CITY OF ORLANDO

2nd ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
RFP14-0119
Request for Proposals for
Distributed Antenna System for the Citrus Bowl
March 20, 2014 9:00 a.m.
Rose and Orchid Conference Rooms, Harry P. Leu Gardens,
1920 N. Forest Avenue, Orlando, Florida 32803

The Advisory Committee for the above project convened on March 20, 2014, at 9:01 a.m. at the Harry P. Leu Gardens facility in Orlando, Florida. The purpose of this meeting was to hear presentations from all four (4) respondents to the RFP and review, score, and rank each of those firms.

Committee Members Present:
1. Frank Usina (Chair)
2. Brent Daubach, SC Advisors
3. Matt Repchak, Citrus Sports
4. Marwan Rashid, TLC Architecture for Engineering
5. David McLatchie, Hunt Construction

Others Present:
Brittany Decker, Purchasing Agent III (Facilitator)
Teddi McCorkle, Contract Administrator

Actions/Discussion/Motions:
The Facilitator called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m. and took the following actions:

1) Advised that the meeting was being recorded.
2) Indicated the date, time and purpose of the meeting and that it was posted by the City Clerk more than forty-eight (48) hours in advance.
3) Introduced herself and asked all in attendance to introduce themselves.
4) Advised the Committee that a quorum was established.
5) Indicated that no other members of the public, other than the presenters, would be present during presentations.
6) Ms. McCorkle explained to the Committee that the Chief Procurement Officer determined that it was in the best interest of the City to go out for Best and Final Offer. This was done as Addendum Three (3).

The Committee discussed the results of their reference checks for the four (4) respondents, the Dunn and Bradstreet Report results for each of the respondents and the responses from Addendum Three (3), Best and Final Offers supplied by the respondents. Following the thirty (30) minute discussion, the presentations began.

The Facilitator advised each presenter that they would be given forty-five (45) minutes total, twenty (20) minutes for a presentation followed by a twenty-five (25) minute question and answer period.

Presentation Schedule of Shortlisted Firms:

Time	Company	Meeting Room
9:30 – 10:15 a.m.	American Tower	Orchid Conference Room
10:30- 11:15 a.m.	Boingo Wireless	Rose Conference Room
11:30-12:15 p.m.	Crown Castle Solutions Corp	Orchid Conference Room
12:45-1:30 p.m.	Mobilitie, LLC	Orchid Conference Room

A thirty (30) minute break for lunch was taken.

Actions/Discussion/Motions:

Following the presentations, the Committee discussed each presentation. Committee members individually scored. The resulting Final Ranking is as follows:

1. Mobilitie, LLC
2. Boingo Wireless
3. American Tower
4. Crown Castle Solutions Corporation

A motion was made by Brent Dabauch, and seconded by David McLatchie, to accept the rankings, to recommend the rankings to City Council for City staff to commence negotiations with the top ranked firm and if unsuccessful to continue in ranked order until successful and to authorize the Chief Procurement Officer to execute a contract after successful negotiations. The motion carried unanimously.

A motion was made by Frank Usina, to adjourn at 3:51 p.m.

These minutes are considered to be the official minutes of the RFP14-0119 2nd Advisory Committee Meeting held on March, 20, 2014, and no other notes, tapes, or other recordings taken by anyone takes precedence.

Submitted by:	Reviewed by:	Reviewed and Accepted by:
Brittany Decker, CPPB (Facilitator) Purchasing Agent III	Teddi McCorkle Sr. Contract Administrator	Frank Usina (Chairperson) Project Manager Orlando Community Venues

Attachments (2)

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SCORING

Committee Member: FRANK LOIACONO Date: March 20, 2014

Firm Name: American Tower

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Proposer's Experience	20	17
B. Business Plan	38	29
C. Staff Experience	10	9
D. Blueprint and Minority/and Women Owned Business Enterprise- the degree of participation by City certified or recognized M/WBE in subcontracts	10	2.8
E. Veteran Business Enterprise participation in subcontracts	2	0
F. Additional Services	10	7
G. Revenue Proposal	16	8.2
TOTAL SCORE	**100**	73
RANK	3	

Each Committee Member will evaluate the above factors to determine the final ranking of the short-listed Proposers. Each Committee Member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each Committee Member will rank the Proposers based upon the Committee Member's score for each Proposer. The ranking established by each Committee Member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each Committee Member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Proposers' total scores from each Committee Member will be added and compared. The Proposer with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Proposers.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SCORING

Committee Member: FRANK USINA Date: March 20, 2014

Firm Name: Boingo Wireless

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Proposer's Experience	20	14
B. Business Plan	30	24
C. Staff Experience	10	7
D. Blueprint and Minority/and Women Owned Business Enterprise- the degree of participation by City certified or recognized M/WBE in subcontracts	10	10
E. Veteran Business Enterprise participation in subcontracts	2	2
F. Additional Services	10	7
G. Revenue Proposal	15	8.5
TOTAL SCORE	**100**	72.5
RANK	4	

Each Committee Member will evaluate the above factors to determine the final ranking of the short-listed Proposers. Each Committee Member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each Committee Member will rank the Proposers based upon the Committee Member's score for each Proposer. The ranking established by each Committee Member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each Committee Member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Proposers' total scores from each Committee Member will be added and compared. The Proposer with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Proposers.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SCORING

Committee Member: FRANK LISINA Date: March 20, 2014

Firm Name: CROWN CASTLE

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Proposer's Experience	20	20
B. Business Plan	39	35
C. Staff Experience	10	10
D. Blueprint and Minority/and Women Owned Business Enterprise- the degree of participation by City certified or recognized M/WBE in subcontracts	10	0
E. Veteran Business Enterprise participation in subcontracts	2	0
F. Additional Services	10	6
G. Revenue Proposal	10	3.9
TOTAL SCORE	**100**	74.9
RANK		1

Each Committee Member will evaluate the above factors to determine the final ranking of the short-listed Proposers. Each Committee Member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each Committee Member will rank the Proposers based upon the Committee Member's score for each Proposer. The ranking established by each Committee Member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each Committee Member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Proposers' total scores from each Committee Member will be added and compared. The Proposer with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Proposers.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SCORING

Committee Member: FRANK USINA Date: March 20, 2014

Firm Name: Mobilitie LLC

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Proposer's Experience	20	18
B. Business Plan	38	28
C. Staff Experience	10	8
D. Blueprint and Minority/and Women Owned Business Enterprise- the degree of participation by City certified or recognized M/WBE in subcontracts	10	2.4
E. Veteran Business Enterprise participation in subcontracts	2	0
F. Additional Services	10	8
G. Revenue Proposal	10	10
TOTAL SCORE	**100**	74.4
RANK	2	

Each Committee Member will evaluate the above factors to determine the final ranking of the short-listed Proposers. Each Committee Member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each Committee Member will rank the Proposers based upon the Committee Member's score for each Proposer. The ranking established by each Committee Member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each Committee Member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Proposers' total scores from each Committee Member will be added and compared. The Proposer with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Proposers.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SCORING

Committee Member: David McLatchie Date: March 20, 2014

Firm Name: American Tower

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Proposer's Experience	20	18
B. Business Plan	38	34
C. Staff Experience	10	8
D. Blueprint and Minority/and Women Owned Business Enterprise- the degree of participation by City certified or recognized M/WBE in subcontracts	10	7
E. Veteran Business Enterprise participation in subcontracts	2	0
F. Additional Services	10	6
G. Revenue Proposal	10	8
TOTAL SCORE	**100**	81
RANK	2	

Each Committee Member will evaluate the above factors to determine the final ranking of the short-listed Proposers. Each Committee Member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each Committee Member will rank the Proposers based upon the Committee Member's score for each Proposer. The ranking established by each Committee Member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each Committee Member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Proposers' total scores from each Committee Member will be added and compared. The Proposer with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Proposers.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SCORING

Committee Member: David McLarchie Date: March 20, 2014

Firm Name: Boingo

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Proposer's Experience	20	15
B. Business Plan	38	28
C. Staff Experience	10	7
D. Blueprint and Minority/and Women Owned Business Enterprise- the degree of participation by City certified or recognized M/WBE in subcontracts	10	9
E. Veteran Business Enterprise participation in subcontracts	2	2
F. Additional Services	10	8
G. Revenue Proposal	10	8
TOTAL SCORE	**100**	77
RANK	3	

Each Committee Member will evaluate the above factors to determine the final ranking of the short-listed Proposers. Each Committee Member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each Committee Member will rank the Proposers based upon the Committee Member's score for each Proposer. The ranking established by each Committee Member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each Committee Member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Proposers' total scores from each Committee Member will be added and compared. The Proposer with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Proposers.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SCORING

Committee Member: David McLatchie Date: March 20, 2014

Firm Name: Crown Castle

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Proposer's Experience	20	18
B. Business Plan	38	32
C. Staff Experience	10	9
D. Blueprint and Minority/and Women Owned Business Enterprise- the degree of participation by City certified or recognized M/WBE in subcontracts	10	0
E. Veteran Business Enterprise participation in subcontracts	2	0
F. Additional Services	10	7
G. Revenue Proposal	10	6
TOTAL SCORE	**100**	72
RANK	4	

Each Committee Member will evaluate the above factors to determine the final ranking of the short-listed Proposers. Each Committee Member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each Committee Member will rank the Proposers based upon the Committee Member's score for each Proposer. The ranking established by each Committee Member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each Committee Member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Proposers' total scores from each Committee Member will be added and compared. The Proposer with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Proposers.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SCORING

Committee Member: David McLatchie Date: March 20, 2014

Firm Name: Mobilitie

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Proposer's Experience	20	18
B. Business Plan	38	33
C. Staff Experience	10	8
D. Blueprint and Minority/and Women Owned Business Enterprise- the degree of participation by City certified or recognized M/WBE in subcontracts	10	6
E. Veteran Business Enterprise participation in subcontracts	2	0
F. Additional Services	10	8
G. Revenue Proposal	10	9
TOTAL SCORE	**100**	82
RANK	1	

Each Committee Member will evaluate the above factors to determine the final ranking of the short-listed Proposers. Each Committee Member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each Committee Member will rank the Proposers based upon the Committee Member's score for each Proposer. The ranking established by each Committee Member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each Committee Member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Proposers' total scores from each Committee Member will be added and compared. The Proposer with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Proposers.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SCORING

Committee Member: BRENT DAUBACH Date: March 20, 2014

Firm Name: AMERICAN TOWER

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Proposer's Experience	20	18
B. Business Plan	~~30~~	35
C. Staff Experience	10	10
D. Blueprint and Minority/and Women Owned Business Enterprise- the degree of participation by City certified or recognized M/WBE in subcontracts	10	7
E. Veteran Business Enterprise participation in subcontracts	2	0
F. Additional Services	10	7
G. Revenue Proposal	~~15~~	8
TOTAL SCORE	**100**	~~86~~ 85 87
RANK	1	

Each Committee Member will evaluate the above factors to determine the final ranking of the short-listed Proposers. Each Committee Member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each Committee Member will rank the Proposers based upon the Committee Member's score for each Proposer. The ranking established by each Committee Member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each Committee Member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Proposers' total scores from each Committee Member will be added and compared. The Proposer with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Proposers.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SCORING

Committee Member: BRENT DAUBACH Date: March 20, 2014

Firm Name: B. BOINGO

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Proposer's Experience	20	15
B. Business Plan	38	30
C. Staff Experience	10	8
D. Blueprint and Minority/and Women Owned Business Enterprise- the degree of participation by City certified or recognized M/WBE in subcontracts	10	9
E. Veteran Business Enterprise participation in subcontracts	2	2
F. Additional Services	10	10
G. Revenue Proposal	10	8
TOTAL SCORE	**100**	82 BD
RANK	2	

Each Committee Member will evaluate the above factors to determine the final ranking of the short-listed Proposers. Each Committee Member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each Committee Member will rank the Proposers based upon the Committee Member's score for each Proposer. The ranking established by each Committee Member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each Committee Member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Proposers' total scores from each Committee Member will be added and compared. The Proposer with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Proposers.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SCORING

Committee Member: BRENT DAUBACH Date: March 20, 2014

Firm Name: CROWN CASTLE

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Proposer's Experience	20	17
B. Business Plan	38	33
C. Staff Experience	10	10
D. Blueprint and Minority/and Women Owned Business Enterprise- the degree of participation by City certified or recognized M/WBE in subcontracts	10	0
E. Veteran Business Enterprise participation in subcontracts	2	0
F. Additional Services	10	7
G. Revenue Proposal	16	6
TOTAL SCORE	**100**	73
RANK	4	

Each Committee Member will evaluate the above factors to determine the final ranking of the short-listed Proposers. Each Committee Member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each Committee Member will rank the Proposers based upon the Committee Member's score for each Proposer. The ranking established by each Committee Member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each Committee Member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Proposers' total scores from each Committee Member will be added and compared. The Proposer with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Proposers.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SCORING

Committee Member: BRENT DAUBACH Date: March 20, 2014

Firm Name: MOBILITIE

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Proposer's Experience	20	17
B. Business Plan	38	31
C. Staff Experience	10	8
D. Blueprint and Minority/and Women Owned Business Enterprise- the degree of participation by City certified or recognized M/WBE in subcontracts	10	6
E. Veteran Business Enterprise participation in subcontracts	2	0
F. Additional Services	10	8
G. Revenue Proposal	16	10
TOTAL SCORE	**100**	80 BT
RANK	3	

Each Committee Member will evaluate the above factors to determine the final ranking of the short-listed Proposers. Each Committee Member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each Committee Member will rank the Proposers based upon the Committee Member's score for each Proposer. The ranking established by each Committee Member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each Committee Member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Proposers' total scores from each Committee Member will be added and compared. The Proposer with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Proposers.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SCORING

Committee Member: MALWAN RASHID Date: March 20, 2014

Firm Name: AMERICAN TRAFFIC.

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Proposer's Experience	20	18
B. Business Plan	38	30
C. Staff Experience	10	8
D. Blueprint and Minority/and Women Owned Business Enterprise- the degree of participation by City certified or recognized M/WBE in subcontracts	10	6
E. Veteran Business Enterprise participation in subcontracts	2	0
F. Additional Services	10	4
G. Revenue Proposal	10	07
TOTAL SCORE	**100**	73
RANK	3	

Each Committee Member will evaluate the above factors to determine the final ranking of the short-listed Proposers. Each Committee Member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each Committee Member will rank the Proposers based upon the Committee Member's score for each Proposer. The ranking established by each Committee Member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each Committee Member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Proposers' total scores from each Committee Member will be added and compared. The Proposer with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Proposers.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SCORING

Committee Member: MARVIN CRISTO Date: March 20, 2014

Firm Name: BOMBO.

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Proposer's Experience	20	16
B. Business Plan	30	30
C. Staff Experience	10	7
D. Blueprint and Minority/and Women Owned Business Enterprise- the degree of participation by City certified or recognized M/WBE in subcontracts	10	10
E. Veteran Business Enterprise participation in subcontracts	2	2
F. Additional Services	10	6
G. Revenue Proposal	10	8
TOTAL SCORE	**100**	79
RANK	1	

Each Committee Member will evaluate the above factors to determine the final ranking of the short-listed Proposers. Each Committee Member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each Committee Member will rank the Proposers based upon the Committee Member's score for each Proposer. The ranking established by each Committee Member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each Committee Member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Proposers' total scores from each Committee Member will be added and compared. The Proposer with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Proposers.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SCORING

Committee Member: MADHAV APSHAD Date: March 20, 2014

Firm Name: CRAN CASTLE

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Proposer's Experience	20	18
B. Business Plan	39	33
C. Staff Experience	10	9
D. Blueprint and Minority/and Women Owned Business Enterprise- the degree of participation by City certified or recognized M/WBE in subcontracts	10	0
E. Veteran Business Enterprise participation in subcontracts	2	0
F. Additional Services	10	4
G. Revenue Proposal	10	4
TOTAL SCORE	**100**	68
RANK	4	

Each Committee Member will evaluate the above factors to determine the final ranking of the short-listed Proposers. Each Committee Member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each Committee Member will rank the Proposers based upon the Committee Member's score for each Proposer. The ranking established by each Committee Member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each Committee Member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Proposers' total scores from each Committee Member will be added and compared. The Proposer with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Proposers.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SCORING

Committee Member: Marwan Qashou Date: March 20, 2014

Firm Name: MOBILITIE

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Proposer's Experience	20	17
B. Business Plan	38	28
C. Staff Experience	10	7.5
D. Blueprint and Minority/and Women Owned Business Enterprise- the degree of participation by City certified or recognized M/WBE in subcontracts	10	4
E. Veteran Business Enterprise participation in subcontracts	2	0
F. Additional Services	10	7
G. Revenue Proposal	10	10
TOTAL SCORE	**100**	73.5
RANK	2	

Each Committee Member will evaluate the above factors to determine the final ranking of the short-listed Proposers. Each Committee Member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each Committee Member will rank the Proposers based upon the Committee Member's score for each Proposer. The ranking established by each Committee Member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each Committee Member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Proposers' total scores from each Committee Member will be added and compared. The Proposer with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Proposers.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SCORING

Committee Member: Matt Repchek Date: March 20, 2014

Firm Name: American Tower

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Proposer's Experience	20	12
B. Business Plan	38	32
C. Staff Experience	10	10
D. Blueprint and Minority/and Women Owned Business Enterprise- the degree of participation by City certified or recognized M/WBE in subcontracts	10	6
E. Veteran Business Enterprise participation in subcontracts	2	0
F. Additional Services	10	6
G. Revenue Proposal	10	7
TOTAL SCORE	**100**	73
RANK	3	

Each Committee Member will evaluate the above factors to determine the final ranking of the short-listed Proposers. Each Committee Member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each Committee Member will rank the Proposers based upon the Committee Member's score for each Proposer. The ranking established by each Committee Member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each Committee Member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Proposers' total scores from each Committee Member will be added and compared. The Proposer with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Proposers.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SCORING

Committee Member: Matt Repchak Date: March 20, 2014

Firm Name: Barnso

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Proposer's Experience	20	15
B. Business Plan	38	29
C. Staff Experience	10	8
D. Blueprint and Minority/and Women Owned Business Enterprise- the degree of participation by City certified or recognized M/WBE in subcontracts	10	10
E. Veteran Business Enterprise participation in subcontracts	2	2
F. Additional Services	10	10
G. Revenue Proposal	16	8
TOTAL SCORE	**100**	82
RANK	1	

Each Committee Member will evaluate the above factors to determine the final ranking of the short-listed Proposers. Each Committee Member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each Committee Member will rank the Proposers based upon the Committee Member's score for each Proposer. The ranking established by each Committee Member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each Committee Member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Proposers' total scores from each Committee Member will be added and compared. The Proposer with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Proposers.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SCORING

Committee Member: Matt Repchak Date: March 20, 2014

Firm Name: Crain Castle

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Proposer's Experience	20	20
B. Business Plan	30	24
C. Staff Experience	10	10
D. Blueprint and Minority/and Women Owned Business Enterprise- the degree of participation by City certified or recognized M/WBE in subcontracts	10	0
E. Veteran Business Enterprise participation in subcontracts	2	0
F. Additional Services	10	6
G. Revenue Proposal	10	3
TOTAL SCORE	**100**	63
RANK	4	

Each Committee Member will evaluate the above factors to determine the final ranking of the short-listed Proposers. Each Committee Member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each Committee Member will rank the Proposers based upon the Committee Member's score for each Proposer. The ranking established by each Committee Member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each Committee Member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Proposers' total scores from each Committee Member will be added and compared. The Proposer with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Proposers.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SCORING

Committee Member: Matt Kepchak Date: March 20, 2014

Firm Name: Mobilitie

RATING FACTORS	MAXIMUM POINTS	ITEM SCORE
A. Proposer's Experience	20	15
B. Business Plan	38	32
C. Staff Experience	10	9
D. Blueprint and Minority/and Women Owned Business Enterprise- the degree of participation by City certified or recognized M/WBE in subcontracts	10	5
E. Veteran Business Enterprise participation in subcontracts	2	0
F. Additional Services	10	9
G. Revenue Proposal	10	10
TOTAL SCORE	**100**	80
RANK	2	

Each Committee Member will evaluate the above factors to determine the final ranking of the short-listed Proposers. Each Committee Member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each Committee Member will rank the Proposers based upon the Committee Member's score for each Proposer. The ranking established by each Committee Member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each Committee Member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Proposers' total scores from each Committee Member will be added and compared. The Proposer with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Proposers.

Request of Qualification Statements
RQS13-0476 Professional Engineering for Material Testing and Inspection
for Florida Citrus Bowl Stadium Reconstruction
Shortlist Scoring

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	American Tower	Boingo	Crown Castle	Mobilitie
A	**20**	17	14	20	18
B	**38**	29	24	35	28
C	**10**	9	7	10	8
D	**10**	2.8	10	0	2.4
E	**2**	0	2	0	0
F	**10**	7	7	6	8
G	**10**	8.2	8.5	3.9	10
TOTAL POINT VALUE	**100**	**73**	**72.5**	**74.9**	**74.4**
Frank Usina		**3**	**4**	**1**	**2**
Ranking					

	Frank Usina	David McLatchie
American Tower	**3**	**2**
Boingo	**4**	**3**
Crown Castle	**1**	**4**
Mobilitie	**2**	**1**

Committee Members -->	Frank Usina	David McLatchie

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	American Tower	Boingo	Crown Castle	Mobilitie
A	**20**	18	15	18	18
B	**38**	34	28	32	33
C	**10**	8	7	9	8
D	**10**	7	9	0	6
E	**2**	0	2	0	0
F	**10**	6	8	7	8
G	**10**	8	8	6	9
	0				
TOTAL POINT VALUE	**100**	**81**	**77**	**72**	**82**
David McLatchie		**2**	**3**	**4**	**1**
Ranking					

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	American Tower	Boingo	Crown Castle	Mobilitie
A	**20**	18	15	17	17
B	**38**	35	30	33	31
C	**10**	10	8	10	8
D	**10**	7	9	0	6
E	**2**	0	2	0	0
F	**10**	7	10	7	8
G	**10**	8	8	6	10
	0				
TOTAL POINT VALUE	**100**	**85**	**82**	**73**	**80**
Brent Daubach		**1**	**2**	**4**	**3**

Request of Qualification Statements
RQS13-0476 Professional Engineering for Material Testing and Inspection
for Florida Citrus Bowl Stadium Reconstruction
Shortlist Scoring

Ranking	**1**	**2**	**4**	**3**

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	American Tower	Boingo	Crown Castle	Mobilitie
A	**20**	18	16	18	17
B	**38**	30	30	33	28
C	**10**	8	7	9	7.5
D	**10**	6	10	0	4
E	**2**	0	2	0	0
F	**10**	4	6	4	7
G	**10**	7	8	4	10
	0				
TOTAL POINT VALUE	**100**	**73**	**79**	**68**	**73.5**
Marwan Rashid		**3**	**1**	**4**	**2**
Ranking					

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	American Tower	Boingo	Crown Castle	Mobilitie
A	**20**	12	15	20	15
B	**38**	32	29	24	32
C	**10**	10	8	10	9
D	**10**	6	10	0	5
E	**2**	0	2	0	0
F	**10**	6	10	6	9
G	**10**	7	8	3	10
	0				
TOTAL POINT VALUE	**100**	**73**	**82**	**63**	**80**
Matt Repchek		**3**	**1**	**4**	**2**
Ranking					

Request of Qualification Statements
RQS13-0476 Professional Engineering for Material Testing and Inspection
for Florida Citrus Bowl Stadium Reconstruction
Shortlist Scoring

Brent Daubach	Marwan Rashid	Matt Repchek	Total	Ranking
1	3	3	12	3
2	1	1	11	2
4	4	4	17	4
3	2	2	10	1

Brent Daubach	Marwan Rashid	Matt Repchek

Request of Qualification Statements
RQS13-0476 Professional Engineering for Material Testing and Inspection
for Florida Citrus Bowl Stadium Reconstruction
Shortlist Scoring