



BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

DATE: December 6, 2011

AGENDA ITEM NO. 15

Consent Agenda

Regular Agenda

Public Hearing

County Administrator's Signature:

W. J. Jones
for PC

Subject:

Approval of Ranking of Consultant Selection - Professional Services Community Development Department Programs Contract No. 101-0294-CN (AM)

Department:

Community Development / Purchasing

Staff Member Responsible:

Anthony Jones / 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 TWO (2) RANKED FIRMS FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES - COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS, ON A CONTINUING BASIS AS OUTLINED IN THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL.

Summary Explanation/Background:

On September 2, 2011, in accordance with Consultant Competitive Negotiation Act (CCNA) requirements, the Purchasing Department on behalf of the Community Development Department let a Request for Proposal (RFP) to seek qualified consultants to provide independent architectural/construction related services for federally funded programs, and other related tasks in support of the Community Development Department. While the County has other contracts for architectural/construction related services, the services contained in this contract are geared toward smaller architectural firms within a specified niche in providing services for federally funded community development type projects.

The evaluation committee consisting of representatives from the Community Development and Real Estate Management Departments, along with a representative from the Purchasing Department acting as a facilitator, met on October, 2011, to evaluate and rank the seven (7) 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 qualified firms after evaluation of the proposals are as follows:

| | | |
|----|--|---------------|
| 1. | Edward C. Hoffman Jr., Architects, P.A. d/b/a Hoffman Architects, P.A. | 848.25 POINTS |
| 2. | SEArchitecture, LLC | 810.31 POINTS |
| 3. | Envision Architects, P.A. | 768.75 POINTS |
| 4. | C.B. Goldsmith and Associates, Inc. | 749.50 POINTS |
| 5. | Polaris Associates, Inc. | 150.00 POINTS |
| 7. | Southeastern Surveying and Mapping Corporation | 150.00 POINTS |

At the direction of the Board, staff will begin negotiation with the two (2) highest ranked firms in accordance with County CCNA procedures. Final negotiated agreements will be presented to the Board for consideration at a later date.

Fiscal Impact/Cost/Revenue Summary:

The upset limit over the sixty (60) month term of the contract is an amount not to exceed \$250,000 annually between both firms for an aggregate amount of \$1,250,000.00. The County Administrator has delegated authority to increase the upset limits of contract purchase orders pertaining to these agreements pending the negotiated rates remain the same.

Exhibits/Attachments Attached:

Contract Review
Evaluation Criteria Tabulation



**PURCHASING DEPARTMENT
CONTRACT REVIEW TRANSMITTAL**

CATS
NO.:
37629

PROJECT: Professional Services Community Development Programs

BID NUMBER: 101-0294-CN (AM) **REQ. NUMBER:**

TYPE: Purchase Contract Other: Construction-Less than \$100,000 One Time

In accordance with the policy guide for Contract Administration, the attached documents are submitted for review and comment. Upon completion of review, complete Contract Review Transmittal and forward to next Review Authority listed. Please indicate suggested changes by revising, in RED, the appropriate section of the document reflecting the exact wording of the change.

RISK MANAGEMENT: Please enter required liability coverage on page: 14 **PRODUCT ONLY**

This is an annual contract. Estimated Expenditure: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, PLEASE PROVIDE GOOD FAITH ESTIMATED BUDGET

| REVIEW SEQUENCE | REVIEW AUTHORITY | REVIEW DATE | REVIEW SIGNATURE | COMMENTS (Attach Separate page if necessary) | COMMENTS INCORPORATED |
|-----------------|---|--------------------|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| 1. | <u>Purchasing Dept.</u> J. Lauro, Director, Amelia McFarlane, Sr., PA | 8/9/11 | <i>[Signature]</i> | Community Development: Please respond to highlighted requests on this form. | |
| 2. | <u>Requesting Dept.</u> <u>Community Development</u> Anthony Jones, Director, Rose Ott | 8/11/11 8/11/11 | C. Reed for A. Jones Rose Ott | Please check if the County's E-Verify Policy should be included. Rose Ott 8/11/11 | OK LWC |

Using Dept please provide below information:

Yes, funding for this requisition is using grant Funding. No, funding for this requisition is not using grant Funding.

If grant funding is being used you must provide Purchasing with the exact clauses that need to be on attached document. *NO Special clauses need to be added. Rose Ott 8/11/11*

| | | | | | |
|----|---|---------|--------------------|--|----------------------------|
| 3. | <u>Risk Management Director</u> Attn: Will Davis <i>(Check applicable box at right)</i> | 8/15/11 | <i>[Signature]</i> | | HIGH RISK NOT HIGH RISK |
| 4. | <u>BCC Finance</u> Attn: Cassandra Williams | | | | |
| 5. | <u>Asst. County Administrator</u> Carl Harness | 8/23/11 | <i>[Signature]</i> | | |
| 6. | <u>Chief of Staff, Asst. County Administrator</u> Attn: M. Woodard | 8/24/11 | <i>[Signature]</i> | Can this work be accomplished using agreements already in place? | See page 4 |
| 7. | <u>Legal</u> Attn: Michelle Wallace | 8/25/11 | MW | will sign final agreement | OK |

RETURN ALL DOCUMENTS TO PURCHASING

Make all inquiries to: **AMELIA MCFARLANE, SR., PROCUREMENT ANALYST** at Extension 43149
In order to meet the following schedule, please return your requirements to Purchasing by: **May 27, 2011**

| TENTATIVE DATES |
|-----------------------------------|
| RFP Mail Out: TBD |
| RFP Opening: TBD |
| Purchasing Director Approval: TBD |

08/2010

LE:
to obtain pricing from current providers of...

PINELLAS COUNTY EVALUATION CRITERIA TABULATION SHEET

**RFP TITLE: PROFESSIONAL SERVICES COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT PROGRAMS
RFP #: 101-0294-CN(AM)**

| COMPANY NAME | EVALUATOR Tom Borawski | EVALUATOR Rose Ott | EVALUATOR Mark Pistillo | EVALUATOR Cheryl Reed | TOTAL POINTS | TOTAL AVERAGE | RANK |
|--|------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|------------------|------|
| 1 Edward C. Hoffman Jr., Architects, P.A. dba Hoffman Architects, P.A. | 840.00 | 858.00 | 847.50 | 847.50 | 3393.00 | 848.25 | 1 |
| 2 SEArchitecture, LLC | 808.75 | 802.50 | 815.00 | 815.00 | 3241.25 | 810.31 | 2 |
| 3 Envision Architects, P.A. | 780.00 | 765.00 | 765.00 | 765.00 | 3075.00 | 768.75 | 3 |
| 4 C.B. Goldsmith and Associates, Inc. | 765.50 | 762.50 | 743.75 | 726.25 | 2998.00 | 749.50 | 4 |
| 5 Enercon Services, Inc. | 345.00 | 345.00 | 327.50 | 345.00 | 1362.50 | 340.63 | 5 |
| 6 Polaris Associates, Inc. | 150.00 | 150.00 | 150.00 | 150.00 | 600.00 | 150.00 | 6 |
| 7 Southeastern Surveying and Mapping Corp. | 150.00 | 150.00 | 150.00 | 150.00 | 600.00 | 150.00 | 7 |

Date: October 24, 2011