

Ranking Architectural Engineering Firms for Architectural Engineering Design Services Police Headquarters – RFQ # POL 19-013

City Commission Meeting
July 3, 2019

Request for Qualifications

- Request For Qualifications (RFQ) on Project #P19-013 were advertised on BidSync on April 8, 2019.
- A total of 144 firms and plan rooms viewed the notice on BidSync, and 13 firms downloaded the RFQ documents from BidSync. A total of 12 questions were posed by potential bidders; questions and responses were posted on BidSync.
- On May 20, 2019; statements of qualifications were received by the City Clerk from 11 firms.
- The responses were distributed to the Evaluation Committee, which was made up of the Director of Development Services, two Police Majors and the City Engineer.

Request for Qualifications

- The Evaluation Committee met on May 30, 2019, in a publicly advertised meeting to evaluate the statements of qualification and short-list the participating firms.
- Four firms were invited on June 11, 2019, to present their team and qualification to the Evaluation Committee in a second publicly advertised meeting.
- The ranking sheet (attached), were based on the 1-4 score of each staff over the two meetings, with 1 being the top ranked. The firm with the highest scores received the most top rankings.

Request for Qualifications



**CITY OF HOLLYWOOD
DEPARTMENT OF DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT**

CONSULTANT SELECTION FINAL RANKING SHEET

RFQ TO PROVIDE ARCHITECTURE/ENGINEERING DESIGN CONTINUING SERVICES

Date of Interview - June 11, 2019

APPLICANT	INITIAL SCREENING CRITERIA					ORAL INTERVIEW CRITERIA					GRAND TOTAL	Final Ranking	
	City Engineer	Director Development Services	Police Major Coffin	Police Major Bolger	Sub-Total Initial	Initial Ranking	SELECTION COMMITTEE:						
							Director Development Services	Police Major Coffin	Police Major Bolger	Sub-Total Initial			
ACAI Associates Inc.	70	75	84	88	317								
Architects Design Group	96	80	95	86	357	2	93	80	95	90	358	715	2
Tamara Peacock Company Architects	74	25	76	78	253								
Crain Atlantis, Inc.	71	17	64	71	223								
DS Arcdhitecture	70	25	82	69	246								
IDEA International Design Engineering & Architecture LLC	67	22	43	43	175								
Urban Robot LLC	65	55	81	56	257								
OD+P	88	85	95	96	364	1	90	90	97	99	376	740	1
Sol Arch	68	60	43	51	222								
Synalovski Romanik Saye LLC	80	65	91	86	322	3	88	76	90	83	337	659	3
PGAL Architects	83	70	86	76	315	4	87	78	91	86	342	657	4

PROJECT: RFQ for Qualifications to Provide Architectural/Engineering Design Services for Police Headquarters

PROJECT NO.: POL 19-013
REVIEWED BY: Terrence Comiskey

Request for Qualifications

- Based on the firms presentations to the Evaluation Committee on June 11, 2019, firms were ranked as follows:

1. OD+P with HOK – 740 points
2. Architects Design Groups with Cartaya – 715 points
3. Synalovski Romanik Saye LLC – 659 points
4. PGAL Architects – 657 points

- The Evaluation Committee recommended the top four ranked firms for consideration for the Architectural/Engineering Design Services Agreement for the Police Headquarters project # P19-013.

- The notice of intent to rank by the City Commission on July 3, 2019 was issued to all firms on June 20, 2019

Questions

287.055 Acquisition of professional architectural, engineering, landscape architectural, or surveying and mapping services; definitions; procedures; contingent fees prohibited; penalties

(4) COMPETITIVE SELECTION.—

(a) For each proposed project, the agency shall evaluate current statements of qualifications and performance data on file with the agency, together with those that may be submitted by other firms regarding the proposed project, and shall conduct discussions with, and may require public presentations by, no fewer than three firms regarding their qualifications, approach to the project, and ability to furnish the required services.

(b) The agency shall select in order of preference no fewer than three firms deemed to be the most highly qualified to perform the required services. In determining whether a firm is qualified, the agency shall consider such factors as the ability of professional personnel; whether a firm is a certified minority business enterprise; past performance; willingness to meet time and budget requirements; location; recent, current, and projected workloads of the firms; and the volume of work previously awarded to each firm by the agency, 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. The agency may request, accept, and consider proposals for the compensation to be paid under the contract only during competitive negotiations under subsection (5).

(5) COMPETITIVE NEGOTIATION.—

(a) The agency shall negotiate a contract with the most qualified firm for professional services at compensation which the agency determines is fair, competitive, and reasonable. In making such determination, the agency shall conduct a detailed analysis of the cost of the professional services required in addition to considering their scope and complexity. For any lump-sum or cost-plus-a-fixed-fee professional service contract over the threshold amount provided in s. 287.017 for CATEGORY FOUR, the agency shall require the firm receiving the award to execute a truth-in-negotiation certificate stating that wage rates and other factual unit costs supporting the compensation are accurate, complete, and current at the time of contracting. Any professional service contract under which such a certificate is required must contain a provision that the original contract price and any additions thereto will be adjusted to exclude any significant sums by which the agency determines the contract price was increased due to inaccurate, incomplete, or noncurrent wage rates and other factual unit costs. All such contract adjustments must be made within 1 year following the end of the contract.

(b) Should the agency be unable to negotiate a satisfactory contract with the firm considered to be the most qualified at a price the agency determines to be fair, competitive, and reasonable, negotiations with that firm must be formally terminated. The agency shall then undertake negotiations with the second most qualified firm. Failing accord with the second most qualified firm, the agency must terminate negotiations. The agency shall then undertake negotiations with the third most qualified firm.