

CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE RFQ EVALUATION COMMITTEE TABULATION RFP# 855-11487/Inspection and Plan Examination November 4, 2014

RFQ	Scoring Tabulation	Rater # 1 Alex Hernandez										Rater # 2 Liza Torres]								
		Cost to the City Previous					revious Scope of Services				Guarantee			Cost to the City			Р	evious	6	Scop	ervices		Guara	ntee		1					
		Total Project Cost Experience,		Experience, Understanding of the o			of minimal staffing (6,000				Total Project Cost Experience		:e	Understanding of the			of minimal staffing														
		qualifications and		qualifications and			qualifications and		qualifications and		overall	overall needs of the City			of inspe						qualifi	cations	s and	overall needs of the City		of the City	(6,000 hours of				
		past performance		st performance of		st performance of		ast performance of		for s	uch serv	vices, as	services)	in the e	event of					past p	erform	ance	for suc	ch serv	ices, as			services) in			
		the proposing fi				resente		an emerg		natural						propo	-	•	esente		t	he eve	ent of								
		including		·	the narrative proposal.			(disaster							includ	0			proposal.		-	gency or								
		persons proposed					e problem								persor	• •				clude	na	tural c	disaster								
						rovide		ident		and the									ovide		•		tification								
						es, facil			propos										es, facil				oposed								
						urces a ference			ork reg	mplish the									urces a erence	-			complish quired.								
					le	erence	5	w	orkreq	uireu								Tel	erence	:5	the w	ork re	quireu.								
															r														ts		
															Factor														otal Combined Points		
	PROPOSING FIRM														ht F													s	d P		
		tor		Subtotal	tor		Subtotal	Factor		otal	Factor		Subtotal	S	Weight		Subtotal	tor		Subtotal	ctor		Subtotal	tor		Subtotal	s	Average Points	oine		
		Fac		lbto	Factor		ubto	Fac		Subtotal	Fac		lbto	Points	3		lbto	Fac		lbto	a		lbtd	Fac		lbto	Points	e Pc	, The second sec		
		ght	king	t SL	ght	anking	t SL	'eight	king		ght	nking	t SL	l Pc		king		ght	king	t Sı	ght	king	t Su	eight	king		Pe	ag	ŏ		
		Weight	Ranking	oint	Weight	lan	Point	Nei	Ranking	Point	Veight	Sanl	oint	lota		lanl	Point	Weight Factor	Ranking	oin	Weight	Ranking	oint	Vei	Ranking	oint	Fotal	Avei	lota		
C.A.F	P. GOVERMENT, INC.	0.3	_	0.30		2	0.60	0.3		0.60	0.1	3	0.30	1.80	0.3	1	0.30	0.3		0.30		1	0.30	0.1	1	0.10	1.00	1.12	5.60		
NOVA	ENGINEERING AND EVIRONM	0.3	2	0.60	0.3	3	0.90	0.3	3	0.90	0.1	2	0.20	2.60	0.3	2	0.60	0.3	3	0.90	0.3	3	0.90	0.1	3	0.30	2.70	2.18	10.90		
CALV	IN, GIORDINO & ASSOCIATES,	0.3		0.90	0.3	1	0.30	0.3	1	0.30	0.1	1	0.10	1.60			0.90	0.3		0.60	0.3	2	0.60	0.1	2	0.20		1.50	7.50		

RFQ Scoring Tabulation	Rater # 3 Mohammad Malik											Rater # 4 John Cioffi												I																		
	Cost to the City Previous					Sco	pe of Se	ervices	Guarante	е	of		Cost	to the	City	Р	revious		Scope	of Se	rvices		Guara	ntee																		
	Total Project Cost Experience		Experience Understanding of the			minimal staffing (6,000				Total Project Cost		Experience		e	Understanding of the		of minimal staffing		l staffing																							
		qualifications and		qualifications and		qualifications and		qualifications and		qualifications and		ualifications and		ualifications and		ualifications and		qualifications and		fications and		needs (of the City	hours	of inspe	tion					qualif	ications	and	overall ne	eeds o	of the City	(6	,000 h	ours of			
		past performance of		for such services, as		vices, as	services) in the event of						past performance		ance	e for such services, as		inspection services) in		ervices) in																						
	the proposing firm,		presented in			an emergency or natural						of the proposing		sing	presented in			the event of																								
	including			the narrative proposal.			disaster							firm	, includ	ing	the narra	ative p	proposal.	an emergency or																						
				persons					e problem									ns prop				clude	na	tural c	lisaster																	
				•	vide th				and the									rovide t		problem																						
				services				propos										es, facil	,			posed																				
					rces and	d			mplish the									ources a	-	method																						
				rete	rences		wo	ork req	uired								re	ference	S	the wo	ork red	quired																				
PROPOSING FIRM	Weight Factor	Ranking	Point Subtotal	Weight Factor	Ranking	Point Subtotal	Weight Factor	Ranking	Point Subtotal	Weight Factor	Ranking	Point Subtotal	Total Points	Weight Factor	Ranking	Point Subtotal	Weight Factor	Ranking	Point Subtotal	Weight Factor	Ranking	Point Subtotal	Weight Factor	Ranking	Point Subtotal	Total Points																
C.A.P. Government, Inc.	0.3	1 0	.30	0.3	1 (0.30	0.3	1	0.30	0.1	1	0.10	1.00	0.3	1	0.30	0.3	2	0.60	0.3	2	0.60	0.1	3	0.30	1.80																
Nova Engineering and Enviromental	0.3	3 0	.90	0.3	3 (0.90	0.3	3	0.90	0.1	3	0.30	3.00	0.3	2	0.60	0.3	3	0.90	0.3	3	0.90	0.1	2	0.20	2.60																
Calvin Giordano & Associates, Inc.	0.3	2 0	.60	0.3	2 (0.60	0.3	2	0.60	0.1	2	0.20	2.00	0.3	3	0.90	0.3	1	0.30	0.3	1	0.30	0.1	1	0.10	1.60																

0.0 0.0 Local Preference (if applicable)	0.0 Deduction	Final Total Score	Final Average Score	Final Ranking	Cost
0.0%	0.00	5.60	1.12		N/A
0.0%	0.00	10.90	2.18		N/A
0.0%	0.00	7.50	1.50		N/A N/A