

## FIRST TIER EVALUATION SCORE SHEET

**Solicitation / Project:** RFQ2026-1, Design Services for Electrical Improvements at WTP & WWTP

**Firm Name:**

**Evaluator Name:**

**Date:**

**Adurra**  
**Dincer Akin Ozaydin**  
**5/15/2026**

### FIRST TIER SCORING CRITERIA

| Criterion          | Evaluation Criteria                                           | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Max Points | Score Awarded | Comments |
|--------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|---------------|----------|
| 1A                 | Qualifications of Firm & Team Members Assigned to the Project | Evaluate the qualifications of the firm and assigned individuals, including staff quality and availability, familiarity with City of Cooper City and Broward County regulations, and overall experience of professional and management staff. | 50         | 45            |          |
| 2A                 | Knowledge and Past Experience of Similar Type Projects        | Evaluate the respondent's understanding of the scope, technical approach, similar project experience, permitting awareness, and knowledge relevant to the services being solicited.                                                           | 25         | 20            |          |
| 3A                 | Past Performance for the Firms                                | Evaluate firm performance, responsiveness, scheduling history, submittal quality, and references for similar Florida projects completed within the past five years.                                                                           | 20         | 18            |          |
| 4A                 | Ability of Team Members to Interface with the City            | Evaluate communication ability, proximity to the project, commitment to City requirements, and familiarity with City guidelines.                                                                                                              | 5          | 5             |          |
| <b>Total Score</b> |                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | <b>0</b>   | <b>88</b>     |          |

### GUIDANCE / RATING NOTES

| Range     | Suggested Meaning                                                                     |
|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Excellent | Proposal materially exceeds requirements and demonstrates exceptional strength.       |
| Good      | Proposal meets requirements and demonstrates notable strengths.                       |
| Fair      | Proposal generally meets requirements but includes some weaknesses or limited detail. |
| Poor      | Proposal fails to sufficiently demonstrate capability or responsiveness.              |

### EVALUATOR CERTIFICATION

I certify that I independently evaluated this proposal in accordance with the solicitation criteria.

Evaluator Signature:

**Dincer Akin Ozaydin**

Date: **5/15/2026**

# FIRST TIER EVALUATION SCORE SHEET

Solicitation / Project: RFQ2026-1, Design Services for Electrical Improvements at WTP & WWTP

Firm Name: Black and Veatch Corp.

Evaluator Name: Dincer Arin Ozoglu

Date: 5/15/2026

## FIRST TIER SCORING CRITERIA

| Criterion   | Evaluation Criteria                                           | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Max Points | Score Awarded | Comments |
|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|---------------|----------|
| 1A          | Qualifications of Firm & Team Members Assigned to the Project | Evaluate the qualifications of the firm and assigned individuals, including staff quality and availability, familiarity with City of Cooper City and Broward County regulations, and overall experience of professional and management staff. | 50         | 44            |          |
| 2A          | Knowledge and Past Experience of Similar Type Projects        | Evaluate the respondent's understanding of the scope, technical approach, similar project experience, permitting awareness, and knowledge relevant to the services being solicited.                                                           | 25         | 22            |          |
| 3A          | Past Performance for the Firms                                | Evaluate firm performance, responsiveness, scheduling history, submittal quality, and references for similar Florida projects completed within the past five years.                                                                           | 20         | 16            |          |
| 4A          | Ability of Team Members to Interface with the City            | Evaluate communication ability, proximity to the project, commitment to City requirements, and familiarity with City guidelines.                                                                                                              | 5          | 5             |          |
| Total Score |                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 0          | 87            |          |

## GUIDANCE / RATING NOTES

| Range     | Suggested Meaning                                                                     |
|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Excellent | Proposal materially exceeds requirements and demonstrates exceptional strength.       |
| Good      | Proposal meets requirements and demonstrates notable strengths.                       |
| Fair      | Proposal generally meets requirements but includes some weaknesses or limited detail. |
| Poor      | Proposal fails to sufficiently demonstrate capability or responsiveness.              |

## EVALUATOR CERTIFICATION

I certify that I independently evaluated this proposal in accordance with the solicitation criteria.

Evaluator Signature:

D. Arin Ozoglu

Date: 5/15/2026



# FIRST TIER EVALUATION SCORE SHEET

Solicitation / Project: RFQ2026-1, Design Services for Electrical Improvements at WTP & WWTP

Firm Name: Conemco Engineering

Evaluator Name: Dincer Akın Özalp

Date: 5/15/2026

## FIRST TIER SCORING CRITERIA

| Criterion   | Evaluation Criteria                                           | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Max Points | Score Awarded | Comments |
|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|---------------|----------|
| 1A          | Qualifications of Firm & Team Members Assigned to the Project | Evaluate the qualifications of the firm and assigned individuals, including staff quality and availability, familiarity with City of Cooper City and Broward County regulations, and overall experience of professional and management staff. | 50         | 45            |          |
| 2A          | Knowledge and Past Experience of Similar Type Projects        | Evaluate the respondent's understanding of the scope, technical approach, similar project experience, permitting awareness, and knowledge relevant to the services being solicited.                                                           | 25         | 21            |          |
| 3A          | Past Performance for the Firms                                | Evaluate firm performance, responsiveness, scheduling history, submittal quality, and references for similar Florida projects completed within the past five years.                                                                           | 20         | 18            |          |
| 4A          | Ability of Team Members to Interface with the City            | Evaluate communication ability, proximity to the project, commitment to City requirements, and familiarity with City guidelines.                                                                                                              | 5          | 5             |          |
| Total Score |                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 0          | 89            |          |

## GUIDANCE / RATING NOTES

| Range     | Suggested Meaning                                                                     |
|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Excellent | Proposal materially exceeds requirements and demonstrates exceptional strength.       |
| Good      | Proposal meets requirements and demonstrates notable strengths.                       |
| Fair      | Proposal generally meets requirements but includes some weaknesses or limited detail. |
| Poor      | Proposal fails to sufficiently demonstrate capability or responsiveness.              |

## EVALUATOR CERTIFICATION

I certify that I independently evaluated this proposal in accordance with the solicitation criteria.

Evaluator Signature:

D. A. Özalp

Date: 5/15/2026

# FIRST TIER EVALUATION SCORE SHEET

Solicitation / Project: RFQ2026-1, Design Services for Electrical Improvements at WTP & WWTP

Firm Name:

CSA Inc.

Evaluator Name:

Dincer Akin Ozaydin

Date:

5/15/2026

## FIRST TIER SCORING CRITERIA

| Criterion   | Evaluation Criteria                                           | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Max Points | Score Awarded | Comments |
|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|---------------|----------|
| 1A          | Qualifications of Firm & Team Members Assigned to the Project | Evaluate the qualifications of the firm and assigned individuals, including staff quality and availability, familiarity with City of Cooper City and Broward County regulations, and overall experience of professional and management staff. | 50         | 47            |          |
| 2A          | Knowledge and Past Experience of Similar Type Projects        | Evaluate the respondent's understanding of the scope, technical approach, similar project experience, permitting awareness, and knowledge relevant to the services being solicited.                                                           | 25         | 22            |          |
| 3A          | Past Performance for the Firms                                | Evaluate firm performance, responsiveness, scheduling history, submittal quality, and references for similar Florida projects completed within the past five years.                                                                           | 20         | 18            |          |
| 4A          | Ability of Team Members to Interface with the City            | Evaluate communication ability, proximity to the project, commitment to City requirements, and familiarity with City guidelines.                                                                                                              | 5          | 5             |          |
| Total Score |                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 0          | 92            |          |

## GUIDANCE / RATING NOTES

| Range     | Suggested Meaning                                                                     |
|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Excellent | Proposal materially exceeds requirements and demonstrates exceptional strength.       |
| Good      | Proposal meets requirements and demonstrates notable strengths.                       |
| Fair      | Proposal generally meets requirements but includes some weaknesses or limited detail. |
| Poor      | Proposal fails to sufficiently demonstrate capability or responsiveness.              |

## EVALUATOR CERTIFICATION

I certify that I independently evaluated this proposal in accordance with the solicitation criteria.

Evaluator Signature:

D.A. Ozaydin

Date:

5/15/2026



# FIRST TIER EVALUATION SCORE SHEET

Solicitation / Project: RFQ2026-1, Design Services for Electrical Improvements at WTP & WWTP  
 Firm Name: Dewberry Engineers Inc.  
 Evaluator Name: Dincer Akin Ozaydin  
 Date: 5/15/2026

## FIRST TIER SCORING CRITERIA

| Criterion   | Evaluation Criteria                                           | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Max Points | Score Awarded | Comments |
|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|---------------|----------|
| 1A          | Qualifications of Firm & Team Members Assigned to the Project | Evaluate the qualifications of the firm and assigned individuals, including staff quality and availability, familiarity with City of Cooper City and Broward County regulations, and overall experience of professional and management staff. | 50         | 40            |          |
| 2A          | Knowledge and Past Experience of Similar Type Projects        | Evaluate the respondent's understanding of the scope, technical approach, similar project experience, permitting awareness, and knowledge relevant to the services being solicited.                                                           | 25         | 20            |          |
| 3A          | Past Performance for the Firms                                | Evaluate firm performance, responsiveness, scheduling history, submittal quality, and references for similar Florida projects completed within the past five years.                                                                           | 20         | 15            |          |
| 4A          | Ability of Team Members to Interface with the City            | Evaluate communication ability, proximity to the project, commitment to City requirements, and familiarity with City guidelines.                                                                                                              | 5          | 5             |          |
| Total Score |                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 0          | 80            |          |

## GUIDANCE / RATING NOTES

| Range     | Suggested Meaning                                                                     |
|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Excellent | Proposal materially exceeds requirements and demonstrates exceptional strength.       |
| Good      | Proposal meets requirements and demonstrates notable strengths.                       |
| Fair      | Proposal generally meets requirements but includes some weaknesses or limited detail. |
| Poor      | Proposal fails to sufficiently demonstrate capability or responsiveness.              |

## EVALUATOR CERTIFICATION

I certify that I independently evaluated this proposal in accordance with the solicitation criteria.

Evaluator Signature:

D.A. Ozaydin

Date: 5/15/2026

# FIRST TIER EVALUATION SCORE SHEET

Solicitation / Project: RFQ2026-1, Design Services for Electrical Improvements at WTP & WWTP

Firm Name:

Evaluator Name:

Date:

Jacobs Engineering Inc.  
5/15/2026 Dincer Akın Özgüç

## FIRST TIER SCORING CRITERIA

| Criterion   | Evaluation Criteria                                           | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Max Points | Score Awarded | Comments |
|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|---------------|----------|
| 1A          | Qualifications of Firm & Team Members Assigned to the Project | Evaluate the qualifications of the firm and assigned individuals, including staff quality and availability, familiarity with City of Cooper City and Broward County regulations, and overall experience of professional and management staff. | 50         | 40            |          |
| 2A          | Knowledge and Past Experience of Similar Type Projects        | Evaluate the respondent's understanding of the scope, technical approach, similar project experience, permitting awareness, and knowledge relevant to the services being solicited.                                                           | 25         | 20            |          |
| 3A          | Past Performance for the Firms                                | Evaluate firm performance, responsiveness, scheduling history, submittal quality, and references for similar Florida projects completed within the past five years.                                                                           | 20         | 15            |          |
| 4A          | Ability of Team Members to Interface with the City            | Evaluate communication ability, proximity to the project, commitment to City requirements, and familiarity with City guidelines.                                                                                                              | 5          | 5             |          |
| Total Score |                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 0          | 80            |          |

## GUIDANCE / RATING NOTES

| Range     | Suggested Meaning                                                                     |
|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Excellent | Proposal materially exceeds requirements and demonstrates exceptional strength.       |
| Good      | Proposal meets requirements and demonstrates notable strengths.                       |
| Fair      | Proposal generally meets requirements but includes some weaknesses or limited detail. |
| Poor      | Proposal fails to sufficiently demonstrate capability or responsiveness.              |

## EVALUATOR CERTIFICATION

I certify that I independently evaluated this proposal in accordance with the solicitation criteria.

Evaluator Signature:

Date: 5/15/2026

Dincer Akın Özgüç



4

## FIRST TIER EVALUATION SCORE SHEET

Solicitation / Project: RFQ2026-1, Design Services for Electrical Improvements at WTP & WWTP

Firm Name:

Evaluator Name:

Date:

4201172  
J McMahon  
5/15/26

### FIRST TIER SCORING CRITERIA

| Criterion   | Evaluation Criteria                                           | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Max Points | Score Awarded | Comments |
|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|---------------|----------|
| 1A          | Qualifications of Firm & Team Members Assigned to the Project | Evaluate the qualifications of the firm and assigned individuals, including staff quality and availability, familiarity with City of Cooper City and Broward County regulations, and overall experience of professional and management staff. | 50         | 45            |          |
| 2A          | Knowledge and Past Experience of Similar Type Projects        | Evaluate the respondent's understanding of the scope, technical approach, similar project experience, permitting awareness, and knowledge relevant to the services being solicited.                                                           | 25         | 18            |          |
| 3A          | Past Performance for the Firms                                | Evaluate firm performance, responsiveness, scheduling history, submittal quality, and references for similar Florida projects completed within the past five years.                                                                           | 20         | 17            |          |
| 4A          | Ability of Team Members to Interface with the City            | Evaluate communication ability, proximity to the project, commitment to City requirements, and familiarity with City guidelines.                                                                                                              | 5          | 5<br>JRM      |          |
| Total Score |                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 0          | 84            |          |

### GUIDANCE / RATING NOTES

| Range     | Suggested Meaning                                                                     |
|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Excellent | Proposal materially exceeds requirements and demonstrates exceptional strength.       |
| Good      | Proposal meets requirements and demonstrates notable strengths.                       |
| Fair      | Proposal generally meets requirements but includes some weaknesses or limited detail. |
| Poor      | Proposal fails to sufficiently demonstrate capability or responsiveness.              |

### EVALUATOR CERTIFICATION

I certify that I independently evaluated this proposal in accordance with the solicitation criteria.

Evaluator Signature:

Date:

5/15/26

2

### FIRST TIER EVALUATION SCORE SHEET

Solicitation / Project: RFQ2026-1, Design Services for Electrical Improvements at WTP & WWTP

Firm Name:

Black & Veatch

Evaluator Name:

J McMahon

Date:

5-15-26

#### FIRST TIER SCORING CRITERIA

| Criterion   | Evaluation Criteria                                           | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Max Points | Score Awarded | Comments |
|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|---------------|----------|
| 1A          | Qualifications of Firm & Team Members Assigned to the Project | Evaluate the qualifications of the firm and assigned individuals, including staff quality and availability, familiarity with City of Cooper City and Broward County regulations, and overall experience of professional and management staff. | 50         | 44            |          |
| 2A          | Knowledge and Past Experience of Similar Type Projects        | Evaluate the respondent's understanding of the scope, technical approach, similar project experience, permitting awareness, and knowledge relevant to the services being solicited.                                                           | 25         | 21            |          |
| 3A          | Past Performance for the Firms                                | Evaluate firm performance, responsiveness, scheduling history, submittal quality, and references for similar Florida projects completed within the past five years.                                                                           | 20         | 18            |          |
| 4A          | Ability of Team Members to Interface with the City            | Evaluate communication ability, proximity to the project, commitment to City requirements, and familiarity with City guidelines.                                                                                                              | 5          | 5             |          |
| Total Score |                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 0          | 88            |          |


#### GUIDANCE / RATING NOTES

| Range     | Suggested Meaning                                                                     |
|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Excellent | Proposal materially exceeds requirements and demonstrates exceptional strength.       |
| Good      | Proposal meets requirements and demonstrates notable strengths.                       |
| Fair      | Proposal generally meets requirements but includes some weaknesses or limited detail. |
| Poor      | Proposal fails to sufficiently demonstrate capability or responsiveness.              |

#### EVALUATOR CERTIFICATION

I certify that I independently evaluated this proposal in accordance with the solicitation criteria.

Evaluator Signature:



Date:

5/15/26



5

## FIRST TIER EVALUATION SCORE SHEET

Solicitation / Project: RFQ2026-1, Design Services for Electrical Improvements at WTP & WWTP

Firm Name:

Evaluator Name:

Date:

Comenco  
J. McMahon  
5/15/26

### FIRST TIER SCORING CRITERIA

| Criterion   | Evaluation Criteria                                           | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Max Points | Score Awarded | Comments |
|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|---------------|----------|
| 1A          | Qualifications of Firm & Team Members Assigned to the Project | Evaluate the qualifications of the firm and assigned individuals, including staff quality and availability, familiarity with City of Cooper City and Broward County regulations, and overall experience of professional and management staff. | 50         | 42            |          |
| 2A          | Knowledge and Past Experience of Similar Type Projects        | Evaluate the respondent's understanding of the scope, technical approach, similar project experience, permitting awareness, and knowledge relevant to the services being solicited.                                                           | 25         | 20            |          |
| 3A          | Past Performance for the Firms                                | Evaluate firm performance, responsiveness, scheduling history, submittal quality, and references for similar Florida projects completed within the past five years.                                                                           | 20         | 15            |          |
| 4A          | Ability of Team Members to Interface with the City            | Evaluate communication ability, proximity to the project, commitment to City requirements, and familiarity with City guidelines.                                                                                                              | 5          | 5             |          |
| Total Score |                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 0          | 82            |          |

### GUIDANCE / RATING NOTES

| Range     | Suggested Meaning                                                                     |
|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Excellent | Proposal materially exceeds requirements and demonstrates exceptional strength.       |
| Good      | Proposal meets requirements and demonstrates notable strengths.                       |
| Fair      | Proposal generally meets requirements but includes some weaknesses or limited detail. |
| Poor      | Proposal fails to sufficiently demonstrate capability or responsiveness.              |


### EVALUATOR CERTIFICATION

I certify that I independently evaluated this proposal in accordance with the solicitation criteria.

Evaluator Signature:

Date:

5/15/26



3

### FIRST TIER EVALUATION SCORE SHEET

Solicitation / Project: RFQ2026-1, Design Services for Electrical Improvements at WTP & WWTP

Firm Name:

Evaluator Name:

Date:

CSA Central  
5/15/26 J. McMahon

#### FIRST TIER SCORING CRITERIA

| Criterion   | Evaluation Criteria                                           | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Max Points | Score Awarded | Comments |
|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|---------------|----------|
| 1A          | Qualifications of Firm & Team Members Assigned to the Project | Evaluate the qualifications of the firm and assigned individuals, including staff quality and availability, familiarity with City of Cooper City and Broward County regulations, and overall experience of professional and management staff. | 50         | 45            |          |
| 2A          | Knowledge and Past Experience of Similar Type Projects        | Evaluate the respondent's understanding of the scope, technical approach, similar project experience, permitting awareness, and knowledge relevant to the services being solicited.                                                           | 25         | 22            |          |
| 3A          | Past Performance for the Firms                                | Evaluate firm performance, responsiveness, scheduling history, submittal quality, and references for similar Florida projects completed within the past five years.                                                                           | 20         | 19            |          |
| 4A          | Ability of Team Members to Interface with the City            | Evaluate communication ability, proximity to the project, commitment to City requirements, and familiarity with City guidelines.                                                                                                              | 5          | 5             |          |
| Total Score |                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 0          | 87            |          |

#### GUIDANCE / RATING NOTES

| Range     | Suggested Meaning                                                                     |
|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Excellent | Proposal materially exceeds requirements and demonstrates exceptional strength.       |
| Good      | Proposal meets requirements and demonstrates notable strengths.                       |
| Fair      | Proposal generally meets requirements but includes some weaknesses or limited detail. |
| Poor      | Proposal fails to sufficiently demonstrate capability or responsiveness.              |

#### EVALUATOR CERTIFICATION

I certify that I independently evaluated this proposal in accordance with the solicitation criteria.

Evaluator Signature:

Date:

5/15/26



6

### FIRST TIER EVALUATION SCORE SHEET

Solicitation / Project: RFQ2026-1, Design Services for Electrical Improvements at WTP & WWTP

Firm Name:

Evaluator Name:

Date:

Dewberry  
J McMahon 5/15/26

#### FIRST TIER SCORING CRITERIA

| Criterion   | Evaluation Criteria                                           | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Max Points | Score Awarded | Comments |
|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|---------------|----------|
| 1A          | Qualifications of Firm & Team Members Assigned to the Project | Evaluate the qualifications of the firm and assigned individuals, including staff quality and availability, familiarity with City of Cooper City and Broward County regulations, and overall experience of professional and management staff. | 50         | 42            |          |
| 2A          | Knowledge and Past Experience of Similar Type Projects        | Evaluate the respondent's understanding of the scope, technical approach, similar project experience, permitting awareness, and knowledge relevant to the services being solicited.                                                           | 25         | 18            |          |
| 3A          | Past Performance for the Firms                                | Evaluate firm performance, responsiveness, scheduling history, submittal quality, and references for similar Florida projects completed within the past five years.                                                                           | 20         | 15            |          |
| 4A          | Ability of Team Members to Interface with the City            | Evaluate communication ability, proximity to the project, commitment to City requirements, and familiarity with City guidelines.                                                                                                              | 5          | 4             |          |
| Total Score |                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 0          | 79            |          |

#### GUIDANCE / RATING NOTES

| Range     | Suggested Meaning                                                                     |
|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Excellent | Proposal materially exceeds requirements and demonstrates exceptional strength.       |
| Good      | Proposal meets requirements and demonstrates notable strengths.                       |
| Fair      | Proposal generally meets requirements but includes some weaknesses or limited detail. |
| Poor      | Proposal fails to sufficiently demonstrate capability or responsiveness.              |

#### EVALUATOR CERTIFICATION

I certify that I independently evaluated this proposal in accordance with the solicitation criteria.

Evaluator Signature:

Date:

5/15

①

## FIRST TIER EVALUATION SCORE SHEET

Solicitation / Project: RFQ2026-1, Design Services for Electrical Improvements at WTP &amp; WWTP

Firm Name:

Evaluator Name:

Date:

JACOBS  
J Mcmahon 5/15/26

## FIRST TIER SCORING CRITERIA

| Criterion   | Evaluation Criteria                                           | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Max Points | Score Awarded | Comments |
|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|---------------|----------|
| 1A          | Qualifications of Firm & Team Members Assigned to the Project | Evaluate the qualifications of the firm and assigned individuals, including staff quality and availability, familiarity with City of Cooper City and Broward County regulations, and overall experience of professional and management staff. | 50         | 46            |          |
| 2A          | Knowledge and Past Experience of Similar Type Projects        | Evaluate the respondent's understanding of the scope, technical approach, similar project experience, permitting awareness, and knowledge relevant to the services being solicited.                                                           | 25         | 22            |          |
| 3A          | Past Performance for the Firms                                | Evaluate firm performance, responsiveness, scheduling history, submittal quality, and references for similar Florida projects completed within the past five years.                                                                           | 20         | 18            |          |
| 4A          | Ability of Team Members to Interface with the City            | Evaluate communication ability, proximity to the project, commitment to City requirements, and familiarity with City guidelines.                                                                                                              | 5          | 5             |          |
| Total Score |                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 0          | 91            |          |

## GUIDANCE / RATING NOTES


| Range     | Suggested Meaning                                                                     |
|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Excellent | Proposal materially exceeds requirements and demonstrates exceptional strength.       |
| Good      | Proposal meets requirements and demonstrates notable strengths.                       |
| Fair      | Proposal generally meets requirements but includes some weaknesses or limited detail. |
| Poor      | Proposal fails to sufficiently demonstrate capability or responsiveness.              |

## EVALUATOR CERTIFICATION

I certify that I independently evaluated this proposal in accordance with the solicitation criteria.

Evaluator Signature:

Date:



5/15/26



## FIRST TIER EVALUATION SCORE SHEET

Solicitation / Project: RFQ2026-1, Design Services for Electrical Improvements at WTP & WWTP

Firm Name: Ardura

Evaluator Name: Raj Verma

Date: 5/15/26

### FIRST TIER SCORING CRITERIA

| Criterion | Evaluation Criteria                                           | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Max Points | Score Awarded | Comments |
|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|---------------|----------|
| 1A        | Qualifications of Firm & Team Members Assigned to the Project | Evaluate the qualifications of the firm and assigned individuals, including staff quality and availability, familiarity with City of Cooper City and Broward County regulations, and overall experience of professional and management staff. | 50         | 40            |          |
| 2A        | Knowledge and Past Experience of Similar Type Projects        | Evaluate the respondent's understanding of the scope, technical approach, similar project experience, permitting awareness, and knowledge relevant to the services being solicited.                                                           | 25         | 18            |          |
| 3A        | Past Performance for the Firms                                | Evaluate firm performance, responsiveness, scheduling history, submittal quality, and references for similar Florida projects completed within the past five years.                                                                           | 20         | 15            |          |
| 4A        | Ability of Team Members to Interface with the City            | Evaluate communication ability, proximity to the project, commitment to City requirements, and familiarity with City guidelines.                                                                                                              | 5          | 5             |          |

Total Score

0


78

### GUIDANCE / RATING NOTES

| Range     | Suggested Meaning                                                                     |
|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Excellent | Proposal materially exceeds requirements and demonstrates exceptional strength.       |
| Good      | Proposal meets requirements and demonstrates notable strengths.                       |
| Fair      | Proposal generally meets requirements but includes some weaknesses or limited detail. |
| Poor      | Proposal fails to sufficiently demonstrate capability or responsiveness.              |

### EVALUATOR CERTIFICATION

I certify that I independently evaluated this proposal in accordance with the solicitation criteria.

Evaluator Signature: 

Date: 5/15/26

## FIRST TIER EVALUATION SCORE SHEET

Solicitation / Project: RFQ2026-1, Design Services for Electrical Improvements at WTP & WWTP

Firm Name: Black & Veatch

Evaluator Name: Raj Verma

Date: 5/15/26

### FIRST TIER SCORING CRITERIA


| Criterion          | Evaluation Criteria                                           | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Max Points | Score Awarded | Comments |
|--------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|---------------|----------|
| 1A                 | Qualifications of Firm & Team Members Assigned to the Project | Evaluate the qualifications of the firm and assigned individuals, including staff quality and availability, familiarity with City of Cooper City and Broward County regulations, and overall experience of professional and management staff. | 50         | 43            |          |
| 2A                 | Knowledge and Past Experience of Similar Type Projects        | Evaluate the respondent's understanding of the scope, technical approach, similar project experience, permitting awareness, and knowledge relevant to the services being solicited.                                                           | 25         | 20            |          |
| 3A                 | Past Performance for the Firms                                | Evaluate firm performance, responsiveness, scheduling history, submittal quality, and references for similar Florida projects completed within the past five years.                                                                           | 20         | 18            |          |
| 4A                 | Ability of Team Members to Interface with the City            | Evaluate communication ability, proximity to the project, commitment to City requirements, and familiarity with City guidelines.                                                                                                              | 5          | 5             |          |
| <b>Total Score</b> |                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 0          | 86            |          |

### GUIDANCE / RATING NOTES

| Range     | Suggested Meaning                                                                     |
|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Excellent | Proposal materially exceeds requirements and demonstrates exceptional strength.       |
| Good      | Proposal meets requirements and demonstrates notable strengths.                       |
| Fair      | Proposal generally meets requirements but includes some weaknesses or limited detail. |
| Poor      | Proposal fails to sufficiently demonstrate capability or responsiveness.              |

### EVALUATOR CERTIFICATION

I certify that I independently evaluated this proposal in accordance with the solicitation criteria.

Evaluator Signature: 

Date: 5/15/26

*Amul*

## FIRST TIER EVALUATION SCORE SHEET

Solicitation / Project: RFQ2026-1, Design Services for Electrical Improvements at WTP & WWTP

Firm Name: ~~Dawberry~~ *Conemco Engr.*

Evaluator Name: *Raj Verma*

Date: *5/15/26*

### FIRST TIER SCORING CRITERIA

| Criterion   | Evaluation Criteria                                           | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Max Points | Score Awarded | Comments                                                |
|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|---------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| 1A          | Qualifications of Firm & Team Members Assigned to the Project | Evaluate the qualifications of the firm and assigned individuals, including staff quality and availability, familiarity with City of Cooper City and Broward County regulations, and overall experience of professional and management staff. | 50         | <i>25</i>     | <i>No electrical experience relevant to the project</i> |
| 2A          | Knowledge and Past Experience of Similar Type Projects        | Evaluate the respondent's understanding of the scope, technical approach, similar project experience, permitting awareness, and knowledge relevant to the services being solicited.                                                           | 25         | <i>10</i>     |                                                         |
| 3A          | Past Performance for the Firms                                | Evaluate firm performance, responsiveness, scheduling history, submittal quality, and references for similar Florida projects completed within the past five years.                                                                           | 20         | <i>5</i>      |                                                         |
| 4A          | Ability of Team Members to Interface with the City            | Evaluate communication ability, proximity to the project, commitment to City requirements, and familiarity with City guidelines.                                                                                                              | 5          | <i>5</i>      |                                                         |
| Total Score |                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 0          | <i>45</i>     |                                                         |

### GUIDANCE / RATING NOTES

| Range     | Suggested Meaning                                                                     |
|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Excellent | Proposal materially exceeds requirements and demonstrates exceptional strength.       |
| Good      | Proposal meets requirements and demonstrates notable strengths.                       |
| Fair      | Proposal generally meets requirements but includes some weaknesses or limited detail. |
| Poor      | Proposal fails to sufficiently demonstrate capability or responsiveness.              |

### EVALUATOR CERTIFICATION

I certify that I independently evaluated this proposal in accordance with the solicitation criteria.

Evaluator Signature: *[Signature]*

Date: *5/15/26*



## FIRST TIER EVALUATION SCORE SHEET

Solicitation / Project: RFQ2026-1, Design Services for Electrical Improvements at WTP & WWTP

Firm Name: CSA Central, Inc.

Evaluator Name: Raj Verma

Date: 5/15/26

### FIRST TIER SCORING CRITERIA


| Criterion   | Evaluation Criteria                                           | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Max Points | Score Awarded | Comments                                          |
|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|---------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| 1A          | Qualifications of Firm & Team Members Assigned to the Project | Evaluate the qualifications of the firm and assigned individuals, including staff quality and availability, familiarity with City of Cooper City and Broward County regulations, and overall experience of professional and management staff. | 50         | 20            | No electrical experience relevant to the project. |
| 2A          | Knowledge and Past Experience of Similar Type Projects        | Evaluate the respondent's understanding of the scope, technical approach, similar project experience, permitting awareness, and knowledge relevant to the services being solicited.                                                           | 25         | 10            |                                                   |
| 3A          | Past Performance for the Firms                                | Evaluate firm performance, responsiveness, scheduling history, submittal quality, and references for similar Florida projects completed within the past five years.                                                                           | 20         | 5             |                                                   |
| 4A          | Ability of Team Members to Interface with the City            | Evaluate communication ability, proximity to the project, commitment to City requirements, and familiarity with City guidelines.                                                                                                              | 5          | 5             |                                                   |
| Total Score |                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 0          | 40            |                                                   |

### GUIDANCE / RATING NOTES

| Range     | Suggested Meaning                                                                     |
|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Excellent | Proposal materially exceeds requirements and demonstrates exceptional strength.       |
| Good      | Proposal meets requirements and demonstrates notable strengths.                       |
| Fair      | Proposal generally meets requirements but includes some weaknesses or limited detail. |
| Poor      | Proposal fails to sufficiently demonstrate capability or responsiveness.              |

### EVALUATOR CERTIFICATION

I certify that I independently evaluated this proposal in accordance with the solicitation criteria.

Evaluator Signature: 

Date: 5/15/26

Dewberry A 11

## FIRST TIER EVALUATION SCORE SHEET

Solicitation / Project: RFQ2026-1, Design Services for Electrical Improvements at WTP & WWTP

Firm Name: Conemco Engineering

Evaluator Name: Raj Verma

Date: 5/15/26

### FIRST TIER SCORING CRITERIA


| Criterion   | Evaluation Criteria                                           | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Max Points | Score Awarded | Comments |
|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|---------------|----------|
| 1A          | Qualifications of Firm & Team Members Assigned to the Project | Evaluate the qualifications of the firm and assigned individuals, including staff quality and availability, familiarity with City of Cooper City and Broward County regulations, and overall experience of professional and management staff. | 50         | 38            |          |
| 2A          | Knowledge and Past Experience of Similar Type Projects        | Evaluate the respondent's understanding of the scope, technical approach, similar project experience, permitting awareness, and knowledge relevant to the services being solicited.                                                           | 25         | 15            |          |
| 3A          | Past Performance for the Firms                                | Evaluate firm performance, responsiveness, scheduling history, submittal quality, and references for similar Florida projects completed within the past five years.                                                                           | 20         | 15            |          |
| 4A          | Ability of Team Members to Interface with the City            | Evaluate communication ability, proximity to the project, commitment to City requirements, and familiarity with City guidelines.                                                                                                              | 5          | 5             |          |
| Total Score |                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 0          | 73            |          |

### GUIDANCE / RATING NOTES

| Range     | Suggested Meaning                                                                     |
|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Excellent | Proposal materially exceeds requirements and demonstrates exceptional strength.       |
| Good      | Proposal meets requirements and demonstrates notable strengths.                       |
| Fair      | Proposal generally meets requirements but includes some weaknesses or limited detail. |
| Poor      | Proposal fails to sufficiently demonstrate capability or responsiveness.              |

### EVALUATOR CERTIFICATION

I certify that I independently evaluated this proposal in accordance with the solicitation criteria.

Evaluator Signature: 

Date: 5/15/26

## FIRST TIER EVALUATION SCORE SHEET

Solicitation / Project: RFQ2026-1, Design Services for Electrical Improvements at WTP & WWTP

Firm Name: Jacobs Engineering Group

Evaluator Name: Raj Verma

Date: 5/15/26

### FIRST TIER SCORING CRITERIA


| Criterion          | Evaluation Criteria                                           | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Max Points | Score Awarded | Comments |
|--------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|---------------|----------|
| 1A                 | Qualifications of Firm & Team Members Assigned to the Project | Evaluate the qualifications of the firm and assigned individuals, including staff quality and availability, familiarity with City of Cooper City and Broward County regulations, and overall experience of professional and management staff. | 50         | 45            |          |
| 2A                 | Knowledge and Past Experience of Similar Type Projects        | Evaluate the respondent's understanding of the scope, technical approach, similar project experience, permitting awareness, and knowledge relevant to the services being solicited.                                                           | 25         | 22            |          |
| 3A                 | Past Performance for the Firms                                | Evaluate firm performance, responsiveness, scheduling history, submittal quality, and references for similar Florida projects completed within the past five years.                                                                           | 20         | 18            |          |
| 4A                 | Ability of Team Members to Interface with the City            | Evaluate communication ability, proximity to the project, commitment to City requirements, and familiarity with City guidelines.                                                                                                              | 5          | 5             |          |
| <b>Total Score</b> |                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | <b>0</b>   | <b>90</b>     |          |

### GUIDANCE / RATING NOTES

| Range     | Suggested Meaning                                                                     |
|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Excellent | Proposal materially exceeds requirements and demonstrates exceptional strength.       |
| Good      | Proposal meets requirements and demonstrates notable strengths.                       |
| Fair      | Proposal generally meets requirements but includes some weaknesses or limited detail. |
| Poor      | Proposal fails to sufficiently demonstrate capability or responsiveness.              |

### EVALUATOR CERTIFICATION

I certify that I independently evaluated this proposal in accordance with the solicitation criteria.

Evaluator Signature: 

Date: 5/15/26



# FIRST TIER EVALUATION SCORE SHEET

Solicitation / Project: RFQ2026-1, Design Services for Electrical Improvements at WTP & WWTP

Firm Name: Adarra Group

Evaluator Name: Timothy A. Welch, P.E.

Date: 5/15/2026

## FIRST TIER SCORING CRITERIA

| Criterion   | Evaluation Criteria                                           | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Max Points | Score Awarded | Comments                                                                         |
|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|---------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1A          | Qualifications of Firm & Team Members Assigned to the Project | Evaluate the qualifications of the firm and assigned individuals, including staff quality and availability, familiarity with City of Cooper City and Broward County regulations, and overall experience of professional and management staff. | 50         | 40            | Reasonably experienced staff and team assigned.                                  |
| 2A          | Knowledge and Past Experience of Similar Type Projects        | Evaluate the respondent's understanding of the scope, technical approach, similar project experience, permitting awareness, and knowledge relevant to the services being solicited.                                                           | 25         | 20            | Similar work in other areas as well as So. Florida                               |
| 3A          | Past Performance for the Firms                                | Evaluate firm performance, responsiveness, scheduling history, submittal quality, and references for similar Florida projects completed within the past five years.                                                                           | 20         | 15            | Very detailed and logical project approach (organized).                          |
| 4A          | Ability of Team Members to Interface with the City            | Evaluate communication ability, proximity to the project, commitment to City requirements, and familiarity with City guidelines.                                                                                                              | 5          | 5             | Not as much familiarity or experience as Jacobs team.                            |
| Total Score |                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 100        | 80            | PM nearby seems very qualified and highly interested in home town responsibility |

## GUIDANCE / RATING NOTES

| Range     | Suggested Meaning                                                                     |
|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Excellent | Proposal materially exceeds requirements and demonstrates exceptional strength.       |
| Good      | Proposal meets requirements and demonstrates notable strengths.                       |
| Fair      | Proposal generally meets requirements but includes some weaknesses or limited detail. |
| Poor      | Proposal fails to sufficiently demonstrate capability or responsiveness.              |

## EVALUATOR CERTIFICATION

I certify that I independently evaluated this proposal in accordance with the solicitation criteria.

Evaluator Signature: Timothy A. Welch

Date: 5/12/2026

# FIRST TIER EVALUATION SCORE SHEET

Solicitation / Project: RFQ2026-1, Design Services for Electrical Improvements at WTP & WWTP

Firm Name: *Black & Veatch*

Evaluator Name: *Timothy A. Welch, P.E.*

Date: *5/15/2026*

## FIRST TIER SCORING CRITERIA

| Criterion   | Evaluation Criteria                                           | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Max Points | Score Awarded | Comments                                                                               |
|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|---------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1A          | Qualifications of Firm & Team Members Assigned to the Project | Evaluate the qualifications of the firm and assigned individuals, including staff quality and availability, familiarity with City of Cooper City and Broward County regulations, and overall experience of professional and management staff. | 50         | <i>42</i>     | <i>Seasoned and experienced team quality professionals selected.</i>                   |
| 2A          | Knowledge and Past Experience of Similar Type Projects        | Evaluate the respondent's understanding of the scope, technical approach, similar project experience, permitting awareness, and knowledge relevant to the services being solicited.                                                           | 25         | <i>21</i>     | <i>Reasonable approach and availability of team.</i>                                   |
| 3A          | Past Performance for the Firms                                | Evaluate firm performance, responsiveness, scheduling history, submittal quality, and references for similar Florida projects completed within the past five years.                                                                           | 20         | <i>16</i>     | <i>Some professionals at location with experience, but not as much as Jacobs team.</i> |
| 4A          | Ability of Team Members to Interface with the City            | Evaluate communication ability, proximity to the project, commitment to City requirements, and familiarity with City guidelines.                                                                                                              | 5          | <i>5</i>      | <i>Close and should be responsive</i>                                                  |
| Total Score |                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | <i>100</i> | <i>84</i>     |                                                                                        |

## GUIDANCE / RATING NOTES

| Range     | Suggested Meaning                                                                     |
|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Excellent | Proposal materially exceeds requirements and demonstrates exceptional strength.       |
| Good      | Proposal meets requirements and demonstrates notable strengths.                       |
| Fair      | Proposal generally meets requirements but includes some weaknesses or limited detail. |
| Poor      | Proposal fails to sufficiently demonstrate capability or responsiveness.              |

## EVALUATOR CERTIFICATION

I certify that I independently evaluated this proposal in accordance with the solicitation criteria.

Evaluator Signature: *Timothy A. Welch*

Date: *5/12/2026*

## FIRST TIER EVALUATION SCORE SHEET

Solicitation / Project: RFQ2026-1, Design Services for Electrical Improvements at WTP & WWTP

Firm Name:

*Conemco*

Evaluator Name:

*Timothy A. Welch P.E.*

Date:

*5/15/2026*

### FIRST TIER SCORING CRITERIA

| Criterion          | Evaluation Criteria                                           | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Max Points | Score Awarded    | Comments |
|--------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|------------------|----------|
| 1A                 | Qualifications of Firm & Team Members Assigned to the Project | Evaluate the qualifications of the firm and assigned individuals, including staff quality and availability, familiarity with City of Cooper City and Broward County regulations, and overall experience of professional and management staff. | 50         | <i>37</i>        |          |
| 2A                 | Knowledge and Past Experience of Similar Type Projects        | Evaluate the respondent's understanding of the scope, technical approach, similar project experience, permitting awareness, and knowledge relevant to the services being solicited.                                                           | 25         | <i>17</i>        |          |
| 3A                 | Past Performance for the Firms                                | Evaluate firm performance, responsiveness, scheduling history, submittal quality, and references for similar Florida projects completed within the past five years.                                                                           | 20         | <i>12</i>        |          |
| 4A                 | Ability of Team Members to Interface with the City            | Evaluate communication ability, proximity to the project, commitment to City requirements, and familiarity with City guidelines.                                                                                                              | 5          | <i>5</i>         |          |
| <b>Total Score</b> |                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | <b>100</b> | <b><i>71</i></b> |          |

### GUIDANCE / RATING NOTES

| Range     | Suggested Meaning                                                                     |
|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Excellent | Proposal materially exceeds requirements and demonstrates exceptional strength.       |
| Good      | Proposal meets requirements and demonstrates notable strengths.                       |
| Fair      | Proposal generally meets requirements but includes some weaknesses or limited detail. |
| Poor      | Proposal fails to sufficiently demonstrate capability or responsiveness.              |

### EVALUATOR CERTIFICATION

I certify that I independently evaluated this proposal in accordance with the solicitation criteria.

Evaluator Signature:

*Timothy A. Welch*

Date:

*5/12/2026*



## FIRST TIER EVALUATION SCORE SHEET

Solicitation / Project: RFQ2026-1, Design Services for Electrical Improvements at WTP & WWTP

Firm Name: CSA Central, Inc.

Evaluator Name: Timothy A. Welch P.E.

Date: 5/15/2026

### FIRST TIER SCORING CRITERIA

| Criterion   | Evaluation Criteria                                           | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Max Points | Score Awarded | Comments |
|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|---------------|----------|
| 1A          | Qualifications of Firm & Team Members Assigned to the Project | Evaluate the qualifications of the firm and assigned individuals, including staff quality and availability, familiarity with City of Cooper City and Broward County regulations, and overall experience of professional and management staff. | 50         | 39            |          |
| 2A          | Knowledge and Past Experience of Similar Type Projects        | Evaluate the respondent's understanding of the scope, technical approach, similar project experience, permitting awareness, and knowledge relevant to the services being solicited.                                                           | 25         | 18            |          |
| 3A          | Past Performance for the Firms                                | Evaluate firm performance, responsiveness, scheduling history, submittal quality, and references for similar Florida projects completed within the past five years.                                                                           | 20         | 14            |          |
| 4A          | Ability of Team Members to Interface with the City            | Evaluate communication ability, proximity to the project, commitment to City requirements, and familiarity with City guidelines.                                                                                                              | 5          | 5             |          |
| Total Score |                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 100        | 76            |          |

### GUIDANCE / RATING NOTES

| Range     | Suggested Meaning                                                                     |
|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Excellent | Proposal materially exceeds requirements and demonstrates exceptional strength.       |
| Good      | Proposal meets requirements and demonstrates notable strengths.                       |
| Fair      | Proposal generally meets requirements but includes some weaknesses or limited detail. |
| Poor      | Proposal fails to sufficiently demonstrate capability or responsiveness.              |

### EVALUATOR CERTIFICATION

I certify that I independently evaluated this proposal in accordance with the solicitation criteria.

Evaluator Signature: 

Date: 5/12/2026

## FIRST TIER EVALUATION SCORE SHEET

Solicitation / Project: RFQ2026-1, Design Services for Electrical Improvements at WTP & WWTP

Firm Name: Pewberry

Evaluator Name: Timothy A. Welch, P.E.

Date: 5/15/2026

### FIRST TIER SCORING CRITERIA

| Criterion          | Evaluation Criteria                                           | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Max Points | Score Awarded    | Comments |
|--------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|------------------|----------|
| 1A                 | Qualifications of Firm & Team Members Assigned to the Project | Evaluate the qualifications of the firm and assigned individuals, including staff quality and availability, familiarity with City of Cooper City and Broward County regulations, and overall experience of professional and management staff. | 50         | <u>38</u>        |          |
| 2A                 | Knowledge and Past Experience of Similar Type Projects        | Evaluate the respondent's understanding of the scope, technical approach, similar project experience, permitting awareness, and knowledge relevant to the services being solicited.                                                           | 25         | <u>18</u>        |          |
| 3A                 | Past Performance for the Firms                                | Evaluate firm performance, responsiveness, scheduling history, submittal quality, and references for similar Florida projects completed within the past five years.                                                                           | 20         | <u>14</u>        |          |
| 4A                 | Ability of Team Members to Interface with the City            | Evaluate communication ability, proximity to the project, commitment to City requirements, and familiarity with City guidelines.                                                                                                              | 5          | <u>2</u>         |          |
| <b>Total Score</b> |                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | <b>0</b>   | <b><u>72</u></b> |          |

### GUIDANCE / RATING NOTES

| Range     | Suggested Meaning                                                                     |
|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Excellent | Proposal materially exceeds requirements and demonstrates exceptional strength.       |
| Good      | Proposal meets requirements and demonstrates notable strengths.                       |
| Fair      | Proposal generally meets requirements but includes some weaknesses or limited detail. |
| Poor      | Proposal fails to sufficiently demonstrate capability or responsiveness.              |

### EVALUATOR CERTIFICATION

I certify that I independently evaluated this proposal in accordance with the solicitation criteria.

Evaluator Signature: Timothy A. Welch

Date: 5/15/2026

## FIRST TIER EVALUATION SCORE SHEET

Solicitation / Project: RFQ2026-1, Design Services for Electrical Improvements at WTP & WWTP

Firm Name: Jacobs

Evaluator Name: Timothy A. Welch, P.E.

Date: 5/15/2026

### FIRST TIER SCORING CRITERIA

| Criterion   | Evaluation Criteria                                           | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Max Points | Score Awarded | Comments                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|---------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1A          | Qualifications of Firm & Team Members Assigned to the Project | Evaluate the qualifications of the firm and assigned individuals, including staff quality and availability, familiarity with City of Cooper City and Broward County regulations, and overall experience of professional and management staff. | 50         | 45            | Previously designed existing plant intimately familiar with operation and needs and intent. Well seasoned and experienced. Key understanding of how plant runs, works on SCADA and highly qualified to carry out design. |
| 2A          | Knowledge and Past Experience of Similar Type Projects        | Evaluate the respondent's understanding of the scope, technical approach, similar project experience, permitting awareness, and knowledge relevant to the services being solicited.                                                           | 25         | 24            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| 3A          | Past Performance for the Firms                                | Evaluate firm performance, responsiveness, scheduling history, submittal quality, and references for similar Florida projects completed within the past five years.                                                                           | 20         | 20            | Track record of timely and accurate work completion.                                                                                                                                                                     |
| 4A          | Ability of Team Members to Interface with the City            | Evaluate communication ability, proximity to the project, commitment to City requirements, and familiarity with City guidelines.                                                                                                              | 5          | 5             | Offices in Ft. Lauderdale and Boca Raton so very close                                                                                                                                                                   |
| Total Score |                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 100        | 94            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |

### GUIDANCE / RATING NOTES

| Range     | Suggested Meaning                                                                     |
|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Excellent | Proposal materially exceeds requirements and demonstrates exceptional strength.       |
| Good      | Proposal meets requirements and demonstrates notable strengths.                       |
| Fair      | Proposal generally meets requirements but includes some weaknesses or limited detail. |
| Poor      | Proposal fails to sufficiently demonstrate capability or responsiveness.              |

### EVALUATOR CERTIFICATION

I certify that I independently evaluated this proposal in accordance with the solicitation criteria.

Evaluator Signature: 

Date: 5/14/2026