

**EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEETING
TO SCORE AND RANK REQUESTS FOR QUALIFICATIONS (RFQs) RECEIVED FOR
CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES - BID NO. NC17-006
PUBLIC WORKS CONFERENCE ROOM
THURSDAY, JUNE 15, 2017 – 2:00 P.M.**

A meeting of the Evaluation Committee was held this 15th day of June 2017 at 2:00 p.m. in the Public Works Conference Room at the James S. Page Governmental Complex, Yulee, Florida to conduct an evaluation of the proposals received for the Request for Qualification (RFQs) for Continuing Contract for Engineering Services - Bid No. NC17-006 in order to formulate a recommendation to be presented to the Board of County Commissioners. Representing the Engineering Services Department were Scott Herring, Becky Bray, and Josephine Craver (voting members) and Angela Gregory, Procurement Manager (non-voting), and Charlotte Young as facilitator. Also present were Peggy Snyder and Melissa Lucey, recording secretaries.

Ms. Young called the meeting to order at 2:04 p.m. She explained the purpose of the meeting. Following introductions, Ms. Young reminded the committee members that any notes they may have made during the evaluation must be turned over to her at the conclusion of the meeting which will become part of the public record. In addition, if the evaluation committee members had made any notations in any of the proposal books, those would also have to be turned in as well. Ms. Young explained that they would be reviewing each evaluation criteria for each proposer. Each evaluation committee member will provide their scores for each criteria and a consensus will be given for each firm. RFQ's were received from the following firms: Connelly and Wicker, Inc. (CW); CPH, Inc. (CPH); Dredging and Marine Consultants (DMC); EltonAlan Consulting Engineers; and STV 100 Years (STV).

The evaluation committee reviewed each firm according to the following seven evaluation criterion: 1) Firm's compliance with RFQ instructions (maximum 5 points); 2) Firm's approach to provide engineering services (maximum 25 points); 3) Firm's Quality Assurance/Quality Control procedures (maximum 15 points); 4) Staff qualifications and Firm's background (15 points); 5) Experience with similar projects and Nassau County (maximum 20 points); 6) Firm's schedule and availability (maximum 10 points); and 7) Firm's references (maximum 10 points). The maximum score is 100 points.

The evaluation committee members provided their scores for each firm based on the information contained in the Requests for Qualifications received. Each evaluation committee members provided their reasoning for their scoring based upon the information contained in the proposals. A consensus score was reached for each evaluation criteria item for each of the five firms, based upon discussion of the evaluation committee and the information provided in the proposal. (*See Attachment 1 for scoring for each firm*).

Following review of each firm, Ms. Young read the following total consensus scores for each firm as follows Connelly and Wicker – 79 points; CPH – 84 points; DMC – 55 points; EltonAlan- 85.5 points; and STV – 83 points. She pointed out that the ranking would be: 1 - CPH; 2 - EltonAlan; 3 - STV; 4 - Connelly and Wicker; and 5 – Dredging and Marine Consultants (DMC).

Mr. Herring explained that according to the Request for Qualifications, the committee would select the top two firms. Mr. Herring pointed out that he had concerns with the number of subcontractors. The two firms currently under contract now are CSI and Peters & Yaffee. Peters & Yaffee is a subcontractor to EltonAlan, STV and Connelly and Wicker; however, CPH is ranked number one. He also pointed out that there is a half a point difference between EltonAlan and STV and one point difference between STV and CPH. Mr. Herring expressed concern with eliminating a firm being a half point below without hearing a presentation from the firm. Ms. Young inquired if the committee wanted to hear oral presentations from the top three firms. Discussion followed regarding DMC being more of a marine contractor.

There was consensus to hear oral presentations from the three top ranked firms: CPH, EltonAlan and STV on Thursday, July 13, 2017 beginning at 9:00 a.m. Ms. Young will send letters to the three top-ranked firms to advise them that they have been short-listed and requested to provide oral presentations on that date.

There being no further business to address, the meeting adjourned at 3:22 p.m.

CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES
 Bid Number: NC17-006
 Nassau County, Florida
 Evaluation Criteria & Ranking
 Evaluation Date: 06-15-17

Evaluation Criteria:

		Maximum Points	Tentative Scores						Consensus Scores					
1 Firms' compliance with RFQ instructions (5 Points) The proposals will be evaluated for general compliance with instructions issued in the RFQ. Noncompliance with significant instructions may be grounds for proposal disqualification. A proposal needs to provide the required information in a simple but detailed format.	5		C&W	CPH	DMC	EltonAlan	STV		C&W	CPH	DMC	EltonAlan	STV	
		S	5	5	5	5	4							
		B	4	5	5	4	4							
		J	5	5	5	5	4		4	5	5	5	4	
2 Firm's Approach to Provide Engineering Services. (25 Points) The proposal will be evaluated on the consultant's approach to staffing, administration, and to provide design services for smaller projects. Consideration will be given on any cost saving or innovative approach to project management and engineering design.	25		C&W	CPH	DMC	EltonAlan	STV		C&W	CPH	DMC	EltonAlan	STV	
		S	17	23	10	22	23							
		B	19	14	12	18	20		18	19	12	22	22	
		J	20	20	15	22	22							
3 Firm's Quality Assurance/Quality Control procedures. (15 Points) 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.	15		C&W	CPH	DMC	EltonAlan	STV		C&W	CPH	DMC	EltonAlan	STV	
		S	13	15	10	7	10							
		B	10	11	8	10	10							
		J	14	13	10	12	12		13	14	10	10	10	
4 Staff Qualifications and Firm's Background (15 Points) The proposals will be evaluated on the basis of the consultant's demonstrated staff qualifications, which must include a Professional Engineer licensed in the State of Florida. Also, the proposal will be evaluated on the basis of the consultant's background, including the number of years in business.	15		C&W	CPH	DMC	EltonAlan	STV		C&W	CPH	DMC	EltonAlan	STV	
		S	13	13	5	12	13							
		B	11	10	8	12	10							
		J	14	12	8	14	14		13	12	8	12.5	13	
5 Experience with Similar Projects and Nassau County (20 Points) The proposal will be evaluated on the basis of similar project experiences (see Section Two-List of possible projects.). Projects completed for Nassau County other Counties or Municipal and other state or federal agencies will be considered.	20		C&W	CPH	DMC	EltonAlan	STV		C&W	CPH	DMC	EltonAlan	STV	
		S	18	17	5	18	17							
		B	13	14	10	17	13		13	14	10	17	15	
		J	15	12	10	15	16							
6 Firm's Schedule and Availability The projected resource availability will be evaluated in the choice of the consultants, although Nassau County understands that the actual beginning and completion dates of projects are subject to the notice to proceed. A firm's close proximity to Nassau County would be important	10		C&W	CPH	DMC	EltonAlan	STV		C&W	CPH	DMC	EltonAlan	STV	
		S	10	10	10	10	10							
		B	10	10	8	10	10		10	10	5	10	9	
		J	7	8	2	9	7							
7 Firm's References (10 Points) The proposal will be evaluated based on submittal of references.	10		C&W	CPH	DMC	EltonAlan	STV		C&W	CPH	DMC	EltonAlan	STV	
		S	8	10	5	7	10							
		B	9	10	10	7	10		8	10	5	7	10	
		J	7	8	5	7	8							
TOTAL SCORE			100						79 84 55 83.5 83					
									4 1 5 2 3					

Evaluation Committee:
 Scott Herring
 Becky Bray
 Josephine Carver
 Charlotte Young (Facilitator)
 Angela Gregory (Procurement Manager)

Attachment 1
 Evaluation Committee Meeting
 June 15, 2017 NC17-006