



RFP No. 2018-046
Beach Equipment Rental Concessions
Evaluation Scoring Summary Form

Technical/Final Evaluations: September 17, 2018 10:30 A.M.

Experience, Background, and References 40 Pts Max.					Experience, Background, and References 40 Pts Max. Scoring Discussions
	Cynthia Fuentes	Danielle Pearson	Jamel Stewart	Criterion Score	
Oceanside Beach Services	35.0	40.0	35.0	110.0	Firm provided all required information in in this category. Firm states they feel they are good will ambassadors for CDB. Firm's presented various equipment options, hurricane plan was not very detailed. Firm provided several letters of reference in proposal. Firm did not present any lawsuits or litigation. Firm included in the proposal a membership program where beachgoers of CDB can sign up for a year's worth of services and can utilize any of the beaches that Oceanside has a contract with for beach equipment rental.
Approach and Capacity 25 Pts. Max.					Approach and Capacity 25 Pts. Max. Scoring Discussions
	Cynthia Fuentes	Danielle Pearson	Jamel Stewart	Criterion Score	
Oceanside Beach Services	23.0	20.0	20.0	63.0	Firm's proposal included several photos and description of proposed equipment. Exact location of where the firm would be housed was not included in proposal. Firm presented timeline of new equipment for CDB. Firm proposed a cheaper version of beach equipment unlike what was used on the current contract. Firm's proposal does not include wood equipment, plastic equipment is presented. Committee feels that wood equipment would give more of a luxury feel and appearance on CDB municipal beach. Firm referenced Article 14A of the Palm Beach County Unified Land Development Code, however no mention of CDB ordinance regarding sea turtles.
Performance and Services 15 Pts Max.					Performance and Services 15 Pts Max. Scoring Discussions
	Cynthia Fuentes	Danielle Pearson	Jamel Stewart	Criterion Score	
Oceanside Beach Services	7.0	13.0	10.0	30.0	The firm's proposal did not provide detailed information regarding additional amenities rental or sales, need more information on how these items would increase revenue. The additional amenities offered included surfing and boggy boarding, however no cost was provided, makes things uncertain of the increased revenue plan. Beach toys were also included as another additional amenity once again no pricing was included in the proposal.

Revenue Fee 20 Pts. Max.	Cynthia Fuentes	Danielle Pearson	Jamel Stewart	Criterion Score	Revenue Fee 20 Pts. Max. Scoring Discussions
Oceanside Beach Services	0.0	15.0	10.0	25.0	The firm's proposal included exceptions to minimum equipment allowed on beach, therefore not meeting the minimum revenue fee requested in the solicitation. As the current contractor for beach equipment rental concessions services committee is not clear why the proposed revenue fee was so low. Firm's proposal includes a combo package which did not include pricing. The pricing presented in the proposal for equipment rental was presented a single items. The committee feels the criteria of the RFP was not met regarding the minimum revenue fee and feels a higher revenue fee should be negotiated.

Firm	Score
Oceanside Beach Services	228.0

Buyer Name: Ja'Anal McAden