



City of Hollywood
Procurement Services

Otis Thomas, Interim Director/Chief Procurement Officer
2600 Hollywood Boulevard, Hollywood, FL 33020

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP-257-25-SA

Urban Design Guidelines

RESPONSE DEADLINE: May 15, 2025 at 2:00 pm

Report Generated: Wednesday, July 23, 2025

PHASE 1

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Firm Qualifications and Experience	Points Based	25 (23.8% of Total)

Description:

Provide a brief overview of the firm(s) performing urban design, planning policy and/or design guidelines, their qualifications in working with various municipal departments, commissions, election officials, and community members, and a description of any special services, expertise, or abilities that the firm(s) can utilize in the performance of the services described herein. Describe experience related to urban design, neighborhood design guidelines, and/ or policy planning projects with similar size and scope. Provide references for at least three (3) relevant projects. Each reference will be submitted using the City's Vendor Reference Form (**See Exhibit B**). Optional: Additional references and reference letters may be submitted.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Project Team and Project Leadership	Points Based	25 (23.8% of Total)

Description:

The Project Team should include planners, architects, and/or urban designers with experience in outreach, planning policy, and design guidelines. Provide an organization chart that identifies the key members of the project, their firm, title, and assigned role within the project team. Briefly summarize the major responsibilities of each team member and the primary tasks they will be working on. Include resumes for all team members highlighting relevant projects and qualifications to complete the assigned tasks. The firm will designate the individual who will be the primary point person with City staff and oversee the scope of work. Describe the Project Leader's qualifications, outline their primary responsibilities, and provide examples of relevant projects of similar scope and size that demonstrate the Project Leader's ability to successfully oversee projects completed on time and within the budget.

EVALUATION TABULATION
RFP No. RFP-257-25-SA
Urban Design Guidelines

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Approach and Work Plan	Points Based	30 (28.6% of Total)

Description:

Provide a written narrative describing the Consultant team’s approach and work plan for completing the scope of work, including but not limited to, the number of meetings, the number of staff to attend meetings, and the time frame for completion.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Fee Statement (Administratively Scored)	Points Based	20 (19% of Total)

Description:

Fees to provide the services as outlined in Respondent's Pricing Table (**See Exhibit C Pricing Table Template**) outlining the timeline and fees associated with each phase.

This criterion will be administratively scored by the Office of Procurement based on an equation and comparison of the lowest proposed fee to each Respondent's fee (See Section 6. Evaluation Committee for a sample scoring methodology).

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Local Preference (Administratively Scored)	Points Based	5 (4.8% of Total)

Description:

Local preference in the form of 5 bonus points will be assigned to each firm identified as a Local Hollywood Vendor. As outlined in the City of Hollywood Code of Ordinances, a Local Hollywood Vendor shall mean a business entity that has maintained a permanent place of business with full-time employees within the City limits for a minimum of one year prior to the date of issuance of a bid or proposal solicitation. The permanent place of business must be the primary place of business of the entity and may not be a post office box or a personal residence. The business must actually distribute goods, supplies, materials, equipment or services from the permanent place of business. The business must have a current local business tax receipt from the City and must not be publicly traded.

This criterion will be administratively scored by the Office of Procurement.

AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY

Vendor	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Total Score (Max Score 105)
DIALOG Design LP	78.1	80.1	80.1	78.1	76.1	78.53
WSP USA Inc.	76.8	81.8	79.8	74.8	75.8	77.84
Bermello Ajamil & Partners, LLC	74	84	71	81	73	76.55
Inspire Placemaking Collective, Inc.	65.9	83.9	63.9	74.9	76.9	73.14
Brooks + Scarpa	68.8	79.8	62.8	59.8	65.8	67.37
PaleoWest, LLC	35	91	45	71	65	61.4

VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA

Vendor	Firm Qualifications and Experience Points Based 25 Points (23.8%)	Project Team and Project Leadership Points Based 25 Points (23.8%)	Approach and Work Plan Points Based 30 Points (28.6%)	Fee Statement (Administratively Scored) Points Based 20 Points (19%)	Local Preference (Administratively Scored) Points Based 5 Points (4.8%)	Total Score (Max Score 105)
DIALOG Design LP	23.6	23.4	26.4	5.1	0	78.53
WSP USA Inc.	23.8	23.2	26	4.8	0	77.84
Bermello Ajamil & Partners, LLC	22.2	21.8	24.6	8	0	76.55
Inspire Placemaking Collective, Inc.	20.6	21.6	23	7.9	0	73.14

EVALUATION TABULATION
RFP No. RFP-257-25-SA
Urban Design Guidelines

Vendor	Firm Qualifications and Experience Points Based 25 Points (23.8%)	Project Team and Project Leadership Points Based 25 Points (23.8%)	Approach and Work Plan Points Based 30 Points (28.6%)	Fee Statement (Administratively Scored) Points Based 20 Points (19%)	Local Preference (Administratively Scored) Points Based 5 Points (4.8%)	Total Score (Max Score 105)
Brooks + Scarpa	21	21	20.6	4.8	0	67.37
PaleoWest, LLC	14.2	14.2	13	20	0	61.4