach

seemed almost nonexistent in the propsoal; failed to provide the current and projected workload of the

firm and the % availability of staff members assigned.

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.

10/12/20

Date

Earl F. Bosworth

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer **RJ BEHAR**

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	<u>12</u>
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	<u>13</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	<u>12</u>
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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>13</u>
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	<u>13</u>
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	<u>6</u>
TOTAL			<u>84</u>

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

COMMENTS:

office in Pembroke Pines, Wellington and Miami; founded in 1999 full service eng firm

13 prof engineers and 32 employees; constantly using value engineering principles to innovate;

exper with Broward County; US Army Corps of Engineers; FDEP; US Coast Guard; SFWMD; FDOT and others

provide more than satisfactory ratings from FDOT and SFWMD; excellent team creds; comprehensive org chart

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.

10/12/2020

Date

Earl F Bosworth

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer Stantec

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	<u>14</u>
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	<u>14</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	<u>13</u>
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	<u>14</u>
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	<u>13</u>
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	<u>13</u>
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	<u>1</u>
TOTAL			<u>82</u>

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

COMMENTS:

Deerfield Beach firm; tech approach strong focus on budget, scheduling and schedule controls;

numerous city projects; :MM Aquatic, Community Park Aquatic Center, Alsdorf; State of Florida and

Broward County; provided extensive ref project list in drainage, utilities, transportation, site planning

and environmental; team all has 20, 30, 40+ years exper, adding Keith, CAS and others as sub consultants;

exc financial presentation.

IMPORTANT NOTE:

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

10/12/20

Earl F. Bosworth

Date

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer Tetra Tech

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	<u>13</u>
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	<u>13</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	<u>12</u>
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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>14</u>
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	<u>14</u>
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	<u>1</u>
TOTAL			<u>82</u>

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

COMMENTS:

Hollywood, Miami, Orlando; provide continuing eng services to over 55 municipalities in FL;

local exper in Pompano Beach , FTL, and Hollywood, worked on several city projects since 2016

-Water Reuse Master Plan Update, and hardening projects at the water treatment plant, raw water

wellfield services; current and projected workload analysis with percentages assigned to staff; tech

approach detailed and comprehensive for all types of work.

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.

10/12/20

Date

Earl F. Bosworth

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer WGI

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	<u>14</u>
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	<u>14</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	<u>12</u>
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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>13</u>
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	<u>14</u>
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	<u>2</u>
TOTAL			<u>84</u>

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

COMMENTS:

_____ offices in FTL and WPB, 233 registered engineers, landscape archtiects, planners, environmental

_____ scientists, surveyors and other professionals; 70 current continuing contracts; extensive civil experience

_____ across FI; excellent team credentials; workload analysis-staff capacity exceeds current committed

_____ hours giving ample % of time to staff;

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.

_____ 10/12/20

Date

_____ Earl F. Bosworth

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer Baker & Goodman

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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>15</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	<u>14</u>
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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>3</u>
TOTAL			<u>92</u>

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

COMMENTS:


VERY NICE MORAL. EXCELLENT QUALIFICATIONS AND
EXPERIENCE IN THE FIELD. VERY THOROUGH APPROACH
TO HANDLING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES. FIRM HAS PLenty OF
GOVERNMENT RELATED WORK AND HAS PRIOR EXPERIENCE
IN COMPANY.

IMPORTANT NOTE:

I have reviewed the Proposal using the Evaluation Criteria stated in the RFI 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.

10/12/2020

Date



Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer Calvin, Gronimo & 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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>15</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	<u>12</u>
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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>2</u>
TOTAL			<u>89</u>

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


COMMENTS:

Company has provided professional services to the City and multiple other government agencies. Team is well equipped and has ample experience with similar type projects. Firm understands how to manage projects and approaches them carefully and responsibly.

IMPORTANT NOTE:

I have reviewed the Proposal using the Evaluation Criteria stated in the RFI 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.

10/12/2020
Date


Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer

CAWCO ENGINEERS

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	<u>12</u>
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	<u>15</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	<u>11</u>
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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>2</u>
TOTAL			<u>85</u>

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


COMMENTS:

A nice package. Good details technical approach indicated team knows how to handle projects. Albeit it focused too much on utilities. Great record reviewing projects on time.

IMPORTANT NOTE:

I have reviewed the Proposal using the Evaluation Criteria stated in the RFI 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.

12/12/2020
Date


Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer CHEN MOORE

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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>13</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	<u>14</u>
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	<u>12</u>
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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>1</u>
TOTAL			<u>85</u>

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

COMMENTS:


THE TEAM HAS HAD AMPLE EXPERIENCE WORKING IN THE CITY AND HAS PROVIDED SIMILAR SERVICES THROUGHOUT THE COUNTRY. DEPENDING ON STAFF ASSIGNED, THEY HAVE DELIVERED AND PROVIDED HIGH-QUALITY SERVICES.

IMPORTANT NOTE:

I have reviewed the Proposal using the Evaluation Criteria stated in the RFI 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.

10/12/2020

Date



Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer CONNECT ENGINEERING

Line	Criteria	Point Range	Score
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-15	<u>11</u>
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	<u>11</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	<u>9</u>
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	<u>12</u> (found errors on p. 17)
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	<u>11</u>
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	<u>7</u>
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	<u>5</u>
TOTAL			<u>66</u>

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


COMMENTS:

UNABLE TO FIND DETAILS REGARDING WORKLOAD.
PACKAGE LACKED DETAILS AND TAGGED COMPARED
TO OTHER PROFESSIONALS.

IMPORTANT NOTE:

I have reviewed the Proposal using the Evaluation Criteria stated in the RFI 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.

10/12/2020
Date


Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer CRAIG A. SMITH

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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>15</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	<u>13</u>
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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>1</u>
TOTAL			<u>89</u>

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

COMMENTS:


basically a Pompano Beach-based firm. That
has ample experience in the industry, particularly
utilities. Staff is very knowledgeable and seasoned
professionals.

IMPORTANT NOTE:

I have reviewed the Proposal using the Evaluation Criteria stated in the RFI 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.

10/12/2020

Date



Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer GRAVEN THOMPSON

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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>15</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	<u>13</u>
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	<u>0</u>
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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>2</u>
TOTAL			<u>75</u>

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


COMMENTS:

FIRM HAS PROVIDED SERVICES TO MULTIPLE GOVERNMENT AGENCIES INCLUDING POLICE AND SEARCH FOR RECOVERIES. STAFF IS WELL REASONED AND KNOWLEDGEABLE IN EVERY ASPECT OF CIVIL ENGINEERING, BUT FIRM DID NOT PROVIDE PROJECTED WORKLOAD AND DIDN'T RECEIVE POINTS IN THAT CATEGORY.

IMPORTANT NOTE:

I have reviewed the Proposal using the Evaluation Criteria stated in the RFI 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.

10/12/20
Date


Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer ECKLER ENGINEERING

Line	Criteria	Point Range	Score
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-15	<u>11</u>
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	<u>13</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	<u>13</u>
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	<u>15</u> <u>Complete</u>
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	<u>13</u>
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	<u>13</u>
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	<u>2</u>
TOTAL			<u>80</u>

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

COMMENTS:


NICE PRESENTATION, GOOD CREDENTIALS. TECHNICAL
APPROACH PROVIDED A GOOD OVERVIEW OF THE
FIRM'S CAPABILITIES AND UNDERSTANDING OF
THEIR POTENTIAL.

IMPORTANT NOTE:

I have reviewed the Proposal using the Evaluation Criteria stated in the RFI 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.

10/12/2020

Date



Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer

ENCENV, 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	<u>11</u>
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	<u>11</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	<u>14</u>
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	<u>14</u>
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	<u>11</u>
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	<u>10</u>
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	<u>5</u>
TOTAL			<u>76</u>

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


COMMENTS:

FIRM HAS AMPLE ROOM IN CURRENT WORKLOAD TO
ACCEPT NEW ASSIGNMENTS, BUT EXPERIENCE AND
CAPABILITIES ARE AT LEAST BELOW OTHER APPLICANTS.
NO DOUBT STAFF CAN DO THE WORK. SIMPLY A
SLIGHTLY OVERMATCHED.

IMPORTANT NOTE:

I have reviewed the Proposal using the Evaluation Criteria stated in the RFI 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.

10/12/20
Date


Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer KCI Technologies

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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>12</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	<u>14</u>
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	<u>0</u>
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	<u>11</u>
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	<u>12</u>
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	<u>1</u>
TOTAL			<u>65</u>

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

COMMENTS:

THE BRION FIRM (KEITH & SCHNERS) PROVIDED SERVICES TO THE CITY AND STATE ASSIGNED HAS EXPERTISE ~~AND~~ WITH GOVERNMENT WORK. COMMUNICATION WOULD BE A STRENGTH. NO WORKLOAD DATA PROVIDED (NO POINTS).

IMPORTANT NOTE:

I have reviewed the Proposal using the Evaluation Criteria stated in the RFI 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.

10/12/20
Date


Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer KEITH

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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>15</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	<u>15</u>
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	<u>13</u>
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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>0</u>

TOTAL

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

88

COMMENTS:

FIRM NEEDS NO INTRODUCTION TO Lombard BEING A LOCAL
OUTLET THAT HAS PROVIDED CONSISTENT SERVICES AND STAFF
IS USUALLY A PHONE CALL AWAY. FIRM HAS GROWN
AND OFFERS VARIOUS SERVICES. THEIR PACKAGE ILLUSTRATED
THE FIRM'S CAPABILITIES. MAY HAVE TOO MUCH
WORK IN THE IMMEDIATE FUTURE, BUT HAS ADDED STAFF
TO HANDLE EXTRA WORKLOAD.

IMPORTANT NOTE:

I have reviewed the Proposal using the Evaluation Criteria stated in the RFI 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.

10/12/20
Date


Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer Kimley-Horn

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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>15</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	<u>10</u>
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	<u>8</u> (PARTIAL PUE TO ASSESS (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	<u>13</u>
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	<u>12</u>
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	<u>4</u>

TOTAL

77

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


COMMENTS:

SUBMIT OUTRIP TOP TO BOTTOM. VERY KNOWLEDGEABLE
AND EXPERIENCED WORKING WITH LOCAL GOVERNMENT
AGENCIES, PORT, COUNTY, ETC. EXCELLENT BACKLOGS
AND CREDENTIALS. NO DETAILS ON WORKLOAD EXCEPT
A STATEMENT ASSURING SERVICES CAN BE PROVIDED
W/OUT IMPACTS.

IMPORTANT NOTE:

I have reviewed the Proposal using the Evaluation Criteria stated in the RFI 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.

10/12/20
Date


Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer MUNSON DESIGN

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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>15</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	<u>15</u>
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	<u>0</u>
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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>6</u>

TOTAL

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

81


COMMENTS:

FIRM HAS PROVIDED EXCELLENT SERVICES TO FORD AND IN THE PAST AT VERY REASONABLE FEES. STAFF IS CAPABLE AND UNDERSTANDS ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES. TECHNICAL APPROACH HAD LITTLE TO NO DATA. SCHEDULE HAD NOTHING. NO WORKLOAD DATA (NO POINTS)

IMPORTANT NOTE:

I have reviewed the Proposal using the Evaluation Criteria stated in the RFI 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.

12/12/20
Date


Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer R J BEGAN

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	<u>12</u>
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	<u>11</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	<u>11</u>
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	<u>13</u>
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	<u>11</u>
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	<u>12</u>
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	<u>6</u>

TOTAL

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

76


COMMENTS:

In General terms, a good company with good
services, particularly utilities. Firm has capabilities.
Well defined technical approach. Good projects
in the past.

IMPORTANT NOTE:

I have reviewed the Proposal using the Evaluation Criteria stated in the RFI 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.

10/12/20
Date


Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer SPANTEC

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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>15</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	<u>13</u>
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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>13</u>
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	<u>13</u>
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	<u>1</u>

TOTAL

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

85

COMMENTS:


EXCELLENT PACKAGE ALL AROUND. FROM HAP EXPERIENCE
DOING WORK IN ROMANIA, AND MANY OTHER AGENCIES.
GOOD TECHNICAL APPROACH. WELL-DEFINED SCHEDULE.
STAFF AND SUBS MAKE FOR A SOLID TEAM.

IMPORTANT NOTE:

I have reviewed the Proposal using the Evaluation Criteria stated in the RFI 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.

10/12/20

Date



Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer TEMA - TECH

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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>15</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	<u>11</u>
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	<u>13</u>
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	<u>14</u>
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	<u>14</u>
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	<u>1</u>
TOTAL			<u>83</u>

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


COMMENTS:

OVERALL, AN EXCELLENT OUTPAT WITH PLENTY OF
EXPERIENCE IN GOVERNMENT WORK. A SOLID PACKAGE
GREAT CREDENTIALS. CURRENT WORKLOAD SHOWS
PLENTY OF ROOM (OL WORKING), WELL STRUCTURED
APPROACH.

IMPORTANT NOTE:

I have reviewed the Proposal using the Evaluation Criteria stated in the RFI 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.

10/12/2020
Date


Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer WGI

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	<u>15</u>
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	<u>15</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	<u>11</u>
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	<u>12</u>
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	<u>13</u>
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	<u>14</u>
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	<u>2</u>
TOTAL			<u>82</u>

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

COMMENTS:

FIRM HAS PERFORMED WELL IN FORMER BEACH. GOOD
TEAM overall. Comprehensive services and capabilities.
well-received approach. plenty of knowledge in
various disciplines. STAFF ASSIGNED HAS EXCELLENT
CAPABILITIES.

IMPORTANT NOTE:

I have reviewed the Proposal using the Evaluation Criteria stated in the RFI 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.

10/12/2020

Date

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

E-20-20

Proposer: Baxter & Woodman, 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	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:

COMMENTS-1: previous projects w/Pompano Beach, knowledgeable with infrastructure

COMMENTS-2: highly qualified firm

COMMENTS-3:

COMMENTS-4:

COMMENTS-5:

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.

10/12/2020

Date

Tammy Good

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

E-20-20

Proposer: Calvin, Giordano & Associates (CGA)

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	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	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			86

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: previous projects w/Pompano Beach, knowledgeable with infrastructure

COMMENTS-2: highly qualified firm

COMMENTS-3:

COMMENTS-4:

COMMENTS-5:

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.

10/12/2020

Date

Tammy Good

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

E-20-20

Proposer: Carollo Engineers Inc.

Line	Criteria	Point Range	Score
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-15	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	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	2
TOTAL			87

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: moreso for utility projects and electrical services design

COMMENTS-2: highly qualified firm

COMMENTS-3: tri-county

COMMENTS-4:

COMMENTS-5:

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.

10/12/2020

Date

Tammy Good

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

E-20-20

Proposer: Chen Moore and Associates (CMA)

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	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	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			89

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: extensive local experience with municipalities

COMMENTS-2: highly qualified firm, well structured

COMMENTS-3: tri-county

COMMENTS-4:

COMMENTS-5:

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.

10/12/2020

Date

Tammy Good

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

E-20-20

Proposer: Connect Engineering, 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	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	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	5
TOTAL			80

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: much less experience with municipal work

COMMENTS-2: references include mostly private projects

COMMENTS-3: tri-county

COMMENTS-4:

COMMENTS-5:

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.

10/12/2020

Date

Tammy Good

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

E-20-20

Proposer: Craig A. Smith & Associates, Inc.

Line	Criteria	Point Range	Score
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-15	15
2	Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-15	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	1
TOTAL			91

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: extensive experience with/Pompano, relationship with staff

COMMENTS-2: highly qualified firm

COMMENTS-3: tri-county

COMMENTS-4:

COMMENTS-5:

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.

10/12/2020

Date

Tammy Good

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

E-20-20

Proposer: Craven Thompson & Associates, Inc. (CTA)

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	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	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			68

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: local municipal experience, basic technical approach

COMMENTS-2: skilled staff

COMMENTS-3: tri-county

COMMENTS-4: missing

COMMENTS-5:

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.

10/12/2020

Date

Tammy Good

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

E-20-20

Proposer: Eckler Engineering, Inc.

Line	Criteria	Point Range	Score
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-15	12
2	Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-15	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	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	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	2
TOTAL			83

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: basic technical approach

COMMENTS-2: moreso skilled in water treatment services

COMMENTS-3: tri-county

COMMENTS-4:

COMMENTS-5:

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.

10/12/2020

Date

Tammy Good

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

E-20-20

Proposer: Engenuity Group, 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	10
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	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	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			73

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: smaller projects, not sure the type of service, size, compelxity this firm can provide

COMMENTS-2: skilled staff

COMMENTS-3: tri-county

COMMENTS-4:

COMMENTS-5:

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.

10/12/2020

Date

Tammy Good

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

E-20-20

Proposer: KCI Technologies, 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	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	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			67

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: good overall technical approach

COMMENTS-2: skilled staff

COMMENTS-3: tri-county

COMMENTS-4: missing

COMMENTS-5:

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.

10/12/2020

Date

Tammy Good

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

E-20-20

Proposer: Keith and Associates, Inc.

Line	Criteria	Point Range	Score
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-15	15
2	Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-15	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	0
TOTAL			90

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: extensive experience with/Pompano, relationship with staff

COMMENTS-2: highly qualified firm

COMMENTS-3: tri-county

COMMENTS-4:

COMMENTS-5:

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.

10/12/2020

Date

Tammy Good

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

E-20-20

Proposer: Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

Line	Criteria	Point Range	Score
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-15	15
2	Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-15	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	4
TOTAL			79

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: extensive experience with/Pompano, relationship with staff

COMMENTS-2: highly qualified firm

COMMENTS-3: tri-county

COMMENTS-4: missing

COMMENTS-5:

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.

10/12/2020

Date

Tammy Good

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

E-20-20

Proposer: Munson Design and Consulting, 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	6
TOTAL			81

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: extensive experience with/Pompano, relationship with staff

COMMENTS-2: highly qualified very small firm

COMMENTS-3: tri-county

COMMENTS-4: missing

COMMENTS-5:

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.

10/12/2020

Date

Tammy Good

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

E-20-20

Proposer: R.J. Behar & Company, 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	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	6
TOTAL			91

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: some issues with design of current project with Pompano

COMMENTS-2: bench depth, excellent overall technical approach

COMMENTS-3: tri-county

COMMENTS-4:

COMMENTS-5:

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.

10/12/2020

Date

Tammy Good

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

E-20-20

Proposer: Stantec Consulting 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	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	1
TOTAL			91

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: extensive varying experience

COMMENTS-2: extensive bench depth

COMMENTS-3: tri-county

COMMENTS-4:

COMMENTS-5:

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.

10/12/2020

Date

Tammy Good

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

E-20-20

Proposer: Tetra Tech

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	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	1
TOTAL			86

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: moreso WTP projects

COMMENTS-2: highly skilled staff

COMMENTS-3: tri-county

COMMENTS-4:

COMMENTS-5:

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.

10/12/2020

Date

Tammy Good

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

E-20-20

Proposer: WGI, Inc.

Line	Criteria	Point Range	Score
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-15	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	2
TOTAL			92

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: extensive experience with/Pompano, relationship with staff

COMMENTS-2: highly skilled staff

COMMENTS-3: tri-county

COMMENTS-4:

COMMENTS-5:

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.

10/12/2020

Date

Tammy Good

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA: RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City

Projects

Proposer: Baxter & Woodman, Inc.

Line		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	10
5	Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Time Respondents will be evaluated on information provided regarding the firm's experience in the successful completion and steadfast conformance to similar project schedules. Provide an example of successful approaches utilized to achieve a timely project completion. Respondents who demonstrate the ability to complete projects on time shall receive more points.	0-15	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	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			85

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Gateway, Kendal, esquire, Wastewater master plan, Reuse expansion. Litigation 3, trip/fall construction injury.

COMMENTS-2: Diverse staff, water/waste, roadway, storm, CEI, GIS, Grants

COMMENTS-3: Fort Lauderdale & West Palm 19 professionals, 400 employees total in 26 offices.

COMMENTS-4: Total "Man-Hours" per month provided, Graph P:24

COMMENTS-5: P:20 detailed approach

COMMENTS-6:

Notes: 0.25

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.

10/12/2020

Date

Matthew Kudrna

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer: Calvin, Giordano & Associates (CGA)

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	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	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	2
TOTAL			68

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Code Compliance, Pier. Litigation 2 dismissed.

COMMENTS-2: Good range general civil, no in house structural (sub)

COMMENTS-3: Ft. Lauderdale 36 professionals identified, 130 total employees

COMMENTS-4: p:10 utilization dashboard report example provided. P:26 Detailed staff work load, existing and projected.

COMMENTS-5: P:12 Detailed approach

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.

10/12/2020

Date

Matthew Kudrna

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer: Carollo Engineers Inc.

Line	Criteria	Point Range	Score
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-15	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	10
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	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	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	2
TOTAL			73

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Electrical Master Plan. Litigation dismissed, 1 open material defect.

COMMENTS-2: Civil, Master Planning, Modeling, Lift Stations+.

COMMENTS-3: Coral Springs 25 professional staff identified. 1.1K employees nation wide.

COMMENTS-4: P:55 Graph by person and subconsultant

COMMENTS-5: p:24 Summarized approach. Explained Deliverables on time by project P:29

COMMENTS-6:

Notes: 0.25

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.

10/12/2020

Date

Matthew Kudrna

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer: Chen Moore and Associates (CMA)

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	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	8
5	Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Time Respondents will be evaluated on information provided regarding the firm's experience in the successful completion and steadfast conformance to similar project schedules. Provide an example of successful approaches utilized to achieve a timely project completion. Respondents who demonstrate the ability to complete projects on time shall receive more points.	0-15	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	1
TOTAL			67

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Avondale, stormwater master plan, lift station, old pompano. Litigation one open Personal injury.

COMMENTS-2: Drainage, pump stations, Utilities, LA, CEI. Sub Stoner. Use of deputy PM

COMMENTS-3: Fort Lauderdale 23 professional staff, 31 total

COMMENTS-4: P:24 Graph, total company hours by month, committed and available.

COMMENTS-5: P:23/26 Explained, general

COMMENTS-6:

Notes: 0.5

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.

10/12/2020

Date

Matthew Kudrna

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer: Connect Engineering, 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	5
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	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	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			42

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: No COPB Projects listed

COMMENTS-2: P:17 General Civil

COMMENTS-3: Miami 7 Employees

COMMENTS-4: Noted in org chart P:17, employee % availability

COMMENTS-5: Noted in general approach.

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.

10/12/2020

Date

Matthew Kudrna

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer: Craig A. Smith & 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	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	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	12
7	Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10	1
TOTAL			76

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Non Sewer area C, US1 & NE 15th. Litigation 2 Personal injury settled, one utility locate pending. 40Yrs in business.

COMMENTS-2: Storm/Waste/Subsurface/survey/SUE/Construction Mgmt.

COMMENTS-3: Boca Raton 40 employees.

COMMENTS-4: Section 11 P:178 Workload by project and by employee presented

COMMENTS-5: P:11 Explained in approach, Gantt for active projects.

COMMENTS-6:

Notes: 0.5

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.

10/12/2020

Date

Matthew Kudrna

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer: Craven Thompson & Associates, Inc. (CTA)

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	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	6
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	2
TOTAL			48

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Study area 2015, sewer improvements, N. Riverside Dr. 2013

COMMENTS-2: Civil and CEI

COMMENTS-3: Fort Lauderdale 9 identified, 57 total employees.

COMMENTS-4: The workload was not addressed.

COMMENTS-5: Noted in general approach. Sample schedule provided.

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.

10/12/2020

Date

Matthew Kudrna

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer: Eckler Engineering, Inc.

Line	Criteria	Point Range	Score
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-15	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	7
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	12
4	Current and Projected Workload Rating is to reflect the workload (both current and projected) of the firm, staff assigned, and the percentage availability of the staff member assigned. Respondents which fail to note both existing and projected workload conditions and percentage of availability of staff assigned shall receive zero (0) points	0-15	10
5	Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Time Respondents will be evaluated on information provided regarding the firm's experience in the successful completion and steadfast conformance to similar project schedules. Provide an example of successful approaches utilized to achieve a timely project completion. Respondents who demonstrate the ability to complete projects on time shall receive more points.	0-15	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	2
TOTAL			49

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Reuse MP update COPB, WTP over 5 years

COMMENTS-2: Engineering, CEI, remaining subs

COMMENTS-3: Coral Springs 12 Employees, P:37 key employees 6, remain mainly subs (7)

COMMENTS-4: P:76 Detailed project spreadsheet with project % complete and number of staff assigned. No staff workload detail

COMMENTS-5: P:10 General approach, sample schedule 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.

10/12/2020

Date

Matthew Kudrna

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer: Engenuity Group, 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	5
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-15	12
4	Current and Projected Workload Rating is to reflect the workload (both current and projected) of the firm, staff assigned, and the percentage availability of the staff member assigned. Respondents which fail to note both existing and projected workload conditions and percentage of availability of staff assigned shall receive zero (0) points	0-15	10
5	Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Time Respondents will be evaluated on information provided regarding the firm's experience in the successful completion and steadfast conformance to similar project schedules. Provide an example of successful approaches utilized to achieve a timely project completion. Respondents who demonstrate the ability to complete projects on time shall receive more points.	0-15	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			47

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: No COPB Projects

COMMENTS-2: P:22 General civil

COMMENTS-3: West Palm Beach 30 Employees, 5 key Civil staff identified.

COMMENTS-4: P:13 workload Chart by employee.

COMMENTS-5: P:11,15 Noted in approach, Gantt chart example provided.

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.

10/12/2020

Date

Matthew Kudrna

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer: KCI Technologies, 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	5
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	1
TOTAL			35

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Atlantic Blvd Keith & Schnars

COMMENTS-2: Civil, Structural, landscape.

COMMENTS-3: Fort Lauderdale, 13 key staff identified. 1600 total employees MD.

COMMENTS-4: Noted, no employee or project detail provided

COMMENTS-5: Noted P:9 in general approach, sample flow chart provided.

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.

10/12/2020

Date

Matthew Kudrna

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer: Keith and Associates, Inc.

Line	Criteria	Point Range	Score
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-15	12
2	Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-15	10
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	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	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			70

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Extensive Project list including Survey. One case settled.

COMMENTS-2: Civil & Traffic, Survey, LA, +

COMMENTS-3: Pompano Beach, key staff identified 14, total 145 employees.

COMMENTS-4: P:21 staff and subs, current and projected availability. No % of project workload.

COMMENTS-5: P:16 Detailed approach, example Gantt

COMMENTS-6:

Notes: 0.5

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.

10/12/2020

Date

Matthew Kudrna

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer: Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

Line	Criteria	Point Range	Score
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-15	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	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	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	4
TOTAL			69

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Atlantic Blvd Bridge, CRA, Bridges, Airpark. Litigation 4 pending, considered without merit.

COMMENTS-2: Extensive staff, structural sub Lakdas. Complete Streets.

COMMENTS-3: Plantation and Orlando 3.5K Total Emp.

COMMENTS-4: P:12 Explained, no detailed percentages provided for staff or projects

COMMENTS-5: P:12 Explained approach, sample Gantt.

COMMENTS-6:

Notes: 0.5

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.

10/12/2020

Date

Matthew Kudrna

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer: Munson Design and Consulting, 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	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	6
TOTAL			64

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Culvert at golf, Emma lou center, Mitchell more drainage, golf shelter, golf ADA

COMMENTS-2: P:46 Eng. & Survey

COMMENTS-3: Coral Springs key staff 4, total 8 Emp.

COMMENTS-4: The workload was not addressed.

COMMENTS-5: P:48/10 General approach, Covid noted.

COMMENTS-6:

Notes: 0

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.

10/12/2020

Date

Matthew Kudrna

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer: R.J. Behar & Company, 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	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	7
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	14
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	6
TOTAL			58

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Lyons Park. Litigation one material use, pending.

COMMENTS-2: General civil,CEI, Survey

COMMENTS-3: Pembroke Pines professional staff 9, total in South FL 32.

COMMENTS-4: P:17 Graph analysis total employee hours, P:44 Workload by staff and project.

COMMENTS-5: Noted in general approach. Sample Gantt charts provided from existing 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.

10/12/2020

Date

Matthew Kudrna

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer: Stantec Consulting 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	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	10
5	Demonstrated Prior Ability to Complete Project on Time Respondents will be evaluated on information provided regarding the firm's experience in the successful completion and steadfast conformance to similar project schedules. Provide an example of successful approaches utilized to achieve a timely project completion. Respondents who demonstrate the ability to complete projects on time shall receive more points.	0-15	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	1
TOTAL			66

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: P:35 Spelling, Alsdorf parking lot 2016, Aquatic center, Community park. Water Master Plan 2020?

COMMENTS-2: General Civil/costal Marine, Traffic, Streetscape, w/ww lift stations, CEI.

COMMENTS-3: Deerfield Beach 22 key staff identified, South FL 166, Total 17K

COMMENTS-4: P:21 by employee & Role % available, current projects listed with notes on workload.

COMMENTS-5: P:22 Approach schedule controls, schedule expediting methods discussed. Sample Gantt chart provided.

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.

10/12/2020

Date

Matthew Kudrna

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer: Tetra Tech

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	9
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	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	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	1
TOTAL			64

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Reuse OASIS plant Masterplan 2019-2020 Avondale, stormwater master plan, lift station, old pompano. Litigation two contract related open.

COMMENTS-2: Gravity force, lift pump, storm drainage, water reuse, Hydraulic modeling, emergency repair. Sub Keith SUE.

COMMENTS-3: Orlando-South FL 52 employees. 20K Total emp worldwide.

COMMENTS-4: P:7-8, 13. Chart company total hours & SS by employee/role % availability.

COMMENTS-5: P:22,24 General approach, project Data contains some on time comments with regards to schedule.

COMMENTS-6:

Notes: 0.5

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.

10/12/2020

Date

Matthew Kudrna

Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI E-20-20 Continuing Contract for Civil Engineering Services for Various City Projects

Proposer: WGI, Inc.

Line	Criteria	Point Range	Score
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-15	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	8
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	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	2
TOTAL			58

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

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS-1: Fishing Pier

COMMENTS-2: Full Civil Multiple locations, Bathymetric data collection

COMMENTS-3: Fort Lauderdale 19 Professionals, West Palm Beach 214 Emp

COMMENTS-4: P:91-95 Chart with company total hours & SS by employee/role showing % availability.

COMMENTS-5: P:19 Detailed approach.

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.

10/12/2020

Date

Matthew Kudrna

Printed Name