

Ranking Architectural Engineering Firms for Architectural Engineering Design Services Hollywood Beach Golf Course Renovation & Clubhouse Construction – RFQ # PR 19-018

City Commission Meeting
August 28, 2019



Request for Qualifications

- Request For Qualifications (RFQ) on Project #PR 19-018 were advertised on BidSync on April 29, 2019.
- A total of 110 firms and plan rooms viewed the notice on BidSync, and 12 firms downloaded the RFQ documents from BidSync. A total of 3 questions were posed by potential bidders; questions and responses were posted on BidSync.
- On May 30, 2019; statements of qualifications were received by the City Clerk from 8 firms.
- The responses were distributed to the Evaluation Committee, which was made up of the Interim Director of Parks, Recreation & Cultural Arts, a Park Manager, a Senior Engineer, a Planning Manager and the City Engineer.

Request for Qualifications

- The Evaluation Committee met on June 6, 2019, in a publicly advertised meeting to evaluate the statements of qualification and short-list the participating firms.
- Five firms were invited on June 13, 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 DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
ARCHITECTURE, ENGINEERING & MOBILITY DIVISION**

CONSULTANT SELECTION FINAL RANKING SHEET

RFQ FOR ARCHITECTURAL/ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR HOLLYWOOD GOLF COURSE RENOVATION & CLUBHOUSE CONSTRUCTION PR 19-018

Date of Interview - June 13, 2019

| APPLICANT | INITIAL SCREENING CRITERIA | | | | | | ORAL INTERVIEW CRITERIA | | | | | | GRAND TOTAL | Final Ranking |
|--|----------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------|---------------|
| | SELECTION COMMITTEE: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | City Engineer | Interim Director of Parks | Planning Manager | Parks Manager | Senior Engineer | Sub-Total Initial | City Engineer | Interim Director of Parks | Planning Manager | Parks Manager | Senior Engineer | Sub-Total Initial | | |
| Kipp Schulties Golf Design | 89 | 69 | 81 | 89 | 82 | 410 | 87 | 80 | 70 | 108 | 88 | 433 | 843 | 4 |
| Tamara Peacock Company Architects of Florida | 81 | 59 | 66 | 63 | 65 | 334 | | | | | | | | |
| Dusenberry Golf Course Design | 91 | 90 | 86 | 85 | 78 | 430 | 86 | 92 | 84 | 96 | 80 | 438 | 868 | 3 |
| Sanford Golf Design | 83 | 90 | 71 | 87 | 81 | 412 | 80 | 90 | 65 | 102 | 92 | 429 | 841 | 5 |
| McCumber Golf | 85 | 90 | 88 | 82 | 68 | 413 | 92 | 96 | 90 | 107 | 93 | 478 | 891 | 1 |
| Morgan Golf Design Inc. | 81 | 65 | 70 | 72 | 64 | 352 | | | | | | | | |
| Synalovski Romanik Saye LLC | 86 | 90 | 75 | 87 | 75 | 413 | 89 | 98 | 83 | 105 | 90 | 465 | 878 | 2 |
| Greg Norman Golf Course Design | 91 | 79 | 78 | 77 | 67 | 392 | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

PROJECT: RFQ for Architectural/Engineering Services for Hollywood Golf Course Renovation & Clubhouse Construction

PROJECT NO.: PR 19-018
REVIEWED BY: Terrence Comiskey

CM-002-2
S:\DCM\Projects\Parks & Recs\PR-19-018 RFQ for Hollywood Beach Golf Course\PR 19-018 RFQ -Oral & Initial Criteria (ALL)\Final .xls\ORAL & INTERVIEW RNK RESULTS



Request for Qualifications

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

| | | |
|-------------------------------|---|------------|
| McCumber Golf | – | 891 points |
| Snyalovski Romanik Saye | – | 878 points |
| Dusenberry Golf Course Design | – | 868 points |
| Kipp Schulties Golf Design | – | 843 points |
| Sanford Golf Design | - | 841 points |

- The Evaluation Committee recommended the top five ranked firms for consideration for the Architectural/Engineering Design Services Agreement for the Police Headquarters project # PR 19-018.
- The notice of intent to rank by the City Commission on August 28, 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.