

Financial Auditing Services (RFP-4667-21-SS) Master Evaluation Form (CITY 6/9/21)	<i>Caballero Fierman Llerena &amp; Garcia, LLP</i>	<i>Marcum LLP</i>	<i>S. Davis &amp; Associates, P.A.</i>
<b>FINAL RANKING OF SHORTLISTED FIRMS</b>			
Josh Levy	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
Caryl S. Shuham	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
Linda Hill Anderson	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
Traci L. Callari	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
Adam Gruber	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
Kevin D. Biederman	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
Linda Sherwood	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>COMBINED RANK</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>FINAL RANK</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>

Financial Auditing Services (RFP-4667-21-SS) Master Evaluation Form (CRA 6/9/21)	<i>Caballero Fierman Llerena &amp; Garcia, LLP</i>	<i>Marcum LLP</i>	<i>S. Davis &amp; Associates, P.A.</i>
FINAL RANKING OF SHORTLISTED FIRMS			
Josh Levy	3	2	1
Caryl S. Shuham	3	2	1
Linda Hill Anderson	3	2	1
Traci L. Callari	3	2	1
Adam Gruber	3	2	1
Kevin D. Biederman	3	2	1
Linda Sherwood	3	2	1
<b>COMBINED RANK</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>FINAL RANK</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

<b>Financial Auditing Services (RFP-4667-21-SS) Master Evaluation Form (CITY &amp; CRA 5/19/21)</b>	<i>Caballero Fierman Llerena &amp; Garcia, LLP</i>	<i>Keefe McCullough</i>	<i>Marcum LLP</i>	<i>RSM US LLP</i>	<i>S. Davis &amp; Associates, P.A.</i>
<b>TECHNICAL QUALIFICATIONS</b>					
Josh Levy	68	60	78	76	62
Caryl S. Shuham	67	62	76	65	63
Linda Hill Anderson	68	60	60	60	80
Traci L. Callari	65	64	76	65	70
Adam Gruber	67	62	70	65	61
Kevin D. Biederman	75	64	70	65	76
Linda Sherwood	74	73	78	79	66
<b>COMBINED TECHNICAL SCORE</b>	<b>484</b>	<b>445</b>	<b>508</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>478</b>
<b>AVERAGE TECHNICAL SCORE</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>LOCAL PREFERENCE (score: 5 points)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>COMPOSITE TECHNICAL SCORE</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>PRICE (maximum score: 20 points)</b>	21: \$221,270 22: \$227,908 23: <u>\$234,745</u> \$683,923 or 21: \$190,960 + \$45,343 22: \$196,689 + \$46,703 23: <u>\$202,589 + \$48,104</u> \$590,238 + \$140,150 <b>\$683,923</b>	21: \$210,000 + \$11,000 22: \$210,000 + \$11,000 23: <u>\$210,000 + \$11,000</u> \$630,000 + \$33,000 24: \$215,000 + \$11,500 25: \$215,000 + \$12,000 <b>\$663,000</b>	21: \$204,750 + \$8,000 22: \$229,750 + \$8,000 23: <u>\$239,750 + \$8,000</u> \$674,250 + \$24,000 <b>\$698,250</b>	21: \$230,000 + \$8,000 22: \$230,000 + \$8,000 23: <u>\$230,000 + \$8,000</u> \$690,000 + \$24,000 <b>\$714,000</b>	21: \$209,980 22: \$209,980 23: <u>\$209,980</u> \$629,940 CRA: \$4,000 bundled with the City or \$10,000 without the City <b>\$641,940</b>
The firm providing the lowest price to the City will receive the maximum of 20 points, all others will receive points based on the following formula:  20 – [20 points X (total cost – lowest total cost) / lowest total cost] Note: If the result is a negative number, the score assigned will be 0.  Example: Proposal 1: \$100,000 Proposal 2: \$130,000 Proposal 1 being the lowest, would achieve a score of 20 points. Proposal 2 would achieve a score of 14 point, calculated as follows: 20 – [20 X (\$130,000 - \$100,000) / \$100,000] = 14 points	<b>18.7</b>	<b>19.3</b>	<b>18.2</b>	<b>17.8</b>	<b>20.0</b>
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>RANK</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>

<b>Financial Auditing Services (RFP-4667-21-SS)</b> <b>Selection Committee Evaluation Form (CITY &amp; CRA)</b>	<i>Caballero Fierman Llerena &amp; Garcia, LLP</i>	<i>Keefe McCullough</i>	<i>Marcum LLP</i>	<i>RSM US LLP</i>	<i>S. Davis &amp; Associates, P.A.</i>
<b>TECHNICAL QUALIFICATIONS</b>					
<b>Qualifications and Experience (maximum score: 20 points)</b> I. A description of the firm. II. A report on the most recent peer review, and whether it includes a review of the quality of specific government audits. III. Information on results of any federal or state desk or field reviews of its audits during the last five years. IV. Information on circumstances and status of any disciplinary action taken or pending against the firm or any of the professional staff during the past three years with State regulatory bodies or professional organizations. V. A summary of any litigation against the proposer in the past five years which is related to the services the proposer provides in the regular course of business. VI. A financial statement, annual report or other similar evidence of proposer's financial stability.	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Partner, Supervisory and Staff Qualifications and Experience (maximum score: 20 points)</b> I. Identification and provision of resumes for staff to be assigned to the audit, including information on continuing professional education. II. Identification and provision of resumes and staff or consultants responsible for ensuring the CAFR complies with the provisions of the ADA, including information on related continuing professional education. III. Experience in conducting similar government audits by the individuals to be assigned to the engagement. IV. The organization of the proposed audit team, including ADA compliance staff or consultants.	<b>18</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Similar Engagements (maximum score: 20 points)</b> I. A list and rank of the five most significant municipal government engagements in the State of Florida within the last five years that are similar to the engagement described in this RFP, excluding any previous engagements with the City of Hollywood, if applicable. Engagements should be for municipalities of similar size and scope to the City of Hollywood. If proposing on the CRA only, then a list and rank of the five most significant engagements of similar size and scope to the CRA. II. A list of the names and contact information of at least three other governments, preferably of similar size and scope, for which the proposer has recently performed audits.	<b>20</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Specific Audit Approach (maximum score: 20 points)</b> I. The proposed schedule of the engagement. II. The staffing assignments and levels to be designated to each proposed segment of the engagement. III. A description of the sampling techniques which will be used. IV. A discussion of the extent of use of electronic data processing software. V. A description of the analytical procedures which will be used. VI. A description of the approach to be taken to gain and document an understanding of the internal control structure. VI. Describe the approach to be taken to gain and document an understanding of the internal control structure. VI. A description of the approach to be taken in determining laws and regulations that will be subject to audit test work. VII. A description of the approach to be taken in determining audit samples for purposes of test compliance. VIII. A description of municipal staff support anticipated for the engagement.	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>RANK</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>

<b>Financial Auditing Services (RFP-4667-21-SS)</b> <b>Selection Committee Evaluation Form (CITY &amp; CRA)</b> <b>Selection Committee Member: Caryl Shuham</b>	<i>Caballero Fierman Llerena &amp; Garcia, LLP</i>	<i>Keefe McCullough</i>	<i>Marcum LLP</i>	<i>RSM US LLP</i>	<i>S. Davis &amp; Associates, P.A.</i>
<b>TECHNICAL QUALIFICATIONS</b>					
<b>Qualifications and Experience (maximum score: 20 points)</b> I. A description of the firm. II. A report on the most recent peer review, and whether it includes a review of the quality of specific government audits. III. Information on results of any federal or state desk or field reviews of its audits during the last five years. IV. Information on circumstances and status of any disciplinary action taken or pending against the firm or any of the professional staff during the past three years with State regulatory bodies or professional organizations. V. A summary of any litigation against the proposer in the past five years which is related to the services the proposer provides in the regular course of business. VI. A financial statement, annual report or other similar evidence of proposer's financial stability.	<b>17</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Partner, Supervisory and Staff Qualifications and Experience (maximum score: 20 points)</b> I. Identification and provision of resumes for staff to be assigned to the audit, including information on continuing professional education. II. Identification and provision of resumes and staff or consultants responsible for ensuring the CAFR complies with the provisions of the ADA, including information on related continuing professional education. III. Experience in conducting similar government audits by the individuals to be assigned to the engagement. IV. The organization of the proposed audit team, including ADA compliance staff or consultants.	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Similar Engagements (maximum score: 20 points)</b> I. A list and rank of the five most significant municipal government engagements in the State of Florida within the last five years that are similar to the engagement described in this RFP, excluding any previous engagements with the City of Hollywood, if applicable. Engagements should be for municipalities of similar size and scope to the City of Hollywood. If proposing on the CRA only, then a list and rank of the five most significant engagements of similar size and scope to the CRA. II. A list of the names and contact information of at least three other governments, preferably of similar size and scope, for which the proposer has recently performed audits.	<b>18</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Specific Audit Approach (maximum score: 20 points)</b> I. The proposed schedule of the engagement. II. The staffing assignments and levels to be designated to each proposed segment of the engagement. III. A description of the sampling techniques which will be used. IV. A discussion of the extent of use of electronic data processing software. V. A description of the analytical procedures which will be used. VI. A description of the approach to be taken to gain and document an understanding of the internal control structure. VI. Describe the approach to be taken to gain and document an understanding of the internal control structure. VI. A description of the approach to be taken in determining laws and regulations that will be subject to audit test work. VII. A description of the approach to be taken in determining audit samples for purposes of test compliance. VIII. A description of municipal staff support anticipated for the engagement.	<b>17</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>RANK</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>

<b>Financial Auditing Services (RFP-4667-21-SS)</b> <b>Selection Committee Evaluation Form (CITY &amp; CRA)</b> <b>Selection Committee Member: <span style="color: red;">Linda Anderson</span></b>	<i>Caballero Fierman Llerena &amp; Garcia, LLP</i>	<i>Keefe McCullough</i>	<i>Marcum LLP</i>	<i>RSM US LLP</i>	<i>S. Davis &amp; Associates, P.A.</i>
<b>TECHNICAL QUALIFICATIONS</b>					
<b>Qualifications and Experience (maximum score: 20 points)</b> I. A description of the firm. II. A report on the most recent peer review, and whether it includes a review of the quality of specific government audits. III. Information on results of any federal or state desk or field reviews of its audits during the last five years. IV. Information on circumstances and status of any disciplinary action taken or pending against the firm or any of the professional staff during the past three years with State regulatory bodies or professional organizations. V. A summary of any litigation against the proposer in the past five years which is related to the services the proposer provides in the regular course of business. VI. A financial statement, annual report or other similar evidence of proposer's financial stability.	<b>20</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Partner, Supervisory and Staff Qualifications and Experience (maximum score: 20 points)</b> I. Identification and provision of resumes for staff to be assigned to the audit, including information on continuing professional education. II. Identification and provision of resumes and staff or consultants responsible for ensuring the CAFR complies with the provisions of the ADA, including information on related continuing professional education. III. Experience in conducting similar government audits by the individuals to be assigned to the engagement. IV. The organization of the proposed audit team, including ADA compliance staff or consultants.	<b>16</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Similar Engagements (maximum score: 20 points)</b> I. A list and rank of the five most significant municipal government engagements in the State of Florida within the last five years that are similar to the engagement described in this RFP, excluding any previous engagements with the City of Hollywood, if applicable. Engagements should be for municipalities of similar size and scope to the City of Hollywood. If proposing on the CRA only, then a list and rank of the five most significant engagements of similar size and scope to the CRA. II. A list of the names and contact information of at least three other governments, preferably of similar size and scope, for which the proposer has recently performed audits.	<b>16</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Specific Audit Approach (maximum score: 20 points)</b> I. The proposed schedule of the engagement. II. The staffing assignments and levels to be designated to each proposed segment of the engagement. III. A description of the sampling techniques which will be used. IV. A discussion of the extent of use of electronic data processing software. V. A description of the analytical procedures which will be used. VI. A description of the approach to be taken to gain and document an understanding of the internal control structure. VI. Describe the approach to be taken to gain and document an understanding of the internal control structure. VI. A description of the approach to be taken in determining laws and regulations that will be subject to audit test work. VII. A description of the approach to be taken in determining audit samples for purposes of test compliance. VIII. A description of municipal staff support anticipated for the engagement.	<b>16</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>RANK</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>

<b>Financial Auditing Services (RFP-4667-21-SS)</b> <b>Selection Committee Evaluation Form (CITY &amp; CRA)</b> <b>Selection Committee Member: <i>Traci Callari</i></b>	<i>Caballero Fierman Llerena &amp; Garcia, LLP</i>	<i>Keefe McCullough</i>	<i>Marcum LLP</i>	<i>RSM US LLP</i>	<i>S. Davis &amp; Associates, P.A.</i>
<b>TECHNICAL QUALIFICATIONS</b>					
<b>Qualifications and Experience (maximum score: 20 points)</b> I. A description of the firm. II. A report on the most recent peer review, and whether it includes a review of the quality of specific government audits. III. Information on results of any federal or state desk or field reviews of its audits during the last five years. IV. Information on circumstances and status of any disciplinary action taken or pending against the firm or any of the professional staff during the past three years with State regulatory bodies or professional organizations. V. A summary of any litigation against the proposer in the past five years which is related to the services the proposer provides in the regular course of business. VI. A financial statement, annual report or other similar evidence of proposer's financial stability.	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Partner, Supervisory and Staff Qualifications and Experience (maximum score: 20 points)</b> I. Identification and provision of resumes for staff to be assigned to the audit, including information on continuing professional education. II. Identification and provision of resumes and staff or consultants responsible for ensuring the CAFR complies with the provisions of the ADA, including information on related continuing professional education. III. Experience in conducting similar government audits by the individuals to be assigned to the engagement. IV. The organization of the proposed audit team, including ADA compliance staff or consultants.	<b>13</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Similar Engagements (maximum score: 20 points)</b> I. A list and rank of the five most significant municipal government engagements in the State of Florida within the last five years that are similar to the engagement described in this RFP, excluding any previous engagements with the City of Hollywood, if applicable. Engagements should be for municipalities of similar size and scope to the City of Hollywood. If proposing on the CRA only, then a list and rank of the five most significant engagements of similar size and scope to the CRA. II. A list of the names and contact information of at least three other governments, preferably of similar size and scope, for which the proposer has recently performed audits.	<b>17</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Specific Audit Approach (maximum score: 20 points)</b> I. The proposed schedule of the engagement. II. The staffing assignments and levels to be designated to each proposed segment of the engagement. III. A description of the sampling techniques which will be used. IV. A discussion of the extent of use of electronic data processing software. V. A description of the analytical procedures which will be used. VI. A description of the approach to be taken to gain and document an understanding of the internal control structure. VI. Describe the approach to be taken to gain and document an understanding of the internal control structure. VI. A description of the approach to be taken in determining laws and regulations that will be subject to audit test work. VII. A description of the approach to be taken in determining audit samples for purposes of test compliance. VIII. A description of municipal staff support anticipated for the engagement.	<b>15</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>RANK</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>

<b>Financial Auditing Services (RFP-4667-21-SS)</b> <b>Selection Committee Evaluation Form (CITY &amp; CRA)</b> <b>Selection Committee Member: Adam Gruber</b>	<i>Caballero Fierman Llerena &amp; Garcia, LLP</i>	<i>Keefe McCullough</i>	<i>Marcum LLP</i>	<i>RSM US LLP</i>	<i>S. Davis &amp; Associates, P.A.</i>
<b>TECHNICAL QUALIFICATIONS</b>					
<b>Qualifications and Experience (maximum score: 20 points)</b> I. A description of the firm. II. A report on the most recent peer review, and whether it includes a review of the quality of specific government audits. III. Information on results of any federal or state desk or field reviews of its audits during the last five years. IV. Information on circumstances and status of any disciplinary action taken or pending against the firm or any of the professional staff during the past three years with State regulatory bodies or professional organizations. V. A summary of any litigation against the proposer in the past five years which is related to the services the proposer provides in the regular course of business. VI. A financial statement, annual report or other similar evidence of proposer's financial stability.	<b>16</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Partner, Supervisory and Staff Qualifications and Experience (maximum score: 20 points)</b> I. Identification and provision of resumes for staff to be assigned to the audit, including information on continuing professional education. II. Identification and provision of resumes and staff or consultants responsible for ensuring the CAFR complies with the provisions of the ADA, including information on related continuing professional education. III. Experience in conducting similar government audits by the individuals to be assigned to the engagement. IV. The organization of the proposed audit team, including ADA compliance staff or consultants.	<b>17</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Similar Engagements (maximum score: 20 points)</b> I. A list and rank of the five most significant municipal government engagements in the State of Florida within the last five years that are similar to the engagement described in this RFP, excluding any previous engagements with the City of Hollywood, if applicable. Engagements should be for municipalities of similar size and scope to the City of Hollywood. If proposing on the CRA only, then a list and rank of the five most significant engagements of similar size and scope to the CRA. II. A list of the names and contact information of at least three other governments, preferably of similar size and scope, for which the proposer has recently performed audits.	<b>18</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Specific Audit Approach (maximum score: 20 points)</b> I. The proposed schedule of the engagement. II. The staffing assignments and levels to be designated to each proposed segment of the engagement. III. A description of the sampling techniques which will be used. IV. A discussion of the extent of use of electronic data processing software. V. A description of the analytical procedures which will be used. VI. A description of the approach to be taken to gain and document an understanding of the internal control structure. VI. Describe the approach to be taken to gain and document an understanding of the internal control structure. VI. A description of the approach to be taken in determining laws and regulations that will be subject to audit test work. VII. A description of the approach to be taken in determining audit samples for purposes of test compliance. VIII. A description of municipal staff support anticipated for the engagement.	<b>16</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>RANK</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>



<b>Financial Auditing Services (RFP-4667-21-SS)</b>	<i>Caballero Fierman Llerena &amp; Garcia, LLP</i>	<i>Keefe McCullough</i>	<i>Marcum LLP</i>	<i>RSM US LLP</i>	<i>S. Davis &amp; Associates, P.A.</i>
<b>Selection Committee Evaluation Form (CITY &amp; CRA)</b>					
<b>Selection Committee Member: Kevin Biederman</b>					
<b>TECHNICAL QUALIFICATIONS</b>					
<b>Qualifications and Experience (maximum score: 20 points)</b> I. A description of the firm. II. A report on the most recent peer review, and whether it includes a review of the quality of specific government audits. III. Information on results of any federal or state desk or field reviews of its audits during the last five years. IV. Information on circumstances and status of any disciplinary action taken or pending against the firm or any of the professional staff during the past three years with State regulatory bodies or professional organizations. V. A summary of any litigation against the proposer in the past five years which is related to the services the proposer provides in the regular course of business. VI. A financial statement, annual report or other similar evidence of proposer's financial stability.	20	18	20	18	18
<b>Partner, Supervisory and Staff Qualifications and Experience (maximum score: 20 points)</b> I. Identification and provision of resumes for staff to be assigned to the audit, including information on continuing professional education. II. Identification and provision of resumes and staff or consultants responsible for ensuring the CAFR complies with the provisions of the ADA, including information on related continuing professional education. III. Experience in conducting similar government audits by the individuals to be assigned to the engagement. IV. The organization of the proposed audit team, including ADA compliance staff or consultants.	20	17	20	17	20
<b>Similar Engagements (maximum score: 20 points)</b> I. A list and rank of the five most significant municipal government engagements in the State of Florida within the last five years that are similar to the engagement described in this RFP, excluding any previous engagements with the City of Hollywood, if applicable. Engagements should be for municipalities of similar size and scope to the City of Hollywood. If proposing on the CRA only, then a list and rank of the five most significant engagements of similar size and scope to the CRA. II. A list of the names and contact information of at least three other governments, preferably of similar size and scope, for which the proposer has recently performed audits.	17	14	20	15	18
<b>Specific Audit Approach (maximum score: 20 points)</b> I. The proposed schedule of the engagement. II. The staffing assignments and levels to be designated to each proposed segment of the engagement. III. A description of the sampling techniques which will be used. IV. A discussion of the extent of use of electronic data processing software. V. A description of the analytical procedures which will be used. VI. A description of the approach to be taken to gain and document an understanding of the internal control structure. VI. Describe the approach to be taken to gain and document an understanding of the internal control structure. VI. A description of the approach to be taken in determining laws and regulations that will be subject to audit test work. VII. A description of the approach to be taken in determining audit samples for purposes of test compliance. VIII. A description of municipal staff support anticipated for the engagement.	18	15	10	15	20
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	75	64	70	65	76
<b>RANK</b>	2	5	3	4	1

<b>Financial Auditing Services (RFP-4667-21-SS)</b> <b>Selection Committee Evaluation Form (CITY &amp; CRA)</b> <b>Selection Committee Member: Linda Sherwood</b>	<i>Caballero Fierman Llerena &amp; Garcia, LLP</i>	<i>Keefe McCullough</i>	<i>Marcum LLP</i>	<i>RSM US LLP</i>	<i>S. Davis &amp; Associates, P.A.</i>
<b>TECHNICAL QUALIFICATIONS</b>					
<b>Qualifications and Experience (maximum score: 20 points)</b> I. A description of the firm. II. A report on the most recent peer review, and whether it includes a review of the quality of specific government audits. III. Information on results of any federal or state desk or field reviews of its audits during the last five years. IV. Information on circumstances and status of any disciplinary action taken or pending against the firm or any of the professional staff during the past three years with State regulatory bodies or professional organizations. V. A summary of any litigation against the proposer in the past five years which is related to the services the proposer provides in the regular course of business. VI. A financial statement, annual report or other similar evidence of proposer's financial stability.	<b>17</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Partner, Supervisory and Staff Qualifications and Experience (maximum score: 20 points)</b> I. Identification and provision of resumes for staff to be assigned to the audit, including information on continuing professional education. II. Identification and provision of resumes and staff or consultants responsible for ensuring the CAFR complies with the provisions of the ADA, including information on related continuing professional education. III. Experience in conducting similar government audits by the individuals to be assigned to the engagement. IV. The organization of the proposed audit team, including ADA compliance staff or consultants.	<b>20</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Similar Engagements (maximum score: 20 points)</b> I. A list and rank of the five most significant municipal government engagements in the State of Florida within the last five years that are similar to the engagement described in this RFP, excluding any previous engagements with the City of Hollywood, if applicable. Engagements should be for municipalities of similar size and scope to the City of Hollywood. If proposing on the CRA only, then a list and rank of the five most significant engagements of similar size and scope to the CRA. II. A list of the names and contact information of at least three other governments, preferably of similar size and scope, for which the proposer has recently performed audits.	<b>19</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Specific Audit Approach (maximum score: 20 points)</b> I. The proposed schedule of the engagement. II. The staffing assignments and levels to be designated to each proposed segment of the engagement. III. A description of the sampling techniques which will be used. IV. A discussion of the extent of use of electronic data processing software. V. A description of the analytical procedures which will be used. VI. A description of the approach to be taken to gain and document an understanding of the internal control structure. VI. Describe the approach to be taken to gain and document an understanding of the internal control structure. VI. A description of the approach to be taken in determining laws and regulations that will be subject to audit test work. VII. A description of the approach to be taken in determining audit samples for purposes of test compliance. VIII. A description of municipal staff support anticipated for the engagement.	<b>18</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>RANK</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>