

11.5.13 # 16



Purchasing Department

Joe Lauro, CPPO/CPPB
Director

INTEROFFICE MEMO

To: The Honorable Chairman and Members of
The Board of County Commissioners

From: Joe Lauro, Purchasing Director

Through: Robert LaSala, County Administrator

Distribution: Mark Woodard, Assistant County Administrator

Subject: Report on Consultant Competitive Negotiation Act (CCNA)
Evaluation Process

Date: November 5, 2013

Purpose

This report and recommendations is a result of a meeting held with CCNA consultants on October 21, 2013 as requested by the Board of County Commissioners (Board). The meeting was an open forum to discuss the memo dated September 12, 2013 pertaining to suggested revisions to the CCNA evaluation process presented to the Board on October 8, 2013.

Background

As a political subdivision of the State of Florida, the County must adhere to Florida Statute 287.055 pertaining to CCNA. For many years, the former Public Works Department processed all CCNA procurement. In 2009, this activity was centralized under the Purchasing Department.

Before developing the current CCNA evaluation process, major counties throughout the state were benchmarked by the Purchasing Department to determine best practices. In addition, an open forum was held with CCNA consultants requesting their input and guidance relative to the evaluation process.

The current process has been in effect since 2009 with very few issues or concerns. Over the years, staff has been complimented by firms claiming our process is one of the most fair evaluation processes utilized.

Meeting with CCNA Consultants

Eighty five (85) firms were invited of which thirty (30) attended. The firms represented a cross section of vendors based on contract awards with the County and professional discipline.

All participants were afforded an opportunity to provide input regarding the recommended changes to the CCNA evaluation process. The discussion lasted almost three (3) hours and the firms were appreciative of the opportunity to provide input into the County CCNA evaluation process.

In summary, the consultants did not want to radically change the existing evaluation process. The general consensus was that the County process worked well but could be improved with a few minor modifications. More specifically, they agreed the existing evaluation criteria and weights were substantially appropriate. Additionally, they supported the proposal that scores from the written evaluations be carried forward (for short listed firms) and combined with oral presentation scores for one total evaluation score. A sample of comments from the evaluators may be found in Exhibit A (see attached).

Recommendation

Based on input from the CCNA consultants, the proposal found in column three (3) is recommended. More detail on the current process and previous proposed process may be found in Exhibit B.

Comparison of Current Evaluation Process to Proposed Processes (Written Evaluation)

Current Process (Separate Scoring Processes)	Proposed 9/12/2013 Memo (Contiguous Process/Scores Carried Forward)	Proposed CCNA Consultants (Separate Scoring/Scores Carried Forward)
Written Evaluation (1000 Points)	Written Evaluation (600 Points)	Written Evaluation (1000 Points)
Ability of Firm and Its Professional Personnel (400 Points)	Ability of Firm and Its Professional Personnel (150 Points)	Ability of Firm and Its Professional Personnel, Willingness and Ability to Meet Schedule and Budget Based on Current and Projected Workload (450 Points)
Firm Experience with Projects of Similar Size (350 Points)	Firm Experience with Projects of Similar Size (100 Points)	Firm Experience with Projects of Similar Size (375 Points)
Firms Willingness and Ability to Meet Schedule and Budget (50 Points)	Firms Willingness and Ability to Meet Schedule and Budget (50 Points)	
Volume of Work Previously Awarded by the County (50 Points)	Volume of Work Previously Awarded by the County (100 Points)	Volume of Work Previously Awarded by the County (50 Points)
Effect of the Firms Current and Projected Workload (50 Points)	Effect of the Firms Current and Projected Workload (50 Points)	
Minority Business Status (50 Points)	Minority Business Status (75 Points)	Minority Business Status (50 Points)
Location (50 Points)	Location (75 Points)	Location (75 Points)
Oral Evaluation (1000 Points)	Oral Evaluation (400 Points)	Oral Evaluation (1000 Points)
Understanding of Project (300 Points)	Understanding of Project (150 Points)	Understanding of Project and Approach/Firm Qualifications (500 Points)
Ability to Provide Services (300 Points)	Ability to Provide Services (50 Points)	Ability to Provide Services Within Schedule and Budget (300 Points)
Approach to Project and Methods (300 Points)	Approach to Project and Methods (100 Points)	Managerial Methods Used to Plan, Design and Administer the Project (200 Points)
Qualifications (100 Points)	Qualifications (100 Points)	

Exhibit A

Listed below is a sample of comments received from consultants regarding our current and proposed evaluation process:

- Criteria narrative is better than most agencies; Pinellas does a better job than most defining evaluation criteria.
- It is important to carry scores forward and consider all criteria in final score.
- Don't penalize firms for doing more work with the County.
- Commission stated at their meeting they want to spread the work of the County; size of firm does not matter.
- Include minority sub-contractors in the evaluation process.
- Keep close evaluation scores as is; if one point separates firms so be it.
- Leave evaluation process as is.
- How is volume of work factored by the County?
- Include past performance of firms on County projects in the evaluation process.
- If everyone had local preference you would only get Pinellas County firms participating.
- Many said "no" to a 1% score tie breaker for RFP's.
- Firm willingness is most important factor; do not lower this score.
- Blend firm willingness into first two criteria.
- The evaluation committee does not work with the awarded firm.
- If BCC has a vested interest, they will make these changes.
- Can't talk to the BCC due to lobbying; firms have fewer rights as compared to a citizen.
- Need evaluators that are more experienced with the type of project they are evaluating.
- Love the County evaluation process; just needs some tweaking.

Exhibit B

I.) Current Evaluation Process

We utilize a two step evaluation process. The first step involves an evaluation of written submittals with short listed firms (the top three as defined by statute) proceeding to step two, oral presentation.

Currently, scores from step one are not carried forward; they are used to short list the firms that will proceed to step two. The oral presentations in step two are scored separately and determine the final ranking.

Step One – Evaluation of Written Submittals

Ability of Firm and Its Professional Personnel	400 Points
Firm Experience with Projects of Similar Size and Past Performance	350 Points
Firm Willingness and Ability to Meet Schedule and Budget Requirements	50 Points
Volume of Work Previously Awarded by the County	50 Points
Effect of the Firms Current and Projected Workload	50 Points
Minority Business Status	50 Points
Location	50 Points

Step Two – Evaluation of Oral Presentation

Understanding of Project	300 Points
Ability to Provide Services	300 Points
Approach to the Project and Methods Used to Plan, Design and Administer	300 Points
Qualifications	100 Points

II.) Proposed Evaluation Process as per September 12, 2013 Memo

- The scores from the written evaluation phase will be carried forward (for highest ranking firms) and combined with scores from the oral presentation for one total score of 1000 points.
- The weights will be revised to provide greater emphasis on volume of work, minority business status and location

Written Evaluation (60% of total award)

Ability of Firm and Its Professional Personnel	150 Points
Firm Experience and Projects of Similar Size and Past Performance	100 Points
Firm Willingness and Ability to Meet Schedule and Budget Requirements	50 Points
Volume of Work Previously Awarded by the County (lower volume – higher score)	100 Points
Effect of the Firms Current and Projected Workload	50 Points
Minority Business Status	75 Points
Location	75 Points

Oral Presentation (40% of total award)

Understanding of Project	150 Points
Ability to Provide Required Services Within the Schedule and Budget	50 Points
Approach to the Project and Methods Used to Plan, Design and Administer	100 Points
Qualifications	100 Points

Exhibit B (Cont)

III.) Proposed Process after Meeting with CCNA Consultants

- The scores from the written evaluation phase will be carried forward (for highest ranking firms) and combined with scores from the oral presentation process for one total score potential of 2000 points.
- The evaluation criteria are regrouped to facilitate ease of submittal, evaluation and scoring
- Criteria weights are modified from current and proposed process (September 12, 2013 memo) to reflect consultant input.

Written Evaluation (1000 Points)

Ability of Firm and Its Professional Personnel, Willingness and Ability to Meet Schedule and Budget Based on the Current and Projected Workload	450 Points
Firm Experience with Projects of Similar Size	375 Points
Volume of Work Previously Awarded by the County	50 Points
Minority Business Status (include minority sub-contractors)	50 Points
Location	75 Points

Oral Presentation (1000 Points)

Understanding of Project and Approach / Firm Qualifications	500 Points
Ability to Provide Services Within Schedule and Budget	300 Points
Managerial Methods used to Plan, Design, and Administer the Project	200 Points