Evaluation Committee for Right of Way Counsel Services; Contract No. 000930, held a duly noticed meeting on Wednesday, February 6, 2013, commencing at 9:48 A.M. in the Pelican Conference Room at the OOCEA Administrative Bldg, Orlando, Florida.

Committee Members Present:
Joe Passiatore, General Counsel
Laura Kelley, Deputy Executive director of Administration
Glenn Pressimone, Director of Engineering
George Hart

Other Attendees:
Robert Johnson, Manager of Procurement
Anthony Policastro, Policastro & Le Roux, P.A. (Evaluation Portion)

Interviews:
Robert commenced each of interviews with an outline of the interview process. Robert stated the interview portion of the meeting is closed to the public and is being recorded in accordance with Florida Statute.

Lowndes, Drosdick, Doster, 09:51 A.M. to 10:21 A.M.
Kantor & Reed, P.A.
Policastro & Le Roux, P.A. 10:32 A.M. to 11:04 A.M.
Shutts & Bowen LLP 11:18 A.M. to 11:49 A.M.

Upon completion of the last interview the recorder was stopped and the meeting was considered no longer closed to the public.

Evaluation Portion:

Technical
The committee members individually scored the technical proposals and interviews and submitted them to Robert for tallying. Robert Johnson tallied the score sheets utilizing the raw scores assigned by each committee member and averaged the raw scores for each Proposal received. Below are the results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposer</th>
<th>Total Raw Points</th>
<th>Average Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lowndes, Drosdick, Doster,</td>
<td>316.00</td>
<td>79.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantor &amp; Reed, P.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policastro &amp; Le Roux, P.A.</td>
<td>313.00</td>
<td>78.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shutts &amp; Bowen LLP</td>
<td>325.00</td>
<td>81.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pricing
Upon completion of the evaluation of the technical portion, Robert opened the pricing proposals and scored the pricing proposals in accordance with the RFP requirements utilizing the attached scenario for each Proposer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposer</th>
<th>Total Price</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lowndes, Drosdick, Doster,</td>
<td>$2,370,000.00</td>
<td>9.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantor &amp; Reed, P.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policastro &amp; Le Roux, P.A.</td>
<td>$2,160,000.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shutts &amp; Bowen LLP</td>
<td>$2,535,000.00</td>
<td>8.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total Points and Rankings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposer</th>
<th>Tech. Points</th>
<th>Pricing Points</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shutts &amp; Bowen LLP</td>
<td>81.25</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>89.77</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policastro &amp; Le Roux, P.A.</td>
<td>78.25</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>88.25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowndes, Drosdick, Doster, Kantor &amp; Reed, P.A.</td>
<td>79.00</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>88.11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Committee recommends the Board approve ranking and recommend award of the Agreement to the top ranked Proposer, Shutts & Bowen LLP.

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 12:08 P.M. These minutes are considered to be the official minutes of the interview, acceptance of the technical proposal and opening of the Price Proposals by the Evaluation Committee at its meeting held Wednesday, February 6, 2013.

Submitted by:  
Robert Johnson, Manager of Procurement  
2/6/2013

On behalf of the Evaluation Committee these minutes have been review and approved by:

Joe Passiatore, General Counsel  
2/6/13
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposer</th>
<th>Technical Points</th>
<th>Price Points</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
<th>Final Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address Incident</th>
<th>Proposal B to Proposal A</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>166,000.00</td>
<td>$1,370,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>$2,555,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposal Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal Value</th>
<th>Proposal Amount</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79.00</td>
<td>78.25</td>
<td>8.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.00</td>
<td>88.88</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluator:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost per Mile</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Aesthetics</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Service</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Performance</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPANY NAME</td>
<td>REPRESENTATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOWNDES, DROSDICK</td>
<td>BRENDAN LYNN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOWNDES, DROSDICK</td>
<td>JAMES SPOONHOUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPANY NAME</td>
<td>REPRESENTATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policastro &amp; LeRoux</td>
<td>R. Vicker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policastro &amp; LeRoux</td>
<td>S. Le Roux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policastro &amp; LeRoux</td>
<td>A. Palmintero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPANY NAME</td>
<td>REPRESENTATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shutts</td>
<td>Ken Wright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shutts</td>
<td>Sidney Callaway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shutts &amp; Bowen</td>
<td>Dillon Smith</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee Member

PROPOSER: LOWNDES, PROSPICK et al

ORLANDO-ORANGE COUNTY EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY

EVALUATION COMMITTEE SCORING SHEET FOR TECHNICAL PROPOSALS FOR

RIGHT-OF-WAY COUNSEL SERVICES; RFP-000930

The Evaluation Committee will consider the following areas in ranking the Proposers through information provided by each Proposer in the Technical Proposal.

The Committee members should strive to provide objective evaluations during all phases and for all parts of the review/evaluation process. Each proposal shall be evaluated on its own merit without comparison to the proposals submitted by other Proposers. Additionally, the evaluations must be done individually by each Committee member. Evaluations should not be done in a meeting type environment where a consensus is determined.

Each Committee member should provide a narrative explanation for his or her score. All individual evaluations should be signed and dated by the Committee member.

When a Committee member has completed evaluation of each proposal, the scores shall be transmitted to the Chairman of the Committee who will calculate the average score for each proposal.

Each member of the Committee must base his/her evaluation on the same criteria so that value uniformity can be established. The following considerations have been established as the review/evaluation criteria. These criteria have been provided to the Proposers in the RFP package.

The four (4) firms with the highest point total after evaluation of the first three criteria in 4.2 below will be shortlisted and requested to sit for an interview with the Committee. The interview will last approximately 30 minutes. Shortlisted firms who fail to participate in the interview will be considered non-responsive and eliminated from further consideration by the Committee. More than 4 firms may be shortlisted at the Committee’s option. If less than 3 firms submit responses, the Authority, at its sole discretion, may elect to continue the selection process or re-advertise the project.
Review of Technical Proposals

Experience of the Firm (90 points max.)

Experience of the Firm (25 points out of 90)

Did the Proposer provide a description of Right-of-Way Counsel services, specifically relating to the governmental sector, which the firm is capable of providing, together with an explanation of how these services might best assist the Authority?

1. A representative list of the last five engagements for which your firm has served as Right-of-Way Counsel for clients of a similar size or nature as the Authority

2. Provide a list for the past 3 years of your firm’s toll/transportation related experience serving as Right-of-Way Counsel. In lieu of toll/transportation experience, experience with other governmental agencies of a similar structure will be acceptable.

3. A description of any disciplinary action, administrative proceedings or malpractice claim or other like proceeding against the firm or any of its lawyers that would serve on this engagement, whether current, pending or threatened.

Experience of the Firm 20 points
(max. 25 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments: Couldn’t find the list of last 5 similar engagements. All experience is on landowner side.
Experience of Attorneys Assigned - (25 points out of 90)

1. Did the Proposer select key personnel within the firm who will be responsible for this engagement? At a minimum, did the Proposer provide the following information for such key personnel and for each member of the professional staff proposed to be assigned to this engagement?
   
a. A brief résumé of the professional experience and qualifications of the individual.
   
b. An outline of the proposed function of the individual in the proposed engagement.
   
c. A description of the accessibility and availability of the individual during the course of the engagement.
   
d. The office location to which the individual is assigned.

2. Did the Proposer provide a list of at least three (3) references for toll/transportation, or other governmental agencies of a similar structure, the Authority may contact in order to assist in the evaluation of assigned attorneys’ past performance as Right-of-Way Counsel? For each reference listed, did the Proposer provide the following information?
   
a. Name and mailing address of the entity.
   
b. Name and telephone number of your contact person within said entity.

Experience of Attorneys Assigned

25 points
(Max. 25 Points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

3
**Approach to Assignment** - (20 points out of 90)

Did the Proposer provide a brief description of the firm’s approach to servicing the Authority as a client to ensure that high quality services are provided in an effective and efficient manner? Did the Proposer include the assigned attorneys’ availability for work group sessions, scheduled meeting and impromptu discussions?

**Approach to Assignment**

\[ \frac{18}{\text{points}} \]

(Max. 20 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Interview (optional) - (20 points out of 90)

Only shortlisted firms will be interviewed.

Were the Committee's questions answered clearly and specifically to enable the Committee to evaluate the technical capability of the Proposer and key staff to provide the desired services?

Interview 20 points
(Max. 20 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments: ____________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORING RECAP

Experience of the Firm (25 points max.)  
Experience of Attorneys Assigned (25 points max.)  
Approach to Assignment (20 points max.)  

Subtotal  

Interview (20 points max.)  

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL TOTAL SCORE  

Points
Committee Member L. Kelley

PROPOSER: Lowndes Drosdick Central FL

ORLANDO-ORANGE COUNTY EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY

EVALUATION COMMITTEE SCORING SHEET FOR TECHNICAL PROPOSALS FOR

RIGHT-OF-WAY COUNSEL SERVICES; RFP-000930

The Evaluation Committee will consider the following areas in ranking the Proposers through information provided by each Proposer in the Technical Proposal.

The Committee members should strive to provide objective evaluations during all phases and for all parts of the review/evaluation process. Each proposal shall be evaluated on its own merit without comparison to the proposals submitted by other Proposers. Additionally, the evaluations must be done individually by each Committee member. Evaluations should not be done in a meeting type environment where a consensus is determined.

Each Committee member should provide a narrative explanation for his or her score. All individual evaluations should be signed and dated by the Committee member.

When a Committee member has completed evaluation of each proposal, the scores shall be transmitted to the Chairman of the Committee who will calculate the average score for each proposal.

Each member of the Committee must base his/her evaluation on the same criteria so that value uniformity can be established. The following considerations have been established as the review/evaluation criteria. These criteria have been provided to the Proposers in the RFP package.

The four (4) firms with the highest point total after evaluation of the first three criteria in 4.2 below will be shortlisted and requested to sit for an interview with the Committee. The interview will last approximately 30 minutes. Shortlisted firms who fail to participate in the interview will be considered non-responsive and eliminated from further consideration by the Committee. More than 4 firms may be shortlisted at the Committee’s option. If less than 3 firms submit responses, the Authority, at its sole discretion, may elect to continue the selection process or re-advertise the project.
Review of Technical Proposals (90 points max.)

Experience of the Firm (25 points out of 90)

Did the Proposer provide a description of Right-of-Way Counsel services, specifically relating to the governmental sector, which the firm is capable of providing, together with an explanation of how these services might best assist the Authority?

1. A representative list of the last five engagements for which your firm has served as Right-of-Way Counsel for clients of a similar size or nature as the Authority.

2. Provide a list for the past 3 years of your firm’s toll/transportation related experience serving as Right-of-Way Counsel. In lieu of toll/transportation experience, experience with other governmental agencies of a similar structure will be acceptable.

3. A description of any disciplinary action, administrative proceedings or malpractice claim or other like proceeding against the firm or any of its lawyers that would serve on this engagement, whether current, pending or threatened.

Experience of the Firm 20 points (max. 25 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments:

extensive property owner representation

20% woman owned
Experience of Attorneys Assigned - (25 points out of 90)

1. Did the Proposer select key personnel within the firm who will be responsible for this engagement? At a minimum, did the Proposer provide the following information for such key personnel and for each member of the professional staff proposed to be assigned to this engagement?

   a. A brief résumé of the professional experience and qualifications of the individual.

   b. An outline of the proposed function of the individual in the proposed engagement.

   c. A description of the accessibility and availability of the individual during the course of the engagement.

   d. The office location to which the individual is assigned.

2. Did the Proposer provide a list of at least three (3) references for toll/transportation, or other governmental agencies of a similar structure, the Authority may contact in order to assist in the evaluation of assigned attorneys' past performance as Right-of-Way Counsel? For each reference listed, did the Proposer provide the following information?

   a. Name and mailing address of the entity.

   b. Name and telephone number of your contact person within said entity.

Experience of Attorneys Assigned

22 points
(Max. 25 Points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials
**Approach to Assignment** - (20 points out of 90)

Did the Proposer provide a brief description of the firm’s approach to servicing the Authority as a client to ensure that high quality services are provided in an effective and efficient manner? Did the Proposer include the assigned attorneys’ availability for work group sessions, scheduled meeting and impromptu discussions?

**Approach to Assignment**

\[18\] points
(Max. 20 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials **LK**

Review Comments:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Interview (optional) - (20 points out of 90)

Only shortlisted firms will be interviewed.

Were the Committee’s questions answered clearly and specifically to enable the Committee to evaluate the technical capability of the Proposer and key staff to provide the desired services?

Interview 17 points
(Max. 20 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials K

Review Comments: 
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
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TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORING RECAP

Experience of the Firm (25 points max.)  
Experience of Attorneys Assigned (25 points max.)  
Approach to Assignment (20 points max.)

Subtotal  

Interview (20 points max.)

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL TOTAL SCORE

77 Points
PROPOSER: Lowndes Drosdick Doster Kantor & Reed, P.A.

ORLANDO-ORANGE COUNTY EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY

EVALUATION COMMITTEE SCORING SHEET FOR TECHNICAL PROPOSALS FOR

RIGHT-OF-WAY COUNSEL SERVICES; RFP-000930

The Evaluation Committee will consider the following areas in ranking the Proposers through information provided by each Proposer in the Technical Proposal.

The Committee members should strive to provide objective evaluations during all phases and for all parts of the review/evaluation process. Each proposal shall be evaluated on its own merit without comparison to the proposals submitted by other Proposers. Additionally, the evaluations must be done individually by each Committee member. Evaluations should not be done in a meeting type environment where a consensus is determined.

Each Committee member should provide a narrative explanation for his or her score. All individual evaluations should be signed and dated by the Committee member.

When a Committee member has completed evaluation of each proposal, the scores shall be transmitted to the Chairman of the Committee who will calculate the average score for each proposal.

Each member of the Committee must base his/her evaluation on the same criteria so that value uniformity can be established. The following considerations have been established as the review/evaluation criteria. These criteria have been provided to the Proposers in the RFP package.

The four (4) firms with the highest point total after evaluation of the first three criteria in 4.2 below will be shortlisted and requested to sit for an interview with the Committee. The interview will last approximately 30 minutes. Shortlisted firms who fail to participate in the interview will be considered non-responsive and eliminated from further consideration by the Committee. More than 4 firms may be shortlisted at the Committee’s option. If less than 3 firms submit responses, the Authority, at its sole discretion, may elect to continue the selection process or re-advertise the project.
Review of Technical Proposals

Experience of the Firm

(90 points max.)
(25 points out of 90)

Did the Proposer provide a description of Right-of-Way Counsel services, specifically relating to the governmental sector, which the firm is capable of providing, together with an explanation of how these services might best assist the Authority?

1. A representative list of the last five engagements for which your firm has served as Right-of-Way Counsel for clients of a similar size or nature as the Authority.

2. Provide a list for the past 3 years of your firm's toll/transportation related experience serving as Right-of-Way Counsel. In lieu of toll/transportation experience, experience with other governmental agencies of a similar structure will be acceptable.

3. A description of any disciplinary action, administrative proceedings or malpractice claim or other like proceeding against the firm or any of its lawyers that would serve on this engagement, whether current, pending or threatened.

Experience of the Firm

22 points (max. 25 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments:

All Areas Covered. Other than very recent OCEA assignment very little experience with Agency representation. Extensive local experience representing property owners may be a positive.
Experience of Attorneys Assigned - (25 points out of 90)

1. Did the Proposer select key personnel within the firm who will be responsible for this engagement? At a minimum, did the Proposer provide the following information for such key personnel and for each member of the professional staff proposed to be assigned to this engagement?
   
   a. A brief résumé of the professional experience and qualifications of the individual.
   
   b. An outline of the proposed function of the individual in the proposed engagement.
   
   c. A description of the accessibility and availability of the individual during the course of the engagement.
   
   d. The office location to which the individual is assigned.

2. Did the Proposer provide a list of at least three (3) references for toll/transportation, or other governmental agencies of a similar structure, the Authority may contact in order to assist in the evaluation of assigned attorneys' past performance as Right-of-Way Counsel? For each reference listed, did the Proposer provide the following information?
   
   a. Name and mailing address of the entity.
   
   b. Name and telephone number of your contact person within said entity.

Experience of Attorneys Assigned

24 points
(Max. 25 Points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments:

[Handwritten notes] Detailed
**Approach to Assignment** - (20 points out of 90)

Did the Proposer provide a brief description of the firm’s approach to servicing the Authority as a client to ensure that high quality services are provided in an effective and efficient manner? Did the Proposer include the assigned attorneys’ availability for work group sessions, scheduled meeting and impromptu discussions?

Approach to Assignment

![Signature and Initials]

Review Comments:  

Brief: Would like to have more detail.
**Interview** (optional) - (20 points out of 90)

Only shortlisted firms will be interviewed.

Were the Committee’s questions answered clearly and specifically to enable the Committee to evaluate the technical capability of the Proposer and key staff to provide the desired services?

**Interview**

18 points
(Max. 20 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments:

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORING RECAP

Experience of the Firm (25 points max.)  
22

Experience of Attorneys Assigned (25 points max.)  
24

Approach to Assignment (20 points max.)  
17

Subtotal  
63

Interview (20 points max.)  
18

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL TOTAL SCORE  
81 Points
Committee Member George Heath

PROPOSER: Lawrence Debock, Doral, Kendall, Peep, P.A.

ORLANDO-ORANGE COUNTY EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY

EVALUATION COMMITTEE SCORING SHEET FOR TECHNICAL PROPOSALS FOR

RIGHT-OF-WAY COUNSEL SERVICES; RFP-000930

The Evaluation Committee will consider the following areas in ranking the Proposers through information provided by each Proposer in the Technical Proposal.

The Committee members should strive to provide objective evaluations during all phases and for all parts of the review/evaluation process. Each proposal shall be evaluated on its own merit without comparison to the proposals submitted by other Proposers. Additionally, the evaluations must be done individually by each Committee member. Evaluations should not be done in a meeting type environment where a consensus is determined.

Each Committee member should provide a narrative explanation for his or her score. All individual evaluations should be signed and dated by the Committee member.

When a Committee member has completed evaluation of each proposal, the scores shall be transmitted to the Chairman of the Committee who will calculate the average score for each proposal.

Each member of the Committee must base his/her evaluation on the same criteria so that value uniformity can be established. The following considerations have been established as the review/evaluation criteria. These criteria have been provided to the Proposers in the RFP package.

The four (4) firms with the highest point total after evaluation of the first three criteria in 4.2 below will be shortlisted and requested to sit for an interview with the Committee. The interview will last approximately 30 minutes. Shortlisted firms who fail to participate in the interview will be considered non-responsive and eliminated from further consideration by the Committee. More than 4 firms may be shortlisted at the Committee’s option. If less than 3 firms submit responses, the Authority, at its sole discretion, may elect to continue the selection process or re-advertise the project.
Review of Technical Proposals

Experience of the Firm

(25 points out of 90)

Did the Proposer provide a description of Right-of-Way Counsel services, specifically relating to the governmental sector, which the firm is capable of providing, together with an explanation of how these services might best assist the Authority?

1. A representative list of the last five engagements for which your firm has served as Right-of-Way Counsel for clients of a similar size or nature as the Authority.

2. Provide a list for the past 3 years of your firm's toll/transportation related experience serving as Right-of-Way Counsel. In lieu of toll/transportation experience, experience with other governmental agencies of a similar structure will be acceptable.

3. A description of any disciplinary action, administrative proceedings or malpractice claim or other like proceeding against the firm or any of its lawyers that would serve on this engagement, whether current, pending or threatened.

Experience of the Firm

15 points

(max. 25 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials ______

Review Comments: Have world of property issues but narrow the
condemning path. Provided a list of client agencies they have
been special counsel or general counsel to but no
specific list of clients or scope or last engagements.
More appear to be similar to OCCER.
Experience of Attorneys Assigned - (25 points out of 90)

1. Did the Proposer select key personnel within the firm who will be responsible for this engagement? At a minimum, did the Proposer provide the following information for such key personnel and for each member of the professional staff proposed to be assigned to this engagement?
   a. A brief résumé of the professional experience and qualifications of the individual.
   b. An outline of the proposed function of the individual in the proposed engagement.
   c. A description of the accessibility and availability of the individual during the course of the engagement.
   d. The office location to which the individual is assigned.

2. Did the Proposer provide a list of at least three (3) references for toll/transportation, or other governmental agencies of a similar structure, the Authority may contact in order to assist in the evaluation of assigned attorneys’ past performance as Right-of-Way Counsel? For each reference listed, did the Proposer provide the following information?
   a. Name and mailing address of the entity.
   b. Name and telephone number of your contact person within said entity.

Experience of Attorneys Assigned

(Max. 25 Points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials _____

Review Comments: Provided will rec info, but only appears to have quiet engaging exp.
**Approach to Assignment** - (20 points out of 90)

Did the Proposer provide a brief description of the firm’s approach to servicing the Authority as a client to ensure that high quality services are provided in an effective and efficient manner? Did the Proposer include the assigned attorneys’ availability for work group sessions, scheduled meeting and impromptu discussions?

**Approach to Assignment**

20 points
(Max. 20 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials _____

Review Comments: ________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

4
**Interview** (optional) - (20 points out of 90)

Only shortlisted firms will be interviewed.

Were the Committee’s questions answered clearly and specifically to enable the Committee to evaluate the technical capability of the Proposer and key staff to provide the desired services?

**Interview**

20 points

(Max. 20 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials ___

Review Comments: ____________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience of the Firm</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of Attorneys Assigned</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach to Assignment</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TECHNICAL PROPOSAL TOTAL SCORE</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong> Points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee Member

PROPOSER: Poliastro Le Loux P.A.

ORLANDO-ORANGE COUNTY EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY

EVALUATION COMMITTEE SCORING SHEET FOR TECHNICAL PROPOSALS FOR

RIGHT-OF-WAY COUNSEL SERVICES; RFP-000930

The Evaluation Committee will consider the following areas in ranking the Proposers through information provided by each Proposer in the Technical Proposal.

The Committee members should strive to provide objective evaluations during all phases and for all parts of the review/evaluation process. Each proposal shall be evaluated on its own merit without comparison to the proposals submitted by other Proposers. Additionally, the evaluations must be done individually by each Committee member. Evaluations should not be done in a meeting type environment where a consensus is determined.

Each Committee member should provide a narrative explanation for his or her score. All individual evaluations should be signed and dated by the Committee member.

When a Committee member has completed evaluation of each proposal, the scores shall be transmitted to the Chairman of the Committee who will calculate the average score for each proposal.

Each member of the Committee must base his/her evaluation on the same criteria so that value uniformity can be established. The following considerations have been established as the review/evaluation criteria. These criteria have been provided to the Proposers in the RFP package.

The four (4) firms with the highest point total after evaluation of the first three criteria in 4.2 below will be shortlisted and requested to sit for an interview with the Committee. The interview will last approximately 30 minutes. Shortlisted firms who fail to participate in the interview will be considered non-responsive and eliminated from further consideration by the Committee. More than 4 firms may be shortlisted at the Committee’s option. If less than 3 firms submit responses, the Authority, at its sole discretion, may elect to continue the selection process or re-advertise the project.
Review of Technical Proposals

Experience of the Firm (25 points out of 90)

Did the Proposer provide a description of Right-of-Way Counsel services, specifically relating to the governmental sector, which the firm is capable of providing, together with an explanation of how these services might best assist the Authority?

1. A representative list of the last five engagements for which your firm has served as Right-of-Way Counsel for clients of a similar size or nature as the Authority

2. Provide a list for the past 3 years of your firm’s toll/transportation related experience serving as Right-of-Way Counsel. In lieu of toll/transportation experience, experience with other governmental agencies of a similar structure will be acceptable.

3. A description of any disciplinary action, administrative proceedings or malpractice claim or other like proceeding against the firm or any of its lawyers that would serve on this engagement, whether current, pending or threatened.

Experience of the Firm

12 points (max. 25 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments:

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
Experience of Attorneys Assigned - (25 points out of 90)

1. Did the Proposer select key personnel within the firm who will be responsible for this engagement? At a minimum, did the Proposer provide the following information for such key personnel and for each member of the professional staff proposed to be assigned to this engagement?
   a. A brief résumé of the professional experience and qualifications of the individual.
   b. An outline of the proposed function of the individual in the proposed engagement.
   c. A description of the accessibility and availability of the individual during the course of the engagement.
   d. The office location to which the individual is assigned.

2. Did the Proposer provide a list of at least three (3) references for toll/transportation, or other governmental agencies of a similar structure, the Authority may contact in order to assist in the evaluation of assigned attorneys' past performance as Right-of-Way Counsel? For each reference listed, did the Proposer provide the following information?
   a. Name and mailing address of the entity.
   b. Name and telephone number of your contact person within said entity.

Experience of Attorneys Assigned

(Max. 25 Points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials
Approach to Assignment - (20 points out of 90)

Did the Proposer provide a brief description of the firm’s approach to servicing the Authority as a client to ensure that high quality services are provided in an effective and efficient manner? Did the Proposer include the assigned attorneys’ availability for work group sessions, scheduled meeting and impromptu discussions?

Approach to Assignment

\[ 18 \text{ points} \]
(Max. 20 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
**Interview** (optional) - (20 points out of 90)

Only shortlisted firms will be interviewed.

Were the Committee’s questions answered clearly and specifically to enable the Committee to evaluate the technical capability of the Proposer and key staff to provide the desired services?

**Interview**

\[
\text{points} \quad 02
\]

(Max. 20 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORING RECAP

Experience of the Firm (25 points max.)  22
Experience of Attorneys Assigned (25 points max.)  20
Approach to Assignment (20 points max.)  18

Subtotal  60
Interview (20 points max.)  12

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL TOTAL SCORE

__________ Points
The Evaluation Committee will consider the following areas in ranking the Proposers through information provided by each Proposer in the Technical Proposal.

The Committee members should strive to provide objective evaluations during all phases and for all parts of the review/evaluation process. Each proposal shall be evaluated on its own merit without comparison to the proposals submitted by other Proposers. Additionally, the evaluations must be done individually by each Committee member. Evaluations should not be done in a meeting type environment where a consensus is determined.

Each Committee member should provide a narrative explanation for his or her score. All individual evaluations should be signed and dated by the Committee member.

When a Committee member has completed evaluation of each proposal, the scores shall be transmitted to the Chairman of the Committee who will calculate the average score for each proposal.

Each member of the Committee must base his/her evaluation on the same criteria so that value uniformity can be established. The following considerations have been established as the review/evaluation criteria. These criteria have been provided to the Proposers in the RFP package.

The four (4) firms with the highest point total after evaluation of the first three criteria in 4.2 below will be shortlisted and requested to sit for an interview with the Committee. The interview will last approximately 30 minutes. Shortlisted firms who fail to participate in the interview will be considered non-responsive and eliminated from further consideration by the Committee. More than 4 firms may be shortlisted at the Committee’s option. If less than 3 firms submit responses, the Authority, at its sole discretion, may elect to continue the selection process or re-advertise the project.
Review of Technical Proposals

Experience of the Firm

Did the Proposer provide a description of Right-of-Way Counsel services, specifically relating to the governmental sector, which the firm is capable of providing, together with an explanation of how these services might best assist the Authority?

1. A representative list of the last five engagements for which your firm has served as Right-of-Way Counsel for clients of a similar size or nature as the Authority.

2. Provide a list for the past 3 years of your firm’s toll/transportation related experience serving as Right-of-Way Counsel. In lieu of toll/transportation experience, experience with other governmental agencies of a similar structure will be acceptable.

3. A description of any disciplinary action, administrative proceedings or malpractice claim or other like proceeding against the firm or any of its lawyers that would serve on this engagement, whether current, pending or threatened.

Experience of the Firm

23 points
(max. 25 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials LK

Review Comments: ______________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
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Experience of Attorneys Assigned - (25 points out of 90)

1. Did the Proposer select key personnel within the firm who will be responsible for this engagement? At a minimum, did the Proposer provide the following information for such key personnel and for each member of the professional staff proposed to be assigned to this engagement?
   a. A brief résumé of the professional experience and qualifications of the individual.
   b. An outline of the proposed function of the individual in the proposed engagement.
   c. A description of the accessibility and availability of the individual during the course of the engagement.
   d. The office location to which the individual is assigned.

2. Did the Proposer provide a list of at least three (3) references for toll/transportation, or other governmental agencies of a similar structure, the Authority may contact in order to assist in the evaluation of assigned attorneys’ past performance as Right-of-Way Counsel? For each reference listed, did the Proposer provide the following information?
   a. Name and mailing address of the entity.
   b. Name and telephone number of your contact person within said entity.

Experience of Attorneys Assigned 23 points
(Max. 25 Points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials UK

Review Comments: ________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
**Approach to Assignment** - (20 points out of 90)

Did the Proposer provide a brief description of the firm’s approach to servicing the Authority as a client to ensure that high quality services are provided in an effective and efficient manner? Did the Proposer include the assigned attorneys’ availability for work group sessions, scheduled meeting and impromptu discussions?

**Approach to Assignment**

![Score](image)

(Max. 20 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
**Interview** (optional) - (20 points out of 90)

Only shortlisted firms will be interviewed.

Were the Committee’s questions answered clearly and specifically to enable the Committee to evaluate the technical capability of the Proposer and key staff to provide the desired services?

**Interview**

\[ 18 \text{ points} \]

(Max. 20 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
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TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORING RECAP

Experience of the Firm (25 points max.) 23
Experience of Attorneys Assigned (25 points max.) 23
Approach to Assignment (20 points max.) 18

Subtotal 64

Interview (20 points max.) 18

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL TOTAL SCORE 82 Points
ORLANDO-ORANGE COUNTY EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY

EVALUATION COMMITTEE SCORING SHEET FOR TECHNICAL PROPOSALS FOR

RIGHT-OF-WAY COUNSEL SERVICES; RFP-000930

The Evaluation Committee will consider the following areas in ranking the Proposers through information provided by each Proposer in the Technical Proposal.

The Committee members should strive to provide objective evaluations during all phases and for all parts of the review/evaluation process. Each proposal shall be evaluated on its own merit without comparison to the proposals submitted by other Proposers. Additionally, the evaluations must be done individually by each Committee member. Evaluations should not be done in a meeting type environment where a consensus is determined.

Each Committee member should provide a narrative explanation for his or her score. All individual evaluations should be signed and dated by the Committee member.

When a Committee member has completed evaluation of each proposal, the scores shall be transmitted to the Chairman of the Committee who will calculate the average score for each proposal.

Each member of the Committee must base his/her evaluation on the same criteria so that value uniformity can be established. The following considerations have been established as the review/evaluation criteria. These criteria have been provided to the Proposers in the RFP package.

The four (4) firms with the highest point total after evaluation of the first three criteria in 4.2 below will be shortlisted and requested to sit for an interview with the Committee. The interview will last approximately 30 minutes. Shortlisted firms who fail to participate in the interview will be considered non-responsive and eliminated from further consideration by the Committee. More than 4 firms may be shortlisted at the Committee’s option. If less than 3 firms submit responses, the Authority, at its sole discretion, may elect to continue the selection process or re-advertise the project.
Review of Technical Proposals

Experience of the Firm

(90 points max.)

(25 points out of 90)

Did the Proposer provide a description of Right-of-Way Counsel services, specifically relating to the governmental sector, which the firm is capable of providing, together with an explanation of how these services might best assist the Authority?

1. A representative list of the last five engagements for which your firm has served as Right-of-Way Counsel for clients of a similar size or nature as the Authority.

2. Provide a list for the past 3 years of your firm's toll/transportation related experience serving as Right-of-Way Counsel. In lieu of toll/transportation experience, experience with other governmental agencies of a similar structure will be acceptable.

3. A description of any disciplinary action, administrative proceedings or malpractice claim or other like proceeding against the firm or any of its lawyers that would serve on this engagement, whether current, pending or threatened.

Experience of the Firm

20 points
(max. 25 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments:

All Areas Covered. Similar Project To 0000A Identified.
Experience of Attorneys Assigned - (25 points out of 90)

1. Did the Proposer select key personnel within the firm who will be responsible for this engagement? At a minimum, did the Proposer provide the following information for such key personnel and for each member of the professional staff proposed to be assigned to this engagement?
   
   a. A brief résumé of the professional experience and qualifications of the individual.
   
   b. An outline of the proposed function of the individual in the proposed engagement.
   
   c. A description of the accessibility and availability of the individual during the course of the engagement.
   
   d. The office location to which the individual is assigned.

2. Did the Proposer provide a list of at least three (3) references for toll/transportation, or other governmental agencies of a similar structure, the Authority may contact in order to assist in the evaluation of assigned attorneys' past performance as Right-of-Way Counsel? For each reference listed, did the Proposer provide the following information?
   
   a. Name and mailing address of the entity.
   
   b. Name and telephone number of your contact person within said entity.

Experience of Attorneys Assigned

24 points
(Max. 25 Points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments: Very Detailed.
**Approach to Assignment** - (20 points out of 90)

Did the Proposer provide a brief description of the firm's approach to servicing the Authority as a client to ensure that high quality services are provided in an effective and efficient manner? Did the Proposer include the assigned attorneys' availability for work group sessions, scheduled meeting and impromptu discussions?

**Approach to Assignment**  

\[ 18 \text{ points} \]  
(Max. 20 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

**Review Comments:**

- Well presented. Only concern with Approach is lack of discussion on Office location with respect to OCETA Office and the system.
Interview (optional) - (20 points out of 90)

Only shortlisted firms will be interviewed.

Were the Committee's questions answered clearly and specifically to enable the Committee to evaluate the technical capability of the Proposer and key staff to provide the desired services?

Interview

\[ \text{(Max. 20 points)} \]

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments:

________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
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TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORING RECAP

Experience of the Firm (25 points max.) 23
Experience of Attorneys Assigned (25 points max.) 24
Approach to Assignment (20 points max.) 18

Subtotal 65

Interview (20 points max.) 16

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL TOTAL SCORE 81 Points
PROPOSER: Policastroleho

ORLANDO-ORANGE COUNTY EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY

EVALUATION COMMITTEE SCORING SHEET FOR TECHNICAL PROPOSALS FOR

RIGHT-OF-WAY COUNSEL SERVICES; RFP-000930

The Evaluation Committee will consider the following areas in ranking the Proposers through information provided by each Proposer in the Technical Proposal.

The Committee members should strive to provide objective evaluations during all phases and for all parts of the review/evaluation process. Each proposal shall be evaluated on its own merit without comparison to the proposals submitted by other Proposers. Additionally, the evaluations must be done individually by each Committee member. Evaluations should not be done in a meeting type environment where a consensus is determined.

Each Committee member should provide a narrative explanation for his or her score. All individual evaluations should be signed and dated by the Committee member.

When a Committee member has completed evaluation of each proposal, the scores shall be transmitted to the Chairman of the Committee who will calculate the average score for each proposal.

Each member of the Committee must base his/her evaluation on the same criteria so that value uniformity can be established. The following considerations have been established as the review/evaluation criteria. These criteria have been provided to the Proposers in the RFP package.

The four (4) firms with the highest point total after evaluation of the first three criteria in 4.2 below will be shortlisted and requested to sit for an interview with the Committee. The interview will last approximately 30 minutes. Shortlisted firms who fail to participate in the interview will be considered non-responsive and eliminated from further consideration by the Committee. More than 4 firms may be shortlisted at the Committee’s option. If less than 3 firms submit responses, the Authority, at its sole discretion, may elect to continue the selection process or re-advertise the project.
Review of Technical Proposals

Experience of the Firm

Did the Proposer provide a description of Right-of-Way Counsel services, specifically relating to the governmental sector, which the firm is capable of providing, together with an explanation of how these services might best assist the Authority?

✓ A representative list of the last five engagements for which your firm has served as Right-of-Way Counsel for clients of a similar size or nature as the Authority.

✓ Provide a list for the past 3 years of your firm’s toll/transportation related experience serving as Right-of-Way Counsel. In lieu of toll/transportation experience, experience with other governmental agencies of a similar structure will be acceptable.

✓ A description of any disciplinary action, administrative proceedings or malpractice claim or other like proceeding against the firm or any of its lawyers that would serve on this engagement, whether current, pending or threatened.

Experience of the Firm

20 points
(max. 25 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials ______

Review Comments: They have experience and listed 5 engagements. They seem to have limited trial exp. at limited exp. of toll roads.
Experience of Attorneys Assigned - (25 points out of 90)

1. Did the Proposer select key personnel within the firm who will be responsible for this engagement? At a minimum, did the Proposer provide the following information for such key personnel and for each member of the professional staff proposed to be assigned to this engagement?

a. A brief résumé of the professional experience and qualifications of the individual.

b. An outline of the proposed function of the individual in the proposed engagement.

c. A description of the accessibility and availability of the individual during the course of the engagement.

d. The office location to which the individual is assigned.

2. Did the Proposer provide a list of at least three (3) references for toll/transportation, or other governmental agencies of a similar structure, the Authority may contact in order to assist in the evaluation of assigned attorneys' past performance as Right-of-Way Counsel? For each reference listed, did the Proposer provide the following information?

a. Name and mailing address of the entity.

b. Name and telephone number of your contact person within said entity.

---

Experience of Attorneys Assigned

20 points
(Max. 25 Points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials ____

Review Comments: Provided all of the requested information except on the title language.
**Approach to Assignment** - (20 points out of 90)

Did the Proposer provide a brief description of the firm's approach to servicing the Authority as a client to ensure that high quality services are provided in an effective and efficient manner? Did the Proposer include the assigned attorneys' availability for work group sessions, scheduled meeting and impromptu discussions?

\[ \checkmark \]

**Approach to Assignment**

\[ 20 \text{ points} \]

(Max. 20 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials ____

Review Comments: ________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________
**Interview** (optional) - (20 points out of 90)

Only shortlisted firms will be interviewed.

Were the Committee's questions answered clearly and specifically to enable the Committee to evaluate the technical capability of the Proposer and key staff to provide the desired services?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>12 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Max. 20 points)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation Committee Member Initials _____

Review Comments: __________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________


TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORING RECAP

Experience of the Firm (25 points max.) 20
Experience of Attorneys Assigned (25 points max.) 20
Approach to Assignment (20 points max.) 20

Subtotal 60

Interview (20 points max.) 18

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL TOTAL SCORE 78 Points
PROPOSER: Shuttles & Bowen

ORLANDO-ORANGE COUNTY EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY

EVALUATION COMMITTEE SCORING SHEET FOR TECHNICAL PROPOSALS FOR

RIGHT-OF-WAY COUNSEL SERVICES; RFP-000930

The Evaluation Committee will consider the following areas in ranking the Proposers through information provided by each Proposer in the Technical Proposal.

The Committee members should strive to provide objective evaluations during all phases and for all parts of the review/evaluation process. Each proposal shall be evaluated on its own merit without comparison to the proposals submitted by other Proposers. Additionally, the evaluations must be done individually by each Committee member. Evaluations should not be done in a meeting type environment where a consensus is determined.

Each Committee member should provide a narrative explanation for his or her score. All individual evaluations should be signed and dated by the Committee member.

When a Committee member has completed evaluation of each proposal, the scores shall be transmitted to the Chairman of the Committee who will calculate the average score for each proposal.

Each member of the Committee must base his/her evaluation on the same criteria so that value uniformity can be established. The following considerations have been established as the review/evaluation criteria. These criteria have been provided to the Proposers in the RFP package.

The four (4) firms with the highest point total after evaluation of the first three criteria in 4.2 below will be shortlisted and requested to sit for an interview with the Committee. The interview will last approximately 30 minutes. Shortlisted firms who fail to participate in the interview will be considered non-responsive and eliminated from further consideration by the Committee. More than 4 firms may be shortlisted at the Committee’s option. If less than 3 firms submit responses, the Authority, at its sole discretion, may elect to continue the selection process or re-advertise the project.


Review of Technical Proposals

Experience of the Firm

(90 points max.)

Experience of the Firm

(25 points out of 90)

Did the Proposer provide a description of Right-of-Way Counsel services, specifically relating to the governmental sector, which the firm is capable of providing, together with an explanation of how these services might best assist the Authority?

1. A representative list of the last five engagements for which your firm has served as Right-of-Way Counsel for clients of a similar size or nature as the Authority.

2. Provide a list for the past 3 years of your firm’s toll/transportation related experience serving as Right-of-Way Counsel. In lieu of toll/transportation experience, experience with other governmental agencies of a similar structure will be acceptable.

3. A description of any disciplinary action, administrative proceedings or malpractice claim or other like proceeding against the firm or any of its lawyers that would serve on this engagement, whether current, pending or threatened.

Experience of the Firm

23 points

(max. 25 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments:

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________
Experience of Attorneys Assigned - (25 points out of 90)

1. Did the Proposer select key personnel within the firm who will be responsible for this engagement? At a minimum, did the Proposer provide the following information for such key personnel and for each member of the professional staff proposed to be assigned to this engagement?

   a. A brief résumé of the professional experience and qualifications of the individual.

   b. An outline of the proposed function of the individual in the proposed engagement.

   c. A description of the accessibility and availability of the individual during the course of the engagement.

   d. The office location to which the individual is assigned.

2. Did the Proposer provide a list of at least three (3) references for toll/transportation, or other governmental agencies of a similar structure, the Authority may contact in order to assist in the evaluation of assigned attorneys’ past performance as Right-of-Way Counsel? For each reference listed, did the Proposer provide the following information?

   a. Name and mailing address of the entity.

   b. Name and telephone number of your contact person within said entity.

-- 22 points
(Max. 25 Points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
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**Approach to Assignment** - (20 points out of 90)

Did the Proposer provide a brief description of the firm’s approach to servicing the Authority as a client to ensure that high quality services are provided in an effective and efficient manner? Did the Proposer include the assigned attorneys’ availability for work group sessions, scheduled meeting and impromptu discussions?

**Approach to Assignment**

18 points
(Max. 20 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
**Interview** (optional) - (20 points out of 90)

Only shortlisted firms will be interviewed.

Were the Committee's questions answered clearly and specifically to enable the Committee to evaluate the technical capability of the Proposer and key staff to provide the desired services?

**Interview**  
20 points  
(Max. 20 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments:

____________________________________

____________________________________

____________________________________

____________________________________

____________________________________

____________________________________

____________________________________
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORING RECAP

Experience of the Firm (25 points max.) 23
Experience of Attorneys Assigned (25 points max.) 22
Approach to Assignment (20 points max.) 18

Subtotal 63

Interview (20 points max.) 20

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL TOTAL SCORE 83 Points
PROPOSER: Shutts & Bowen
Orlando

ORLANDO-ORANGE COUNTY EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY

EVALUATION COMMITTEE SCORING SHEET FOR TECHNICAL PROPOSALS FOR

RIGHT-OF-WAY COUNSEL SERVICES; RFP-000930

The Evaluation Committee will consider the following areas in ranking the Proposers through information provided by each Proposer in the Technical Proposal.

The Committee members should strive to provide objective evaluations during all phases and for all parts of the review/evaluation process. Each proposal shall be evaluated on its own merit without comparison to the proposals submitted by other Proposers. Additionally, the evaluations must be done individually by each Committee member. Evaluations should not be done in a meeting type environment where a consensus is determined.

Each Committee member should provide a narrative explanation for his or her score. All individual evaluations should be signed and dated by the Committee member.

When a Committee member has completed evaluation of each proposal, the scores shall be transmitted to the Chairman of the Committee who will calculate the average score for each proposal.

Each member of the Committee must base his/her evaluation on the same criteria so that value uniformity can be established. The following considerations have been established as the review/evaluation criteria. These criteria have been provided to the Proposers in the RFP package.

The four (4) firms with the highest point total after evaluation of the first three criteria in 4.2 below will be shortlisted and requested to sit for an interview with the Committee. The interview will last approximately 30 minutes. Shortlisted firms who fail to participate in the interview will be considered non-responsive and eliminated from further consideration by the Committee. More than 4 firms may be shortlisted at the Committee’s option. If less than 3 firms submit responses, the Authority, at its sole discretion, may elect to continue the selection process or re-advertise the project.
Review of Technical Proposals

Experience of the Firm

(25 points out of 90)

Did the Proposer provide a description of Right-of-Way Counsel services, specifically relating to the governmental sector, which the firm is capable of providing, together with an explanation of how these services might best assist the Authority?

1. A representative list of the last five engagements for which your firm has served as Right-of-Way Counsel for clients of a similar size or nature as the Authority.

2. Provide a list for the past 3 years of your firm's toll/transportation related experience serving as Right-of-Way Counsel. In lieu of toll/transportation experience, experience with other governmental agencies of a similar structure will be acceptable.

3. A description of any disciplinary action, administrative proceedings or malpractice claim or other like proceeding against the firm or any of its lawyers that would serve on this engagement, whether current, pending or threatened.

Experience of the Firm

22 points
(max. 25 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials LK

Review Comments:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Experience of Attorneys Assigned - (25 points out of 90)

1. Did the Proposer select key personnel within the firm who will be responsible for this engagement? At a minimum, did the Proposer provide the following information for such key personnel and for each member of the professional staff proposed to be assigned to this engagement?
   a. A brief résumé of the professional experience and qualifications of the individual.
   b. An outline of the proposed function of the individual in the proposed engagement.
   c. A description of the accessibility and availability of the individual during the course of the engagement.
   d. The office location to which the individual is assigned.

2. Did the Proposer provide a list of at least three (3) references for toll/transportation, or other governmental agencies of a similar structure, the Authority may contact in order to assist in the evaluation of assigned attorneys’ past performance as Right-of-Way Counsel? For each reference listed, did the Proposer provide the following information?
   a. Name and mailing address of the entity.
   b. Name and telephone number of your contact person within said entity.

Experience of Attorneys Assigned

24 points
(Max. 25 Points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments: 

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
**Approach to Assignment** - (20 points out of 90)

Did the Proposer provide a brief description of the firm’s approach to servicing the Authority as a client to ensure that high quality services are provided in an effective and efficient manner? Did the Proposer include the assigned attorneys’ availability for work group sessions, scheduled meeting and impromptu discussions?

**Approach to Assignment**

\[ \text{20 points} \]

(Max. 20 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials \( \text{UK} \)

Review Comments:

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
**Interview** (optional) - (20 points out of 90)

Only shortlisted firms will be interviewed.

Were the Committee’s questions answered clearly and specifically to enable the Committee to evaluate the technical capability of the Proposer and key staff to provide the desired services?

**Interview**

$19$ points

(Max. 20 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

5
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORING RECAP

Experience of the Firm (25 points max.)  22
Experience of Attorneys Assigned (25 points max.)  24
Approach to Assignment (20 points max.)  20

Subtotal  66

Interview (20 points max.)  19

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL TOTAL SCORE  85 Points
Committee Member: G. Pressimone

PROPOSER: Skutt & Bowen, LLP

ORLANDO-ORANGE COUNTY EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY

EVALUATION COMMITTEE SCORING SHEET FOR TECHNICAL PROPOSALS FOR

RIGHT-OF-WAY COUNSEL SERVICES; RFP-000930

The Evaluation Committee will consider the following areas in ranking the Proposers through information provided by each Proposer in the Technical Proposal.

The Committee members should strive to provide objective evaluations during all phases and for all parts of the review/evaluation process. Each proposal shall be evaluated on its own merit without comparison to the proposals submitted by other Proposers. Additionally, the evaluations must be done individually by each Committee member. Evaluations should not be done in a meeting type environment where a consensus is determined.

Each Committee member should provide a narrative explanation for his or her score. All individual evaluations should be signed and dated by the Committee member.

When a Committee member has completed evaluation of each proposal, the scores shall be transmitted to the Chairman of the Committee who will calculate the average score for each proposal.

Each member of the Committee must base his/her evaluation on the same criteria so that value uniformity can be established. The following considerations have been established as the review/evaluation criteria. These criteria have been provided to the Proposers in the RFP package.

The four (4) firms with the highest point total after evaluation of the first three criteria in 4.2 below will be shortlisted and requested to sit for an interview with the Committee. The interview will last approximately 30 minutes. Shortlisted firms who fail to participate in the interview will be considered non-responsive and eliminated from further consideration by the Committee. More than 4 firms may be shortlisted at the Committee’s option. If less than 3 firms submit responses, the Authority, at its sole discretion, may elect to continue the selection process or re-advertise the project.
Review of Technical Proposals

Experience of the Firm (25 points out of 90)

Did the Proposer provide a description of Right-of-Way Counsel services, specifically relating to the governmental sector, which the firm is capable of providing, together with an explanation of how these services might best assist the Authority?

1. A representative list of the last five engagements for which your firm has served as Right-of-Way Counsel for clients of a similar size or nature as the Authority.

2. Provide a list for the past 3 years of your firm’s toll/transportation related experience serving as Right-of-Way Counsel. In lieu of toll/transportation experience, experience with other governmental agencies of a similar structure will be acceptable.

3. A description of any disciplinary action, administrative proceedings or malpractice claim or other like proceeding against the firm or any of its lawyers that would serve on this engagement, whether current, pending or threatened.

Experience of the Firm

[Signature]
Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments: All Areas Covered. Similar Project to COCEA identified. Previous COCEA experience.
Experience of Attorneys Assigned - (25 points out of 90)

1. Did the Proposer select key personnel within the firm who will be responsible for this engagement? At a minimum, did the Proposer provide the following information for such key personnel and for each member of the professional staff proposed to be assigned to this engagement?
   
   a. A brief résumé of the professional experience and qualifications of the individual.
   
   b. An outline of the proposed function of the individual in the proposed engagement.
   
   c. A description of the accessibility and availability of the individual during the course of the engagement.
   
   d. The office location to which the individual is assigned.

2. Did the Proposer provide a list of at least three (3) references for toll/transportation, or other governmental agencies of a similar structure, the Authority may contact in order to assist in the evaluation of assigned attorneys' past performance as Right-of-Way Counsel? For each reference listed, did the Proposer provide the following information?
   
   a. Name and mailing address of the entity.
   
   b. Name and telephone number of your contact person within said entity.

Experience of Attorneys Assigned

24 points
(Max. 25 Points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments: Very Detailed.
Approach to Assignment - (20 points out of 90)

Did the Proposer provide a brief description of the firm’s approach to servicing the Authority as a client to ensure that high quality services are provided in an effective and efficient manner? Did the Proposer include the assigned attorneys’ availability for work group sessions, scheduled meeting and impromptu discussions?

Approach to Assignment

\[
\frac{19}{20} \text{ points} \\
(\text{Max. 20 points})
\]

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments: Well Presented.
**Interview** (optional) - (20 points out of 90)

Only shortlisted firms will be interviewed.

Were the Committee's questions answered clearly and specifically to enable the Committee to evaluate the technical capability of the Proposer and key staff to provide the desired services?

**Interview**

19 points
(Max. 20 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments: __________________________________________
________________________
________________________
________________________
________________________
________________________
________________________
________________________
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORING RECAP

Experience of the Firm (25 points max.)  23
Experience of Attorneys Assigned (25 points max.)  24
Approach to Assignment (20 points max.)  19

Subtotal  66

Interview (20 points max.)  19

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL TOTAL SCORE  85 Points
ORLANDO-ORANGE COUNTY EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY

EVALUATION COMMITTEE SCORING SHEET FOR TECHNICAL PROPOSALS FOR

RIGHT-OF-WAY COUNSEL SERVICES; RFP-000930

The Evaluation Committee will consider the following areas in ranking the Proposers through information provided by each Proposer in the Technical Proposal.

The Committee members should strive to provide objective evaluations during all phases and for all parts of the review/evaluation process. Each proposal shall be evaluated on its own merit without comparison to the proposals submitted by other Proposers. Additionally, the evaluations must be done individually by each Committee member. Evaluations should not be done in a meeting type environment where a consensus is determined.

Each Committee member should provide a narrative explanation for his or her score. All individual evaluations should be signed and dated by the Committee member.

When a Committee member has completed evaluation of each proposal, the scores shall be transmitted to the Chairman of the Committee who will calculate the average score for each proposal.

Each member of the Committee must base his/her evaluation on the same criteria so that value uniformity can be established. The following considerations have been established as the review/evaluation criteria. These criteria have been provided to the Proposers in the RFP package.

The four (4) firms with the highest point total after evaluation of the first three criteria in 4.2 below will be shortlisted and requested to sit for an interview with the Committee. The interview will last approximately 30 minutes. Shortlisted firms who fail to participate in the interview will be considered non-responsive and eliminated from further consideration by the Committee. More than 4 firms may be shortlisted at the Committee’s option. If less than 3 firms submit responses, the Authority, at its sole discretion, may elect to continue the selection process or re-advertise the project.
Review of Technical Proposals (90 points max.)

Experience of the Firm (25 points out of 90)

Did the Proposer provide a description of Right-of-Way Counsel services, specifically relating to the governmental sector, which the firm is capable of providing, together with an explanation of how these services might best assist the Authority?

✓  A representative list of the last five engagements for which your firm has served as Right-of-Way Counsel for clients of a similar size or nature as the Authority

✓  Provide a list for the past 3 years of your firm’s toll/transportation related experience serving as Right-of-Way Counsel. In lieu of toll/transportation experience, experience with other governmental agencies of a similar structure will be acceptable.

✓  A description of any disciplinary action, administrative proceedings or malpractice claim or other like proceeding against the firm or any of its lawyers that would serve on this engagement, whether current, pending or threatened.

Experience of the Firm 20 points
(max. 25 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials ______

Review Comments:
1. Explanation of 4 of 5 and why 3 in my detail.
2. A brief description of the
3. OK

Confidential presentation
Experience of Attorneys Assigned  - (25 points out of 90)

1. Did the Proposer select key personnel within the firm who will be responsible for this engagement? At a minimum, did the Proposer provide the following information for such key personnel and for each member of the professional staff proposed to be assigned to this engagement?

   a. A brief resumé of the professional experience and qualifications of the individual.

   b. An outline of the proposed function of the individual in the proposed engagement.

   c. A description of the accessibility and availability of the individual during the course of the engagement.

   d. The office location to which the individual is assigned.

2. Did the Proposer provide a list of at least three (3) references for toll/transportation, or other governmental agencies of a similar structure, the Authority may contact in order to assist in the evaluation of assigned attorneys’ past performance as Right-of-Way Counsel? For each reference listed, did the Proposer provide the following information?

   a. Name and mailing address of the entity.

   b. Name and telephone number of your contact person within said entity.

Experience of Attorneys Assigned  

       20 points  

       (Max. 25 Points)  

Evaluation Committee Member Initials ____

Review Comments: Only Review Initials E. O. 

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
**Approach to Assignment**  (20 points out of 90)

Did the Proposer provide a brief description of the firm’s approach to servicing the Authority as a client to ensure that high quality services are provided in an effective and efficient manner? Did the Proposer include the assigned attorneys’ availability for work group sessions, scheduled meeting and impromptu discussions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach to Assignment</th>
<th>15 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Max. 20 points)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation Committee Member Initials ______

Review Comments:  

*yes, but confusing + Shady + Sealed & Weight*

*did not discuss availability of anyone but Shady & Weight*

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________
**Interview** (optional) - (20 points out of 90)

Only shortlisted firms will be interviewed.

Were the Committee’s questions answered clearly and specifically to enable the Committee to evaluate the technical capability of the Proposer and key staff to provide the desired services?

**Interview**

17 points

(Max. 20 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials ____

Review Comments: ____________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORING RECAP

Experience of the Firm (25 points max.)  
Experience of Attorneys Assigned (25 points max.)  
Approach to Assignment (20 points max.)  

Subtotal  

Interview (20 points max.)  

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL TOTAL SCORE  

72  

Points
ORLANDO-ORANGE COUNTY EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY

EVALUATION COMMITTEE SCORING SHEET FOR TECHNICAL PROPOSALS FOR

RIGHT-OF-WAY COUNSEL SERVICES; RFP-000930

The Evaluation Committee will consider the following areas in ranking the Proposers through information provided by each Proposer in the Technical Proposal.

The Committee members should strive to provide objective evaluations during all phases and for all parts of the review/evaluation process. Each proposal shall be evaluated on its own merit without comparison to the proposals submitted by other Proposers. Additionally, the evaluations must be done individually by each Committee member. Evaluations should not be done in a meeting type environment where a consensus is determined.

Each Committee member should provide a narrative explanation for his or her score. All individual evaluations should be signed and dated by the Committee member.

When a Committee member has completed evaluation of each proposal, the scores shall be transmitted to the Chairman of the Committee who will calculate the average score for each proposal.

Each member of the Committee must base his/her evaluation on the same criteria so that value uniformity can be established. The following considerations have been established as the review/evaluation criteria. These criteria have been provided to the Proposers in the RFP package.

The four (4) firms with the highest point total after evaluation of the first three criteria in 4.2 below will be shortlisted and requested to sit for an interview with the Committee. The interview will last approximately 30 minutes. Shortlisted firms who fail to participate in the interview will be considered non-responsive and eliminated from further consideration by the Committee. More than 4 firms may be shortlisted at the Committee’s option. If less than 3 firms submit responses, the Authority, at its sole discretion, may elect to continue the selection process or re-advertise the project.
Review of Technical Proposals (90 points max.)

Experience of the Firm (25 points out of 90)

Did the Proposer provide a description of Right-of-Way Counsel services, specifically relating to the governmental sector, which the firm is capable of providing, together with an explanation of how these services might best assist the Authority?

1. A representative list of the last five engagements for which your firm has served as Right-of-Way Counsel for clients of a similar size or nature as the Authority

2. Provide a list for the past 3 years of your firm’s toll/transportation related experience serving as Right-of-Way Counsel. In lieu of toll/transportation experience, experience with other governmental agencies of a similar structure will be acceptable.

3. A description of any disciplinary action, administrative proceedings or malpractice claim or other like proceeding against the firm or any of its lawyers that would serve on this engagement, whether current, pending or threatened.

Experience of the Firm

18 points (max. 25 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments: Not a transactional real estate firm.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Experience of Attorneys Assigned - (25 points out of 90)

1. Did the Proposer select key personnel within the firm who will be responsible for this engagement? At a minimum, did the Proposer provide the following information for such key personnel and for each member of the professional staff proposed to be assigned to this engagement?
   a. A brief résumé of the professional experience and qualifications of the individual.
   b. An outline of the proposed function of the individual in the proposed engagement.
   c. A description of the accessibility and availability of the individual during the course of the engagement.
   d. The office location to which the individual is assigned.

2. Did the Proposer provide a list of at least three (3) references for toll/transportation, or other governmental agencies of a similar structure, the Authority may contact in order to assist in the evaluation of assigned attorneys’ past performance as Right-of-Way Counsel? For each reference listed, did the Proposer provide the following information?
   a. Name and mailing address of the entity.
   b. Name and telephone number of your contact person within said entity.

Experience of Attorneys Assigned

(25 points)
(Max. 25 Points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments:
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

3
**Approach to Assignment** - (20 points out of 90)

Did the Proposer provide a brief description of the firm’s approach to servicing the Authority as a client to ensure that high quality services are provided in an effective and efficient manner? Did the Proposer include the assigned attorneys’ availability for work group sessions, scheduled meeting and impromptu discussions?

**Approach to Assignment**

\[ \frac{18}{\text{points}} \]

(Max. 20 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Interview (optional) - (20 points out of 90)

Only shortlisted firms will be interviewed.

Were the Committee's questions answered clearly and specifically to enable the Committee to evaluate the technical capability of the Proposer and key staff to provide the desired services?

Interview ______ points
(Max. 20 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials ______

Review Comments: _________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORING RECAP

Experience of the Firm (25 points max.) 18
Experience of Attorneys Assigned (25 points max.) 17
Approach to Assignment (20 points max.) 18

Subtotal

Interview (20 points max.)

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL TOTAL SCORE

Points
PROPOSER: Adorno Law Firm

ORLANDO-ORANGE COUNTY EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY

EVALUATION COMMITTEE SCORING SHEET FOR TECHNICAL PROPOSALS FOR

RIGHT-OF-WAY COUNSEL SERVICES; RFP-000930

The Evaluation Committee will consider the following areas in ranking the Proposers through information provided by each Proposer in the Technical Proposal.

The Committee members should strive to provide objective evaluations during all phases and for all parts of the review/evaluation process. Each proposal shall be evaluated on its own merit without comparison to the proposals submitted by other Proposers. Additionally, the evaluations must be done individually by each Committee member. Evaluations should not be done in a meeting type environment where a consensus is determined.

Each Committee member should provide a narrative explanation for his or her score. All individual evaluations should be signed and dated by the Committee member.

When a Committee member has completed evaluation of each proposal, the scores shall be transmitted to the Chairman of the Committee who will calculate the average score for each proposal.

Each member of the Committee must base his/her evaluation on the same criteria so that value uniformity can be established. The following considerations have been established as the review/evaluation criteria. These criteria have been provided to the Proposers in the RFP package.

The four (4) firms with the highest point total after evaluation of the first three criteria in 4.2 below will be shortlisted and requested to sit for an interview with the Committee. The interview will last approximately 30 minutes. Shortlisted firms who fail to participate in the interview will be considered non-responsive and eliminated from further consideration by the Committee. More than 4 firms may be shortlisted at the Committee’s option. If less than 3 firms submit responses, the Authority, at its sole discretion, may elect to continue the selection process or re-advertise the project.
Review of Technical Proposals

Experience of the Firm

(25 points out of 90)

Did the Proposer provide a description of Right-of-Way Counsel services, specifically relating to the governmental sector, which the firm is capable of providing, together with an explanation of how these services might best assist the Authority?

1. A representative list of the last five engagements for which your firm has served as Right-of-Way Counsel for clients of a similar size or nature as the Authority

2. Provide a list for the past 3 years of your firm’s toll/transportation related experience serving as Right-of-Way Counsel. In lieu of toll/transportation experience, experience with other governmental agencies of a similar structure will be acceptable.

3. A description of any disciplinary action, administrative proceedings or malpractice claim or other like proceeding against the firm or any of its lawyers that would serve on this engagement, whether current, pending or threatened.

Experience of the Firm

20 points
(max. 25 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments: Woman Owned Business 100%
Experience of Attorneys Assigned - (25 points out of 90)

1. Did the Proposer select key personnel within the firm who will be responsible for this engagement? At a minimum, did the Proposer provide the following information for such key personnel and for each member of the professional staff proposed to be assigned to this engagement?
   a. A brief résumé of the professional experience and qualifications of the individual.
   b. An outline of the proposed function of the individual in the proposed engagement.
   c. A description of the accessibility and availability of the individual during the course of the engagement.
   d. The office location to which the individual is assigned.

2. Did the Proposer provide a list of at least three (3) references for toll/transportation, or other governmental agencies of a similar structure, the Authority may contact in order to assist in the evaluation of assigned attorneys' past performance as Right-of-Way Counsel? For each reference listed, did the Proposer provide the following information?
   a. Name and mailing address of the entity.
   b. Name and telephone number of your contact person within said entity.

Experience of Attorneys Assigned  
18 points  
(Max. 25 Points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials  

Review Comments:  

_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________
**Approach to Assignment** - (20 points out of 90)

Did the Proposer provide a brief description of the firm’s approach to servicing the Authority as a client to ensure that high quality services are provided in an effective and efficient manner? Did the Proposer include the assigned attorneys’ availability for work group sessions, scheduled meeting and impromptu discussions?

**Approach to Assignment**

15 points
(Max. 20 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
**Interview** (optional) - (20 points out of 90)

Only shortlisted firms will be interviewed.

Were the Committee's questions answered clearly and specifically to enable the Committee to evaluate the technical capability of the Proposer and key staff to provide the desired services?

**Interview**

_____ points

(Max. 20 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials ____

Review Comments:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORING RECAP

Experience of the Firm (25 points max.)  
20

Experience of Attorneys Assigned (25 points max.)  
18

Approach to Assignment (20 points max.)  
15

Subtotal  
53

Interview (20 points max.)  

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL TOTAL SCORE  

Points
PROPOSER: Adorno Law Firm

ORLANDO-ORANGE COUNTY EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY

EVALUATION COMMITTEE SCORING SHEET FOR TECHNICAL PROPOSALS FOR

RIGHT-OF-WAY COUNSEL SERVICES; RFP-000930

The Evaluation Committee will consider the following areas in ranking the Proposers through information provided by each Proposer in the Technical Proposal.

The Committee members should strive to provide objective evaluations during all phases and for all parts of the review/evaluation process. Each proposal shall be evaluated on its own merit without comparison to the proposals submitted by other Proposers. Additionally, the evaluations must be done individually by each Committee member. Evaluations should not be done in a meeting type environment where a consensus is determined.

Each Committee member should provide a narrative explanation for his or her score. All individual evaluations should be signed and dated by the Committee member.

When a Committee member has completed evaluation of each proposal, the scores shall be transmitted to the Chairman of the Committee who will calculate the average score for each proposal.

Each member of the Committee must base his/her evaluation on the same criteria so that value uniformity can be established. The following considerations have been established as the review/evaluation criteria. These criteria have been provided to the Proposers in the RFP package.

The four (4) firms with the highest point total after evaluation of the first three criteria in 4.2 below will be shortlisted and requested to sit for an interview with the Committee. The interview will last approximately 30 minutes. Shortlisted firms who fail to participate in the interview will be considered non-responsive and eliminated from further consideration by the Committee. More than 4 firms may be shortlisted at the Committee's option. If less than 3 firms submit responses, the Authority, at its sole discretion, may elect to continue the selection process or re-advertise the project.
Review of Technical Proposals (90 points max.)

Experience of the Firm (25 points out of 90)

Did the Proposer provide a description of Right-of-Way Counsel services, specifically relating to the governmental sector, which the firm is capable of providing, together with an explanation of how these services might best assist the Authority?

1. A representative list of the last five engagements for which your firm has served as Right-of-Way Counsel for clients of a similar size or nature as the Authority.

2. Provide a list for the past 3 years of your firm’s toll/transportation related experience serving as Right-of-Way Counsel. In lieu of toll/transportation experience, experience with other governmental agencies of a similar structure will be acceptable.

3. A description of any disciplinary action, administrative proceedings or malpractice claim or other like proceeding against the firm or any of its lawyers that would serve on this engagement, whether current, pending or threatened.

Experience of the Firm

18 points
(max. 25 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments: All Areas Covered, Experience Not exactly similar to what we have at DCEA
Experience of Attorneys Assigned - (25 points out of 90)

1. Did the Proposer select key personnel within the firm who will be responsible for this engagement? At a minimum, did the Proposer provide the following information for such key personnel and for each member of the professional staff proposed to be assigned to this engagement?
   a. A brief résumé of the professional experience and qualifications of the individual.
   b. An outline of the proposed function of the individual in the proposed engagement.
   c. A description of the accessibility and availability of the individual during the course of the engagement.
   d. The office location to which the individual is assigned.

2. Did the Proposer provide a list of at least three (3) references for toll/transportation, or other governmental agencies of a similar structure, the Authority may contact in order to assist in the evaluation of assigned attorneys’ past performance as Right-of-Way Counsel? For each reference listed, did the Proposer provide the following information?
   a. Name and mailing address of the entity.
   b. Name and telephone number of your contact person within said entity.

Experience of Attorneys Assigned 18 points  
(Max. 25 Points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments:
Scope of this project too large for just 1 Attorney.
Approach to Assignment - (20 points out of 90)

Did the Proposer provide a brief description of the firm’s approach to servicing the Authority as a client to ensure that high quality services are provided in an effective and efficient manner? Did the Proposer include the assigned attorneys’ availability for work group sessions, scheduled meeting and impromptu discussions?

Approach to Assignment

\[ \frac{17}{20} \text{ points} \]
(Max. 20 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments: 
Decent Approach Presented.
**Interview** (optional) - (20 points out of 90)

Only shortlisted firms will be interviewed.

Were the Committee’s questions answered clearly and specifically to enable the Committee to evaluate the technical capability of the Proposer and key staff to provide the desired services?

**Interview**

___ points

(Max. 20 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials ____

Review Comments:

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORING RECAP

Experience of the Firm (25 points max.)  18
Experience of Attorneys Assigned (25 points max.)  18
Approach to Assignment (20 points max.)  17

Subtotal  53

Interview (20 points max.)

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL TOTAL SCORE  _________ Points
The Evaluation Committee will consider the following areas in ranking the Proposers through information provided by each Proposer in the Technical Proposal.

The Committee members should strive to provide objective evaluations during all phases and for all parts of the review/evaluation process. Each proposal shall be evaluated on its own merit without comparison to the proposals submitted by other Proposers. Additionally, the evaluations must be done individually by each Committee member. Evaluations should not be done in a meeting type environment where a consensus is determined.

Each Committee member should provide a narrative explanation for his or her score. All individual evaluations should be signed and dated by the Committee member.

When a Committee member has completed evaluation of each proposal, the scores shall be transmitted to the Chairman of the Committee who will calculate the average score for each proposal.

Each member of the Committee must base his/her evaluation on the same criteria so that value uniformity can be established. The following considerations have been established as the review/evaluation criteria. These criteria have been provided to the Proposers in the RFP package.

The four (4) firms with the highest point total after evaluation of the first three criteria in 4.2 below will be shortlisted and requested to sit for an interview with the Committee. The interview will last approximately 30 minutes. Shortlisted firms who fail to participate in the interview will be considered non-responsive and eliminated from further consideration by the Committee. More than 4 firms may be shortlisted at the Committee’s option. If less than 3 firms submit responses, the Authority, at its sole discretion, may elect to continue the selection process or re-advertise the project.
Review of Technical Proposals

Experience of the Firm

Did the Proposer provide a description of Right-of-Way Counsel services, specifically relating to the governmental sector, which the firm is capable of providing, together with an explanation of how these services might best assist the Authority?

1. A representative list of the last five engagements for which your firm has served as Right-of-Way Counsel for clients of a similar size or nature as the Authority.
2. Provide a list for the past 3 years of your firm’s toll/transportation related experience serving as Right-of-Way Counsel. In lieu of toll/transportation experience, experience with other governmental agencies of a similar structure will be acceptable.
3. A description of any disciplinary action, administrative proceedings or malpractice claim or other like proceeding against the firm or any of its lawyers that would serve on this engagement, whether current, pending or threatened.

Experience of the Firm

70 points
(max. 25 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials ____

Review Comments: [Handwritten notes: "Need brief exp w/toll road with not similar size." ]
Experience of Attorneys Assigned - (25 points out of 90)

1. Did the Proposer select key personnel within the firm who will be responsible for this engagement? At a minimum, did the Proposer provide the following information for such key personnel and for each member of the professional staff proposed to be assigned to this engagement?

   a. ✓ A brief résumé of the professional experience and qualifications of the individual.

   b. ✓ An outline of the proposed function of the individual in the proposed engagement.

   c. ✓ A description of the accessibility and availability of the individual during the course of the engagement.

   d. ✓ The office location to which the individual is assigned.

2. Did the Proposer provide a list of at least three (3) references for toll/transportation, or other governmental agencies of a similar structure, the Authority may contact in order to assist in the evaluation of assigned attorneys’ past performance as Right-of-Way Counsel? For each reference listed, did the Proposer provide the following information?

   a. ✓ Name and mailing address of the entity.

   b. ✓ Name and telephone number of your contact person within said entity.

Experience of Attorneys Assigned

(20 points)
(Max. 25 Points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials _____

Review Comments:

Provide one line.

Provide one line.

Provide one line.

Provide one line.

Provide one line.
**Approach to Assignment** - (20 points out of 90)

Did the Proposer provide a brief description of the firm’s approach to servicing the Authority as a client to ensure that high quality services are provided in an effective and efficient manner? Did the Proposer include the assigned attorneys’ availability for work group sessions, scheduled meeting and impromptu discussions?

**Approach to Assignment**

![Image with hand-written text: Review Comments: yes, and is available other job. Approaches legal practice.]

Evaluation Committee Member Initials ______

(points 20)
(Max. 20 points)
**Interview** (optional) - (20 points out of 90)

Only shortlisted firms will be interviewed.

Were the Committee’s questions answered clearly and specifically to enable the Committee to evaluate the technical capability of the Proposer and key staff to provide the desired services?

**Interview**

______ points

(Max. 20 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials _____

Review Comments: ________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORING RECAP

Experience of the Firm (25 points max.)

Experience of Attorneys Assigned (25 points max.)

Approach to Assignment (20 points max.)

Subtotal

Interview (20 points max.)

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL TOTAL SCORE

Points
Committee Member: 

PROPOSER: Brown, Carganese et al.

ORLANDO-ORANGE COUNTY EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY

EVALUATION COMMITTEE SCORING SHEET FOR TECHNICAL PROPOSALS FOR

RIGHT-OF-WAY COUNSEL SERVICES; RFP-000930

The Evaluation Committee will consider the following areas in ranking the Proposers through information provided by each Proposer in the Technical Proposal.

The Committee members should strive to provide objective evaluations during all phases and for all parts of the review/evaluation process. Each proposal shall be evaluated on its own merit without comparison to the proposals submitted by other Proposers. Additionally, the evaluations must be done individually by each Committee member. Evaluations should not be done in a meeting type environment where a consensus is determined.

Each Committee member should provide a narrative explanation for his or her score. All individual evaluations should be signed and dated by the Committee member.

When a Committee member has completed evaluation of each proposal, the scores shall be transmitted to the Chairman of the Committee who will calculate the average score for each proposal.

Each member of the Committee must base his/her evaluation on the same criteria so that value uniformity can be established. The following considerations have been established as the review/evaluation criteria. These criteria have been provided to the Proposers in the RFP package.

The four (4) firms with the highest point total after evaluation of the first three criteria in 4.2 below will be shortlisted and requested to sit for an interview with the Committee. The interview will last approximately 30 minutes. Shortlisted firms who fail to participate in the interview will be considered non-responsive and eliminated from further consideration by the Committee. More than 4 firms may be shortlisted at the Committee’s option. If less than 3 firms submit responses, the Authority, at its sole discretion, may elect to continue the selection process or re-advertise the project.
Review of Technical Proposals

Experience of the Firm

Did the Proposer provide a description of Right-of-Way Counsel services, specifically relating to the governmental sector, which the firm is capable of providing, together with an explanation of how these services might best assist the Authority?

1. A representative list of the last five engagements for which your firm has served as Right-of-Way Counsel for clients of a similar size or nature as the Authority

2. Provide a list for the past 3 years of your firm’s toll/transportation related experience serving as Right-of-Way Counsel. In lieu of toll/transportation experience, experience with other governmental agencies of a similar structure will be acceptable.

3. A description of any disciplinary action, administrative proceedings or malpractice claim or other like proceeding against the firm or any of its lawyers that would serve on this engagement, whether current, pending or threatened.

Experience of the Firm

23 points
(max. 25 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments:

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
Experience of Attorneys Assigned - (25 points out of 90)

1. Did the Proposer select key personnel within the firm who will be responsible for this engagement? At a minimum, did the Proposer provide the following information for such key personnel and for each member of the professional staff proposed to be assigned to this engagement?
   a. A brief resumé of the professional experience and qualifications of the individual.
   b. An outline of the proposed function of the individual in the proposed engagement.
   c. A description of the accessibility and availability of the individual during the course of the engagement.
   d. The office location to which the individual is assigned.

2. Did the Proposer provide a list of at least three (3) references for toll/transportation, or other governmental agencies of a similar structure, the Authority may contact in order to assist in the evaluation of assigned attorneys’ past performance as Right-of-Way Counsel? For each reference listed, did the Proposer provide the following information?
   a. Name and mailing address of the entity.
   b. Name and telephone number of your contact person within said entity.

Experience of Attorneys Assigned

[19 points]
(Max. 25 Points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials ______

Review Comments: ___________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

**Approach to Assignment** - (20 points out of 90)

Did the Proposer provide a brief description of the firm's approach to servicing the Authority as a client to ensure that high quality services are provided in an effective and efficient manner? Did the Proposer include the assigned attorneys' availability for work group sessions, scheduled meeting and impromptu discussions?

**Approach to Assignment**

15 points
(Max. 20 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments:
____________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________
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Interview (optional) - (20 points out of 90)

Only shortlisted firms will be interviewed.

Were the Committee’s questions answered clearly and specifically to enable the Committee to evaluate the technical capability of the Proposer and key staff to provide the desired services?

**Interview** ________________________________________________

_____ points

(Max. 20 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials ______

Review Comments: ____________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORING RECAP

Experience of the Firm (25 points max.)  23
Experience of Attorneys Assigned (25 points max.)  19
Approach to Assignment (20 points max.)  15

Subtotal  57

Interview (20 points max.)

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL TOTAL SCORE  [Blank] Points
PROPOSER: Brown/Dorman
Orlando/Clearwater

ORLANDO-ORANGE COUNTY EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY

EVALUATION COMMITTEE SCORING SHEET FOR TECHNICAL PROPOSALS FOR

RIGHT-OF-WAY COUNSEL SERVICES; RFP-000930

The Evaluation Committee will consider the following areas in ranking the Proposers through information provided by each Proposer in the Technical Proposal.

The Committee members should strive to provide objective evaluations during all phases and for all parts of the review/evaluation process. Each proposal shall be evaluated on its own merit without comparison to the proposals submitted by other Proposers. Additionally, the evaluations must be done individually by each Committee member. Evaluations should not be done in a meeting type environment where a consensus is determined.

Each Committee member should provide a narrative explanation for his or her score. All individual evaluations should be signed and dated by the Committee member.

When a Committee member has completed evaluation of each proposal, the scores shall be transmitted to the Chairman of the Committee who will calculate the average score for each proposal.

Each member of the Committee must base his/her evaluation on the same criteria so that value uniformity can be established. The following considerations have been established as the review/evaluation criteria. These criteria have been provided to the Proposers in the RFP package.

The four (4) firms with the highest point total after evaluation of the first three criteria in 4.2 below will be shortlisted and requested to sit for an interview with the Committee. The interview will last approximately 30 minutes. Shortlisted firms who fail to participate in the interview will be considered non-responsive and eliminated from further consideration by the Committee. More than 4 firms may be shortlisted at the Committee’s option. If less than 3 firms submit responses, the Authority, at its sole discretion, may elect to continue the selection process or re-advertise the project.
Review of Technical Proposals

Experience of the Firm

Did the Proposer provide a description of Right-of-Way Counsel services, specifically relating to the governmental sector, which the firm is capable of providing, together with an explanation of how these services might best assist the Authority?

1. A representative list of the last five engagements for which your firm has served as Right-of-Way Counsel for clients of a similar size or nature as the Authority.

2. Provide a list for the past 3 years of your firm’s toll/transportation related experience serving as Right-of-Way Counsel. In lieu of toll/transportation experience, experience with other governmental agencies of a similar structure will be acceptable.

3. A description of any disciplinary action, administrative proceedings or malpractice claim or other like proceeding against the firm or any of its lawyers that would serve on this engagement, whether current, pending or threatened.

Experience of the Firm

22 points
(max. 25 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments:
50% Woman-Owned (Dorman & Gutman)
Brown - 75% Women Staff
75% Minorities Staff
Experience of Attorneys Assigned - (25 points out of 90)

1. Did the Proposer select key personnel within the firm who will be responsible for this engagement? At a minimum, did the Proposer provide the following information for such key personnel and for each member of the professional staff proposed to be assigned to this engagement?
   a. A brief résumé of the professional experience and qualifications of the individual.
   b. An outline of the proposed function of the individual in the proposed engagement.
   c. A description of the accessibility and availability of the individual during the course of the engagement.
   d. The office location to which the individual is assigned.

2. Did the Proposer provide a list of at least three (3) references for toll/transportation, or other governmental agencies of a similar structure, the Authority may contact in order to assist in the evaluation of assigned attorneys' past performance as Right-of-Way Counsel? For each reference listed, did the Proposer provide the following information?
   a. Name and mailing address of the entity.
   b. Name and telephone number of your contact person within said entity.

Experience of Attorneys Assigned  

22 points  (Max. 25 Points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments: 

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
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**Approach to Assignment** - (20 points out of 90)

Did the Proposer provide a brief description of the firm’s approach to servicing the Authority as a client to ensure that high quality services are provided in an effective and efficient manner? Did the Proposer include the assigned attorneys’ availability for work group sessions, scheduled meeting and impromptu discussions?

Approach to Assignment

15 points
(Max. 20 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials LK

Review Comments:

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

4
**Interview** (optional) - (20 points out of 90)

Only shortlisted firms will be interviewed.

Were the Committee’s questions answered clearly and specifically to enable the Committee to evaluate the technical capability of the Proposer and key staff to provide the desired services?

**Interview**

_____ points

(Max. 20 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials _____

Review Comments: ____________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORING RECAP

Experience of the Firm (25 points max.)  22
Experience of Attorneys Assigned (25 points max.)  22
Approach to Assignment (20 points max.)  15

Subtotal  59

Interview (20 points max.)

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL TOTAL SCORE  ________ Points
The Evaluation Committee will consider the following areas in ranking the Proposers through information provided by each Proposer in the Technical Proposal.

The Committee members should strive to provide objective evaluations during all phases and for all parts of the review/evaluation process. Each proposal shall be evaluated on its own merit without comparison to the proposals submitted by other Proposers. Additionally, the evaluations must be done individually by each Committee member. Evaluations should not be done in a meeting type environment where a consensus is determined.

Each Committee member should provide a narrative explanation for his or her score. All individual evaluations should be signed and dated by the Committee member.

When a Committee member has completed evaluation of each proposal, the scores shall be transmitted to the Chairman of the Committee who will calculate the average score for each proposal.

Each member of the Committee must base his/her evaluation on the same criteria so that value uniformity can be established. The following considerations have been established as the review/evaluation criteria. These criteria have been provided to the Proposers in the RFP package.

The four (4) firms with the highest point total after evaluation of the first three criteria in 4.2 below will be shortlisted and requested to sit for an interview with the Committee. The interview will last approximately 30 minutes. Shortlisted firms who fail to participate in the interview will be considered non-responsive and eliminated from further consideration by the Committee. More than 4 firms may be shortlisted at the Committee’s option. If less than 3 firms submit responses, the Authority, at its sole discretion, may elect to continue the selection process or re-advertise the project.
Review of Technical Proposals (90 points max.)

Experience of the Firm (25 points out of 90)

Did the Proposer provide a description of Right-of-Way Counsel services, specifically relating to the governmental sector, which the firm is capable of providing, together with an explanation of how these services might best assist the Authority?

1. A representative list of the last five engagements for which your firm has served as Right-of-Way Counsel for clients of a similar size or nature as the Authority.

2. Provide a list for the past 3 years of your firm’s toll/transportation related experience serving as Right-of-Way Counsel. In lieu of toll/transportation experience, experience with other governmental agencies of a similar structure will be acceptable.

3. A description of any disciplinary action, administrative proceedings or malpractice claim or other like proceeding against the firm or any of its lawyers that would serve on this engagement, whether current, pending or threatened.

Experience of the Firm

18 points
(max. 25 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments:

All Areas Covered. Lacking similar experience to what we have at ODOTA.
**Experience of Attorneys Assigned** - (25 points out of 90)

1. Did the Proposer select key personnel within the firm who will be responsible for this engagement? At a minimum, did the Proposer provide the following information for such key personnel and for each member of the professional staff proposed to be assigned to this engagement?
   
   a. A brief résumé of the professional experience and qualifications of the individual.
   
   b. An outline of the proposed function of the individual in the proposed engagement.
   
   c. A description of the accessibility and availability of the individual during the course of the engagement.
   
   d. The office location to which the individual is assigned.

2. Did the Proposer provide a list of at least three (3) references for toll/transportation, or other governmental agencies of a similar structure, the Authority may contact in order to assist in the evaluation of assigned attorneys’ past performance as Right-of-Way Counsel? For each reference listed, did the Proposer provide the following information?

   a. Name and mailing address of the entity.
   
   b. Name and telephone number of your contact person within said entity.

---

**Experience of Attorneys Assigned**

20 points
(Max. 25 Points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments:

All Areas Covered.
**Approach to Assignment** - (20 points out of 90)

Did the Proposer provide a brief description of the firm’s approach to servicing the Authority as a client to ensure that high quality services are provided in an effective and efficient manner? Did the Proposer include the assigned attorneys’ availability for work group sessions, scheduled meeting and impromptu discussions?

**Approach to Assignment**

15 points  
(Max. 20 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials

Review Comments: __________________________

________________________

________________________

________________________

________________________

________________________

________________________
**Interview** (optional) - (20 points out of 90)

Only shortlisted firms will be interviewed.

Were the Committee’s questions answered clearly and specifically to enable the Committee to evaluate the technical capability of the Proposer and key staff to provide the desired services?

**Interview** ______ points
(Max. 20 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials ______

Review Comments:_________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORING RECAP

Experience of the Firm (25 points max.)  
18

Experience of Attorneys Assigned (25 points max.)  
20

Approach to Assignment (20 points max.)  
15

Subtotal  
53

Interview (20 points max.)  

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL TOTAL SCORE  

Points
Committee Member

PROPOSER: Brown, Garcia, Weiss & D'Agosta, PA
+ Derman & Gutman

ORLANDO-ORANGE COUNTY EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY

EVALUATION COMMITTEE SCORING SHEET FOR TECHNICAL PROPOSALS FOR

RIGHT-OF-WAY COUNSEL SERVICES; RFP-000930

The Evaluation Committee will consider the following areas in ranking the Proposers through information provided by each Proposer in the Technical Proposal.

The Committee members should strive to provide objective evaluations during all phases and for all parts of the review/evaluation process. Each proposal shall be evaluated on its own merit without comparison to the proposals submitted by other Proposers. Additionally, the evaluations must be done individually by each Committee member. Evaluations should not be done in a meeting type environment where a consensus is determined.

Each Committee member should provide a narrative explanation for his or her score. All individual evaluations should be signed and dated by the Committee member.

When a Committee member has completed evaluation of each proposal, the scores shall be transmitted to the Chairman of the Committee who will calculate the average score for each proposal.

Each member of the Committee must base his/her evaluation on the same criteria so that value uniformity can be established. The following considerations have been established as the review/evaluation criteria. These criteria have been provided to the Proposers in the RFP package.

The four (4) firms with the highest point total after evaluation of the first three criteria in 4.2 below will be shortlisted and requested to sit for an interview with the Committee. The interview will last approximately 30 minutes. Shortlisted firms who fail to participate in the interview will be considered non-responsive and eliminated from further consideration by the Committee. More than 4 firms may be shortlisted at the Committee's option. If less than 3 firms submit responses, the Authority, at its sole discretion, may elect to continue the selection process or re-advertise the project.
Review of Technical Proposals (90 points max.)

Experience of the Firm (25 points out of 90)

Did the Proposer provide a description of Right-of-Way Counsel services, specifically relating to the governmental sector, which the firm is capable of providing, together with an explanation of how these services might best assist the Authority?

1. A representative list of the last five engagements for which your firm has served as Right-of-Way Counsel for clients of a similar size or nature as the Authority.

2. Provide a list for the past 3 years of your firm’s toll/transportation related experience serving as Right-of-Way Counsel. In lieu of toll/transportation experience, experience with other governmental agencies of a similar structure will be acceptable.

3. A description of any disciplinary action, administrative proceedings or malpractice claim or other like proceeding against the firm or any of its lawyers that would serve on this engagement, whether current, pending or threatened.

Experience of the Firm

≥ 5 points (max. 25 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials ______

Review Comments: Well presented in firm's scope and format on E.D.
Experience of Attorneys Assigned - (25 points out of 90)

1. Did the Proposer select key personnel within the firm who will be responsible for this engagement? At a minimum, did the Proposer provide the following information for such key personnel and for each member of the professional staff proposed to be assigned to this engagement?
   a. A brief résumé of the professional experience and qualifications of the individual.
   b. An outline of the proposed function of the individual in the proposed engagement.
   c. A description of the accessibility and availability of the individual during the course of the engagement.
   d. The office location to which the individual is assigned.

2. Did the Proposer provide a list of at least three (3) references for toll/transportation, or other governmental agencies of a similar structure, the Authority may contact in order to assist in the evaluation of assigned attorneys' past performance as Right-of-Way Counsel? For each reference listed, did the Proposer provide the following information?
   a. Name and mailing address of the entity.
   b. Name and telephone number of your contact person within said entity.

Experience of Attorneys Assigned

(Max. 25 Points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials ______

Review Comments: ____________________________
Approach to Assignment - (20 points out of 90)

Did the Proposer provide a brief description of the firm’s approach to servicing the Authority as a client to ensure that high quality services are provided in an effective and efficient manner? Did the Proposer include the assigned attorneys’ availability for work group sessions, scheduled meeting and impromptu discussions?

Approach to Assignment

Evaluation Committee Member Initials ______

Review Comments: very brief
**Interview** (optional) - (20 points out of 90)

Only shortlisted firms will be interviewed.

Were the Committee's questions answered clearly and specifically to enable the Committee to evaluate the technical capability of the Proposer and key staff to provide the desired services?

**Interview**

[Blank for points]

(Max. 20 points)

Evaluation Committee Member Initials ____

Review Comments: ____________________________________________
___________________________
___________________________
___________________________
___________________________
___________________________
___________________________
___________________________
___________________________
___________________________
___________________________
___________________________
___________________________
___________________________
___________________________
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TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORING RECAP

Experience of the Firm (25 points max.)              25  
Experience of Attorneys Assigned (25 points max.)   25  
Approach to Assignment (20 points max.)             10  

Subtotal                                                60

Interview (20 points max.)                            ______

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL TOTAL SCORE                       _______ Points