

4858 RFP No. 2020-16 Peer Review and Design Consultant for Lake Drive Park Associated to New Marina Construction Project

Evaluation phase Ends on **Jun 9 2020 10:00 AM**

Settings Participants Schedule Pricing sheets Questionnaires Question & Answer
Offers/Applications Evaluate Compare & Select 0

[My Evaluation](#) [Evaluators progress](#) All evaluations [Overview](#)

Fairfax, Sammons & Partners LLC

2. EVALUATION FACTORS Questionnaire

6 Questions

[Help](#)

2.1. EVALUATION FACTORS

All answers are evaluated

5 Knockout questions (1 KO) Weight: 100% Score: 84.65%

[Back to question groups](#)

[Quick Edit](#)

Company administrator:



Solicitations Palm Beach
(561) 838-5406
solicitations@townofpalmbeach



Need help using Negometrix3?

[Visit our support page](#)

[? Help](#)

EXPERIENCE OF FIRM/PAST PERFORMANCE

2.1.1. evaluated Knockout question

Weight: 30%

Please attach the following evaluation information:

- Company Credentials
- Relevant Project Experience
- Completed Municipal Projects
- Schedule/Budget Compliance
- References

Answer

Attached documents by supplier:

- | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| 2020_April_Anne Fairfax_CV_.pdf 65 Kb | Download | | Preview |
| 2020_April_Richard Sammons_CV.pdf 91 Kb | Download | | Preview |
| Anne and Richard Bio.pdf 94 Kb | Download | | Preview |

Score: 26.4%

[View evaluation method](#)

Tim Campbell (20%) [4](#)

Score Comment

4.8% Experience seems more geared to residential projects and private owned businesses. No references listed.

Support

| | Score | Comment |
|---|-------|---|
| Jane LeClainche (20%) 4.5 | 5.4% | A lot of architectural experience on the island. Does not discuss landscaping or public parks. Serves on ARCOM and Landmarks. |
| Jorge Sanchez (20%) 5 | 6% | Their background in new urbanism and past project experience is directly inline with what is needed on this project |
| Carolyn Stone (20%) 4 | 4.8% | Explanation |
| Brian Vertesch (20%) 4.5 | 5.4% | Explanation |

Total score: 26.4%

[Add summarizing comment](#)

There is no comment

EXPERIENCE/ABILITY OF PERSONNEL

2.1.2. evaluated Knockout question

Weight: 35%

Please attach the following evaluation information:

- Organizational chart / Resources
- Management's Credentials
- Project Personnel Credentials
- Sub-consultant Credentials
- Demonstrated Experience designing consultant services similar to this project


Answer

Attached documents by supplier:

 f&s-project-sample.pdf 63437 Kb [Download](#) | [Preview](#)

Score: 32.55%

[View evaluation method](#)

| | Score | Comment |
|--|-------|-------------------------|
| Tim Campbell (20%) 4  | 5.6% | no organizational chart |

Support

| | Score | Comment |
|---|-------|---|
| Jane LeClainche (20%) 4.5 | 6.3% | Experience in PB, mostly architectural rather than park or civic. Serve on ARCOM and Landmarks and understand the Town. Lived next to the park. |
| Jorge Sanchez (20%) 5 | 7% | The credentials are excellent |
| Carolyn Stone (20%) 5 | 7% | Explanation |
| Brian Vertesch (20%) 4.75 | 6.65% | Explanation |
| Total score: 32.55% | | |

[Add summarizing comment](#)

There is no comment

WORKLOAD AND SCHEDULING

2.1.3. evaluated Knockout question

Weight: 20%

Please attach the following evaluation information:

- Over-all workload of the company
- Project scheduling ability/timely completion of work by XXXX
- Technical Approach to complete scope of work

Answer

Attached documents by supplier:

 RFP-Lake-Drive-Cover-Letter.pdf 21 Kb [Download](#) | [Preview](#)

Score: 16.8%

[View evaluation method](#)

| | Score | Comment |
|---|-------|---|
| Tim Campbell (20%) 4 | 3.2% | Satisfied the criteria for workload and scheduling, but not much detail. |
| Jane LeClainche (20%) 5 | 4% | Provided timeline and described their scope. Did not see a workload schedule. |
| Jorge Sanchez (20%) 4 | 3.2% | Explanation |
| Carolyn Stone (20%) 4 | 3.2% | Explanation |
| Brian Vertesch (20%) 4 | 3.2% | Explanation |

Total score: 16.8%

[Add summarizing comment](#)

There is no comment

FINANCIAL INFORMATION

2.1.4. evaluated Knockout question

Weight: 5%

Please attach the following evaluation information:

An indication of the resources and the necessary working capital available and how it will relate to the firm's financial stability through the life of the contract shall be included in the RFQ response. Show evidence of financial resources and capabilities to complete the work.

Answer

KO

Attached documents by supplier:






 Statement_2020-04-30.pdf 902 Kb

[Download](#)

[Preview](#)

Score: 0%

[View evaluation method](#)

| | Score | Comment |
|---|-------|--|
| Tim Campbell (20%) 0  | 0% | Town decided to eliminate this criteria. |
| Jane LeClainche (20%) 0  | 0% | Town decided to eliminate this criteria. |
| Jorge Sanchez (20%) 0  | 0% | Town decided to eliminate this criteria. |
| Carolyn Stone (20%) 0  | 0% | Town decided to eliminate this criteria. |
| Brian Vertesch (20%) 0  | 0% | Town decided to eliminate this criteria. |

Total score: 0%

[Add summarizing comment](#)

There is no comment

VOLUME OF WORK

2.1.5. evaluated

Weight: 5%

Support

Points awarded based upon past awards made by the Town:


Points will be awarded based upon the percentage of past awards made by the Town. At the closing of the Request for Qualifications the total of all purchase orders issued (for the past three-year period) will be determined for each proposer. The highest proposer total will become the basis for evaluation point distribution.

The point distribution will be as follows:

- Proposers whose past awards have totaled less than 5% of the basis will receive 5 points.
- Proposers whose past awards have totaled over 5%, but less than 25% will receive 4 points.
- Proposers whose past awards have totaled over 25%, but less than 50% will receive 3 points.
- Proposers whose past awards have totaled over 50%, but less than 85% will receive 2 points.
- Proposers whose past awards have totaled over 85% will receive 1 point.

Answer

Attached documents by supplier:

 statement of work with Town of Palm Beach.pdf 87 Kb [Download](#) | [Preview](#)

Score: 5%

[View evaluation method](#)

| | | Score | Comment |
|-----------------------|---|-------|-----------------------------|
| Tim Campbell (20%) | 5 | 1% | Explanation |
| Jane LeClainche (20%) | 5 | 1% | Explanation |
| Jorge Sanchez (20%) | 5 | 1% | Explanation |
| Carolyn Stone (20%) | 5 | 1% | Explanation |
| Brian Vertesch (20%) | 5  | 1% | Explanation |

Total score: 5%

[Add summarizing comment](#)

There is no comment

OTHER

2.1.6. evaluated Knockout question


Weight: 5%

Please attach the following evaluation information:

- Overall completeness, clarity and quality of proposal
- Location of firm; ability to attend meetings at Public Works or Town Council
- Disputes, Litigation and Resolution

Answer

Attached documents by supplier:

 statement of availability.pdf 86 Kb [Download](#) | [Preview](#)

Score: 3.9%

[View evaluation method](#)

ScoreComment

| | | Score | Comment |
|---|------------|-------------------|---|
| Tim Campbell (20%) | <u>3</u> | 0.6% | I did not feel the proposal was complete or clear. Not much detail on how they were going to get from point A to B. |
| Jane LeClainche (20%) | <u>4.5</u> | 0.9% | Proposal contained the information requested. |
| Jorge Sanchez (20%) | <u>4.5</u> | 0.9% | Explanation |
| Carolyn Stone (20%) | <u>3</u> | 0.6% | Explanation |
| Brian Vertesch (20%) | <u>4.5</u> | 0.9% | Explanation |
| | | Total score: 3.9% | |
| Add summarizing comment | | | |
| There is no comment | | | |

[Back to question groups](#)
[Previous group](#)

2.1. EVALUATION FACTOR: ▼

[Next group](#)