



**Proposal Evaluation Form
RFQ 2022-016 Plans Review & Building Inspection Services
Totals Composite
Form Active**

Selection Criteria \ Proposers	Maximum Criteria Points per Evaluator	Total Maximum Sub-Criteria Points	C.A.P. Government, Inc.	J.E.M. Inspections & Engineering Services, Inc.	M.T. Causley, LLC.	Universal Engineering Sciences
			TOTAL:	TOTAL:	TOTAL:	TOTAL:
Experience & Qualifications	25	125				
Proposer's qualifications, including, but not limited to: company history and description, the number of years in business, size, number of employees, office location where work is to be performed, licenses/certifications, credentials, capabilities and capacity to effectively meet the City's needs, relevant experience, and proven track record of providing the scope of services as identified in this solicitation to public sector agencies		50	47.0	43.0	44.0	50.0
Qualifications and experience of all proposed key personnel		75	70.0	65.0	68.0	70.0
Experience & Qualifications Total			117.0	108.0	112.0	120.0
Project Understanding, Proposed Approach, Methodology	40	200				
Proposer's overall detailed approach and methodology to perform the services solicited herein. Understanding of the RFQ scope and requirements, strategies for assuring assigned work is completed on time		50	43.0	31.0	49.0	48.0
Recent, current, and projected workload for the Proposer and key personnel and how the potential contract will fit into the Proposer's workload		50	34.0	29.0	49.0	50.0
Describe the Proposer's approach to recruitment and retention. Explain how proposer recruit and retains the best qualified employees for the needs of the city		50	43.0	20.0	45.0	45.0
Describe Proposer's approach to employee training and quality assurance. Explain the training proposer provides to employees and its quality assurance initiatives		25	22.0	15.0	24.0	24.0
Describe the Proposer's ability to address conflicts of interest. Explain how proposer will assure that there are not conflicts of interest with regard to employees working on any project for the city for which the proposer is assisting or representing private owners and developers		25	23.0	14.0	23.0	23.0
Project Understanding, Proposed Approach, Methodology Total			165.0	109.0	190.0	190.0
Past Performance and References	30	150				
Provide detailed information on four (4) of the Proposer's most recent and relevant projects similar in scope and nature to the services described in the solicitation. If planning to be included in both areas (General Specialty and Geotechnical) provide two (2) references under each specialty		50	50.0	40.5	45.0	50.0
All contracts which the Proposer has performed (past and present) for the City of Coral Gables. The City will review all contracts the Proposer has performed for the City in accordance with Section 4.10 Evaluation of Responses (c) (4) which states the City may consider "Proposer's unsatisfactory performance record, judged from the standpoint of conduct of work, workmanship, progress or standards of performance agreed upon in the Contract as substantiated by past or current work with the City".		50	47.0	40.0	48.0	50.0
List with contact information of public sector clients, if any, that have discontinued use of Proposer's services within the past two (2) years and indicate the reasons for the same		25	23.0	18.0	25.0	25.0
Please identify each incident within the last five (5) years where (a) a civil, criminal, administrative, other similar proceeding was filed or is pending, if such proceeding arises from or is a dispute concerning the Proposer's rights, remedies or duties under a contract for the same or similar type services to be provided under this RFQ		25	25.0	20.0	21.0	21.0
Past Performance and References Total			145.0	118.5	139.0	146.0
Agreement Exceptions	5	25				
Review exceptions made by the proposer to the conditions listed in the agreement for the services.		25	25.0	23.0	23.0	25.0
Agreement Exceptions Total			25.0	23.0	23.0	25.0
Not Applicable	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Points	100	500	452.0	358.5	464.0	481.0

Ranking

Group 1 - General Specialty Group	Ranking
M.T. Causley, LLC	1
C.A.P. Government, Inc.	2
J.E.M. Inspections & Engineering Services, Inc	3
Group 2 - Geotechnical Group	Ranking
Universal Engineering Sciences	1