

**EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEETING
TO SCORE AND RANK REQUESTS FOR PRE-QUALIFICATIONS (RFQs) FOR
DESIGN SERVICES FOR WILLIAM BURGESS EXTENSION PROJECT - BID NO. NC19-016
ENGINEERING/PUBLIC SERVICES CONFERENCE ROOM
September 16, 2019 – 11:00 A.M.**

A meeting of the Evaluation Committee was held this 16th day of September, 2019 at 11:00 a.m. in the Engineering/Public Services conference room at the James S. Page Governmental Complex, Yulee, Florida to conduct evaluation, score, and rank proposals for Pre-Qualifications (RFQs) for the Design Services for William Burgess Extension Project, Bid No. NC19-016. Voting members present were Robert Champion, Interim County Engineer; Katie Peay, Engineering Services; Pat Gilroy, Engineering Services and Kailey Saver, Senior Planner. Also present were Grayson Hagins, Contract Manager (non-voting), as facilitator and Melissa Lucey, recording secretary.

Mr. Hagins called the evaluation committee meeting to order at 11:06 a.m. Following introductions, he explained that the purpose of the evaluation committee meeting is to evaluate, score, rank and short list to the top three (3) ranked firms for the proposals received for the pre-qualifications for the Design Services for William Burgess Extension Project. Request for Qualification (RFQ) received were from Civil Services, Inc. (CSI); Pond & Company; Peters & Yaffee; GAI Consultants, Inc.; and McCranie & Associates, Inc.

Mr. Hagins explained that they would be reviewing each evaluation criteria from the proposers. The evaluation criteria will be on the following six (6) factors: 1) Compliance with RFQ Instructions [maximum 5 points]; 2) Firm Qualifications and Experience [maximum 20 points]; 3) Project Team/Abilities and Expertise [maximum 15 points]; 4) Project Approach [maximum 35 points]; 5) Quality Control [maximum 10 points]; and 6) Previous Projects/References [maximum 15 points]. The total maximum score is 100 points. The evaluation committee members provided reasons for their scores contained in the proposals received. A consensus score was reached for each evaluation criteria item for each firm, based upon discussion of the evaluation committee and the information provided in the proposal received. (*See Attachment 1 for scoring for each firm*).

Following the review of each firm, Mr. Hagins advised that the top ranked firm would be GAI Consultants, Inc; and CSI; Pond & Company; and Peters & Yaffee tied for second ranked firm. The top rank firm will be presented to the Board of County Commissioners for approval for the short listing and the Request for Proposal (RFP) for the cost. He reminded the committee members that any notes they may have made during the evaluation must be turned over to him at the conclusion of the meeting which will become part of the public record. In addition, if the evaluation committee members have made any notations in any of the proposal books, those would also have to be turned in as well.

The meeting adjourned at 11:38 a.m.

EVALUATION SCORE SHEET
PROFESSIONAL DESIGN SERVICES FOR WILLIAM BURGESS EXTENSION PROJECT
RFQ NO. NC19-016
EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEETING 9/16/19

	CRITERIA/SCORE VALUE	POINTS	Civil Services, Inc.	Pond & Company	Peters & Yaffee	GAI Consultants, Inc	McCranie & Associates
1	Compliance with RFQ Instructions- Compliance shall be graded on a scale of 0 – 5 points.	0-5	5	5	4	5	3
2	Firms Qualifications and Experience - A.The ability and capability of firm to perform services of this type. B.Firm's experience and expertise on similar projects. C.Firm's ability to communicate, work effectively in a group and build consensus with staff, elected officials, board, committees and the public. D.Firm's experience regarding project budgets and schedules, and their demonstrated ability to meet both. Qualifications and Experience shall be graded on a scale of 0 – 20 points.	0-20	17	18	18	18	18
3	Project Team/Abilities and Expertise – A.The adequacy of the firm's professional key personnel and project team to be assigned to the project. B.Project team's previous experience demonstrates success in completing projects. C.Project team's previous experience program schedule, budget, and technical requirements that are directly relevant to the projects described in this RFQ Team Abilities and Expertise shall be graded on a scale of 0 – 15 points.	0-15	14	15	14	14	13
4	PROJECT APPROACH – A.Firm's detailed project management plan, Interpretation of scope and method of approach. Including any proposed innovative concepts that may enhance value and quality, any favorable cost containment approaches or additional or alternative ideas that may be successful in implemented by Nassau County. B.Firm's methods employed to ensure prompt service, customer satisfaction, and prompt compliant resolution C.Responsibilities and capabilities of the management and staff personnel, including sub-contractors, who will work on the project D.Firm's proposed schedule for services, timely initiation and completion of all work. Project Approach shall be graded on a scale of 0 – 35 points.	0-35	33	31	33	33	32
5	QUALITY CONTROL – A.The proposal will be evaluated on the quality control process to be implemented to ensure that quality work products and services can be delivered in a timely manner Quality Control shall be graded on a scale of 0 – 10 points.	0-10	8	7	8	8	8

EVALUATION SCORE SHEET
PROFESSIONAL DESIGN SERVICES FOR WILLIAM BURGESS EXTENSION PROJECT
RFQ NO. NC19-016
EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEETING 9/16/19

CRITERIA/SCORE VALUE		POINTS	<i>Civil Services, Inc.</i>	<i>Pond & Company</i>	<i>Peters & Yaffee</i>	<i>GAI Consultants, Inc</i>	<i>McCrane & Associates</i>
6	PREVIOUS PROJECTS/REFERENCES-- A. Firm's references with emphasis on similar size projects. Proposal will be evaluated on the basis of project experiences that include projects outlined in the Scope of Work and Services required. Projects completed for counties and other state or federal agencies will be considered. Projects and References shall be graded on a scale of 0 – 15 points.	0-15	13	14	13	14	12
TOTAL SCORE:		100	90	90	90	92	86

Evaluation Committee Signatures:

Robert Companion _____
 Kalley Saver _____
 Katie Peay _____
 Pat Gilroy _____