

CITY OF KEY WEST

RFQ 26-001 – Sign-In Sheet

Project Title: Chief Building Official and Inspection Service

Date: March 17, 2026

Location: 1300 White Street, Key West, Florida 33040

Time: 1:00 PM (Eastern Standard Time)

#	Name (Print)	Company Name	Email Address	Signature
1	Rodriguez	CKW	rdelostrinda@cityofkeywest-fl.gov	
2	Melissa Freling	City of Key West	melissa.freling@cityofkeywest-fl.gov	Melissa Freling
3	Brandy Lewis	City of Key West	brandy.lewis@cityofkeywest-fl.gov	Brandy Lewis
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				

Minutes

RFQ Evaluation Committee Meeting

RFQ 26-001 Chief Building Official and Inspection Services

Location: City Commission Conference Room, 1300 White Street, Key West, Florida 33040

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at [1 : 00 PM] by Lucas Torres-Bull

2. Roll Call/Attendance

The following members were present:

[Rod Delostrinos], Committee Member

[Brandy Lewis], Committee Member

[Melissa Freling], Committee Member

[Lucas Torres-Bull], Procurement Representative (non-voting)

3. Purpose of Meeting

The purpose of the meeting is to evaluate the responses received in response to Request for Qualification (RFQ) No. [RFQ 26-001], for Chief Building Official and Inspection Services and to rank the firms based on their overall proposals in accordance with the evaluation criteria outlined in the RFP.

4. Overview of Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation Representative reviewed the evaluation process and criteria, which included the following:

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Points
1. Qualifications and Relevant Experience	Prior experience serving as a Chief Building Official in Florida <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Experience with building inspections (commercial, residential, marine, historic)• Knowledge of Florida Building Code, FEMA regulations, and local ordinances	30

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Points
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ICC certifications and State licensure • Experience with plan review, permitting, and enforcement • Experience with digital permitting and inspection software <p>Also Evaluated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff qualifications (licensure and certifications) • Safety and risk mitigation procedures • Quality control practices • Similar municipal contract experience • Methods to ensure code compliance and efficiency 	
<p>2. References and Quality of Past Performance</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance on similar government contracts • Responsiveness, professionalism, and client satisfaction • Ability to collaborate with City Departments 	<p style="text-align: center;">25</p>
<p>3. Project Approach – Ability to Meet Requirements</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staffing assignments and availability • Coverage plan (vacations, illness, peak workload) • Inspection scheduling and turnaround time • Communication with contractors and public • Workflow and recordkeeping procedures • Use of technology (inspection apps, reporting platforms) 	<p style="text-align: center;">25</p>

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Points
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protocols for notices, violations, and stop-work orders 	
<p style="text-align: center;">4. Other Information</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Value-added services (public education, technology integration) • Familiarity with City of Key West codes and environment • Experience with clients in Florida, South Florida, or Key West 	10
<p style="text-align: center;">5. Project Schedule and Deliverables</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transition plan and implementation timeline • Milestones, reporting deadlines, and deliverables • Ability to meet urgent inspection requests 	10
<p style="text-align: center;">6. Litigation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • History of litigation, claims, or disputes • Current legal actions impacting <p>Performance Scoring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 = No issues • Up to -5 = Incomplete or concerning disclosures 	-5 to 0
TOTAL		100

1) Review of Submittals

The committee reviewed and discussed the submittals received from the following proposer:

1. JPI – Melbourne, FL

Note: Each firm's submission was evaluated individually

2) Total Scoring and Ranking

After discussion, each committee member independently completed a scoring sheet. The individual scores were then compiled, and the firms were ranked in accordance with the results reflected in the Excel Scoring Matrix, which is attached to these minutes as a separate document.

3) Recommendation

Based on the following scoring outcome, the evaluation committee recommended that the award for RFQ 26-001 to JPI.

4) Adjournment

There being no further business or discussions, the meeting was adjourned at 2:00 PM.

Minutes prepared by:

Lucas Torres-Bull

Procurement Manager

03/17/2026

Rod - No
Maksa - yes
Brantey - yes

RFQ 26-001 - Chief Building Official and Inspection Services

#	Evaluation Category	Max Points	Evaluator Score	Key Evaluation Considerations	Notes / Justification
1	Qualifications and Relevant Experience	30		<p>Prior experience serving as a Chief Building Official in Florida.</p> <p>Experience with building inspections services (commercial, residential, marine, historic).</p> <p>Knowledge of Florida Building Code, FEMA regulations, and local ordinances.</p> <p>International Code Council (ICC) and state licensure.</p> <p>Experience with plan review, permitting, and enforcement.</p> <p>Experience with digital permitting and inspectors software</p> <p>Experience with digital permitting and inspectors software</p> <p>Also Evaluated:</p> <p>Staff qualifications, including licensure and certifications.</p> <p>Safety and risk mitigation procedures.</p> <p>Quality control practices.</p> <p>Number and types of similar municipal contracts previously performed.</p> <p>Methods used to ensure code compliance and efficiency.</p>	<p>25</p> <p>WELL STAFFED</p>
2	References and Quality of Past Performance:	25		<p>Performance on similar government contracts.</p> <p>Responsiveness, professionalism, and client satisfaction.</p> <p>Demonstrated ability to work collaboratively with City Departments.</p> <p>Proposed staffing assignments and availability.</p> <p>Coverage plan for vacations, illness, and peak workloads.</p> <p>Inspection scheduling process and turnaround time.</p> <p>Communication with contractors and the public.</p> <p>Project Management:</p> <p>Who/How and recordkeeping procedures.</p> <p>Use of Technology (Inspection apps, reporting platforms).</p> <p>Protocol for issuing notices, violations, stop-work orders.</p>	<p>20</p> <p>SUBSTANTIVE + VARIETY PROJECTS</p>
3	Project Approach - Ability to Meet Requirements:	25		<p>Project Management:</p> <p>Who/How and recordkeeping procedures.</p> <p>Use of Technology (Inspection apps, reporting platforms).</p> <p>Protocol for issuing notices, violations, stop-work orders.</p>	<p>15</p> <p>UNCLEAR HOW OUR REMOTENESS TRANSLATES TO QUALITY RESULTS</p>

4 Other Information:	10	Value-added services (e.g., public education, technology integrations). Familiarity with City of Key West Building Code and environment. Prior or current clients in Florida, South Florida, or Key West.	2 SOFTWARE NEGOTIATION; NOT EFFECTIVE; HARRIS; LOR
4 Project Schedule and Deliverables	10	Proposed transition plan and timeline to assume responsibilities. Milestones, reporting deadlines, and deliverables. Ability to meet urgent inspections requests.	7/11/16 5
4 Litigation:	-5 to 0	History of litigation, claims, or contract disputes. Current legal actions that may affect contract performance. Score: 0 if clean, up to -5 if incomplete or missing.	0

Evaluator: Rodrigo G. Delostrino, Jr.



17 MAR 26

RFQ 26-001 - Chief Building Official and Inspection Services

#	Evaluation Category	Max Points	Evaluator Score	Key Evaluation Considerations	Notes / Justification
1	<p>Qualifications and Relevant Experience</p>	30	28	<p>Prior experience serving as a Chief Building Official in Florida.</p> <p>Experience with building inspections services (commercial, residential, marine, historic).</p> <p>Knowledge of Florida Building Code, FEMA regulations, and local ordinances.</p> <p>International Code Council (ICC) and state licensure.</p> <p>Experience with plan review, permitting, and enforcement.</p> <p>Experience with digital permitting and inspections software</p> <p>Also Evaluated: Staff qualifications, including licensure and certifications. Safety and risk mitigation procedures. Quality control practices.</p> <p>Number and types of similar municipal contracts previously performed.</p> <p>Methods used to ensure code compliance and efficiency.</p>	<p>Building Official Singley is currently the Interim Building official in Fort Pierce through JP, and is listed as a key contact on the proposal, is he able to be CBO in two jurisdictions? Home based/Remote Multiple CBO's, will they have the same levels of requirements as far as permitting, reporting, etc.</p>
2	<p>References and Quality of Past Performance:</p>	25	25	<p>Performance on similar government contracts.</p> <p>Responsiveness, professionalism, and client satisfaction.</p> <p>Demonstrated ability to work collaboratively with City Departments.</p> <p>Proposed staffing assignments and availability.</p> <p>Coverage plan for vacations, illness, and peak workloads.</p> <p>Inspection scheduling process and turnaround time.</p> <p>Communication with contractors and the public.</p> <p>Project Management: Workflow and record-keeping procedures.</p> <p>Use of Technology (inspection apps, reporting platforms).</p> <p>Protocol for issuing notices, violations, stop-work orders.</p>	<p>Perfect responses from current/past clients; multiple renewals on contracts</p>
3	<p>Project Approach – Ability to Meet Requirements:</p>	25	20	<p>Proposed staffing assignments and availability.</p> <p>Coverage plan for vacations, illness, and peak workloads.</p> <p>Inspection scheduling process and turnaround time.</p> <p>Communication with contractors and the public.</p> <p>Project Management: Workflow and record-keeping procedures.</p> <p>Use of Technology (inspection apps, reporting platforms).</p> <p>Protocol for issuing notices, violations, stop-work orders.</p>	<p>Differing guidelines/level of requirements due to multiple building officials provided under contract? Remote work would only offer 50% response time for SWO's, or Unsafe structure determinations, etc. Inspections are scheduled the day before (sometimes not even 24 hours in advance)- 50-90% chance of completion? Why would they send review comments to building department staff for approval prior to placing the comment on Trakit? Seems unnecessary especially if the comment is based on a code.</p>

	4 Other Information:	10	4	<p>Value-added services (e.g., public education, technology integrations).</p> <p>Familiarity with City of Key West Building Code and environment.</p> <p>Prior or current clients in Florida, South Florida, or Key West.</p>	<p>Public Education piece? Out of the personnel provided, one worked for the City of Key West for less than 1 year, and 4 of them have some experience in South Florida.</p>
	4 Project Schedule and Deliverables	10	6	<p>Proposed transition plan and timeline to assume responsibilities.</p> <p>Milestones, reporting deadlines, and deliverables.</p> <p>Ability to meet urgent inspections requests.</p>	<p>Urgent inspection requests would have a 50% chance of being responded to.</p>
	4 Litigation:	-5 to 0	0	<p>History of litigation, claims, or contract disputes.</p> <p>Current legal actions that may affect contract performance.</p> <p>Score: 0 if clean, up to -5 if incomplete or missing.</p>	

RFQ 26-001 - Chief Building Official and Inspection Services

#	Evaluation Category	Max Points	Evaluator Score	Key Evaluation Considerations	Notes / Justification
1		30	28	<p>Prior experience serving as a Chief Building Official in Florida.</p> <p>Experience with building inspections services (commercial, residential, marine, historic).</p> <p>Knowledge of Florida Building Code, FEMA regulations, and local ordinances.</p> <p>International Code Council (ICC) and state licensure.</p> <p>Experience with plan review, permitting, and enforcement.</p> <p>Experience with digital permitting and inspections software</p> <p>Also Evaluated: Staff qualifications, including licensure and certifications.</p> <p>Safety and risk mitigation procedures. Quality control practices.</p> <p>Number and types of similar municipal contracts previously performed.</p> <p>Methods used to ensure code compliance and efficiency.</p>	<p>Overall, JPI's proposal comes across as very strong. They have sub services in Florida, and they've supported a wide range of inspecti and historic projects. Their familiarity with the Florida Building Cor local ordinances is a clear strength.</p> <p>The team they're proposing is deep—multiple licensed Building Of inspectors—and the resumes show long, relevant careers. They al and use digital permitting systems regularly across many of the ro statewide.</p> <p>There are a few areas where follow-up would help, such as getting confirming compatibility with the City's permitting platform, and a procedures. But overall, their qualifications are strong and align w</p>
2	References and Quality of Past Performance:	25	23	<p>Performance on similar government contracts.</p> <p>Responsiveness, professionalism, and client satisfaction.</p> <p>Demonstrated ability to work collaboratively with City Departments.</p>	<p>JPI has a solid track record with other governments, including long cities, which shows they can handle similar work reliably. Their pr professionalism, backed up by positive performance surveys and e comfortable working across departments, with established coordi Works, and FEMA-related functions. Overall, their past performan support a strong score, with only a few minor items that would ber</p>
3	Project Approach – Ability to Meet Requirements:	25	23	<p>Proposed staffing assignments and availability.</p> <p>Coverage plan for vacations, illness, and peak workloads.</p> <p>Inspection scheduling process and turnaround time.</p> <p>Communication with contractors and the public.</p> <p>Project Management: Workflow and recordkeeping procedures.</p> <p>Use of Technology (inspection apps, reporting platforms).</p> <p>Protocol for issuing notices, violations, stop-work orders.</p>	<p>JPI outlines a solid operational approach overall, with a well-staffe plan for absences or heavier workloads. Their inspection schedulir communication with contractors and the public appears straightfc project-management workflows, good recordkeeping practices, ar tools for inspections and documentation. Their enforcement proce risks are confirming that their technology integrates smoothly with communication templates and notice forms, as well as seeing hov practice.</p>
4	Other Information:	10	9	<p>Value-added services (e.g., public education, technology integrations).</p> <p>Familiarity with City of Key West Building Code and environment.</p> <p>Prior or current clients in Florida, South Florida, or Key West.</p>	<p>JPI did well in this area because they actually bring some useful ex communication tools, code-update outreach, and even tech add-i They also clearly understand Key West's code requirements, espe tend to trip people up, and they've worked all over Florida, includir the MySafeFlorida program. 1 The only reason I took a point off is t at a pretty high level, and they didn't give strong examples of wher before. Other than that, their familiarity with the area and their Flo</p>
4	Project Schedule and Deliverables	10	9	<p>Proposed transition plan and timeline to assume responsibilities.</p> <p>Milestones, reporting deadlines, and deliverables.</p> <p>Ability to meet urgent inspections requests.</p>	<p>JPI's transition plan is strong overall—they outline a fast startup, w have inspections running within 24 hours, and get fully oriented or milestones and reporting expectations are also clearly laid out, inc same-day inspection result deadlines. They've also shown they ca record of meeting 24-hour needs and even same-day calls when n fact that some parts of the transition plan and reporting structure : sample templates or more detail on how the first few days of hand supports a high score.</p>
4	Litigation:	5 to 0	0	<p>History of litigation, claims, or contract disputes.</p> <p>Current legal actions that may affect contract performance.</p>	<p>JPI states they have no pending litigation, no history of claims or di</p>

