

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 there 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 EVA	LUATOR: Stephen H. Bogner					
NAME OF PRO	OPOSER: Spatco Energy Solutions					
please rank of 1	S TO EVALUATORS: After thorough review of the complete RFP and each proposal, each proposal according to the following evaluation criteria. There is a total 100 points able to be awarded. The proposals will then be ranked according to the of points awarded by the committee.					
CRITERIA	Pronocor's Quality of Poforonces: how the proposer was rated on					
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 =					
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 =					
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 =					
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 =					
e.	Price Proposal: Proposer's proposed total price for the work Maximum Points = 20 Awarded Points = 15					
N × 1	=67					
XViala	11) cer 4-5-22					

Date

Signature of Evaluator

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

NAME OF EVA	LUATOR: John Dityostino
NAME OF PRO	POSER: SPATCO
please rank of maximum of 1	S TO EVALUATORS: After thorough review of the complete RFP and each proposal, each proposal according to the following evaluation criteria. There is a total .00 points able to be awarded. The proposals will then be ranked according to the of points awarded by the committee.
<u>CRITERIA</u> 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
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
e.	Price Proposal: Proposer's proposed total price for the work Maximum Points = 20 Awarded Points = 20
signature of Evalua	$\frac{4-5-22}{\text{Date}}$

RFP 103-2022 LAKE PARK HARBOR MARINA FUEL DISPENSER REPLACEMENT

PROPOSAL SCORING MATRIX

Evaluation Criteria Breakdown Completeness of Response to RFP (Pass/Fail) ALL required schedules, forms and informational items have been submitted (Tabs 1, 2, 3) A Proposer's Quality of References Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to more aggressive work schedule in the project completion in the higher the scores. C. Firm's Years of Industry Experience Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O	\vdash							
Completeness of Response to RFP (Pass/Fail) ALL required schedules, forms and informational items have been submitted (Tabs 1, 2, 3). A Proposer's Quality of References Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to references to successful work of greater complexity, scope, and cost. B. Work Schedule / Time to Completion Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to a more aggressive work schedule and shorter time to completion - the more aggressive work schedule and shorter time to completion, the higher the score. C. Firm's Years of Industry Experience Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES 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 Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to greater experience in the industry, higher scores for marine-related installations. TOTAL ALL SCORES 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 Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's work Plan. Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 1. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price, the lower the price.		Evaluation Criteria Breakdown	Points		111.			
ALL required schedules, forms and informational items have been submitted (Tabs 1, 2, 3). A. Proposer's Quality of References Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES 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 B. Work Schedule / Time to Completion 10 Points B. Work Schedule and shorter lime to completion. The more aggressive work schedule and shorter lime to completion. The higher the score. C. Firm's Years of Industry Experience Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to greater expenence in the industry, higher scores for marine-related installations. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to greater expenence in the industry, higher scores for marine-related installations. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to greater expenence in the industry, higher scores for marine-related installations. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the proposer's submitted price for the project. The lower the price, the lower the p	c		7 011110					
Deen submitted (Tabs 1, 2, 3). FAIL			Page/Fail					
Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES O O O O O Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to references to successful work of greater complexity, scope, and cost. B. Work Schedule / Time to Completion Evaluator 1. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES O O O O O D O O O O O O O O O O O O O			1 433/1 411		FAIL			
Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to references to successful work of greater complexity, scope, and cost. B. Work Schedule / Time to Completion Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES 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 Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES 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 Evaluator 1. Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price, the lower the pri	A.	Proposer's Quality of References	20 Points					
Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to references to successful work of greater complexity, scope, and cost. B. Work Schedule / Time to Completion Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to a more aggressive who schedule and shorter time to completion, the higher the score. C. Firm's Years of Industry Experience Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES 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 Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the proposer's submitted price for the project the lower the price, proposer's submitted price for the project the lower the price, proposer's submitted price for the project the lower the price, proposer's submitted price for the project the lower the price, price proposer's submitted price for the project the lower the price, price price proposer's submitted price for the project the lower the price, price price price proposer's submitted price for the project the lower the price, price pri		Evaluator 1,	25					
Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to references to successful work of greater complexity, scope, and cost. B. Work Schedule / Time to Completion Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to a more aggressive work schedule and shorter time to completion , the higher the score. Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES 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 Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. E. Price Proposal Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. E. Price Proposal Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. E. Price Proposal Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. E. Price Proposal Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price, brite price, brit		Evaluator 2.	12 W					
Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to references to successful work of greater complexity, scope, and cost. B. Work Schedule / Time to Completion Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to a more aggressive work schedule and shorter time to completion - the more aggressive work schedule/time to project completion, the higher the score. C. Firm's Years of Industry Experience Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES 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 Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. E. Price Proposal Evaluator 1. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. E. Price Proposal Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. E. Price Proposal Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the perpopeser's submitted price for the project - the lower the price,		Evaluator 3.	GINIS					
references to successful work of greater complexity, scope, and cost. B. Work Schedule / Time to Completion Ivaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to a more aggressive work schedule/time to project completion the more aggressive the schedule/time to project completion, the higher the score. C. Firm's Years of Industry Experience Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES 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 Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. E. Price Proposal Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. E. Price Proposal Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. E. Price Proposal Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. E. Price Proposal Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the proposer's work Plan. E. Price Proposal Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the proposer's work Plan. Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the proposer's submitted price for the project the lower the price.		TOTAL ALL SCORES	V C	0	0	0	0	0
Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES 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 Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES 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 Evaluator 1. Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. E. Price Proposal Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. E. Price Proposal Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price.		references to successful work of greater complexity, scope, and						
Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES 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 Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES 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 Evaluator 1. Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. E. Price Proposal Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. E. Price Proposal Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price.	В.	Work Schedule / Time to Completion	10 Points					
Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES 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 Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES 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 Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. E. Price Proposal Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. E. Price Proposal Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. E. Price Proposal Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price.								
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 Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES 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 Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. E. Price Proposal Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. E. Price Proposal Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price.		Evaluator 2.	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 Evaluator 1. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES D. Adequacy of Written Work Plan Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES 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 Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. Evaluator 1. Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Submitted price for the project - the lower the price.		Evaluator 3.	8.2					
Inigher the score. C. Firm's Years of Industry Experience 20 Points Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES 0 0 0 0 0 0		TOTAL ALL SCORES		0	0	0	0	0
Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES 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 Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. E. Price Proposal Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. E. Price Proposal Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price, proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price,		higher the score.	16					
Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES 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 Evaluator 1. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. E. Price Proposal Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. E. Price Proposal Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price, proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price,	C.	Firm's Years of Industry Experience	20 Points					
Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O		Evaluator 1.						
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 Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and statil of the proposer's Work Plan. Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price, proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price,		Evaluator 2.	20					
Installations. D. Adequacy of Written Work Plan Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. E. Price Proposal Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES O O O O Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES O O O O Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price, proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price, proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price, proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price, proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price, proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price, proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price, proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price, proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price, proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price, proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price, proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price, proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price for the project -		Evaluator 3.	11					
Installations. D. Adequacy of Written Work Plan Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. E. Price Proposal Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES O O O O Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES O O O O Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price, proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price, proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price, proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price, proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price, proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price, proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price, proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price, proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price, proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price, proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price, proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price, proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price for the project -		TOTAL ALL SCORES	617	0	0	0	0	0
Evaluator 1. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. E. Price Proposal Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O		Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to greater experience in the industry; higher scores for marine-related installations.	Svice 1935					
Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. E. Price Proposal Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price,	D.	Adequacy of Written Work Plan	20 Points					
Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. E. Price Proposal Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price,		Evaluator 1.	4.4					
Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the level of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan. E. Price Proposal Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price,		Evaluator 2.	15 057					
Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price,		Evaluator 3.	14.5					
Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price,		TOTAL ALL SCORES	il colored	0	0	0	0	0
Evaluator 1. Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price,		of thoroughness and detail of the proposer's Work Plan.	Noghaduse					
Evaluator 2. Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price,	E.		20 Points					
Evaluator 3. TOTAL ALL SCORES 0 0 0 0 Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price,			4.					
Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price,		Evaluator 2.	208/2					
Scores rated on an increasing scale corresponding to the proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price,			\$ 11 (20)					
proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price,				0	0	0	0	0
		proposer's submitted price for the project - the lower the price,	aproper					
75			75					
TOTAL 100 Points (X 3)	TC	DTAL	100 Points (X 3)	:•0	0.0	-		0#0

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

W"	(ya ma	
Simpature		
oig cattire	\sim	

Signature		
-		

Signature