10-26-10 #12

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

DATE: October 26, 2010
AGENDA ITEM NO.

Consent Agenda ☒ **Regular Agenda** ☐ **Public Hearing** ☐

County Administrator's Signature: for PSC

Subject:

Approval of Ranking of Consultant Selection - Roadways, Drainage, Structural, Civil and Traffic Engineering Consulting Services
Contract No. 090-0348-CN(AM)

Department:

Public Works / Purchasing

Staff Member Responsible:

Pete Yauch / Joe Lauro

Recommended Action:

I RECOMMEND THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS (BOARD) APPROVE THE RANKING OF FIRMS AND AUTHORIZE STAFF TO NEGOTIATE AN AGREEMENT WITH EACH OF THE TOP RANKED FIRMS FOR ROADWAYS, DRAINAGE, STRUCTURAL, CIVIL AND TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTING SERVICES ON A CONTINUING BASIS AS OUTLINED IN THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL.

Summary Explanation/Background:

On July 30, 2010, in accordance with the Consultants' Competitive Negotiation Act (CCNA) requirements, the Purchasing Department on behalf of the Public Works Department let a Request for Proposal (RFP) to obtain the services of consultants to perform roadways, drainage, structural, civil and traffic engineering consulting services. The intent of the RFP was to obtain resources form qualified professional firms to provide a wide range of engineering services to assist in bringing to completion numerous projects identified in the Capital Improvement Plan. The RFP contained specific projects (attached) which the prospective firms had to base their qualifications upon. In addition, state statute stipulates that smaller nonspecific projects not exceeding $2 million in cost or $200k in consultant fees may also be included in continuing contracts. Therefore, the ranking of firms was divided between firms who were qualified to perform both specific/nonspecific projects and firms qualified to only perform smaller nonspecific projects.

The evaluation committee consisting of two (2) representatives from the Public Works Department, one representative from the Airport, a representative from the Utilities Department, a representative from Real Estate Management, along with a representative from the Purchasing Department acting as a facilitator met on September 28, 2010 to evaluate and rank the forty nine (49) proposals received.

The committee evaluated the firms per the following criteria based on a potential score of 1000 points:

1.	Ability of the Firm and its Professional Personnel	375 points
2.	Firm's Experience with Projects of Similar Size and Past Performance	350 points
3.	Volume of Work Previously Awarded by the County	50 points
4.	Effect of the Firm's Current and Projected Workload	125 points
5.	Minority Business Status	50 points
6.	Location	50 points

The order of ranking of most qualified firms (1-27) after evaluation of the proposals are as follows:

RANKING OF FIRMS FOR SPECIFIC/NONSPECIFIC PROJECTS AS IDENTIFIED IN THE RFP:

1.	TBE GROUP, INC. DBA / CARDNO TBE, CLEARWATER, FLORIDA	893.00 POINTS
2.	URS CORPORATION SOUTHERN D/B/A URS, TAMPA, FLORIDA	862.75 POINTS
3.	CUMBEY AND FAIR, INC., CLEARWATER, FLORIDA	851.75 POINTS
4.	ENGINEERING & APPLIED SCIENCE, INC., TAMPA, FLORIDA	847.50 POINTS
5.	POST, BUCKLEY, SCHUH & JERNIGAN, TAMPA, FLORIDA	845.25 POINTS
6.	KISSINGER CAMPO AND ASSOCIATES, CORPORATION, TAMPA, FLORIDA	844.75 POINTS
7.	H. W. LOCHNER, INC., TAMPA, FLORIDA	837.00 POINTS
8.	THE HEIMBURG GROUP, INC., TAMPA, FLORIDA	835.00 POINTS
9.	VOLKERT, INC., TAMPA, FLORIDA	833.75 POINTS
10.	ICON CONSULTANT GROUP, INC., TAMPA, FLORIDA	822.75 POINTS
11.	JONES EDMUNDS & ASSOCIATES, INC., TAMPA, FLORIDA	817.75 POINTS
12.	HDR ENGINEERING, INC., TAMPA, FLORIDA	801.75 POINTS
13.	WADE TRIM, INC., TAMPA, FLORIDA	801.00 POINTS

RANKING OF FIRMS FOR SMALL NONSPECIFIC PROJECTS

14.	AYRES ASSOCIATES INC., TAMPA, FLORIDA	796.75 POINTS
15.	E.C. DRIVER & ASSOCIATES, INC., TAMPA, FLORIDA	796.25 POINTS
16.	KCI TECHNOLOGIES, INC., TAMPA, FLORIDA	793.75 POINTS
17.	FALLER, DAVIS & ASSOCIATES, INC., TAMPA, FLORIDA	790.25 POINTS
18.	GEORGE F. YOUNG, INC., ST. PETERSBURG, FLORIDA	788.50 POINTS
19.	BAYSIDE ENGINEERING, INC., TAMPA, FLORIDA	782.75 POINTS
20.	HALCROW, INC., TAMPA, FLORIDA	782.50 POINTS
21.	REYNOLDS, SMITH, AND HILLS, INC., TAMPA, FLORIDA	777.50 POINTS
22.	HTNB, CORPORATION, TAMPA, FLORIDA	776.75 POINTS
23.	LOCKWOOD, ANDREWS AND NEWMAN, INC., TAMPA, FLORIDA	775.25 POINTS
24.	FLORIDA DESIGN CONSULTANTS, INC., NEW PORT RICHEY, FLORIDA	775.00 POINTS
25.	DYER, RIDDLE, MILLS AND PRECOURT, INC., TAMPA, FLORIDA	771.50 POINTS
26.	KING ENGINEERING ASSOCIATES, INC., TAMPA, FLORIDA	759.00 POINTS
27.	HAMILTON ENGINEERING & SURVEYING INC., TAMPA, FLORIDA	754.75 POINTS

A LIST OF THE FINAL RANKING OF ALL FIRMS IS ATTACHED FOR REFERENCE

At the direction of the Board, Public Works Department staff will begin negotiation with the twenty seven (27) most qualified firms in accordance with County CCNA procedures. Final negotiated agreements for consultants who have demonstrated the necessary qualifications for specific projects listed and scoped in the RFP and agreements with consultants for nonspecific projects smaller in scope (less than $2 million/$200k fee) will be presented to the Board for consideration at a later date.

While this specific continuing CCNA contract was initiated by the Public Works Department, it may be utilized by all departments and agencies including but not limited to the Real Estate Management Department and the Airport. Therefore the final agreements will take into consideration fees by departments other than Public Works.

At the direction of the Board, staff has extended agreements with consultants for a six (6) month time period and is currently extending agreements for an additional sixty (60) days to ensure no lapse occurs while negotiations are proceeding.

Fiscal Impact/Cost/Revenue Summary:

Prior to negotiations, the total estimated aggregate value of this contract is in an amount not to exceed forty million ($40 million) dollars for the potential five year term of the agreements with twenty seven (27) firms. The County Administrator has delegated authority to increase the upset limits of agreements as long as the negotiated rates remain the same.

Exhibits/Attachments Attached:

Contract Review
Scope of Work of Specific Projects
Evaluation Criteria Tabulation