

**EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEETING  
FACILITIES SPACE NEEDS ASSESSMENT (FSNA)  
(Bid No. NC20-007)  
THURSDAY, JUNE 11, 2020 at 3:00 P.M.**

A noticed evaluation meeting was held this 11th day of June, 2020, at 3:00 p.m. via teleconference, to rank bidding firms (AJAX, CGL, Novus, and Skinner) for Facilities Space Needs Assessment (FSNA) (Bid No. NC20-007).

Present via GoTo Meeting were Robert Companion, County Engineer; John Crawford, Nassau County Clerk of the Circuit Court; Megan Diehl, Office of Management and Budget Director; Michael Hickcox, Property Appraiser; Mitch Keiter; Nassau County Chief of Operations; Lisa Lynch, Office of Management and Budget Finance Manager; Doug Podiak, Public Works Director; Taco Pope, Assistant County Manager; John Cox, Grants Administrator, as facilitator; and recording Secretary, Amanda Manzanilla.

Mr. Cox called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m. He advised, this is the first evaluation meeting for ranking bidding firms AJAX, CGL, Novus, and Skinner. Mr. Pope explained to the committee that this meeting is step one in a step-two process. The FSNA will provide base data and reasons for county facility needs at the judicial complex. An evaluation of each six evaluation criteria followed. For each criteria, elements were discussed and points assigned.

**1. Qualifications and Experience – 50 points**

**a. Firm's past experience and performance on comparable public facilities space needs assessments – 0-25 points.**

- i. Ms. Diehl opined that AJAX has earned all 25 possible points for this component. Mr. Pope agreed and confirmed that the firm is out of Jacksonville. The general consensus differed, that while AJAX scored fairly high, CGL performed better on this component in regards to judicial projects. After discussion, Mr. Pope motioned that the scores for criteria 1a be recorded as follows: AJAX 23, CGL 25, Novus 21, and Skinner 21. Counter discussion by Ms. Diehl and Mr. Keiter ensued regarding the quality of the Novus proposal and departmental needs. Ms. Diehl proposed amending the scores for recording: AJAX 23, CGL 25, Novus 18, and Skinner 21. The amended scores were seconded by Mr. Podiak.

CRITERIA 1A.	
FIRM	SCORE
AJAX	23
CGL	25
Novus	18
Skinner	21

- b. **Firm's references with emphasis on similar engagements. Proposal will be evaluated on the basis of experiences that include the services outlined in the Scope of Work. Projects completed for adjacent counties and other state or federal agencies will be considered – 0-10 points.**

- i. Mr. Keiter stated that he holds similar opinions for this criteria as he did for the previous criteria. Ms. Diehl agreed and motioned for scores to be recorded as AJAX 9, CGL 10, Novus 7, and Skinner 8. Mr. Pope indicated that AJAX included actual letters of recommendation. Mr. Keiter stated that as the RFQ did not require the letters, equal opportunity was not provided to all firms to provide them. The scores motioned by Ms. Diehl were recorded. The committee reached consensus. There was not a second.

CRITERIA 1B.	
FIRM	SCORE
AJAX	9
CGL	10
Novus	7
Skinner	8

**c. The quality and experience of the firm’s professional in-house personnel and any sub consultants to be assigned to the project – 0-15 points.**

- i. The committee discussed the firms professionals contained in-house and assigned to the proposed project. Ms. Diehl noted that Skinner’s assigned personnel presented as very inexperienced to the type of work requested. Mr. Keiter concurred. Mr. Pope motioned that scores be recorded as AJAX 15, CGL 15, Novus 12, and Skinner 10. The committee reached consensus. There was not a second.

CRITERIA 1C.	
FIRM	SCORE
AJAX	15
CGL	15
Novus	12
Skinner	10

**2. Work Plan – 50 points**

**a. Adequacy of firm’s detailed work plan including staffing plan, data collection, analysis methodologies, and final report delivery format – 0-25 points.**

- i. Discussion ensued on proposal presentation, the ability to follow it, goal setting, and scheduling. Mr. Pope iterated the importance of criteria(s) 2a and 2b and their means of exhibiting the firm’s understanding of project goals. The committee discussed the vital perspective that the RFQ calls for a needs assessment to develop a master plan later and criteria(s) 2a and 2b indicate which firms have not been able to isolate the steps in the process and remain within scope. Mr. Pope inquired of Mr. Podiak his opinion referencing his management experience of large-scale, multi-year, projects. Mr. Podiak shared his preference for the work schedule systematically presented by AJAX and thus scored them the maximum 25 points and CGL 23 points. No official motion was made, the committee reached consensus. After further discussion, the final determined numbers for criteria 2a were determined as AJAX 25, CGL 22, Novus 15, and Skinner 15.

CRITERIA 2A.	
FIRM	SCORE
AJAX	25
CGL	22
Novus	15
Skinner	15

**b. Understanding of the purpose and future use of the FSNA report by the County as outlined in this RFQ – 0-10 points.**

- i. Mr. Pope began by stating, Skinner’s proposed steps included a flaw – to examine the Master Plan – indicating their lack of understanding the project scope. He further stated that AJAX was most on-point at articulating their understanding of the project. Ms. Diehl motioned that scores be recorded as AJAX 10, CGL 9, Novus 7, and Skinner 5. The committee reached consensus. There was not a second.

CRITERIA 2B.	
FIRM	SCORE
AJAX	10
CGL	9
Novus	7
Skinner	5

**c. Demonstration of how deliverables will be formatted to incorporate functionality for the intended use by the County for its described purpose – 0-10 points.**

- i. The committee discussed how precisely the AJAX proposal mirrored the RFP, County requests, and expectations. The committee also discussed how AJAX’s presented deliverables demonstrate their understanding of what the County is looking for and needs. Discussion was also had on specific shortcomings of the Novus, Skinner, and CGL proposals. Ms. Diehl opined that Skinner and CGL provided the same level of information. Mr. Companion motioned that scores be recorded as AJAX 10, CGL 8, Novus 5, and Skinner 8. The committee reached consensus. There was not a second.

CRITERIA 2C.	
FIRM	SCORE
AJAX	10
CGL	8
Novus	5
Skinner	8

**d. Proposed Schedule – 0-5 points.**

- i. Mr. Companion shared that he found the schedule provided by AJAX as decent and gave them 4 points, the highest of the firms; however, it still lacked a critical path. Mr. Keiter stated that as Novus did not provide a schedule they earned a score of 0. Mr. Pope pointed to the AJAX schedule, noting a 5 months completion expectation, versus CGL's expected completion of a year. No official motion made, the committee reached consensus. After further discussion, the final determined numbers for criteria 2d were determined as AJAX 4, CGL 3, Novus 0, and Skinner 2.

CRITERIA 2D.	
FIRM	SCORE
AJAX	4
CGL	3
Novus	0
Skinner	2

Mr. Cox calculated the final scores and shared the totals to the committee.

FINAL EVALUATION SCORE	
FIRM	SCORE
AJAX	96
CGL	92
Novus	64
Skinner	69

Ms. Diehl confirmed, after committee agreement to the scores, the next steps were to present the results of the evaluation to the Board of County Commissioners and to ask directions on whether to enter into negotiations.

There being no further business, the evaluation session adjourned at 3:50 p.m.