

**SHORT LIST ORAL PRESENTATIONS/
EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEETING
THURSDAY, JULY 13, 2017 – 8:30 A.M.
BID NO. NC17-006– CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES
COMMISSION CHAMBERS, JAMES S. PAGE GOVERNMENTAL COMPLEX**

A noticed evaluation committee meeting was held this 13th day of July 2017 beginning at 8:30 a.m. in the Commission Chambers, James S. Page Governmental Complex, Yulee, Florida. The purpose of the meeting was to hear oral presentations as part of a competitive solicitation at which vendors will make presentations and may answer questions regarding Bid No. NC17-006 for Continuing Contract for Engineering Services. The three firms presenting were CPH, Inc., EltonAlan, and, STV, Inc.

Evaluation Committee members present were Scott Herring, Public Works Director; Becky Bray, Engineer III; and Josephine Craver, Engineer II (voting members); Angela Gregory, Procurement Manager; and Charlotte Young, Contract Management (facilitators, non-voting members). Also present was Peggy Snyder, recording secretary.

Ms. Young called the meeting to order at 8:54 a.m. noting that this meeting was the short list oral presentations and evaluations for Continuing Contract for Engineering Services, Bid No. NC17-006. The participants introduced themselves for the record. Ms. Young explained the time frame for the firms to make presentation and ensuing questions and answer session.

The first firm to provide presentation was CPH, Inc. represented by Nikhel Jindal, Kurt Luman and Wade Olszewski. Mr. Jindal pointed out that what was unique about CPH was their history in Florida, established since 1981 and the three of them have worked together over 16 years. The firm has 250 staff of which 220 are located in Florida including architects and surveyors which provides a multi-disciplined firm. Mr. Jindal provided an overview of the numerous long-term communities in Florida they have serviced for over 30 years. Mr. Olszewski advised that he is the branch manager for the Jacksonville office and would be the project manager on this contract. Mr. Luman provided an overview of the local projects the firm has done as well as cited examples of projects they have done related to sewer replacement and streetscape design/build, landscaping, drainage and roadway improvements, street widening, resurfacing and turn lane improvements, as well as intersection and pedestrian safety projects include Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) Local Agency Program (LAP) Safe Routes to School project as well as exercise trails. They are very familiar with the FDOT process and funding programs. Mr. Luman reviewed the transportation, drainage projects, and roundabouts. He discussed how CPH identifies roads that need to be resurfaced, overlaid, or actually reconstructed based upon the budget.

In summary, Mr. Jindal explained that their approach is to be an extension of the County's staff and available for any questions. In his PowerPoint, Mr. Jindal provided a list of innovative solutions their firm has implemented such as reducing lane widths to minimize right-of-way impacts. Mr. Luman explained how the firm places an exercise trail or pocket park around the area of retention ponds. The firm is proactive in their coordination with FDOT to ensure that the firm's Maintenance of Traffic (MOT) plans match with FDOT. Mr. Jindal explained that CPH's goal is to spend the county's and citizen's funds as if it was their own money.

The firm responded to the following questions posed by the evaluation committee as follows: 1) Explain how you would provide value engineering on a major intersection improvement that came in over budget. 2) Provide information on your firm's experience performing safety studies that qualify for Federal and State Funding. 3) What is your firm's experience working on LAP projects? 4) Describe your firm's experience with paving dirt roads with a constrained right-of-way. 5) Describe your firm's experience with contractor claims submittals. 6) Describe your firm's experience with right-of-way acquisition and public outreach.

The representatives from CPH, Inc. departed the meeting at 9:30 a.m. There was neither pause in the proceedings nor any action taken.

Mr. Herring advised that the committee will begin their preliminary evaluation and scoring of the CPH, Inc.'s proposal and presentation. Following a lengthy discussion, the evaluation committee as a group agreed to the following score:

CPH, Inc.	Scott Herring	Becky Bray	Josephine Craver
Staff Qualifications and Project Team (Max 25 pts)	20	20	20
Approach and Successfully Completed Projects of Similar Size and Scope (Max 25 points)	20	20	20
Response to Questions (Max 50 points)	40	40	40
Total Points	80	80	80

The next firm to provide presentation was EltonAlan Consulting Engineers. Representing EltonAlan were Dale Dubberly, Paul Doherty, Rachel Lewis and Mike Holcomb. Following introductions, Mr. Dubberly thanked the committee for the opportunity to provide their presentation. He explained that he was the President of EltonAlan as well as a general contractor. His role will be to serve as the Quality Assurance Officer and will provide constructability reviews on all products. Along with Mr. Holcomb, they will insure the designs are buildable and biddable. Mr. Holcomb has overseen many projects in the past in Nassau County and will serve as the Project Manager and Engineer of Record; Mr. Doherty will serve as lead roadway designer; and, Ms. Lewis serves as Contract Administrator. He added that the goal of EltonAlan is to serve their customers well.

Mr. Holcomb provided an overview of his and the team's project experience in Nassau County. He provided a map indicating the 27 projects he was involved in Nassau County and noted that every one of these jobs was successful. He explained their success in acquiring rights of way through quit claim deeds for dozens of adjacent property owners without having to purchase rights-of-way. He added that a relationship with Nassau County means trust and communication available at all times. Mr. Doherty advised that they have done many projects with FDOT and are aware of the permitting requirements and also the details that are not required for the small dirt to pave jobs which will save money. EltonAlan has been able to acquire techniques from FDOT and apply them to a county standard. Mr. Holcomb pointed out that EltonAlan has three clients that have made up 85 percent of their business and Nassau County is one of them. He felt that this was a better business model for them because they are more relationship people than salespeople.

EltonAlan representatives provided responses to questions posed by the committee members as follows: 1) Explain how you would provide value engineering on a major intersection improvement that came in over budget. 2) Provide information on your firm's experience performing safety studies that qualify for Federal and State Funding. 3) What is your firm's experience working on LAP projects? 4) Describe your firm's experience with paving dirt roads with a constrained right-of-way. 5) Describe your firm's experience with contractor claims submittals. 6) Describe your firm's experience with right-of-way acquisition and public outreach. Ms. Young explained that this concludes the presentation time frame. The firm departed the meeting at 10:16 a.m. There was no pause in the proceedings or action taken.

The Evaluation Committee began their preliminary evaluation of EltonAlan based upon their presentation and responses. Following a lengthy discussion, the evaluation committee as a group agreed to the following score:

EltonAlan	Scott Herring	Becky Bray	Josephine Craver
Staff Qualifications and Project Team (Max 25 pts)	20	20	20
Approach and Successfully Completed Projects of Similar Size and Scope (Max 25 points)	23	23	23
Response to Questions (Max 50 points)	45	45	45
Total Points	88	88	88

The next firm to make presentation was STV, Inc. represented by Keith Jackson, Jason Breda, Bryon Wuczynski, Kenneth T. Kelley, Russell Yaffee with Peters and Yaffee Transportation Engineers, and Brad Tompa, Terracom Consulting Engineers.

Mr. Jackson addressed how STV, Inc. would meet the purpose of the proposal. STV, Inc. brings technical expertise, engineering proficiency and regional knowledge as well as subconsultants that would prove an asset to Nassau County. He provided an overview of STV's FDOT prequalified services such as PD&E studies, highway design-roadway, highway design-bridges, bridge inspection, traffic engineering and operations studies, traffic operations design, construction engineering inspection, engineering contract administration and management, planning, and architects. The STV team also includes support services such as survey, geotechnical, utility coordination and rail coordination. Mr. Jackson pointed out the regional presence including 51 engineering professionals in the state supported by more than 300 southeast region employees. Their expertise is demonstrated by their awards, their ENR rankings, and their recommendations. As an employee-owned company, they are vested in the success of the firm. Mr. Jackson explained that he would be the contract and project manager for the projects and provided an overview of Nassau County small project GEC experience with drainage repair and intersection improvements as well as FDOT and City of Jacksonville contract projects.

Mr. Jackson highlighted several of their key personnel with many years of experience in the field. Nassau County would get the best of STV's staff. STV also ensures priority for small business firms and Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) participation of approximately 22 percent. STV has a large pool of staff and talent that will be available to Nassau County in order to handle multiple projects simultaneously. Next, Mr. Jackson explained the firm's quality control procedures and the ability to deliver projects under General Engineering Consultant (GEC) contracts. STV would be committed to Nassau County values, and offer full service with a nationally resources and local team presence. The firm has FDOT expertise and connections as well as design-build criteria experts and railroad coordination expertise. They offer 3-D aerial renderings and 3-D CAD technology. In conclusion, Mr. Jackson explained why STV should be awarded the contract because of their knowledge, experience, resources and success. Mr. Jackson introduced the other members of his team and subconsultants attending.

The firm responded to questions posed by the committee members related to the following: 1) Explain how you would provide value engineering on a major intersection improvement that came in over budget. 2) Provide information on your firm's experience performing safety studies that qualify for Federal and State Funding. 3) What is your firm's experience working on LAP projects? 4) Describe your firm's experience with paving dirt roads with a constrained right-of-way. 5) Describe your firm's experience with contractor claims submittals. 6) Describe your firm's experience with right-of-way acquisition and public outreach.

The representatives from STV departed the meeting at 11:03 a.m. and the evaluation committee began their preliminary review of the firm. Following a lengthy discussion, the evaluation committee as a group agreed to the following score:

STV	Scott Herring	Becky Bray	Josephine Craver
Staff Qualifications and Project Team (Max 25 pts)	20	20	20
Approach and Successfully Completed Projects of Similar Size and Scope (Max 25 points)	18	18	18
Response to Questions (Max 50 points)	38	38	38
Total Points	76	76	76

The evaluation committee members began their final evaluation of the three top-ranked firms. Following a lengthy discussion, there was consensus of the committee to provide the final scoring as follows:

Firms	CPH	EltonAlan	STV, Inc.
Staff Qualifications and Project Team (Max 25 pts)	20	20	20
Approach and Successfully Completed Projects of Similar Size and Scope (Max 25 points)	20	23	18
Response to Questions (Max 50 points)	40	45	38
Total Points (Max 100 points)	80	88	76

It was the recommendation of the evaluation committee that the rankings of the firms be as follows: 1) EltonAlan, 2) CPH, and 3) STV. The committee will request that the Board of County Commissioners approve these rankings and authorize contract negotiations with the two top-ranked firms, EltonAlan and CPH, Inc. The negotiation committee will remain the same as the evaluation committee.

There being no further discussion, the meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m.