

**EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEETING  
CEI SERVICES FOR PAGES DAIRY ROAD WIDENING  
(Bid No. NC20-013)  
THURSDAY, JUNE 18, 2020 at 3:00 P.M.**

A noticed evaluation meeting was held this 18th day of June, 2020, at 3:00 p.m. via teleconference, to rank bidding firms (KCI Technologies, AECOM Technical Services, Lochner, Keville Enterprises, CSI Geo, and England-Thims and Miller (ETM)) for CEI Services for Pages Dairy Road Widening (Bid No. NC20-013).

Voting committee members present via GoTo Meeting were Robert Companion, County Engineer; Katie Peay, Nassau County Engineering Services; Gabe Porter, Nassau County Engineering Department; and Abby Weiss, Nassau County Planning Department; John Cox, Grants Administrator, and Sharon Johns as facilitators; recording secretary, Amanda Manzanilla and observer, Peggy Snyder were present. Public observers included Jeff Carpenter, AECOM; James Cuneo, Karle Maye, and William Price CSI Geo; and Kent Miller, ETM.

John Cox called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m. Mr. Cox advised, this is the first evaluation meeting for ranking bidding firms KCI, AECOM, Lochner, Keville, CSI, and ETM. An evaluation of six evaluation criteria followed. For each criteria, elements were discussed and points assigned.

**1. Compliance with RFQ Instructions – 5 points**

Mr. Companion initiated the discussion by stating that all firms followed the instructions provided by the County. He motioned that each firm receives 5 points. The motion was seconded by Ms. Weiss, and the vote carried unanimously.

| <i>EVALUATION CRITERIA I</i> |     |       |         |         |     |     |
|------------------------------|-----|-------|---------|---------|-----|-----|
| <i>FIRM</i>                  | KCI | AECOM | Lochner | Keville | CSI | ETM |
| <i>SCORE</i>                 | 5   | 5     | 5       | 5       | 5   | 5   |

**2. Firms qualifications and experience – 20 points**

- 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.**

Mr. Companion addressed the experience of CSI and ETM have as working sub-contractors.

Discussion ensued in order to reach consensus. Mr. Porter agreed to raise his 19 points assigned to Lochner to 20 in order for an unanimous score to be reached. Mr. Companion motioned for numbers to be recorded as follows. The motion was seconded by Ms. Weiss, and the vote carried unanimously.

| <i>EVALUATION CRITERIA 2</i> |     |       |         |         |     |     |
|------------------------------|-----|-------|---------|---------|-----|-----|
| <i>FIRM</i>                  | KCI | AECOM | Lochner | Keville | CSI | ETM |
| <i>SCORE</i>                 | 18  | 18    | 20      | 17      | 17  | 20  |

**3. Project Team/Abilities and Expertise – 15 points**

- a. The adequacy of the firm's professional key personnel and project team to be assigned to
- 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 projects described in this RFQ.

The Committee shared their individual scores and reached consensus. Mr. Companion motioned for the numbers to be recorded as follows. The motion was seconded by Ms. Peay, and the vote carried unanimously.

| <i>EVALUATION CRITERIA 3</i> |     |       |         |         |     |     |
|------------------------------|-----|-------|---------|---------|-----|-----|
| <i>FIRM</i>                  | KCI | AECOM | Lochner | Keville | CSI | ETM |
| <i>SCORE</i>                 | 14  | 14    | 14      | 13      | 14  | 15  |

**4. Project Approach – 35 points**

- a. Firm's detailed 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 in the 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 for the project
- d. Firm's proposed schedule for services, timely initiation, and completion of all work.

Mr. Companion shared that the ETM proposal included an approach specific to Pages Dairy Road. Mr. Porter stated that he favored the manner in which AECOM addressed railroad and school. He noted some of the firms addressed school and rail but not MOT and vice versa. Mr. Companion motioned for numbers to be recorded as follows. The motion was seconded by Ms. Weiss, and the vote carried unanimously.

| <i>EVALUATION CRITERIA 4</i> |     |       |         |         |     |     |
|------------------------------|-----|-------|---------|---------|-----|-----|
| <i>FIRM</i>                  | KCI | AECOM | Lochner | Keville | CSI | ETM |
| <i>SCORE</i>                 | 32  | 31    | 31      | 31      | 32  | 33  |

**5. Quality Control – 10 points**

- a. The proposal will be evaluated on the quality of the control process to be implemented to ensure that quality work products and services can be delivered in a timely manner.

Mr. Companion stated that CSI and KSI displayed more attention to detail. The Committee shared their individual scores and reached consensus. Mr. Companion motioned for numbers to be recorded as follows. The motion was seconded by Ms. Weiss, and the vote carried unanimously.

| <i>EVALUATION CRITERIA 5</i> |     |       |         |         |     |     |
|------------------------------|-----|-------|---------|---------|-----|-----|
| <i>FIRM</i>                  | KCI | AECOM | Lochner | Keville | CSI | ETM |
| <i>SCORE</i>                 | 8   | 8     | 7       | 7       | 8   | 7   |

**6. Previous Projects/References – 15 points**

- 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 the County, other adjacent counties and other state or federal agencies will be considered.**

AECOM was docked one point for references with the remaining firms receiving the full 15 available points. All of AECOM's references were from the same source – Collier County. Mr. Companion motioned for numbers to be recorded as follows. The motion was seconded by Mr. Porter, and the vote carried unanimously.

| <i>EVALUATION CRITERIA 6</i> |     |       |         |         |     |     |
|------------------------------|-----|-------|---------|---------|-----|-----|
| <i>FIRM</i>                  | KCI | AECOM | Lochner | Keville | CSI | ETM |
| <i>SCORE</i>                 | 15  | 14    | 15      | 15      | 15  | 15  |

Mr. Companion stated the calculated scores before the Committee as follows:

| <i>FINAL EVALUATION SCORE</i> |     |       |         |         |     |     |
|-------------------------------|-----|-------|---------|---------|-----|-----|
| <i>FIRM</i>                   | KCI | AECOM | Lochner | Keville | CSI | ETM |
| <i>SCORE</i>                  | 92  | 90    | 92      | 88      | 91  | 95  |

Ms. Johns shared the rankings of bidding firms, based upon the Final Evaluation Score.

| <i>RANKING OF FIRMS</i> |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
|-------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| <i>FIRM</i>             | ETM             | KCI             | Lochner         | CSI             | AECOM           | Keville         |
| <i>RANKING</i>          | 1 <sup>st</sup> | 2 <sup>nd</sup> | 3 <sup>rd</sup> | 4 <sup>th</sup> | 5 <sup>th</sup> | 6 <sup>th</sup> |
| <i>SCORE</i>            | 95              | 92              | 92              | 91              | 90              | 88              |

Mr. Companion motioned to approve the rankings. The motion was seconded by Ms. Weiss. Vote carried unanimously.

Ms. Johns was questioned by the clerk's office of the subsequent steps and whether oral presentations will be heard. Ms. Johns informed that the rankings of the firms are the sole purpose and plan of the evaluation committee at this time.

There being no further business, the evaluation session adjourned at 4:04 p.m.

EVALUATION SCORE SHEET  
CEI SERVICES FOR PAGES DAIRY ROAD WIDENING  
RFQ NO. NC20-013  
EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEETING 6/18/2020

| CRITERIA/SCORE VALUE |  | POINTS | KO Technologies, Inc. | AFCOM Technical Services, Inc. | Lochner | Kenville Enterprises, Inc. | CU Geo | ETH - Englund-Thoma & Miller, Inc. |
|----------------------|--|--------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|---------|----------------------------|--------|------------------------------------|
| 1                    | Compliance with RFQ Instructions -<br>Compliance shall be graded on a scale of 0 - 5 points.   | 0-5    | 5                     | 5                              | 5       | 5                          | 5      | 5                                  |
| 2                    | Firm's Qualifications and Experience -<br>A. The ability and capability of firm to perform services of this type.<br>B. Firm's experience and expertise on similar projects.<br>C. Firm's ability to communicate, work effectively in a group and build consensus with staff, elected officials, board, committees and the public.<br>D. Firm's experience regarding project budgets and schedules, and their demonstrated ability to meet both.<br>Qualifications and Experience shall be graded on a scale of 0 - 20 points.   | 0-20   | 18                    | 18                             | 20      | 17                         | 17     | 20                                 |
| 3                    | Project Team/Abilities and Expertise -<br>A. The adequacy of the firm's professional key personnel and project team to be assigned to the project.<br>B. Project team's previous experience demonstrates success in completing projects.<br>C. Project team's previous experience program schedule, budget, and technical requirements that are directly relevant to the projects described in this RFQ.<br>Team Abilities and Expertise shall be graded on a scale of 0 - 15 points.  | 0-15   | 14                    | 14                             | 14      | 13                         | 14     | 15                                 |
| 4                    | PROJECT APPROACH -<br>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 the County.<br>B. Firm's methods employed to ensure prompt service, customer satisfaction, and prompt complaint resolution.<br>C. Responsibilities and capabilities of the management and staff personnel, including sub-contractors, who will work on the project.<br>D. Firm's proposed schedule for services, timely initiation and completion of all work.<br>Project Approach shall be graded on a scale of 0 - 35 points. | 0-35   | 32                    | 31                             | 31      | 31                         | 32     | 33                                 |
| 5                    | QUALITY CONTROL -<br>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.<br>Quality Control shall be graded on a scale of 0 - 10 points.   | 0-10   | 8                     | 8                              | 7       | 7                          | 8      | 7                                  |
| 6                    | PREVIOUS PROJECTS/REFERENCES -<br>A. Firm's references with emphasis on similar size projects.<br>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 the County, other adjacent counties and other state or federal agencies will be considered.<br>Projects and References shall be graded on a scale of 0 - 15 points.   | 0-15   | 15                    | 14                             | 15      | 15                         | 15     | 15                                 |
| TOTAL SCORE:         |  | 100    | 92                    | 90                             | 92      | 88                         | 91     | 95                                 |

Evaluation Committee Signatures:

Robert Companion Robby Peery 06/19/2020  
Katie Peay Katie Peay 06/22/2020  
Gabe Porter Gabe Porter 06/22/2020  
Abigail Weiss Abigail Weiss 06/22/2020

Ranking: 2 5 3 6 4 1

YULEE, FLORIDA  
MAY 21, 2020

Pursuant to advertisement, Requests for Qualifications (RFQs) were received for "CEI SERVICES FOR PAGES DAIRY ROAD WIDENING" - Bid No. NC20-013". Proof of publication was present. The Requests for Qualifications (RFQs) were due by 4:00 p.m. on May 20, 2020 and opened at 10:00 a.m. on May 21, 2020, by Brenda Linville and Peggy Snyder, Deputy Clerks, at the Robert M. Foster Justice Center, 76347 Veteran's Way, Yulee, Florida. This bid opening was open to the public; however, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the bid opening was held via GoTo Meeting. Present representing Nassau County Contract Management were Grayson Hagins and Sharon Johns. Also in attendance as observers were Jessica White, Kimley Horn; and Jeff Carpenter, AECOM Technical.

KCI Technologies, Inc.

11043 Crystal Springs Road, Unit 8  
Jacksonville, FL 32221

Bid Received 5-18-20 at 2:12 p.m.

AECOM Technical Services, Inc.

4168 Southpoint Parkway South, Suite 205  
Jacksonville, FL 32216

Bid Received 5-19-20 at 12:42 p.m.

Lochner

Jacksonville Office  
5011 Gate Parkway Building 100, Suite 120,  
Jacksonville, FL 32256

Bid Received 5-19-20 at 12:46 p.m.

Keville Enterprises, Inc.

301 West Bay Street, Suite 1406  
Jacksonville, FL 32202

Bid Received 5-20-20 at 1:02 p.m.

CSI Geo

2394 St. John Bluff Road, South, Suite 200  
Jacksonville, FL 32246

Bid Received 5-20-20 at 1:09 p.m.

ETM - England-Thims & Miller, Inc.

463688 State Road 200, Unit 7

Yulee, FL 32097

Bid Received 5-20-20 2:07 p.m.