

Summary of All Scores

CCNA # PSEN-18-02-04

“Design & Post Services – Pines Village Water Main Improvements Phase II”

Evaluation Committee Score Sheet

Tuesday, May 28, 2019

	Evaluator/Vendor	John England	George Wrrves	Giraldo Hernandez	Total	Rank
H	CPH, Inc.	1	1	4	6	1
A	Calvin, Giordano & Associates, Inc.	6	4	1	11	3
F	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	7	2	2	11	2
B	A.D.A. Engineering, Inc.	2	5	6	13	4
C	CES Consultants, Inc.	3	7	3	13	5
D	Premiere Design Solutions, Inc.	4	6	5	15	6
E	Craven Thompson & Associates, Inc.	5	3	7	15	7
G	Chen Moore and Associates, Inc.	8	8	8	24	8
I	Florida Technical Consultants, LLC	9	9	9	27	9

Certifier of Score

Katherine Borgstrom

Please Print Name

Katherine Borgstrom

Signature

5/28/2019

Date

CCNA # PSEN-18-02-04
"Design & Post Services – Pines Village Water Main Improvements Phase II "

Evaluator Score Sheet
 May 28, 2019

Instructions:

Each Evaluator is provided with the following information to assist with evaluating the proposals

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) Evaluation Instructions | 5) Vendor's Responses |
| 2) This Evaluation Scoring Sheet | 6) RFQ # PSEN-18-02 - Professional Service Providers |
| 3) Bid Tab for PSEN-18-02-04 | 7) Bid Tab for RFQ # PSEN-18-02 |
| 4) CCNA # PSEN-18-04 - Design & Post Services – Pines Village Water Main Improvements Phase II | 8) Firms statements of qualifications and response to RFQ # PSEN-18-02 |

After your evaluation of the information provided, you will score each of the weighted categories that have a "Category Multiplier" on the evaluator score sheet based on how you feel the material rates according to the following quality levels in the table below:

Quality	Level	Description
Excellent	5	Meets all requirements; reflects significant enhancements or strengths as compared to minimum levels of acceptability, no offsetting weaknesses.
Very Good	4	Meets all requirements; reflects some enhancements or strengths, few if any offsetting weaknesses.
Good	3	Meets minimum requirements, strengths and weaknesses, if any, tend to offset one another equally.
Fair	2	Contains significant weaknesses only partially offset by less pronounced strengths, may meet minimum requirements but doubt exists.
Poor	1	Serious doubt exists about ability to meet needs but may be sufficient; significant weaknesses without offsetting strengths.
Deficient	0	Will not meet minimum requirements.

The respective "Quality Level" will then be multiplied by the respective "Category Multiplier" to get the Total Score for the respective category. For example, if a category has an pre-assigned "Category Multiplier" of 6 and the evaluator assigns a "Quality" of "Good" which would result in the "Quality Level" of 3 being multiplied by the "Category Multiplier" of 6 to get a Total Score of 18 for the respective category. See sample below.

When scoring on a computer, you can click on the pink cells to choose a "Quality" from the dropdown list which will automatically calculate the corresponding score for that Category.

For categories such as "Whether a firm is a certified minority business enterprise", the firm will be given all 5 points if they are a certified minority business enterprise or 0 points if they are not a certified minority business enterprise.

The Evaluation Committee shall have the opportunity to discuss the qualifications of the proposers during the public evaluation committee meeting. Once all firms have been reviewed, the committee will be given time to finalize their scores for each of the firms. Once the score cards are complete, the City Clerk will tally each evaluator's score card. For each evaluator's score card, the total scores will then be ranked, with the highest score receiving a 1.

Please enter any comments or notes for why you scored each vendor the way that you have in the corresponding "Notes/Comments" section of the spreadsheet or provide additional pages of Notes/Comments on the following tab.

		Ability of Professional Personnel	Whether a firm is a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Past Record	Willingness to meet time and budget requirements	Location	Recent, current, and projected workload of the firm	Total	Rank	Notes/Comments
	Category Multiplier	6	N/A	6	3	2	2			
	Maximum Score	30	5	30	15	10	10	100.00		
	Sample	Excellent	Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	74.00		
		30.00	5.00	24.00	9.00	4.00	2.00			
A	Calvin, Giordano & Associates, Inc.	Excellent	Not a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Very Good	Excellent	Excellent	Very Good	87.00	4	
		30.00	0.00	24.00	15.00	10.00	8.00			
B	A.D.A. Engineering, Inc.	Very Good	Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Very Good	Excellent	Excellent	Very Good	86.00	5	
		24.00	5.00	24.00	15.00	10.00	8.00			
C	CES Consultants, Inc.	Good	Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	75.00	7	
		18.00	5.00	24.00	12.00	8.00	8.00			
D	Premiere Design Solutions, Inc.	Very Good	Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Very Good	Excellent	Very Good	Very Good	84.00	6	
		24.00	5.00	24.00	15.00	8.00	8.00			
E	Craven Thompson & Associates, Inc.	Excellent	Not a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Good	91.00	3	
		30.00	0.00	30.00	15.00	10.00	6.00			
F	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	Excellent	Not a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Very Good	93.00	2	
		30.00	0.00	30.00	15.00	10.00	8.00			
G	Chen Moore and Associates, Inc.	Very Good	Not a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	70.00	8	
		24.00	0.00	18.00	12.00	8.00	8.00			
H	CPH, Inc.	Excellent	Not a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	95.00	1	
		30.00	0.00	30.00	15.00	10.00	10.00			
I	Florida Technical Consultants, LLC	Good	Not a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	64.00	9	
		18.00	0.00	18.00	12.00	8.00	8.00			

Note: In the event a score for an individual evaluator results in a tie or the overall score results in a tie, the evaluator or evaluation committee will be asked to break the tie and rank the tied vendors based on the volume of work previously awarded to each firm by the City, with the object of effecting an equitable distribution of contracts among qualified firms, provided such distribution does not violate the principle of selection of the most highly qualified firms.

In the event the score still results in a tie, the evaluator or evaluation committee will be asked to break the tie and give preference to a business that certifies that it has implemented a drug-free workplace program on the Vendor Drug-Free Workplace Certification Form.

In the event the score still results in a tie, the evaluator or evaluation committee will be asked to break the tie by publicly drawing lots.

Once the scores have been read for all services, an evaluating member of the committee must make a motion, which must be approved by majority vote of the committee.

Certifier of Score:

George W. Wines
 Please Print Name

[Signature]
 Signature

5/28/19
 Date

CCNA # PSEN-18-02-04
"Design & Post Services – Pines Village Water Main Improvements Phase II "

Evaluator Score Sheet
 May 28, 2019

Instructions:

Each Evaluator is provided with the following information to assist with evaluating the proposals

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) Evaluation Instructions | 5) Vendor's Responses |
| 2) This Evaluation Scoring Sheet | 6) RFQ # PSEN-18-02 - Professional Service Providers |
| 3) Bid Tab for PSEN-18-02-04 | 7) Bid Tab for RFQ # PSEN-18-02 |
| 4) CCNA # PSEN-18-04 - Design & Post Services – Pines Village Water Main Improvements Phase II | 8) Firms statements of qualifications and response to RFQ # PSEN-18-02 |

After your evaluation of the information provided, you will score each of the weighted categories that have a "Category Multiplier" on the evaluator score sheet based on how you feel the material rates according to the following quality levels in the table below:

Quality	Level	Description
Excellent	5	Meets all requirements, reflects significant enhancements or strengths as compared to minimum levels of acceptability, no offsetting weaknesses.
Very Good	4	Meets all requirements, reflects some enhancements or strengths, few if any offsetting weaknesses.
Good	3	Meets minimum requirements, strengths and weaknesses, if any, tend to offset one another equally.
Fair	2	Contains significant weaknesses only partially offset by less pronounced strengths; may meet minimum requirements but doubt exists.
Poor	1	Serious doubt exists about ability to meet needs but may be sufficient, significant weaknesses without offsetting strengths.
Deficient	0	Will not meet minimum requirements.

The respective "Quality Level" will then be multiplied by the respective "Category Multiplier" to get the Total Score for the respective category. For example, if a category has an pre-assigned "Category Multiplier" of 6 and the evaluator assigns a "Quality" of "Good" which would result in the "Quality Level" of 3 being multiplied by the "Category Multiplier" of 6 to get a Total Score of 18 for the respective category. See sample below.

When scoring on a computer, you can click on the pink cells to choose a "Quality" from the dropdown list which will automatically calculate the corresponding score for that Category.

For categories such as "Whether a firm is a certified minority business enterprise", the firm will be given all 5 points if they are a certified minority business enterprise or 0 points if they are not a certified minority business enterprise.

The Evaluation Committee shall have the opportunity to discuss the qualifications of the proposers during the public evaluation committee meeting. Once all firms have been reviewed, the committee will be given time to finalize their scores for each of the firms. Once the score cards are complete, the City Clerk will tally each evaluator's score card. For each evaluator's score card, the total scores will then be ranked, with the highest score receiving a 1.

Please enter any comments or notes for why you scored each vendor the way that you have in the corresponding "Notes/Comments" section of the spreadsheet or provide additional pages of Notes/Comments on the following tab.

	Ability of Professional Personnel	Whether a firm is a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Past Record	Willingness to meet time and budget requirements	Location	Recent, current, and projected workloads of the firm	Total	Rank	Notes/Comments
Category Multiplier	6	N/A	6	3	2	2	100.00		
Maximum Score	30	5	30	15	10	10			
Sample	Excellent	Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	74.00		
	30.00	5.00	24.00	9.00	4.00	2.00			
A Calvin, Giordano & Associates, Inc.	Excellent	Not a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Very Good	Very Good	Excellent	Excellent	86.00	6	
	30.00	0.00	24.00	12.00	10.00	10.00			
B A.D.A. Engineering, Inc.	Excellent	Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Very Good	Excellent	Very Good	Excellent	92.00	2	
	30.00	5.00	24.00	15.00	8.00	10.00			
C CES Consultants, Inc.	Excellent	Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Very Good	Excellent	Excellent	Good	90.00	3	
	30.00	5.00	24.00	15.00	10.00	6.00			
D Premiere Design Solutions, Inc.	Excellent	Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Very Good	Very Good	Excellent	Very Good	89.00	4	
	30.00	5.00	24.00	12.00	10.00	8.00			
E Craven Thompson & Associates, Inc.	Excellent	Not a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Very Good	Excellent	Very Good	Excellent	87.00	5	
	30.00	0.00	24.00	15.00	8.00	10.00			
F Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	Excellent	Not a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Excellent	84.00	7	
	30.00	0.00	24.00	12.00	8.00	10.00			
G Chen Moore and Associates, Inc.	Excellent	Not a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	82.00	8	
	30.00	0.00	24.00	12.00	8.00	8.00			
H CPH, Inc.	Excellent	Not a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Excellent	Excellent	Very Good	Excellent	93.00	1	
	30.00	0.00	30.00	15.00	8.00	10.00			
I Florida Technical Consultants, LLC	Very Good	Not a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	76.00	9	
	24.00	0.00	24.00	12.00	8.00	8.00			

Note: In the event a score for an individual evaluator results in a tie or the overall score results in a tie, the evaluator or evaluation committee will be asked to break the tie and rank the tied vendors based on the volume of work previously awarded to each firm by the City, with the object of effecting an equitable distribution of contracts among qualified firms, provided such distribution does not violate the principle of selection of the most highly qualified firms.

In the event the score still results in a tie, the evaluator or evaluation committee will be asked to break the tie and give preference to a business that certifies that it has implemented a drug-free workplace program on the Vendor Drug-Free Workplace Certification Form.

In the event the score still results in a tie, the evaluator or evaluation committee will be asked to break the tie by publicly drawing lots.

Once the scores have been read for all services, an evaluating member of the committee must make a motion, which must be approved by majority vote of the committee.

Certified Evaluator:

John L. England
 Please Print Name

Signature

John L. England

Date

5/28/19

CCNA # PSEN-18-02-04
"Design & Post Services – Pines Village Water Main Improvements Phase II "

Evaluator Score Sheet
 May 28, 2019

Instructions:

Each Evaluator is provided with the following information to assist with evaluating the proposals

- 1) Evaluation Instructions
- 2) This Evaluation Scoring Sheet
- 3) Bid Tab for PSEN-18-02-04
- 4) CCNA # PSEN-18-04 - Design & Post Services – Pines Village Water Main Improvements Phase II

- 5) Vendor's Responses
- 6) RFQ # PSEN-18-02 - Professional Service Providers
- 7) Bid Tab for RFQ # PSEN-18-02
- 8) Firms statements of qualifications and response to RFQ # PSEN-18-02

After your evaluation of the information provided, you will score each of the weighted categories that have a "Category Multiplier" on the evaluator score sheet based on how you feel the material rates according to the following quality levels in the table below:

Quality	Level	Description
Excellent	5	Meets all requirements, reflects significant enhancements or strengths as compared to minimum levels of acceptability, no offsetting weaknesses.
Very Good	4	Meets all requirements, reflects some enhancements or strengths, few if any offsetting weaknesses.
Good	3	Meets minimum requirements, strengths and weaknesses, if any, tend to offset one another equally.
Fair	2	Contains significant weaknesses only partially offset by less pronounced strengths, may meet minimum requirements but doubt exists.
Poor	1	Serious doubt exists about ability to meet needs but may be sufficient, significant weaknesses without offsetting strengths.
Deficient	0	Will not meet minimum requirements.

The respective "Quality Level" will then be multiplied by the respective "Category Multiplier" to get the Total Score for the respective category. For example, if a category has an pre-assigned "Category Multiplier" of 6 and the evaluator assigns a "Quality" of "Good" which would result in the "Quality Level" of 3 being multiplied by the "Category Multiplier" of 6 to get a Total Score of 18 for the respective category. See sample below.

When scoring on a computer, you can click on the pink cells to choose a "Quality" from the dropdown list which will automatically calculate the corresponding score for that Category.

For categories such as "Whether a firm is a certified minority business enterprise", the firm will be given all 5 points if they are a certified minority business enterprise or 0 points if they are not a certified minority business enterprise.

The Evaluation Committee shall have the opportunity to discuss the qualifications of the proposers during the public evaluation committee meeting. Once all firms have been reviewed, the committee will be given time to finalize their scores for each of the firms. Once the score cards are complete, the City Clerk will tally each evaluator's score card. For each evaluator's score card, the total scores will then be ranked, with the highest score receiving a 1.

Please enter any comments or notes for why you scored each vendor the way that you have in the corresponding "Notes/Comments" section of the spreadsheet or provide additional pages of Notes/Comments on the following tab.

		Ability of Professional Personnel	Whether a firm is a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Past Record	Willingness to meet time and budget requirements	Location	Recent, current, and projected workbooks of the firms	Total	Rank	Notes/Comments
	Category Multiplier	6	NA	6	3	2	2			
	Maximum Score	30	5	30	15	10	10	100.00		
	Sample	Excellent	Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	74.00		
		30.00	5.00	24.00	8.00	4.00	2.00			
A	Calvin, Giordano & Associates, Inc.	Excellent	Not a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Excellent	Excellent	Very Good	Very Good	91.00	1	
		30.00	0.00	30.00	15.00	8.00	8.00			
B	A.D.A. Engineering, Inc.	Excellent	Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Good	Good	Very Good	Good	76.00	6	
		30.00	5.00	18.00	9.00	8.00	6.00			
C	CES Consultants, Inc.	Excellent	Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Very Good	Very Good	Excellent	Good	87.00	3	
		30.00	5.00	24.00	12.00	10.00	6.00			
D	Premiere Design Solutions, Inc.	Excellent	Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Good	Excellent	Excellent	Good	84.00	5	
		30.00	5.00	18.00	15.00	10.00	6.00			
E	Craven Thompson & Associates, Inc.	Very Good	Not a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	70.00	7	
		24.00	0.00	18.00	12.00	8.00	8.00			
F	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	Excellent	Not a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Excellent	Very Good	Very Good	Excellent	90.00	2	
		30.00	0.00	30.00	12.00	8.00	10.00			
G	Chen Moore and Associates, Inc.	Good	Not a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Good	68.00	8	
		18.00	0.00	24.00	12.00	8.00	6.00			
H	CPH, Inc.	Excellent	Not a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Very Good	86.00	4	
		30.00	0.00	30.00	12.00	6.00	8.00			
I	Florida Technical Consultants, LLC	Good	Not a Certified Minority Business Enterprise	Good	Very Good	Good	Good	60.00	9	
		18.00	0.00	18.00	12.00	6.00	6.00			

Note: In the event a score for an individual evaluator results in a tie or the overall score results in a tie, the evaluator or evaluation committee will be asked to break the tie and rank the tied vendors based on the volume of work previously awarded to each firm by the City, with the object of effecting an equitable distribution of contracts among qualified firms, provided such distribution does not violate the principle of selection of the most highly qualified firms.

In the event the score still results in a tie, the evaluator or evaluation committee will be asked to break the tie and give preference to a business that certifies that it has implemented a drug-free workplace program on the Vendor Drug-Free Workplace Certification Form.

In the event the score still results in a tie, the evaluator or evaluation committee will be asked to break the tie by publicly drawing lots.

Once the scores have been read for all services, an evaluating member of the committee must make a motion, which must be approved by majority vote of the committee.

Certifier of Score:

Gerald Hernandez
 Please Print Name

Signature

[Handwritten Signature]

05-28-19
 Date