

Meeting Date: 10/27/15

Agenda Item 9

REQUESTED COMMISSION ACTION:

Consent Ordinance Resolution Consideration/Discussion Presentation

SHORT TITLE Approve ranking order for RLI L-40-15 Continuing Contract for Professional Engineering Services for Water and Reuse Treatment Plant Projects, and authorize staff to negotiate contracts with the six highest ranked firms: Carollo Engineers, Inc., Mathews Consulting, Inc., McCafferty Brinson Consulting, LLC, Globaltech, Inc., MWH Americas, Inc. and Tetra Tech, Inc. (No cost at this time.)

Summary of Purpose and Why:

RLI L-40-15 was issued to obtain responses from professional firms to provide continuing services to the City for professional engineering services for those Water and Reuse Treatment Plant projects with a construction cost not exceeding \$2 million, and for any study activity for which fees will not exceed \$200,000. City Commission approval of the ranking order presented by the Selection/Evaluation Committee is requested, and authorization is requested for appropriate City staff to negotiate contracts with the six highest-ranked firms as detailed above.

- (1) Origin of request for this action: Staff
- (2) Primary staff contact: A. Randolph Brown, Utilities Director 954 786-7043
- (3) Expiration of contract, if applicable: n/a
- (4) Fiscal impact and source of funding: No cost at this time.

DEPARTMENTAL COORDINATION	DATE	DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION	DEPARTMENTAL HEAD SIGNATURE
Utilities	<u>10/15/15</u>	<u>APPROVE</u>	<u>[Signature] For RANDY BROWN</u>
General Services	<u>10/14/15</u>	<u>APPROVE</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>
Finance	<u>10/15/15</u>	<u>Approval</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>
Budget	<u>10/19/15</u>	<u>Approve</u>	<u>Diana [Signature] for Ernest Rojas</u>

[Signature]

City Manager

[Signature]

ACTION TAKEN BY COMMISSION:

<u>Ordinance</u>	<u>Resolution</u>	<u>Consideration</u>	<u>Workshop</u>
1 st Reading	1 st Reading	Results:	Results:
2 nd Reading			

MEMORANDUM

Purchasing #16-005
October 14, 2015

To: Dennis W. Beach, City Manager

Through: Otis J. Thomas, General Services Director *OT*

From: Cassandra LeMasurier, Purchasing Supervisor *CL*

Subject: Background for L-40-15, Continuing Contract for Professional Engineering Services for Water and Reuse Treatment Plant Projects

Contract Need/Background

Request for Letters of Interest (RLI) #L-40-15 was issued to select multiple firms to provide continuing professional services to the City for professional engineering services for Water and Reuse Treatment Plant Projects for which the construction cost will not exceed \$2 million, and for any study activity for which fees will not exceed \$200,000. John Sfiropoulos, City Engineer, provided the project scope of services.

Notice List

The notice list for this project was created by using companies suggested by the requesting department, companies that have responded to prior solicitations, companies that have requested their names be placed on the notice list, and companies from appropriate listings in other sources.

Number of firms submitting proposals 10

Advertising

The RLI was advertised in the Sun Sentinel, and notices were sent to bid notice agencies throughout the nation. The RLI package was also posted on the City's web page for download by interested firms and sent to all registered bidders by email.

Selection/Evaluation Committee

Ten responses were received to the solicitation. The Selection/Evaluation Committee met on October 13 (in a public meeting) to review and evaluate the responses. All responses were reviewed, and the Committee ranked the firms. Copies of the minutes of the meeting, and the voting matrix and scoring sheets, are attached.

Market Research

The General Services conducted outreach to (10) ten local Pompano Beach Engineering firms to inform them of the solicitation.

Recommendation

The recommendation from the Selection/Evaluation Committee to the City Commission is to approve the ranking order, and authorize the City staff to negotiate contracts with the six-highest-ranked firms: Carollo Engineers, Inc., Mathews Consulting, Inc., McCafferty Brinson Consulting, LLC, Globaltech, Inc., MWH Americas, Inc. and Tetra Tech, Inc.

attachments

cc: file

**MINUTES
SELECTION / EVALUATION COMMITTEE
RLI #L-40-15
CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE
TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS
Public Works Administration Conference Room
3:02 p.m. 10/13/15**

The committee consisted of:

- A. Randolph Brown, Utilities Director (Voting)
 - Phil Hyer, Utilities Treatment Plant Superintendent (Voting)
 - Maria Loucraft, Utilities Compliance and Efficiency Manager (Voting)
 - John Sfiropoulos, City Engineer (Voting)
- Also in attendance: Cassie LeMasurier, Purchasing Supervisor

The meeting was held to evaluate the proposals received in response to the City's solicitation to establish contracts with multiple firms to provide consulting as needed. This meeting was posted as a "Public Meeting" both at City Hall and at the Purchasing Division office, and on the City's website. Ten firms submitted responses to the City's Request for Letters of Interest.

Randy Brown led the technical discussion. The Purchasing Supervisor reviewed evaluation procedures and distributed Conflict of Interest Statements for completion by all voting members. The Purchasing Supervisor distributed a spreadsheet indicating the points to be assigned for MBE participation.

Each Committee member had reviewed all of the responses in advance of the meeting.

The Committee discussed each of the proposals in alphabetical order, and scored the responses using voting forms containing the evaluation criteria published in the RLI, with the following results:

(1)	Carollo Engineers, Inc.	360
(2)	Mathews Consulting, Inc.	350
(3)	McCafferty Brinson Consulting, LLC	340
(4)	Globaltech, Inc.	338
(5)	MWH Americas, Inc.	299
(6)	Tetra Tech, Inc.	287
(7)	Kimley-Horn	262
(8)	A.D.A. Engineering, Inc.	239
(9)	Total Municipal Solutions, Inc.	227
(10)	Nino & Moreno, Inc.	185

(As per the RLI terms and conditions, those firms that tied are arrayed based on the value of orders over the past five years, with those firms who have received less work arrayed higher than the other tied firm(s).)

A copy of the voting matrix is attached. The Committee decided oral presentations would not be required as the scoring results showed sufficient distinction between the responding firms. The Committee then discussed how many firms should be recommended for continuing contracts. The consensus of the Committee was that the top six scored firms would be recommended for

contracts, with work authorizations assigned as appropriate to each firm's skill set. An agenda item will be prepared to present the Committee's recommendation to the City Commission for their approval to negotiate contracts with the with the six highest-ranked firms as detailed above.

The Committee meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Analysis Comparison L-40-15 Continuing Contract for Engineering Services for Water and Reuse Treatment Plant Projects

	Total Potential Points	A.D.A. Engineering, Inc.	Carollo Engineers, Inc.	Globaltech, Inc.	Kimley- Horn	Mathews Consulting, Inc.
Committee Member	Potential Points					
<u>A. Radolph Brown</u>						
Prior Experience	0-45	20	45	35	20	40
Qualifications of Personnel	0-35	20	35	30	25	30
Proximity of the Nearest Office	0-10	5	10	8	6	5
Certified Minority Business Enterprise	0-10	6	4	2	3	6
	Total =	51	94	75	54	81

	Potential Points					
Committee Member	Potential Points					
<u>Phil Hyer</u>						
Prior Experience	0-45	25	45	45	35	45
Qualifications of Personnel	0-35	20	35	35	30	33
Proximity of the Nearest Office	0-10	6	6	10	6	6
Certified Minority Business Enterprise	0-10	6	4	2	3	6
	Total =	57	90	92	74	90

	Potential Points					
Committee Member	Potential Points					
<u>Maria Loucraft</u>						
Prior Experience	0-45	25	42	45	22	45
Qualifications of Personnel	0-35	27	35	29	25	29
Proximity of the Nearest Office	0-10	8	8	7	8	7
Certified Minority Business Enterprise	0-10	6	4	2	3	6
	Total =	66	89	83	58	87

	Potential Points					
Committee Member	Potential Points					
<u>John Sfiropoulos</u>						
Prior Experience	0-45	30	42	43	37	44
Qualifications of Personnel	0-35	20	32	34	27	34
Proximity of the Nearest Office	0-10	9	9	9	9	8
Certified Minority Business Enterprise	0-10	6	4	2	3	6
	Total =	65	87	88	76	92

Analysis Comparison L-40-15 Continuing Contract for Engineering Services for Water and Reuse Treatment Plant Projects

	Total Potential Points	McCafferty Brinson Consulting, LLC	MWH Americas, Inc.	Nino & Moreno, Inc.	Tetra Tech, Inc.	Total Municipal Solutions, Inc.
Committee Member	Potential Points					
A. Radolph Brown						
Prior Experience	0-45	37	30	15	30	15
Qualifications of Personnel	0-35	30	30	10	30	15
Proximity of the Nearest Office	0-10	6	5	3	6	4
Certified Minority Business Enterprise	0-10	8	3	0	1	6
	Total =	81	68	28	67	40

	Potential Points					
Committee Member	Potential Points					
Phil Hyer						
Prior Experience	0-45	45	35	25	35	20
Qualifications of Personnel	0-35	30	35	20	30	15
Proximity of the Nearest Office	0-10	10	6	7	10	7
Certified Minority Business Enterprise	0-10	8	3	0	1	6
	Total =	93	79	52	76	48

	Potential Points					
Committee Member	Potential Points					
Maria Loucraft						
Prior Experience	0-45	34	34	17	30	28
Qualifications of Personnel	0-35	33	26	23	34	27
Proximity of the Nearest Office	0-10	7	8	6	9	9
Certified Minority Business Enterprise	0-10	6	3	0	1	6
	Total =	80	71	46	74	70

	Potential Points					
Committee Member	Potential Points					
John Sfiropoulos						
Prior Experience	0-45	40	40	30	35	32
Qualifications of Personnel	0-35	29	29	20	25	22
Proximity of the Nearest Office	0-10	9	9	9	9	9
Certified Minority Business Enterprise	0-10	8	3	0	1	6
	Total =	86	81	59	70	69

Analysis Comparison L-40-15 Continuing Contract for Engineering Services for Water and Reuse Treatment Plant Projects

	Total Potential Points	A.D.A. Engineering, Inc.	Carollo Engineers, Inc.	Globaltech, Inc.	Kimley- Horn	Mathews Consulting, Inc.
--	------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------

Committee Members (Average)	Potential Points					
Prior Experience	0-45	25	44	42	29	44
Qualifications of Personnel	0-35	22	34	32	27	32
Proximity of the Nearest Office	0-10	7	8	9	7	7
Certified Minority Business Enterprise	0-10	6	4	2	3	6
	Average Score =	60	90	85	66	88

Committee Members (Total)	Potential Points					
Prior Experience	0-180	100	174	168	114	174
Qualifications of Personnel	0-140	87	137	128	107	126
Proximity of the Nearest Office	0-40	28	33	34	29	26
Certified Minority Business Enterprise	0-40	24	16	8	12	24
	Grand Total=	239	360	338	262	350

Analysis Comparison L-40-15 Continuing Contract for Engineering Services for Water and Reuse Treatment Plant Projects

	Total Potential Points	McCafferty Brinson Consulting, LLC	MWH Americas, Inc.	Nino & Moreno, Inc.	Tetra Tech, Inc.	Total Municipal Solutions, Inc.
--	------------------------	------------------------------------	--------------------	---------------------	------------------	---------------------------------

Committee Members (Average)	Potential Points					
Prior Experience	0-45	39	35	22	33	24
Qualifications of Personnel	0-35	31	30	18	30	20
Proximity of the Nearest Office	0-10	8	7	6	9	7
Certified Minority Business Enterprise	0-10	8	3	0	1	6
	Average Score =	85	75	46	72	57

Committee Members (Total)	Potential Points					
Prior Experience	0-180	156	139	87	130	95
Qualifications of Personnel	0-140	122	120	73	119	79
Proximity of the Nearest Office	0-40	32	28	25	34	29
Certified Minority Business Enterprise	0-40	30	12	0	4	24
	Grand Total=	340	299	185	287	227


EVALUATION CRITERIA
RLI L-40-15 – CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS

VENDOR NAME: A.D.A. Engineering

	<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Point Range</u>	<u>Score</u>
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-45 points	<u>20</u>
2	Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-35 points	<u>20</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-10 points	<u>5</u>
4	Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10 points	<u>6</u>
TOTAL			<u>51</u>

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

Have not had any experience or knowledge of this firm, except for the Project Manager Mr. Rubio. Mr. Rubio is very thorough and professional. No Litigation

 10/13/15 A. Randolph Brown
 Signature of Evaluator Date Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA
RLI L-40-15 – CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS

VENDOR NAME: Carollo Engineering

	<u>Point Range</u>	<u>Score</u>
1 Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-45 points	<u>45</u>
2 Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-35 points	<u>35</u>
3 Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-10 points	<u>10</u>
4 Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10 points	<u>4</u>
TOTAL		<u>94</u>

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

Carollo is one of our best engineering consulting firms. They specialize in water, reuse and wastewater thus have a vast knowledge and nationwide network. We have worked with this firm in many of our organizations. This firm has done a very good job with previous projects. Good to see Chen and Gamboa as a sub-consultants, Seven cases of litigation in the past 5 years



 Signature of Evaluator

10/13/15

 Date

A. Randolph Brown

 Printed Name

**EVALUATION CRITERIA
RLI L-40-15 – CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE
TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS**

VENDOR NAME: Globaltech Inc

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Point Range</u>	<u>Score</u>
1 Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-45 points	<u>35</u>
2 Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-35 points	<u>30</u>
3 Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-10 points	<u>8</u>
4 Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10 points	<u>2</u>
TOTAL		<u>75</u>

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

The industry speaks highly of this firm. We have visited their projects and have worked with them in our organizations, Good to see good firms like McNabb and ADS Electrical as a sub-consultants, No litigation

 10/13/15 A. Randolph Brown
Signature of Evaluator Date Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA
RLI L-40-15 – CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS

VENDOR NAME: Kimley Horn

	<u>Point Range</u>	<u>Score</u>
1 Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-45 points	<u>20</u>
2 Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-35 points	<u>25</u>
3 Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-10 points	<u>6</u>
4 Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10 points	<u>3</u>
TOTAL		<u>54</u>

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

Limited experience with this firm some difficulties with the Western Wellfield development that Kimley Horn represents. Enjoy Mr. Potts's knowledge and professionalism, Nice select of Sub-contractors, Numerous litigation many safety related


Signature of Evaluator

10/13/15
Date

A. Randolph Brown
Printed Name

**EVALUATION CRITERIA
 RLI L-40-15 – CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE
 TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS**

VENDOR NAME: Matthews Consulting Inc.

	<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Point Range</u>	<u>Score</u>
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-45 points	<u>40</u>
2	Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-35 points	<u>30</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-10 points	<u>5</u>
4	Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10 points	<u>6</u>
TOTAL			<u>81</u>

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

We have had a very good working relationship with this firm. They have done a good job with our reuse and wastewater master plans along with our stormwater projects. No litigation

	10/13/15	A. Randolph Brown
Signature of Evaluator	Date	Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA
RLI L-40-15 – CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS

VENDOR NAME: McCafferty Brinson Consulting

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Point Range</u>	<u>Score</u>
1 Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-45 points	<u>37</u>
2 Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-35 points	<u>30</u>
3 Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-10 points	<u>6</u>
4 Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10 points	<u>8</u>
TOTAL		<u>81</u>

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

We have had very good working relations with this firm for our reuse, water projects. This firm has done a very good job with previous projects. Good to see Hiller and Holtz as a sub-consultants, No litigation currently however they lost points since they failed to state if there has been any litigation in the last 5 years.


Signature of Evaluator

10/13/15
Date

A. Randolph Brown
Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA
RLI L-40-15 – CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS

VENDOR NAME: Nino & Moreno, Inc.

	<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Point Range</u>	<u>Score</u>
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-45 points	<u>15</u>
2	Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-35 points	<u>10</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-10 points	<u>3</u>
4	Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10 points	<u>0</u>
TOTAL			<u>28</u>

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

Have not had any experience or knowledge of this firm, very little treatment plant experience, No litigation


10/13/15
A. Randolph Brown

 Signature of Evaluator Date Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA
RLI L-40-15 – CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS

VENDOR NAME: TetraTech

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Point Range</u>	<u>Score</u>
1 Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-45 points	<u>30</u>
2 Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-35 points	<u>30</u>
3 Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-10 points	<u>6</u>
4 Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10 points	<u>1</u>
TOTAL		<u>67</u>

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

Major engineering firm with good experience and staff. We have worked with them in our organizations, Good to see Pace Analytical as a sub-consultant, Not mentioning their litigation cases hurt them in the ratings, it was not for their determine what was important, but ours.


Signature of Evaluator

10/13/15
Date

A. Randolph Brown
Printed Name


EVALUATION CRITERIA
RLI L-40-15 – CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS

VENDOR NAME: TMS, Inc.

	<u>Point Range</u>	<u>Score</u>
1 Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-45 points	<u>15</u>
2 Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-35 points	<u>15</u>
3 Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-10 points	<u>4</u>
4 Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10 points	<u>6</u>
TOTAL		<u>40</u>

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

Have not had any experience with this firm, Pleasant working relationship with Mr. Verma when he was with Coconut Creek, very professional, No litigation

 Signature of Evaluator	<u>10/13/15</u> Date	<u>A. Randolph Brown</u> Printed Name
--	-------------------------	--


EVALUATION CRITERIA
 RLI L-40-15 – CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE
 TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS

VENDOR NAME: A.D.A. ENGINEERING, INC

	<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Point Range</u>	<u>Score</u>
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-45 points	<u>25</u>
2	Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-35 points	<u>20</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-10 points	<u>6</u>
4	Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10 points	<u>6</u>
TOTAL			<u>57</u>

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

NO REUSE PLANT PROJECTS -
NOT MUCH TREATMENT PLANT WORK OTHER THAN W&R PUBLIC


 Signature of Evaluator

10/13/15
 Date

PHIL HYER
 Printed Name


EVALUATION CRITERIA
 RLI L-40-15 – CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE
 TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS

VENDOR NAME: CAROLLO ENGINEERS, INC.

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Point Range</u>	<u>Score</u>
1 Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-45 points	<u>43</u>
2 Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-35 points	<u>35</u>
3 Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-10 points	<u>6</u>
4 Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10 points	<u>4</u>
TOTAL		<u>90</u>

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

WELL VERSED IN TYPES OF PROJECTS OF SIMILAR NEEDS.
OF COPB - GOOD TRACK RECORD WITH COPB -
GOOD SUBS - ESPECIALLY M. GAMBOSA. HAS WORKED
WELL W/ STAFF.


 Signature of Evaluator

10/13/15
 Date

PHIL HYER
 Printed Name


EVALUATION CRITERIA
 RLI L-40-15 – CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE
 TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS

VENDOR NAME: GLOBALTECH, INC.

	<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Point Range</u>	<u>Score</u>
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-45 points	<u>43</u>
2	Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-35 points	<u>35</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-10 points	<u>10</u>
4	Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10 points	<u>2</u>
TOTAL			<u>92</u>

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

EXTENSIVE EXPERIENCE w/ SIMILAR PROJECTS-
VAST ABILITIES AS FAR AS RESOURCES & EXPERIENCES
GOOD REFERENCES - FROM OTHER UTILITIES-


 Signature of Evaluator

10/13/15
 Date

PHIL HYER
 Printed Name


EVALUATION CRITERIA
 RLI L-40-15 – CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE
 TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS

VENDOR NAME: Kimley Horn

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Point Range</u>	<u>Score</u>
1 Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-45 points	<u>35</u>
2 Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-35 points	<u>30</u>
3 Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-10 points	<u>6</u>
4 Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10 points	<u>3</u>
TOTAL		<u>74</u>

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

DID WORK FOR GOODYEAR RUNWAY - MISSED ELECTRICAL WORK USED IN WELL VAULT
GOOD EXPERIENCE w/ J. POTTS - MEMBRANE KNOWLEDGE.
OTHER THAN JOHN'S EXPERIENCE - MORE CIVIL TYPE OF WORK
A LOT OF LITIGATION -


 Signature of Evaluator

10/13/15
 Date

PHIL HYER
 Printed Name


EVALUATION CRITERIA
 RLI L-40-15 – CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE
 TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS

VENDOR NAME: MATTHEWS CONSULTING, INC

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Point Range</u>	<u>Score</u>
1 Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-45 points	<u>45</u>
2 Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-35 points	<u>33</u>
3 Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-10 points	<u>6</u>
4 Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10 points	<u>6</u>
TOTAL		<u>90</u>

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

DID EXCELLENT WORK ON REUSE MASTER PLAN
- GOOD PROPOSAL
- VAST EXPERIENCE IN ALL TYPES OF UTILITIES WORK
- GOOD FEEDBACK FROM OTHER UTILITIES
NO LITIGATION!


 Signature of Evaluator

10/13/15
 Date

PHIL HYER
 Printed Name


EVALUATION CRITERIA
 RLI L-40-15 – CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE
 TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS

VENDOR NAME: MC CAFFERTY DRINSON CONSULTING, LLC

	<u>Point Range</u>	<u>Score</u>
1 Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-45 points	<u>45</u>
2 Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-35 points	<u>30</u>
3 Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-10 points	<u>10</u>
4 Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10 points	<u>8</u>
TOTAL		<u>93</u>

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

SMALL BUT VERY ACCESSABLE - OPEN MINDED - EASY TO TALK TO
HAS DONE WORK FOR US - GOOD REFERENCES - FROM OTHER UTILITIES.
GOOD EXPERIENCE W/ OTHER TYPES OF PROJECTS - REUSE, WATER
DISTRIBUTION -


 Signature of Evaluator

10/13/15
 Date

PHIL HYER
 Printed Name


EVALUATION CRITERIA
 RLI L-40-15 – CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE
 TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS

VENDOR NAME: MWH AMERICAS, INC.

	<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Point Range</u>	<u>Score</u>
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-45 points	<u>35</u>
2	Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-35 points	<u>35</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-10 points	<u>6</u>
4	Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10 points	<u>3</u>
TOTAL			<u>79</u>

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

MUCH KNOWLEDGE OF UTILITIES - LARGE COMPANY W/ RESOURCES
AND TECHNICAL EXPERTISE -
HAS WORKED ON SEVERAL PROJECTS FOR THE CITY - SOME ISSUES
BUT WORKED OUT IN THE END -
LITIGATION LISTED


 Signature of Evaluator

10/13/15
 Date

PHIL HYER
 Printed Name


EVALUATION CRITERIA
 RLI L-40-15 – CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE
 TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS

VENDOR NAME: NINO & MORENO, INC.

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Point Range</u>	<u>Score</u>
1 Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-45 points	<u>25</u>
2 Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-35 points	<u>20</u>
3 Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-10 points	<u>7</u>
4 Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10 points	<u>0</u>
TOTAL		<u>52</u>

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

LIMITED EXPERIENCE, IN DIFFERENT TYPES OF UTILITIES
PROJECTS SUCH AS TREATMENT PLANT REHAB -
LISTED A/E COM ON REFERENCE SHEET FOR WORK DONE FOR
CITY OF DAVIE -

 10/13/15 PAYER
 Signature of Evaluator Date Printed Name


EVALUATION CRITERIA
 RLI L-40-15 – CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE
 TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS

VENDOR NAME: TETRA TECH, INC.

	<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Point Range</u>	<u>Score</u>
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-45 points	<u>35</u>
2	Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-35 points	<u>30</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-10 points	<u>10</u>
4	Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10 points	<u>1</u>
TOTAL			<u>76</u>

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

GOOD EXPERIENCE - GOOD TEAM MEMBERS - BUT NOT LOCAL
OTHER THAN D. MCNEVIN & J. KINSLOW - DO NOT KNOW OTHERS -
NO WORK FOR POMPANO
LITIGATION NOT SPECIFIED - WORDING -


 Signature of Evaluator

10/13/15
 Date

PHIL HYER
 Printed Name


EVALUATION CRITERIA
 RLI L-40-15 – CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE
 TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS

VENDOR NAME: TOTAL MUNICIPAL SOLUTIONS, INC.

	<u>Point Range</u>	<u>Score</u>
1 Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-45 points	<u>20</u>
2 Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-35 points	<u>15</u>
3 Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-10 points	<u>7</u>
4 Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10 points	<u>6</u>
TOTAL		<u>48</u>

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

LIMITED # OF SIMILAR PROJECTS - OF SIZE & COMPLEXITY -
NO PROJECTS AS OF YET W/ CITY -
ONLY ONE PE ON STAFF (PRIME)
LIMITED RESOURCES


 Signature of Evaluator

10/13/15
 Date

PHIL HYLLE
 Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA
RLI L-40-15 – CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS

VENDOR NAME: A.D.A. Engineering Inc.

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Point Range</u>	<u>Score</u>
<p>1 Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity:</p> <p>a. Number of similar projects</p> <p>b. Complexity of similar projects</p> <p>c. References from past projects performed by the firm</p> <p>d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description)</p> <p>e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome) ✓</p>	0-45 points	<u>25</u>
<p>2 Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants:</p> <p>a. Organizational chart for project</p> <p>b. Number of technical staff 8+1</p> <p>c. Qualifications of technical staff:</p> <p>(1) Number of licensed staff 8+1</p> <p>(2) Education of staff</p> <p>(3) Experience of staff on similar projects 178</p>	0-35 points	<u>27</u>
<p>3 Proximity of the nearest office to the project location:</p> <p>a. Location WPB (5)</p> <p>b. Number of staff at the nearest office 1200A</p>	0-10 points	<u>8</u>
<p>4 Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)</p>	0-10 points	<u>6</u>
TOTAL		<u>66</u>

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

ADA has some experience with WTPs, but water +
Reuse task leader has no projects listed as WW or
Reuse plant projects.

[Signature]
 Signature of Evaluator

10-05-15
10-13-15

Maria Loucraft
 Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA
 RLI L-40-15 – CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE
 TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS

VENDOR NAME: Carollo

	<u>Point Range</u>	<u>Score</u>
1 Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm ✓ d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-45 points	<u>42</u>
2 Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff $8 + 6 = 14$ c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects <u>236 hrs</u>	0-35 points	<u>35</u>
3 Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-10 points	<u>8</u>
4 Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10 points	<u>4</u>
TOTAL		<u>89</u>

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

Has diverse + use full subs - such as electrical experts and wastewater experts. Have Reuse + WTD water quality + process experts. See experience with tracking new technologies, projects, regulatory + water quality and asset management. ✓

[Signature] 10-05-15 Maria Loucraft

Signature of Evaluator Date Printed Name

10-12-15

EVALUATION CRITERIA


RLI L-40-15 – CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS

VENDOR NAME: Global Tech

	<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Point Range</u>	<u>Score</u>
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-45 points	<u>45</u>
2	Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: 5+2 (1) Number of licensed staff 7 (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects 140 yrs	0-35 points	<u>29</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-10 points	<u>7</u>
4	Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10 points	<u>2</u>
TOTAL			<u>83</u>

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

Have WTP + Reuse plant experience. Saw use of trench box ✓
Experience with Equipment at Reuse Facility ✓



10-05-15
Date
10-13-15

Maria Loucraft
Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA
RLI L-40-15 – CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS

VENDOR NAME: Kimley-Horn

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Point Range</u>	<u>Score</u>
1 Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-45 points	<u>22</u>
2 Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-35 points	<u>25</u>
3 Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-10 points	<u>8</u>
4 Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10 points	<u>3</u>
TOTAL		<u>58</u>

Litigation 0

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

Nice to have electrical sub and water quality experts. (Airport City, Ind. mnd)
Cartaya is listed as sub - they were architects/engineers
on membrane building - no sprinklers for fire.
"humans may not want to drink treated wastewater but in many respects it is beneficial for vegetation" - shows lack of scientific background
10-05-15 Maria Loucraft
10-13-15

and lack of understanding of how industrial is used (I know).


EVALUATION CRITERIA
RLI L-40-15 – CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS

VENDOR NAME: Mathews Consulting

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Point Range</u>	<u>Score</u>
1 Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-45 points	<u>45</u>
2 Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff <u>6+2</u> c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff <u>4</u> (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-35 points	<u>29</u>
3 Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location <u>WPB</u> b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-10 points	<u>7</u>
4 Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10 points	<u>6</u>
TOTAL		<u>87</u>

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

Brought in an electrical sub ✓
Excellent work on Reuse & Wastewater
Master plans ✓

 10-05-15 Maria Loucraft
Signature of Evaluator Date Printed Name
10-13-15

EVALUATION CRITERIA
 RLI L-40-15 – CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE
 TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS

VENDOR NAME: McCafferty Branson Consulting, LLC

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Point Range</u>	<u>Score</u>
1 Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-45 points	<u>34</u>
2 Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-35 points	<u>33</u>
3 Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-10 points	<u>7</u>
4 Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10 points	<u>6</u>
TOTAL		<u>80</u>

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

Did not answer litigation question properly - did not provide list. Gave 0 credit for this.

[Signature]
 Signature of Evaluator

10-05-15
10-13-15

Maria Loucraft
 District Manager

EVALUATION CRITERIA
RLI L-40-15 – CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS

VENDOR NAME: MWA

	<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Point Range</u>	<u>Score</u>
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-45 points	<u>34</u>
2	Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff <i>(not avail for recent projects)</i> c. Qualifications of technical staff: <i>(sent inexperienced staff)</i> (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-35 points	<u>26</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location <i>WPD</i> b. Number of staff at the nearest office <i>60</i>	0-10 points	<u>8</u>
4	Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10 points	<u>3</u>
TOTAL			<u>71</u>

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

Does not have enough staff for current projects.

[Signature]
 Signature of Evaluator

10-25-15
 Date
10-13-15

Maria Loucraft
 Rated Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA
 RLI L-40-15 – CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE
 TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS

VENDOR NAME: Nino & Moreno, Inc.

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Point Range</u>	<u>Score</u>
1 Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome) ✓	0-45 points	<u>17</u>
2 Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects 123	0-35 points	<u>23</u>
3 Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-10 points	<u>6</u>
4 Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10 points	<u>0</u>
TOTAL		<u>46</u>

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

all WTP construction experience is found in one person and they are listed as consulting engineer. (aguctech)

[Signature]
 Signature of Evaluator

10-13-15
 Date

Maria Loucraft
 Printed Name

**EVALUATION CRITERIA
 RLI L-40-15 – CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE
 TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS**

VENDOR NAME: Tetra Tech Inc

	<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Point Range</u>	<u>Score</u>
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-45 points	<u>30</u>
2	Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-35 points	<u>34</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location <u> Ft. Lauderdale (6 Staff)</u> b. Number of staff at the nearest office <u> 500 in FL & 6 in Ft. Lauderdale</u>	0-10 points	<u>9</u>
4	Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10 points	<u>1</u>
TOTAL			<u>74</u>

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

Litigation was not specified (list) & no credit provided.
Has no prior work with City.

[Signature]
 Signature of Evaluator

10-13-15
 Date

Maria Loucraft
 Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA
 RLI L-40-15 – CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE
 TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS

VENDOR NAME: Total Municipal Solutions

	<u>Point Range</u>	<u>Score</u>
1 Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity:	0-45 points	<u>28</u>
a. Number of similar projects		
b. Complexity of similar projects		
c. References from past projects performed by the firm		
d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description)		
e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)		
2 Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants:	0-35 points	<u>27</u>
a. Organizational chart for project		
b. Number of technical staff		
c. Qualifications of technical staff:		
(1) Number of licensed staff		
(2) Education of staff		
(3) Experience of staff on similar projects		
3 Proximity of the nearest office to the project location:	0-10 points	<u>9</u>
a. Location <u>Pompano Beach</u>		
b. Number of staff at the nearest office <u>(3)</u>		
4 Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10 points	<u>6</u>
TOTAL		<u>70</u>

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

Distribution projects

[Signature]

10-05-15
Date
10-13-15

Maria Loucraft
District Manager


EVALUATION CRITERIA
RLI L-40-15 – CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS

VENDOR NAME: A.S.A.

	<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Point Range</u>	<u>Score</u>
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects <i>SEE SECTION 4</i> b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm ✓ d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) <i>P.M. OSCAR RUBIO</i> e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome) <i>NONE</i>	0-45 points	<u>30</u>
2	Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project ✓ b. Number of technical staff <i>PRIME 3 B.S. / 1 M.S. / 4 P.E.'S</i> c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff <i>2 - SUBS</i> (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-35 points	<u>20</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location <i>W.P.B.</i> b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-10 points	<u>9</u>
4	Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10 points	<u>6</u>
TOTAL			<u>65</u>

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

NO PREVIOUS PROJECTS PERFORMED WITH CITY.
DID NOT ADEQUATELY HIGHLIGHT EXPERIENCE &
SIMILAR TYPE PROJECTS. MEDIOCRE PROPOSAL.


 Signature of Evaluator

10/13/15
 Date

JOHN SFEROPOULOS
 Printed Name


**EVALUATION CRITERIA
 RLI L-40-15 – CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE
 TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS**

VENDOR NAME: CAROLLO

	<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Point Range</u>	<u>Score</u>
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm ✓ d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) SEVERAL e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome) 7	0-45 points	<u>42</u>
2	Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project ✓ b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-35 points	<u>32</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location LAKE NORTON b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-10 points	<u>9</u>
4	Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10 points	<u>4</u>
TOTAL			<u>87</u>

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

EXTENSIVE SIMILAR PROJECTS & QUALIFICATIONS. SEVERAL
PREVIOUS PROJECTS PERFORMED FOR CITY.



10/13/15
Date

JOHN SPANOPOULOS
Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI L-40-15 – CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS

VENDOR NAME: GLOBAL TECH

	<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Point Range</u>	<u>Score</u>
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-45 points	<u>43</u>
	<i>EXTENSIVE</i>		
	<i>NONE</i>		
2	Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-35 points	<u>34</u>
	<i>PE'S, G.C.E. MECHANICAL & PLUMBING CONTRACTORS</i>		
	<i>6 - SUBS. UTILITY & EXCAVATION CONTRACTORS</i>		
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-10 points	<u>9</u>
	<i>BOCA RATON</i>		
4	Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10 points	<u>2</u>
TOTAL			<u>88</u>

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

EXTENSIVE EXPERIENCE & QUALIFICATIONS. NO LITIGATION.
SOLID & DIVERSE STAFF WITH PE'S, MECHANICAL &
PLUMBING CONTRACTORS, & UTILITY & EXCAVATION CONTRACTORS.

[Signature]
 Signature of Evaluator

10/13/15
 Date

JOHN SPANPOLOS
 Printed Name


EVALUATION CRITERIA
RLI L-40-15 – CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS

VENDOR NAME: KIMLEY-HORN

	<u>Point Range</u>	<u>Score</u>
1 Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects <u>EXTENSIVE</u> c. References from past projects performed by the firm ✓ d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) <u>AIRPARK</u> e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome) <u>17 (73 OFFICES IN 22-STATES)</u> 	0-45 points	<u>37</u>
2 Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Organizational chart for project <u>*JOHN POTTS</u> b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: <u>8-SUBS</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects 	0-35 points	<u>27</u>
3 Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Location <u>DELAY</u> b. Number of staff at the nearest office 	0-10 points	<u>9</u>
4 Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10 points	<u>3</u>
TOTAL		<u>76</u>

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

PRIOR EXPERIENCE WITH CITY LIMITED TO AIRPARK.
NUMEROUS LITIGATION & SUBCONSULTANTS.
EXTENSIVE QUALIFICATIONS & EXPERIENCE. JOHN POTTS
IS EXCEPTIONAL TO WORK WITH & A LEADER IN THE
INDUSTRY.


 Signature of Evaluator

10/13/15
 Date

JOHN SARPOPOULOS
 Printed Name


**EVALUATION CRITERIA
 RLI L-40-15 – CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE
 TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS**

VENDOR NAME: MATTHEWS

	<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Point Range</u>	<u>Score</u>
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-45 points	<u>44</u>
	<i>NUMEROUS, DIVERSE & EXTENSIVE</i> <i>BEHAT</i> <i>NONE</i> <i>* EXCELLENT PROPOSAL → WATER & REUSE PROJECTS SEPARATED & STUDIES & REPORTS, ELECTRICAL & INST.</i>		
2	Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-35 points	<u>34</u>
	<i>CONST. MANAGEMENT & VALVE ENG.</i> <i>2-SUBS</i> <i>JASON PUGSLEY → EXCELLENT</i> <i>* MEDIUM SIZE FIRM</i>		
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-10 points	<u>8</u>
	<i>W.P.B.</i>		
4	Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10 points	<u>6</u>
TOTAL			<u>92</u>

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

NUMEROUS, DIVERSE & EXTENSIVE PROJECTS
EXCELLENT & DETAILED PROPOSAL. NO LITIGATION
& PRIOR EXPERIENCE WITH THEM.


 Signature of Evaluator

10/13/15
 Date

JOHN SFRAPPOULOS
 Printed Name


EVALUATION CRITERIA
RLI L-40-15 – CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE
TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS

VENDOR NAME: Mc CAFFERTY BRINSON

	<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Point Range</u>	<u>Score</u>
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm ✓ d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) <i>SEVERAL</i> e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome) <i>NONE</i>	0-45 points	<u>40</u>
2	Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project ✓ b. Number of technical staff <i>FRANK - VERY ACCESSIBLE</i> c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff <i>5 - SUBS</i> (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-35 points	<u>29</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location PALESTINE <i>FR. LAVERGNE</i> b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-10 points	<u>9</u>
4	Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10 points	<u>8</u>
TOTAL			<u>86</u>

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

SEVERAL PROJECTS PERFORMED FOR CITY. FRANK BRINSON
IS VERY KNOWLEDGEABLE & ACCESSIBLE. SIMILAR
TYPE PROJECTS & EXCELLENT QUALIFICATIONS.

Signature of Evaluator  Date 10/13/15 Printed Name JOHN S. PAPAPOPOULOS

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RLI L-40-15 – CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS

VENDOR NAME: MWH

	<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Point Range</u>	<u>Score</u>
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects <i>EXTENSIVE</i> c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) <i>SEVERAL</i> e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome) <i>8</i> <i>* MEDIOCRE PROPOSAL</i>	0-45 points	<u>40</u>
2	Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff <i>EXTENSIVE</i> c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-35 points	<u>29</u>
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location PLAINS <i>W.P.B.</i> b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-10 points	<u>9</u>
4	Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10 points	<u>3</u>
TOTAL			<u>81</u>

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

SEVERAL PROJECTS PERFORMED FOR CITY. EXTENSIVE
QUALIFICATIONS & EXPERIENCE.

[Signature]
 Signature of Evaluator

10/12/15
 Date

JOHN SARPOULOS
 Printed Name


EVALUATION CRITERIA
RLI L-40-15 – CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE
TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS

VENDOR NAME: NINO & MORENO

	<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Point Range</u>	<u>Score</u>
	<i>MEDIOCRE SUBMITTAL</i>		
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-45 points	<u>30</u>
	<i>? DID NOT HIGHLIGHT WTP ER WTP PROJECTS AS OTHERS. ✓ NONE NONE</i>		
2	Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-35 points	<u>20</u>
	<i>PRIME 2 PEs / 1 BS / 1 MS. 2 - SUBS.</i>		
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-10 points	<u>9</u>
	<i>DAVE PARKLAND # OF RESOURCES IN QUESTION</i>		
4	Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10 points	<u>0</u>
	TOTAL		<u>59</u>

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

NO PREVIOUS PROJECTS PERFORMED WITH CITY.
DID NOT ADEQUATELY HIGHLIGHT EXPERIENCE & QUALIFICATIONS FOR SIMILAR TYPE PROJECTS.
MEDIOCRE PROPOSAL.


 Signature of Evaluator

10/12/15
 Date

JOHN SPERDOULOS
 Printed Name

EVALUATION CRITERIA
 RLI L-40-15 – CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE
 TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS


VENDOR NAME: ~~FOTAL MUNICIPAL SOLUTIONS~~ TETA TECH

* NICE PROPOSAL

	<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Point Range</u>	<u>Score</u>
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-45 points	35
	EXTENSIVE 15 CONTINUING SERVICE CONTRACTS DID NOT LIST		
2	Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-35 points	25
	PRIME (4 PE'S, 3 MS., 1 BS., 1 PHD) SOLID TEAM (WATER SUPPLY, WATER TREATMENT, QA/QC, RECLAIMED, MODELING, GIS, ENV.) * MOST IN ORLANDO 2 SUBS		
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-10 points	9
	DAVE FT. LAUD.		
4	Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10 points	1
TOTAL			70

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

SOLID TEAM BUT RESOURCES IN QUESTION AS MOST IN ORLANDO. DID NOT LIST LITIGATION.



10/13/15
Date

JOHN SPANOPOULOS
Printed Name


**EVALUATION CRITERIA
 RLI L-40-15 – CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE
 TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS**

VENDOR NAME: ~~FERRA TICH~~ TOTAL MUNICIPAL SOLUTIONS

	<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Point Range</u>	<u>Score</u>
1	Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity: a. Number of similar projects b. Complexity of similar projects c. References from past projects performed by the firm d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description) e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	0-45 points	<u>32</u>
	HEAVY IN REUSE & WW. ONLY SUBS (QUEST ENG & SURVEYING) NONE		
2	Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants: a. Organizational chart for project b. Number of technical staff c. Qualifications of technical staff: (1) Number of licensed staff (2) Education of staff (3) Experience of staff on similar projects	0-35 points	<u>22</u>
	2 MS. (PRIME) 2 PE'S (PRIME) SUBS: 3		
3	Proximity of the nearest office to the project location: a. Location b. Number of staff at the nearest office	0-10 points	<u>9</u>
	FERRA TICH DAVIE RESOURCES IN QUESTION		
4	Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10 points	<u>6</u>
	TOTAL		<u>69</u>

List the reasons for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring):

PREVIOUS PROJECTS WITH CITY LIMITED TO
SUBCONSULTANTS ONLY. NUMBER OF RESOURCES
IN QUESTION. DID NOT ADEQUATELY HIGHLIGHT
WATER PROJECTS



10/13/15
 Date

JOHN SARODOULOS
 Printed Name



Florida's Warmest Welcome

**CITY OF POMPANO BEACH
REQUEST FOR LETTERS OF INTEREST
L-40-15**

**CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING
SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE TREATMENT
PLANT PROJECTS**

**RLI OPENING: September 23, 2015, 2:00 P.M.
PURCHASING OFFICE
1190 N.E. 3RD AVENUE, BUILDING C (Front)
POMPANO BEACH, FLORIDA 33060**

August 20, 2015

CITY OF POMPANO BEACH, FLORIDA
REQUEST FOR LETTERS OF INTEREST (RLI)
L-40-15

CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER AND REUSE
TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS

Pursuant to Florida Statutes Chapter 287.055 "Consultants' Competitive Negotiation Act" the City of Pompano Beach invites qualified engineering firms to submit Letters of Interest, qualifications and experience for consideration to provide Professional Engineering Consulting services to the City on a continuing as-needed basis.

The City will receive sealed proposals until **2:00 p.m. (local), September 23, 2015**, in the City's Purchasing Office, 1190 N.E. 3rd Avenue, Building C, Pompano Beach, Florida, 33060. E-mailed or faxed proposals will not be acceptable.

The City intends to issue multiple contracts to engineering firms to provide continuing professional services to the City for various Water and Reuse Treatment Plant projects. Professional services under this contract will be restricted to those required for any project for which construction costs will not exceed \$2 million, and for any study activity for which fees will not exceed \$200,000. The contracts will be for an initial term of (1) one year, with automatic renewals for (4) four (1) one-year periods.

1. **The types of projects to be undertaken may include, but are not limited to**

- Reuse Water Treatment Plant Expansion Projects
- Reuse Water Treatment Plant Modification and/or Enhancement Projects
- Water Treatment Plant Expansion Projects
- Water Treatment Plant Modification and/or Enhancement Projects
- The City's approved Capital Improvement Program maybe found here http://pompanobeachfl.gov/pages/department_directory/budget/budget.html.php

2. **The scope of services may include, but is not limited to, the following;**

- Prepare studies and make recommendations on methods of operation and/or treatment.
- Prepare preliminary design reports and/or design alternative recommendations. This may include various types of utility modeling, surveying and field data analysis.
- Prepare all required bidding/construction documents for projects. This will include survey preparations, design plan preparations, technical specification preparations and cost estimate preparations. Attendance at all required pre-design, design, bidding and bid award meetings is required.

- Attend pre-bid conference, prepare possible bid addendums for plan revisions. Assist in making bid award recommendations for contracting/construction services.
- Prepare all required permit applications and submittal packages as required for permit issuance of all agency permits (i.e. State, County and City).
- Provide construction engineering/management services for projects. Services during construction may include shop drawing/contractor submittal reviews and approvals, inspection and approval of project improvements, possible plan revisions and review and approval of contractor pay applications.
- Provide project close-out services. This may include preliminary and final acceptance of projects, preparation and approval of punch list items and project certification as required to all permitting agencies.
- Firms must have previous experience in municipal water and reuse treatment plant projects and must be licensed to practice Professional Engineering in the State of Florida, Florida State Statute 481, by the Board of Professional Regulation.

3 Term of Contract

The initial contract period shall be (1) one year, commencing upon award by the appropriate City officials.

The contract shall be automatically renewed for four (4) additional one-year periods unless the General Services Director or the successful bidder receiving award shall give notice to the other party of intent not to renew for the additional period, which notice must be delivered by certified mail and must be received at least sixty (60) days prior to the end of the initial contract period. All terms, prices and conditions shall remain firm for the initial period of the contract, and any renewal period.

4. Small Business Enterprise Program

The Pompano Beach City Commission has established a voluntary Small Business Enterprise (SBE) Program to encourage and foster the participation of Small Business Enterprises in the central procurement activities of the City. The City of Pompano Beach is strongly committed to ensuring the participation of Small Business Enterprises (SBE's) as contractors and subcontractors for the procurement of goods and services. The definition of a SBE, for the purpose of the City's voluntary program, is taken from the State of Florida Statute 288.703(1).

As of the date of publication of this solicitation, a small business means an independently owned and operated business concern that employs 200 or fewer permanent full-time employees and that, together with its affiliates, has a net worth of not more than \$5 million or any firm based in Florida that has a Small Business Administration 8(a) certification. As applicable to sole proprietorships, the \$5 million net worth requirement shall include both personal and business investments.

The City encourages all firms to undertake good faith efforts to identify appropriate Small Business Enterprise partners. Sources of information on certified Small Business Enterprises include the Broward County Small Business Development Division, the State of Florida Office of Supplier Diversity, South Florida Water Management District, and other

agencies throughout the State. The City includes links to these organizations from the City's website www.pompanobeachfl.gov.

The City has set a 5% voluntary Small Business Enterprise Goal for this project. SBE Forms are located at the end of this solicitation, and all firms responding must return a response of participation or non-participation in order to be considered responsive for evaluation purposes.

Please indicate in your response if your firm is a certified Small Business Enterprise, and include the completed "Good Faith Effort Report" form with your proposal. Proposers should submit Exhibit A, detailing the list of SBE firms to be used on the proposed contract, and a completed Letter of Intent, Exhibit B, for all participating SBE firms. Submit Exhibit C listing SBE firms that were solicited but not selected. Submit Exhibit D explaining your firm's good faith efforts to include SBE firms on this contract.

5. Local Business Program

On March 23, 2010, the City Commission approved a Resolution establishing a Local Business Program, a policy to increase the participation of City of Pompano Beach businesses in the City's procurement process.

You can view the list of City businesses that have a current Business Tax Receipt on the City's website, and locate local firms that are available to perform the work required by the specifications. The business information, sorted by business use classification, is posted on the webpage for the Business Tax Receipt Division: http://pompanobeachfl.gov/pages/department_directory/development_services/business_tax_receipt_division/business_tax_receipt_division.html.php

The City has set a 5% voluntary Local Business goal for this project. Local Business program forms are located at the end of this solicitation, and all firms responding must return a response of participation or non-participation in order to be considered responsive for evaluation purposes.

The City of Pompano Beach is strongly committed to insuring the participation of City of Pompano Beach Businesses as contractors and subcontractors for the procurement of goods and services. Proposers are encouraged to participate in the City of Pompano Beach's voluntary Local Business Program by including, as part of their package, the Local Business Participation Form (Exhibit E,) listing the local businesses that will be used on the contract, and the Letter of Intent Form (Exhibit F) from each local business that will participate in the contract. Proposers should utilize businesses that are physically located in the City of Pompano Beach with a current Business Tax Receipt. Proposers who are unable to meet the recommended voluntary goals should also provide the Local Business Unavailability Form (Exhibit G,) listing firms that were contacted but not available, and the Good Faith Effort Report (Exhibit H) describing the efforts made to include local business participation in the contract.

6. Required Proposal Submittal

Submission/Format Requirements

Submit one (1) original unbound proposal and five (5) bound photocopies of the proposal. Use 8 ½" x 11" plain white paper; proposal to be typed, and signed by an authorized representative who is able to contractually bind the Proposer. In addition, Proposers must submit one (1) original copy of the Proposal on electronic media in printable Adobe or Microsoft Word format (or other format approved by the City). Duplicate copies must contain all information included in the original submittal. Failure to adhere to the submittal quantity criteria may result in the Proposal being considered non-responsive.

Information to be included in the proposal: In order to maintain comparability and expedite the review process, it is required that proposals be organized in the manner specified below, with tabs or dividers between the sections:

Title page:

Show the project name and number, the name of the Proposer's firm, address, telephone number, name of contact person and the date.

Table of Contents:

Include a clear identification of the material by section and by page.

Letter of Interest:

A Letter of Interest, signed by an authorized representative of your firm, expressing your understanding of the project and expressing a positive commitment to provide the services described herein. In the letter, include:

- complete corporate name of the primary firm responding
- applicable Federal Tax Identification Number
- address
- telephone and fax numbers
- name, title, and email of the person to contact regarding your submission

Please limit this section to two pages.

Project Team Form:

Submit a completed "Project Team" form. The purpose of this form is to identify the key members of your team, including any specialty subconsultants.

Organizational Chart:

Specifically identify the management plan (if needed) and provide an organizational chart for the team. The proposer must describe at a minimum, the basic approach to these projects, to include reporting hierarchy of staff and sub-consultants, clarify the individual(s) responsible for the co-ordination of separate components of the scope of services.

Statement of Skills and Experience of Project Team:

Describe the experience of the entire project team as it relates to the types of projects described in the Scope section of this RLI. Include the experience of the prime consultants as well as other members of the project team; i.e., additional personnel, sub-consultants, branch office, team members, and other resources anticipated to be utilized for this project. Name specific projects (successfully completed within the past five years) where the team members have performed similar projects previously.

Resumes of Key Personnel

Include resumes for key personnel for prime and subconsultants.

References:

References for past projects in the tri-county area (Broward, Palm Beach, and Miami-Dade.) If past projects are not located in the tri-county area references for past projects in other areas of the State of Florida can be provided. Describe the scope of each project in physical terms and by cost, describe the respondent's responsibilities, and provide the contact information (name, email, telephone number) of an individual in a position of responsibility who can attest to respondent's activities in relation to the project.

List any prior projects performed for the City of Pompano Beach.

Office Locations:

Identify the location of the office from which services will be rendered, and the number of professional and administrative staff at the prime office location. Also identify the location of office(s) of the prime and/or sub consultants that may be utilized to support any or all of the professional services listed above and the number of professional and administrative staff at the prime office location.

If firms are situated outside the local area, (Broward, Palm Beach, and Miami-Dade counties) include a brief statement as to whether or not the firm will arrange for a local office during the term of the contract, if necessary.

Minority Business Enterprises:

It is the intent of the City of Pompano Beach to encourage minority and women owned firms to participate in the process. The methods by which this is accomplished should be developed and presented by the respondents in their submissions.

For any member of your team that is a certified Minority Business Enterprise (as defined by the State of Florida) you must include copies of their certifications for them to be considered toward Item 5 in the evaluation criteria. Complete Exhibit I and attach certificates.

Small Business Enterprises:

Completed SBE program forms, Exhibits A-D. Include copies of all SBE certifications for firms listed on these forms.

Local Businesses:

Completed Local Business program forms, Exhibits E-H.

Litigation:

Disclose any litigation within the past five (5) years arising out your firm's performance, including status/outcome.

Acknowledgement of all Addenda issued.

City Forms:

Responses should include all pages of this solicitation, initialed where indicated, in addition to completed SBE and Local Business forms.

7. **Insurance**

The insurance described herein reflects the insurance requirements deemed necessary for this contract by the City. It is not necessary to have this level of insurance in effect at the time of submittal, but certificates indicating that the insurance is currently carried or a letter from the Carrier indicating upgrade ability will speed the review process to determine the most qualified Proposer.

The successful Proposer(s) shall not commence operations until certification or proof of insurance, detailing terms and provisions of coverage, has been received and approved by the City of Pompano Beach Risk Manager.

The following insurance coverage shall be required.

- a. Worker's Compensation Insurance covering all employees and providing benefits as required by Florida Statute, Chapter 440, regardless of the size of the company (number of employees). The Contractor further agrees to be responsible for employment, control and conduct of its employees and for any injury sustained by such employees in the course of their employment.
- b. Liability Insurance
 - 1) Naming the City of Pompano Beach as an additional insured, on General Liability Insurance only, in connection with work being done under this contract.
 - 2) Such Liability insurance shall include the following checked types of insurance and indicated minimum policy limits.

(The rest of this page has been left blank intentionally.)

LIMITS OF LIABILITY

Type of Insurance		each occurrence	aggregate
GENERAL LIABILITY: MINIMUM \$1,000,000 per OCCURRENCE/\$1,000,000 AGGREGATE			
* Policy to be written on a claims incurred basis			
XX	comprehensive form		
XX	premises - operations	bodily injury	
—	explosion & collapse hazard	property damage	
—	underground hazard		
—	products/completed operations hazard	bodily injury and property damage	
XX	contractual insurance	combined	
XX	broad form property damage		
XX	independent contractors		
XX	personal injury	personal injury	

AUTOMOBILE LIABILITY: MINIMUM \$1,000,000 per OCCURRENCE/\$1,000,000 AGGREGATE

		bodily injury (each person)	
		bodily injury (each accident)	
XX	comprehensive form	property damage	
XX	owned		
XX	hired	bodily injury and property damage	
XX	non-owned	combined	

REAL & PERSONAL PROPERTY

XX comprehensive form Consultant must show proof they have this coverage.

EXCESS LIABILITY

XX	umbrella form	bodily injury and property damage		
XX	other than umbrella	combined	\$2,000,000.	\$2,000,000.
XX	PROFESSIONAL LIABILITY		\$2,000,000.	\$2,000,000.
	* Policy to be written on a claims made basis			

The certification or proof of insurance must contain a provision for notification to the City, and the City's contracted law enforcement provider if applicable, thirty (30) days in advance of any material change in coverage or cancellation.

The successful Proposer shall furnish to the City the certification or proof of insurance required by the provisions set forth above, within ten (10) days after notification of award of contract.

8. Selection/Evaluation Process

A Selection/Evaluation Committee will be appointed to select the most qualified firm(s). The Selection/Evaluation Committee will present their findings to the City Commission.

The Committee will rank responses based upon the following criteria.

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Point Range</u>
1. Prior experience of the firm with projects of similar size and complexity:	0-45 points
a. Number of similar projects	
b. Complexity of similar projects	
c. References from past projects performed by the firm	
d. Previous projects performed for the City (provide description)	
e. Litigation within the past 5 years arising out of firm's performance (list, describe outcome)	
2. Qualifications of personnel including sub consultants:	0-35 points
a. Organizational chart for project	
b. Number of technical staff	
c. Qualifications of technical staff:	
(1) Number of licensed staff	
(2) Education of staff	
(3) Experience of staff on similar projects	
3. Proximity of the nearest office to the project location:	0-10 points
a. Location	
b. Number of staff at the nearest office	
4. Is the firm a certified minority business enterprise as defined by the Florida Small and Minority Business Assistance Act of 1985? (Certification of any sub-contractors should also be included with the response.)	0-10 points

Value of Work Previously Awarded to Firm (Tie-breaker) - In the event of a tie, the firm with the lowest value of work as a prime contractor on City of Pompano Beach projects within the last five years will receive the higher ranking, the firm with the next lowest value of work shall receive the next highest ranking, and so on. The analysis of past work will be based on the City's Purchase Order and payment records.

The Committee has the option to use the above criteria for the initial ranking to short-list Proposers and to use an ordinal ranking system to score short-listed Proposers following

presentations (if deemed necessary) with a score of "1" assigned to the short-listed Proposer deemed most qualified by the Committee.

Each firm should submit documentation that evidences the firm's capability to provide the services required for the Committee's review for short listing purposes. After an initial review of the Proposals, the City may invite Proposers for an interview to discuss the proposal and meet firm representatives, particularly key personnel who would be assigned to the project. Should interviews be deemed necessary, it is understood that the City shall incur no costs as a result of this interview, nor bear any obligation in further consideration of the submittal.

When more than three responses are received, the committee shall furnish the City Commission (for their approval) a listing, in ranked order, of no fewer than three firms deemed to be the most highly qualified to perform the service. If three or less firms respond to the RLI, the list will contain the ranking of all responses.

The City Commission has the authority to (including, but not limited to); approve the recommendation; reject the recommendation and direct staff to re-advertise the solicitation; or, review the responses themselves and/or request oral presentations and determine a ranking order that may be the same or different from what was originally presented to the City Commission.

9. Hold Harmless and Indemnification

Proposer covenants and agrees that it will indemnify and hold harmless the City and all of its officers, agents, and employees from any claim, loss, damage, cost, charge or expense arising out of any act, action, neglect or omission by the Proposer, whether direct or indirect, or whether to any person or property to which the City or said parties may be subject, except that neither the Proposer nor any of its subcontractors will be liable under this section for damages arising out of injury or damage to persons or property directly caused by or resulting from the sole negligence of the City or any of its officers, agents or employees.

10. Retention of Records and Right to Access

The selected firm shall maintain during the term of the contract all books of account, receipt invoices, reports and records in accordance with generally accepted accounting practices and standards. The form of all records and reports shall be subject to the approval of the City's Internal Auditor. The selected firm must comply with the Internal Auditor's recommendation for changes, additions, or deletions. The City's Internal Auditor must be permitted during normal business hours to audit and examine the books of account, reports, and records relating to this contract. The selected firm shall maintain and make available such records and files for the duration of the contract and retain them until the expiration of three years after final payment under the contract.

11. Communications

No negotiations, decisions, or actions shall be initiated or executed by the firm as a result of any discussions with any City employee. Only those communications, which are in writing from the City, may be considered as a duly authorized expression on behalf of the

City. In addition, only communications from firms that are signed and in writing will be recognized by the City as duly authorized expressions on behalf of firms.

12. No Discrimination

There shall be no discrimination as to race, sex, color, age, religion, or national origin in the operations conducted under any contract with the City.

13. Independent Contractor

The selected firm will conduct business as an independent contractor under the terms of this contract. Personnel services provided by the firm shall be by employees of the firm and subject to supervision by the firm, and not as officers, employees, or agents of the City. Personnel policies, tax responsibilities, social security and health insurance, employee benefits, purchasing policies and other similar administrative procedures applicable to services rendered under this agreement shall be those of the firm.

14. Staff Assignment

The City of Pompano Beach reserves the right to approve or reject, for any reasons, Proposer's staff assigned to this project at any time. Background checks may be required.

15. Contract Terms

The contract resulting from this RLI shall include, but not be limited to the following terms:

The contract shall include as a minimum, the entirety of this RLI document, together with the successful Proposer's proposal. Contract shall be prepared by the City of Pompano Beach City Attorney.

If the City of Pompano Beach defends any claim, demand, cause of action, or lawsuit arising out of any act, action, negligent acts or negligent omissions, or willful misconduct of the contractor, its employees, agents or servants during the performance of the contract, whether directly or indirectly, contractor agrees to reimburse the City of Pompano Beach for all expenses, attorney's fees, and court costs incurred in defending such claim, cause of action or lawsuit.

16. Waiver

It is agreed that no waiver or modification of the contract resulting from this RLI, or of any covenant, condition or limitation contained in it shall be valid unless it is in writing and duly executed by the party to be charged with it, and that no evidence of any waiver or modification shall be offered or received in evidence in any proceeding, arbitration, or litigation between the parties arising out of or affecting this contract, or the right or obligations of any party under it, unless such waiver or modification is in writing, duly executed as above. The parties agree that the provisions of this paragraph may not be waived except by a duly executed writing.

17. Survivorship Rights

This contract resulting from this RLI shall be binding on and inure to the benefit of the respective parties and their executors, administrators, heirs, personal representative, successors and assigns.

18. Termination

The contract resulting from this RLI may be terminated by the City of Pompano Beach without cause upon providing contractor with a least sixty (60) days prior written notice.

Should either party fail to perform any of its obligations under the contract resulting from this RLI for a period of thirty (30) days after receipt of written notice of such failure, the non-defaulting part will have the right to terminate the contract immediately upon delivery of written notice to the defaulting part of its election to do so. The foregoing rights of termination are in addition to any other rights and remedies that such party may have.

19. Manner of Performance

Proposer agrees to perform its duties and obligations under the contract resulting from this RLI in a professional manner and in accordance with all applicable local, federal and state laws, rules and regulations.

Proposer agrees that the services provided under the contract resulting from this RLI shall be provided by employees that are educated, trained and experienced, certified and licensed in all areas encompassed within their designated duties. Proposer agrees to furnish the City of Pompano Beach with all documentation, certification, authorization, license, permit, or registration currently required by applicable laws or rules and regulations. Proposer further certifies that it and its employees are now in and will maintain good standing with such governmental agencies and that it and its employees will keep all license, permits, registration, authorization or certification required by applicable laws or regulations in full force and effect during the term of this contract. Failure of Proposer to comply with this paragraph shall constitute a material breach of contract.

20. Acceptance Period

Proposals submitted in response to this RLI must be valid for a period no less than ninety (90) days from the closing date of this solicitation.

21. RLI Conditions and Provisions

The proposal must be submitted to the City on or before the time and date stated herein. All Proposers, by submission of a proposal, shall agree to comply with all of the conditions, requirements and instructions of this RLI as stated or implied herein. All proposals and supporting materials submitted will become the property of the City.

Exceptions or deviations to this solicitation may not be added after the submittal date.

All Proposers are required to provide all information requested in this RLI. Failure to do so may result in disqualification of the proposal.

The City reserves the right to postpone or cancel this RLI, or reject all proposals, if in its sole discretion it deems it to be in the best interest of the City to do so.

The City reserves the right to waive any technical or formal errors or omissions and to reject all proposals, or to award contract for the items herein, in part or whole, if it is determined to be in the best interests of the City to do so.

The City shall not be liable for any costs incurred by the Proposer in the preparation of proposals or for any work performed in connection therein.

22. Standard Provisions

a. Governing Law

Any agreement resulting from this RLI shall be governed by the laws of the State of Florida, and the venue for any legal action relating to such agreement will be in Broward County, Florida.

b. Licenses

In order to perform public work, the successful Proposer shall:
Be licensed to do business in Florida, if an entity, and hold or obtain such Contractor' and Business Licenses if required by State Statutes or local ordinances.

c. Conflict Of Interest

For purposes of determining any possible conflict of interest, each Proposer must disclose if any Elected Official, Appointed Official, or City Employee is also an owner, corporate officer, or an employee of the firm. If any Elected Official, Appointed Official, or City Employee is an owner, corporate officer, or an employee, the Proposer must file a statement with the Broward County Supervisor of Elections pursuant to §112.313, Florida Statutes.

d. Drug Free Workplace

The selected firm(s) will be required to verify they will operate a "Drug Free Workplace" as set forth in Florida Statute, 287.087.

e. Public Entity Crimes

A person or affiliate who has been placed on the convicted vendor list following a conviction for public entity crime may not submit a proposal on a contract to provide any goods or services to a public entity, may not submit a proposal on a contract with a public entity for the construction or repair of a public building or public work, may not submit proposals on leases of real property to public entity, may not be awarded or perform work as a contractor, supplier, subcontractor, or consultant under a contract with any public entity, and may not transact business with any public entity in excess of the threshold amount provided in Florida Statute, Section 287.017, for CATEGORY TWO for a period of 36 months from the date of being placed on the convicted vendor list.

f. Patent Fees, Royalties, And Licenses

If the selected Proposer requires or desires to use any design, trademark, device, material or process covered by letters of patent or copyright, the selected Proposer and his surety shall indemnify and hold harmless the City from any and all claims for infringement by reason of the use of any such patented design, device, trademark, copyright, material or process in connection with the work agreed to be performed and shall indemnify the City from any cost, expense, royalty or damage which the City may be obligated to pay by reason of any infringement at any time during or after completion of the work.

g. Familiarity With Laws

It is assumed the selected firm(s) will be familiar with all federal, state and local laws, ordinances, rules and regulations that may affect its services pursuant to this RLI. Ignorance on the part of the firm will in no way relieve the firm from responsibility.

h. Withdrawal Of Proposals

A firm may withdraw its proposal without prejudice no later than the advertised deadline for submission of proposals by written communication to the General Services Department, 1190 N.E. 3rd Avenue, Building C, Pompano Beach, Florida 33060.

i. Composition Of Project Team

Firms are required to commit that the principals and personnel named in the proposal will perform the services throughout the contractual term unless otherwise provided for by way of a negotiated contract or written amendment to same executed by both parties. No diversion or substitution of principals or personnel will be allowed unless a written request that sets forth the qualifications and experience of the proposed replacement(s) is submitted to and approved by the City in writing.

j. Invoicing/Payment

All invoices should be sent to City of Pompano Beach, Accounts Payable, P.O. Drawer 1300, Pompano Beach, Florida, 33061. In accordance with Florida Statutes, Chapter 218, payment will be made within 45 days after receipt of a proper invoice.

k. Public Records

1. The City of Pompano Beach is a public agency subject to Chapter 119, Florida Statutes. The Contractor shall comply with Florida's Public Records Law. Specifically, the Contractor shall:

- a. Keep and maintain public records that ordinarily and necessarily would be required by the City in order to perform the service;
- b. Provide the public with access to such public records on the same terms and conditions that the City would provide the records and at a cost that

does not exceed that provided in chapter 119, Fla. Stat., or as otherwise provided by law;

- c. Ensure that public records that are exempt or that are confidential and exempt from public record requirements are not disclosed except as authorized by law; and
- d. Meet all requirements for retaining public records and transfer to the City, at no cost, all public records in possession of the contractor upon termination of the contract and destroy any duplicate public records that are exempt or confidential and exempt. All records stored electronically must be provided to the City in a format that is compatible with the information technology systems of the agency.

- 2. The failure of Contractor to comply with the provisions set forth in this Article shall constitute a Default and Breach of this Agreement and the City shall enforce the Default in accordance with the provisions set forth herein.

23. Questions and Communication

All questions regarding the RLI are to be submitted in writing to the Purchasing Office, 1190 N.E. 3rd Avenue, Building C (Front), Pompano Beach, Florida 33060, fax (954) 786-4168, or email purchasing@copbfl.com. All questions must include the inquiring firm's name, address, telephone number and RLI name and number. Questions must be received at least seven (7) calendar days before the scheduled solicitation opening. Oral and other interpretations or clarifications will be without legal effect. Any addendum necessary to answer questions will be posted to the City's website, and it is the Proposer's responsibility to obtain all addenda before submitting a response to the solicitation.

24. Addenda

The issuance of a written addendum is the only official method whereby interpretation, clarification, or additional information can be given. If any addenda are issued to this solicitation the City will attempt to notify all known prospective Proposers, however, it shall be the responsibility of each Proposer, prior to submitting their response, to contact the City Purchasing Office at (954) 786-4098 to determine if addenda were issued and to make such addenda a part of their proposal.

PROJECT TEAM

RLI NUMBER _____

Federal I.D.# _____

PRIME

Role	Name of Individual Assigned to Project	Number of Years Experience	Education, Degrees
Principal-In-Charge	_____	_____	_____
Project Manager	_____	_____	_____
Asst. Project Manager	_____	_____	_____
Other Key Member	_____	_____	_____
Other Key Member	_____	_____	_____

SUB-CONSULTANT

Role	Company Name and Address of Office Handling This Project	Name of Individual Assigned to the Project
Surveying	_____	_____
	_____	_____
Landscaping	_____	_____
	_____	_____
Engineering	_____	_____
	_____	_____
Other Key Member	_____	_____
	_____	_____
Other Key Member	_____	_____
	_____	_____
Other Key Member	_____	_____
	_____	_____
Other Key Member	_____	_____
	_____	_____

(use attachments if necessary)

EXHIBIT "A"
CITY OF POMPANO BEACH, FLORIDA
SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE
PARTICIPATION FORM

RLI Number & Title:

Contractor's Name:

<u>Name of Firm</u>	<u>Contact Person, Telephone Number</u>	<u>Type of Work to be Performed</u>	<u>Contract Percentage of Work</u>
---------------------	---	-------------------------------------	--

(INCLUDE CERTIFICATES FOR ANY FIRMS LISTED ON THIS PAGE)

FOR CITY USE ONLY

Total SBE Contract Participation _____

Are documents requested submitted accordingly YES NO

EXHIBIT "B"
SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE
LETTER OF INTENT TO PERFORM AS A SUBCONTRACTOR

RLI Number _____

TO: _____
(Name of Prime or General Contractor)

The undersigned intends to perform subcontracting work in connection with the above contract as (check below)

_____ an individual

_____ a corporation

_____ a partnership

_____ a joint venture

The undersigned is prepared to perform the following work in connection with the above Contract, as hereafter described in detail:

(Date)

(Name of SBE Contractor)

BY: _____

EXHIBIT "C"
SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE
UNAVAILABILITY FORM

RLI # _____

I, _____
(Name and Title)

of _____, certify that on the _____ day of _____, _____, I invited the following SBE CONTRACTOR(s) to bid work items to be performed in the City of Pompano Beach:

SBE Contractor Address	Work Items Sought	Form of Bid Sought (i.e., Unit Price, Materials/Labor, Labor Only, etc.)
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

Said SBE CONTRACTOR(s):

- _____ Did not bid in response to the invitation
- _____ Submitted a bid that was not the low responsible bid
- _____ Other: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Note: Attach additional documents as available.

EXHIBIT "D"
SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE
GOOD FAITH EFFORT REPORT

RLI # _____

1. What portions of the contract have you identified as SBE opportunities?

2. Did you provide adequate information to identified SBE? Please comment on how you provided this information.

3. Did you send written notices to SBEs?

Yes No

If yes, please include copy of the notice and the list of individuals who were forwarded copies of the notices.

4. Did you advertise in local publications?

Yes No

If yes, please attach copies of the ads, including name and dates of publication.

5. Did you contact any organizations with large constituents of SBE members for possible sub-contractors? Please attach list of resource organizations used.

6. What type of efforts did you make to assist SBEs in contracting with you?

7. List the SBEs you will utilize and subcontract percentage of work.

8. Other comments: _____

Note: Please attach the unavailability letters with this report.

EXHIBIT E
CITY OF POMPANO BEACH, FLORIDA
LOCAL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION FORM

RLI Number & Title: _____

Prime Contractor's Name: _____

<u>Name of Firm, Address</u>	<u>Contact Person, Telephone Number</u>	<u>Type of Work to be Performed</u>	<u>% of Work</u>

EXHIBIT G
LOCAL BUSINESS
UNAVAILABILITY FORM

RLI # _____

I, _____
(Name and Title)

of _____, certify that on the _____ day of

_____, _____, I invited the following LOCAL BUSINESSES to bid work items to be performed in the City of Pompano Beach:

Business Name, Address	Work Items Sought	Form of Bid Sought (i.e., Unit Price, Materials/Labor, Labor Only, etc.)
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

Said Local Businesses:

- ___ Did not bid in response to the invitation
- ___ Submitted a bid which was not the low responsible bid
- ___ Other: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Note: Attach additional documents as available.

EXHIBIT H
GOOD FAITH EFFORT REPORT
LOCAL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION

RLI # _____

1. What portions of the contract have you identified as Local Business opportunities?

2. Did you provide adequate information to identified Local Businesses? Please comment on how you provided this information.

3. Did you send written notices to Local Businesses?

___ Yes ___ No

If yes, please include copy of the notice and the list of individuals who were forwarded copies of the notices.

4. Did you advertise in local publications?

___ Yes ___ No

If yes, please attach copies of the ads, including name and dates of publication.

5. What type of efforts did you make to assist Local Businesses in contracting with you ?

7. List the Local Businesses you will utilize and subcontract percentage of work.

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

8. Other comments: _____

STATEMENT OF NO RESPONSE
RLI L-40-15 CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR
WATER AND REUSE TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS

If you do not intend to submit on this requirement, please complete and return this form by the submittal deadline to the City of Pompano Beach Purchasing Division, Building C, 1190 N.E. 3rd Avenue, Pompano Beach, Florida 33060; this form may be faxed to (954) 786-4168. Failure to respond, either by submitting a proposal, or by submitting a "Statement of No Response" form, may result in your firm's name being removed from our mailing list.

WE, the undersigned, have declined to submit on this solicitation for the following reason(s):

- _____ We do not offer this product or an equivalent
- _____ Our workload would not permit us to perform
- _____ Insufficient time to respond to the Request for Letters of Interest
- _____ Unable to meet specifications (explain below)
- _____ Other (specify below)

Remarks _____

COMPANY NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

TELEPHONE _____

SIGNATURE/TITLE _____

DATE _____