



Minutes
Evaluation Committee Meeting
Town of Lake Park, Florida
Request for Proposal 103-2022
Lake Park Harbor Marina Fuel Dispenser
Replacement Project
April 5, 2022, 3:00 p.m.
Town Hall Commission Chamber,
Town Hall, 535 Park Avenue

The Evaluation Committee meeting for Request for Proposal 103-2022, Lake Park Harbor Marina Fuel Dispenser Replacement was conducted on April 5, 2022 at 3 p.m. Present were Town Manager John D'Agostino, Marina Director Stephen Bogner and Town Clerk Vivian Mendez.

Marina Director Bogner called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m., and introduced everyone. Marina Director Bogner explained the purpose of the meeting was to evaluate the submittals for the Lake Park Harbor Marina Fuel Dispenser Replacement Project. He explained that Glasgow Equipment Services did not submit the required bond, therefore their submittal was considered non-responsive.

The Evaluation Committee member explained their evaluation of the submittal (See attached).

Marina Director Bogner announced that Spatco Energy Solutions submittal was responsive. A Notice of Intent to Award would be issued and the recommendation of award of contract would be provided to the Town Commission for consideration at a future Commission meeting.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

Town Clerk Vivian Mendez, MMC

RFP 103-2022 – LAKE PARK HARBOR MARINA DOCK REPAIRS - EVALUATION COMMITTEE
SCORING SHEET

NAME OF EVALUATOR: Stephen H. Bogner

NAME OF PROPOSER: Spatco Energy Solutions

INSTRUCTIONS TO EVALUATORS: After thorough review of the complete RFP and each proposal, please rank each proposal according to the following evaluation criteria. There is a total maximum of 100 points able to be awarded. The proposals will then be ranked according to the total number of points awarded by the committee.

CRITERIA

- a. **Proposer's Quality of References:** how the proposer was rated on similar projects, with higher scores awarded for work of greater scope, complexity, and project cost.
Maximum Points = 20 Awarded Points = 15

- b. **Work Schedule / Time to Completion:** concise timeline and details of the proposers work schedule and timeframe to complete the project, with higher scores awarded for more aggressive work schedule and shorter time to completion.
Maximum Points = 20 Awarded Points = 0

- c. **Firm's Years of Petroleum Equipment Industry Experience:** Higher scores awarded to firms with experience with marine-related installations.
Maximum Points = 20 Awarded Points = 20

- d. **Adequacy of Written Work Plan:** How the proposer lays out their plan and approach to making the repairs; higher scores corresponding to greater thoroughness, detail, and creativeness and innovation in their work plan.
Maximum Points = 20 Awarded Points = 17

- e. **Price Proposal:** Proposer's proposed total price for the work
Maximum Points = 20 Awarded Points = 15

Stephen H. Bogner
Signature of Evaluator

4-5-22
Date

= 67

**RFP 103-2022 – LAKE PARK HARBOR MARINA DOCK REPAIRS - EVALUATION COMMITTEE
SCORING SHEET**

NAME OF EVALUATOR: John DiGostino
NAME OF PROPOSER: SPATCO

INSTRUCTIONS TO EVALUATORS: After thorough review of the complete RFP and each proposal, please rank each proposal according to the following evaluation criteria. There is a total maximum of 100 points able to be awarded. The proposals will then be ranked according to the total number of points awarded by the committee.

CRITERIA

- a. **Proposer's Quality of References:** how the proposer was rated on similar projects, with higher scores awarded for work of greater scope, complexity, and project cost.
Maximum Points = 20 **Awarded Points =** 20

- b. **Work Schedule / Time to Completion:** concise timeline and details of the proposers work schedule and timeframe to complete the project, with higher scores awarded for more aggressive work schedule and shorter time to completion.
Maximum Points = 20 **Awarded Points =** 0

- c. **Firm's Years of Petroleum Equipment Industry Experience:** Higher scores awarded to firms with experience with marine-related installations.
Maximum Points = 20 **Awarded Points =** 20

- d. **Adequacy of Written Work Plan:** How the proposer lays out their plan and approach to making the repairs; higher scores corresponding to greater thoroughness, detail, and creativeness and innovation in their work plan.
Maximum Points = 20 **Awarded Points =** 15

- e. **Price Proposal:** Proposer's proposed total price for the work
Maximum Points = 20 **Awarded Points =** 20



Signature of Evaluator

4-5-22


Date

RFP 103-2022 LAKE PARK HARBOR MARINA FUEL DISPENSER REPLACEMENT

PROPOSAL SCORING MATRIX

| Evaluation Criteria Breakdown | Points | Spatco Energy Solutions | Glasgow Equipment Svc. | | | |
|--|------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|
| Completeness of Response to RFP (Pass/Fail) | | | | | | |
| ALL required schedules, forms and informational items have been submitted (Tabs 1, 2, 3). | Pass/Fail | | FAIL | | | |
| A. Proposer's Quality of References | 20 Points | | | | | |
| Evaluator 1. | 20 Points | | | | | |
| Evaluator 2. | | | | | | |
| Evaluator 3. | | | | | | |
| TOTAL ALL SCORES | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to references to successful work of greater complexity, scope, and cost. | | | | | | |
| B. Work Schedule / Time to Completion | 10 Points | | | | | |
| Evaluator 1. | -0- | | | | | |
| Evaluator 2. | | | | | | |
| Evaluator 3. | | | | | | |
| TOTAL ALL SCORES | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to a more aggressive work schedule and shorter time to completion - the more aggressive the schedule/time to project completion, the higher the score. | | | | | | |
| C. Firm's Years of Industry Experience | 20 Points | | | | | |
| Evaluator 1. | 20 pts | | | | | |
| Evaluator 2. | | | | | | |
| Evaluator 3. | | | | | | |
| TOTAL ALL SCORES | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to greater experience in the industry; higher scores for marine-related installations. | | | | | | |
| D. Adequacy of Written Work Plan | 20 Points | | | | | |
| Evaluator 1. | 15 pts | | | | | |
| Evaluator 2. | | | | | | |
| Evaluator 3. | | | | | | |
| TOTAL ALL SCORES | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. | | | | | | |
| E. Price Proposal | 20 Points | | | | | |
| Evaluator 1. | 20 pts | | | | | |
| Evaluator 2. | | | | | | |
| Evaluator 3. | | | | | | |
| TOTAL ALL SCORES | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price, the higher the score. | | | | | | |
| | 75 | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 100 Points (X 3) | - | - | - | - | - |

Evaluation Committee Member 1. John D'Agostino
 Tuesday, April 5, 2022
 Evaluation Committee Member 2. John Payne
 Tuesday, April 5, 2022
 Evaluation Committee Member 3. Stephen Bogner
 Tuesday, April 5, 2022


 Signature

 Signature

 Signature
