1st ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES RFP16-0150 ORLANDO CITY HALL ENERGY EFFICIENCY UPGRADES & HVAC RETROFIT March 1, 2016

City Hall – 2nd Floor, Agenda Conference Room 9:00 a.m.

The Advisory Committee (Committee) for the above project convened on March 1, 2016, at 9:06 am at the Agenda Conference Room, City Hall. The purpose of this meeting was to review the responsive proposals and to have general discussions on the upcoming meeting.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ian LaHiff, Energy Project Manager (Chair)
Marissis Gandert, Building Plans Examiner II
Byron Raysor, Contract Compliance, Minority Business Enterprise Office
David Dunn, Division Manager, Fleet & Facilities Management Division
Doris Wasson, Director of Operations, Owens Realty Services

TECHNICAL ADVISOR:

Mark Hartley, Technical Advisor, TLC Engineering for Architecture

PROCUREMENT REPRESENTATIVES:

Teddi McCorkle, Senior Contract Administrator (Facilitator) Silvia Coste, Purchasing Agent II

Actions/Discussion/Motions:

The Ms. McCorkle, Facilitator, introduced herself and took the following actions:

- 1. Called the meeting to order at 9:06 a.m.
- 2. Reminded everyone that the meeting is being recorded.
- 3. Had all Committee members and others present introduce themselves.
- 4. Advised that the Committee was approved and ethics forms were received.
- 5. Advised the Committee that a quorum was established.
- 6. Announced that the meeting was publicly posted for more than 48 hours in advance.
- 7. Asked all attendees to sign the sign-in sheet.
- 8. Facilitator reviewed Advisory Committee Rules.
- 9. Reviewed Public Input Procedures Explained that, though no public representatives were present, policy requires that public input be allowed prior to each vote on non-ministerial motions.

A motion was made by $\underline{\text{lan Lahiff}}$, and seconded by $\underline{\text{Byron Raysor}}$, to accept the Public Input Procedures. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. McCorkle reminded everyone that they were emailed a copy of the solicitation, addenda, proposals and references received to date.

Ms. McCorkle indicated that two (2) proposals submitted in response to this solicitation. The firms submitting proposals are as follows:

- Air Mechanical and Services Corporation
- Ellis Mechanical Corporation

DISCUSSION AND MOTIONS:

General Discussion about proposals – references Ian Lahiff described the project to the Committee.

Byron Rayzor indicated that he will report at the next meeting the MWBE participation plan by the proposers. Teddi McCorkle indicated that there were no Veterans participation submitted for this solicitation.

The Committee had a general discussion about the need for presentations. A motion was made by <u>David</u> Dunn and seconded by Ian Lahiff to have presentations with Air Mechanical and Services Corporation and Ellis Mechanical Corporation. There was no member of the Public present Discussion ensued. The motion carried unanimously.

The Committee requested that the Proposers focus their presentation on the specific sections of their The Committee requested the Ian Lahiff and Teddi McCorkle finalize the suggested questions/subject matters recommendations made by the Committee in a general discussion.

<u>Ian Lahiff</u> made a motion, seconded by <u>David Dunn</u>, to allow five (5) minutes for introductions, <u>forty (40)</u> minutes presentations/clarifications, and fifteen (15) minutes for a question and answer period for each presentation. A thirty (30) minute break will be scheduled between the two (2) presenters. Discussion ensued. The motion carried unanimously.

Teddi McCorkle will notify the proposers of their presentation date and time, and referenced questions to be discussed during their presentation time allotment.

The next Committee Meeting and Presentations are scheduled for March 11, 2016, beginning at 9:00 a.m. in the Agenda Conference Room (2nd Floor) and alternating between Veterans Conference Room and the Agenda Conference Room (2nd Floor) of City Hall.

A motion was made by Ian Lahiff, and seconded by Byron Raysor, to adjourn at 10:25 a.m. The motion carried unanimously.

These minutes are considered to be the official minutes of the RFP16-0150 Advisory Committee Meeting held on March 1, 2016, and no other notes, tapes, or other recordings taken by anyone takes precedence.

Submitted by:

Teddi McCorkle City of Orlando

Senior Contract Administrator

Reviewed and Accepted by

Ian LaHiff (Chair)

City of Orlando

Energy Project Manager

Attachment: Sign-in Sheet

References

Public Input Procedures

CITY OF ORLANDO

Procurement and Contracts Division 1st Committee Meeting Sign-In Sheet



Date: 03/01/16

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Bid Number: RFP16-0150

Location: City Hall at One City Commons, 400 South Orange Avenue, Agenda Conference Room, 2nd Floor, Orlando, Florida

Title: Orlando City Hall Energy Efficiency Upgrades and HVAC Retrofit

	CHOPANIO REPRESENTATIONE CHOPASSIONIS E CHOPASSIONISME, &	SDN (ORGANDINGS)	TERETHONE #	respectively.
	PROVIDENCIARURE	ADOENO DE LA PORTE DE LA NEOLETANIO.		
Procurement & Contracts Div. 400 South Orange Avenue, 4 th Floor, City Hall Orlando, Florida 32801	Teddi McCorkle, Sr. Contract Admin. Silvia Coste, Purchasing Agent II	teddi.mccorkle@cityoforlando.net silvia.coste@cityoforlando.net	(407) 246-2332 (407) 246-2216	(407) 246-2869
City of Orlando, Facilities Management	Ian LaHiff Energy Project Manager	Ian.lahiff@cityoforlando.net	(407) 246-3853	
City of Orlando Economic Development Department	Marissis Gandert Building Plans Examiner II MUUM Goudut	Marissis.gandert@cityoforlando.net	(407) 246-3213	
City of Orlando Orlando-Minority Business Enterprise Office	Byron Raysor Contractor Compliance	Byron.Raysor@cityoforlando.net	(407) 246-2896	
City of Orlando Fleet & Facilities Management Division	David Dunn Division Manager	David.dunn@cityoforlando.net	(407) 246-3873	

CITY OF ORLANDO

Procurement and Contracts Division 1st Committee Meeting Sign-In Sheet



Date: 03/01/16

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Bid Number: RFP16-0150

Location: City Hall at One City Commons, 400 South Orange Avenue, Agenda Conference Room, 2nd Floor, Orlando, Florida

Title: Orlando City Hall Energy Efficiency Upgrades and HVAC Retrofit

GOVIDANALNANTE, K. ADDRIBS TOTT ARRAY BANDA OF FACTOR	COMPANY REPRESENTATIVE OBERANCEROUS LEGIBLE YOUR NAME W	EMAIL ADDRESS:	TDEBRHONE#. EAX#
	PROVIDE'S (GNATURE)	(DIG) NOTE () EAVEEDNBLANK)	
Owens Realty Services	Doris Wasson Director of Operations	dwasson@owens-services.com	(407) 246-3793
	Wassen		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
TLC Engineering for	Mike Hartley Technical Advisor	mike.hartley@tlc-eng.com	(407) 487-1142
Architecture	All Survisor	,	
City & Orlando Fleet d'Facilities Management	Andrew Phillips	andrew.phillipt@city& orlando.net	321 217 8396
City of orlando Fleet Feulities M.	Celestrop De la Cuz	Celsture. deloas a city of or	407,873 8314



February 18, 2016

Mr. Bill Bradford Hanson Professional Services 4311 North Lois Avenue Tampa, FL 33614 Via Email: bbradford@hanson-inc.com

Dear Mr. Bradford:

The City of Orlando has publicly solicited proposals regarding RFP16-0150, RFP for Orlando City Hall Energy Efficiency Upgrades and HVAC Retrofit in which Air Mechanical and Service Corporation has provided you as a reference. We would greatly appreciate your input in completing this Reference Questionnaire.

The Procurement and Contracts Division requests return of the Questionnaire by **Thursday February 25 at 5:00 p.m.** Please fax or email your completed Questionnaire to the attention of: Teddi McCorkle at <u>TeamC@cityoforlando.net</u> or by fax (407) 246-2869.

Thank you for your time in assisting us with this feedback.

1. Briefly describe the nature of the services provided.

	WE HAVE WORKED W/ AMSCO ON MULTIPLE PROJECTS. TWO PLOJECTS FOR WHICH THETY
	WERE THE MECHANICAD CONTRACTOR AND PROVIDED CONTROL WERE THE FOLE!
	LAB upcense in Theist
2.	Contract Value: FOLE LAB (WIAMA) > \$2.4M MARATHON RSC CHILLER REPLACEMENT ~ 675 K Was the project completed on time? To No.
3.	Was the project completed on time? ✓ Yes or No If no, please explain:
4,	How would you rate the overall Service Level provided by the firm? □1 □2 □3 □4 □5 (On a scale from 1-5 with 5 being the highest)
5.	How would you rate the quality and timeliness of service? □1 □2 □3 □4 ៤5
6.	Were there any warranty issues after the installation? ☐ Yes or ☐ No If so, how where they handled?
7.	Did the installation occur as a live installation or with an empty area? Live Zustaurion
8.	Were there any problems during the performance of the work? Yes or No If yes, please explain:
	PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTS DIVISION

Did the firm resolve issues in a satisfactory manner? ✓ Yes or No
Were the firm's employees/workers courteous and did they perform in a professional manner while on the job? ☑ Yes ☐ No
How well did firm's staff perform? □1 □2 □3 □4 □5 (On a scale from 1-5 with 5 being the highest)
Did the firm meet your expectations? ✓ Yes or No Please explain:
According to Contract requirements, scope, terms and conditions, please rate the overall performance of the firm. 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
Was the project completed on budget? ✓ Yes or ☐ No If no, please explain:
Were there any issues with safe performance of the work? ☐ Yes or ☐ No If yes, please explain:
Was there any lost time? ☐ Yes or ☑ No If yes, please explain:
Were there any injuries? □ Yes or ☑ No If yes, please explain:
Was there any property damage to adjacent structures? ☐ Yes or ☐ No If yes, please explain:
Contract Value? SEE TTEN #Z ASOUR
Overall, would you enter into Contract with this firm again? ✓ Yes or □ No
Is there anything else you would like to share about the project or the firm's capabilities?

PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTS DIVISION

CITY HALL • 400 SOUTH ORANGE AVENUE • P.O. Box 4990 • ORLANDO, FLORIDA 32802-4990

PHONE 407.246.2291 • FAX 407.246.2869 • CityofOrlando.net • esupplier.cityoforlando.net

February 18, 2016

Ms. Cheryl Anthony Orange County Govetnment Capital Projects Division 201 South Rosiland Avenue Orlando, FL 32801 Via Email: cheryl.anthony@ocfl.net

Dear Ms. Anthony:

The City of Orlando has publicly solicited proposals regarding RFP16-0150, RFP for Orlando City Hall Energy Efficiency Upgrades and HVAC Retrofit in which Air Mechanical and Service Corporation has provided you as a reference. We would greatly appreciate your input in completing this Reference Questionnaire.

The Procurement and Contracts Division requests return of the Questionnaire by **Thursday February 25 at 5:00 p.m.** Please fax or email your completed Questionnaire to the attention of: Teddi McCorkle at <u>TeamC@cityoforlando.net</u> or by fax (407) 246-2869.

Thank you for your time in assisting us with this feedback.

1.	Replacement of FTB's VAIS above Ceiling in acciding
1	Replacement of FTBS & VAV above Ceiling in occipied awild, along w/ Foot top AHU. @ O.C. Administration Center. Mot regured.
2.	Contract Value: \$1,120,476 Advun WAC Phase I
3.	Was the project completed on time? ✓ Yes or No If no, please explain:
4.	How would you rate the overall Service Level provided by the firm? □1 □2 □3 □4 □5 (On a scale from 1-5 with 5 being the highest)
5.	How would you rate the quality and timeliness of service? $\Box 1$ $\Box 2$ $\Box 3$ $\Box 4$ $\Box 5$
6.	Were there any warranty issues after the installation? Yes or No If so, how where they handled?
7.	Did the installation occur as a live installation or with an empty area?
8.	Were there any problems during the performance of the work? ☐ Yes or ☑ No If yes, please explain:
	PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTS DIVISION

9.	Did the firm resolve issues in a satisfactory manner? ✓ Yes or □ No
10.	Were the firm's employees/workers courteous and did they perform in a professional manner while on the job? ✓ Yes □ No
11.	How well did firm's staff perform? □1 □2 □3 □4 □5 (On a scale from 1-5 with 5 being the highest)
12.	Did the firm meet your expectations? ✓ Yes or □ No Please explain:
13.	According to Contract requirements, scope, terms and conditions, please rate the overall performance of the firm. 1 1 2 3 4 5 (On a scale from 1-5 with 5 being the highest)
14.	Was the project completed on budget? ✓ Yes or □ No If no, please explain:
15.	Were there any issues with safe performance of the work? ☐ Yes or ☐ No If yes, please explain:
16.	Was there any lost time? ☐ Yes or ☐ No If yes, please explain:
17.	Were there any injuries? □ Yes or ☑ No If yes, please explain:
18.	Was there any property damage to adjacent structures? ☐ Yes or ☐ No If yes, please explain:
19.	Contract Value? \$ 1, 120, 4-76
20.	Overall, would you enter into Contract with this firm again? Yes or I No
21.	Is there anything else you would like to share about the project or the firm's capabilities? AMSCO THEES OWNERSHIP W/ THEIR WORK AND
	VARY KNOWLEDGEARDLE OF THE MECH INDUSTRY. GREAT TO WORK WHA
Q	uestionnaire completed by: Chery L Anthony, Prosect Manager Date: 2/02/16 (Name and Title)

PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTS DIVISION

CITY HALL • 400 SOUTH ORANGE AVENUE • P.O. BOX 4990 • ORLANDO, FLORIDA 32802-4990 PHONE 407.246.2291 • FAX 407.246.2869 • CityofOrlando.net • esupplier.cityoforlando.net



February 18, 2016

Mr. Mike Woodall Via Email: <u>mwoodall@pasco.k12.fl.us</u> Pasco County School Board 5334 Parkway Boulevard Land O' Lakes, FL 34639 Dear Mr. Woodall: The City of Orlando has publicly solicited proposals regarding RFP16-0150, RFP for Orlando City Hall Energy Efficiency Upgrades and HVAC Retrofit in which Air Mechanical and Service Corporation has provided you as a reference. We would greatly appreciate your input in completing this Reference Questionnaire. The Procurement and Contracts Division requests return of the Questionnaire by Thursday February 25 at 5:00 p.m. Please fax or email your completed Questionnaire to the attention of: Teddi McCorkle at TeamC@cityoforlando.net or by fax (407) 246-2869. Thank you for your time in assisting us with this feedback. 1. Briefly describe the nature of the services provided. Multiple HVAC Projecte 2. Contract Value: 4 m.l (+) 3. Was the project completed on time?

✓ Yes or □ No If no, please explain: 4. How would you rate the overall Service Level provided by the firm? □1 □2 □3 □4 □5 (On a scale from 1-5 with 5 being the highest) 5. How would you rate the quality and timeliness of service? □1 □2 □3 □4 □5 6. Were there any warranty issues after the installation?

✓ Yes or □ No If so, how where they handled? Timely & Professional

PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTS DIVISION

7. Did the installation occur as a live installation or with an empty area?

8. Were there any problems during the performance of the work?

Yes or

No

If yes, please explain:

9.	Did the firm resolve issues in a satisfactory manner?
10.	Were the firm's employees/workers courteous and did they perform in a professional manner while on the job? Yes □ No
11.	How well did firm's staff perform? □1 □2 □3 □4 □5 (On a scale from 1-5 with 5 being the highest)
12.	Did the firm meet your expectations? ☐ Yes or ☐ No Please explain:
13.	According to Contract requirements, scope, terms and conditions, please rate the overall performance of the firm. 1 1 2 13 14 55 (On a scale from 1-5 with 5 being the highest)
14.	Was the project completed on budget? ✓ Yes or No If no, please explain:
15.	Were there any issues with safe performance of the work? ☐ Yes or ☐ No If yes, please explain:
16.	Was there any lost time? ☐ Yes or ☒ No If yes, please explain:
17.	Were there any injuries? ☐ Yes or ☒ No If yes, please explain:
18.	Was there any property damage to adjacent structures? ☐ Yes or ☑ No If yes, please explain:
9.	Contract Value? 4 M11 (+)
20.	Overall, would you enter into Contract with this firm again? 💢 Yes or 🗆 No
1.	Is there anything else you would like to share about the project or the firm's capabilities?
Que	estionnaire completed by: Why Why Facilities OP Date 57 2.23.11

PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTS DIVISION

CITY HALL • 400 SOUTH ORANGE AVENUE • P.O. BOX 4990 • ORLANDO, FLORIDA 32802-4990 PHONE 407.246.2291 • FAX 407.246.2869 • CityofOrlando.net • esupplier.cityoforlando.net



February 18, 2016

Mr. Rich Gauvey Pinellas County School Board 1815 77th Avenue North St. Petersburg, FL 33702

Via Email: gauveyr@pinellas.k12.fl.us

Dear Mr. Gauvey:

The City of Orlando has publicly solicited proposals regarding RFP16-0150, RFP for Orlando City Hall Energy Efficiency Upgrades and HVAC Retrofit in which Air Mechanical and Service Corporation has provided you as a reference. We would greatly appreciate your input in completing this Reference Questionnaire.

The Procurement and Contracts Division requests return of the Questionnaire by Thursday February 25 at 5:00 p.m. Please fax or email your completed Questionnaire to the attention of: Teddi McCorkle at TeamC@cityoforlando.net or by fax (407) 246-2869.

Thank you for your time in assisting us with this feedback.

1,	HVAC, CEILING & LIGHTS REPLACEMENT IN A ELEMENTARY SCHOOL.
2,	Contract Value: 2.6 m
3.	Was the project completed on time? ✓ Yes or □ No If no, please explain:
4.	How would you rate the overall Service Level provided by the firm? □1 □2 □3 □4 ☒5 (On a scale from 1-5 with 5 being the highest)
5,	How would you rate the quality and timeliness of service? □1 □2 □3 □4 🔏5
6.	Were there any warranty issues after the installation? Yes or D No If so, how where they handled? HVAC CONTROLS SOFTWARE NEEDED TO BE FIXED.
7.	Did the installation occur as a live installation or with an empty area? Both, may Thro Dic.
	Were there any problems during the performance of the work? ☐ Yes or ☒ No If yes, please explain:
	PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTS DIVISION

),	Did the firm resolve issues in a satisfactory manner? 💆 Yes or 🗆 No
	Were the firm's employees/workers courteous and did they perform in a professional manner while on the job? ☑ Yes ☐ No
	How well did firm's staff perform? □1 □2 □3 □4 ⋈5 (On a scale from 1-5 with 5 being the highest)
	Did the firm meet your expectations? X Yes or No Please explain:
	According to Contract requirements, scope, terms and conditions, please rate the overall performance of the firm. 1 12 13 14 25 (On a scale from 1-5 with 5 being the highest)
	Was the project completed on budget? \(\sums \) Yes or \(\sums \) No If no, please explain: \(\frac{\colored \text{Planes}}{\colored \colored \c
	Were there any issues with safe performance of the work? ☐ Yes or ☑ No If yes, please explain:
G	Was there any lost time? Yes or No If yes, please explain:
	Were there any injuries? ☐ Yes or ☒ No If yes, please explain:
	Was there any property damage to adjacent structures? ☐ Yes or ☑ No If yes, please explain;
	Contract Value? 2.6 m
	Overall, would you enter into Contract with this firm again? 💆 Yes or 🖂 No
	Is there anything else you would like to share about the project or the firm's capabilities? Amsco is a broat company to work with.
ue	estionnaire completed by: Rick Garry SR. constant Corrector Date: 2/19/16 (Name and Title)

PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTS DIVISION

CITY HALL • 400 SOUTH ORANGE AVENUE • P.O. BOX 4990 • ORLANDO, FLORIDA 32802-4990 PHONE 407.246.2291 • FAX 407.246.2869 • CityofOrlando.net • esupplier.cityoforlando.net



February 18, 2016

Mr. Mitesh Smart RTM Engineering Consultants 925 S. Semoran Boulevard, Suite 100 Winter Park, FL 32792 Via Email: mitesh.smart@rtmassociates.com

Dear Mr. Smart:

The City of Orlando has publicly solicited proposals regarding **RFP16-0150**, **RFP for Orlando**City Hall Energy Efficiency Upgrades and HVAC Retrofit in which Air Mechanical and

Service Corporation has provided you as a reference. We would greatly appreciate your input in completing this Reference Questionnaire.

The Procurement and Contracts Division requests return of the Questionnaire by **Thursday February 25 at 5:00 p.m**. Please fax or email your completed Questionnaire to the attention of: Teddi McCorkle at <u>TeamC@cityoforlando.net</u> or by fax (407) 246-2869.

Thank you for your time in assisting us with this feedback.

1.	Briefly describe the nature of the services provided. Mechanical Contrading Chiller Replacement Emersy +
	CONTROLS UPRIABLES
2.	Contract Value: \$ 1-8 mil- (collective 19)
3.	Was the project completed on time? ☐ Yes or ☐ No If no, please explain:
4.	How would you rate the overall Service Level provided by the firm? □1 □2 □3 □4 □5 (On a scale from 1-5 with 5 being the highest)
	How would you rate the quality and timeliness of service? □1 □2 □3 □4 □5
6.	Were there any warranty issues after the installation? ✓ Yes or No
	If so, how where they handled?
	Some equipment had manufacture defects. This was promptly resolved.
	was prompty resolved.
7.	Did the installation occur as a live installation or with an empty area?
	Were there any problems during the performance of the work? ☐ Yes or PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTS DIVISION CITY HALL • 400 SOUTH ORANGE AVENUE • P.O. BOX 4990 • ORLANDO, FLORIDA 32802-4990 PHONE 407.246.2291 • FAX 407.246.2869 • CityofOrlando.net • esupplier.cityoforlando.net

If yes, please explain:
Did the firm resolve issues in a satisfactory manner? ▼ Yes or □ No (No byses)
Were the firm's employees/workers courteous and did they perform in a professional manner while on the job? Yes No
How well did firm's staff perform? □1 □2 □3 □4 □5 (On a scale from 1-5 with 5 being the highest)
Did the firm meet your expectations? ✓ Yes or ☐ No Please explain:
According to Contract requirements, scope, terms and conditions, please rate the overall performance of the firm. □1 □2 □3 □4 □5 (On a scale from 1-5 with 5 being the highest)
Was the project completed on budget? ✓ Yes or ☐ No If no, please explain:
Were there any issues with safe performance of the work? ☐ Yes or ☐ No If yes, please explain:
Was there any lost time? ☐ Yes or ☑ No If yes, please explain:
Were there any injuries? ☐ Yes or ☑ No If yes, please explain:
Was there any property damage to adjacent structures? ☐ Yes or ☐ No If yes, please explain:
Contract Value?
Overall, would you enter into Contract with this firm again? Yes or I No
Is there anything else you would like to share about the project or the firm's capabilities?
excellent work!
pestionnaire completed by: Mitch Smart Date: 02/13/16

CITY HALL • 400 SOUTH ORANGE AVENUE • P.O. Box 4990 • ORLANDO, FLORIDA 32802-499 PHONE 407.246.2291 • FAX 407.246.2869 • CityofOrlando.net • esupplier.cityoforlando.net

(Name and Title)

PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTS DIVISION

CITY HALL • 400 SOUTH ORANGE AVENUE • P.O. BOX 4990 • ORLANDO, FLORIDA 32802-4990 PHONE 407.246.2291 • FAX 407.246.2869 • CityofOrlando.net • esupplier.cityoforlando.net



February 18, 2016

Edgewater Elementary School 801 S Old County Rd Edgewater, FL 32132

Dear Mr. Stephens:

The City of Orlando has publicly solicited proposals regarding **RFP16-0150**, **RFP for Orlando City Hall Energy Efficiency Upgrades and HVAC Retrofit** in which <u>Ellis Mechanical Corporation</u>, has provided you as a reference. We would greatly appreciate your input in completing this Reference Questionnaire.

The Procurement and Contracts Division requests return of the Questionnaire by **Thursday February 25 at 5:00 p.m**. Please fax or email your completed Questionnaire to the attention of: Teddi McCorkle at <u>TeamC@cityoforlando.net</u> or by fax (407) 246-2869.

Ellis Mechanical Corporation

Thank you for your time in assisting us with this feedback.

1. Briefly describe the nature of the services provided.

	provided a complete renovation of the Chilled Water Plant at Edgewater Public School,
	Volusia County, FL, where a 250 ton Primary/Secondary Chilled Water Pumping System
	was converted to Variable primary pumping system, including the installation (2) 250 ton
	Air Cooled Chillers. The work was completed on time and did not require interruption of
	the facility's activities during the conversion.
2.	Contract Value: \$1,014,927.66
3.	Was the project completed on time? ■ Yes or □ No If no, please explain:
4.	How would you rate the overall Service Level provided by the firm? □1 □2 □3 □4 ■5 (On a scale from 1-5 with 5 being the highest)
5.	How would you rate the quality and timeliness of service? $\Box 1$ $\Box 2$ $\Box 3$ $\Box 4$ $\blacksquare 5$
6.	Were there any warranty issues after the installation? ■ Yes or □ No If so, how where they handled? _Warranty issues arose with the (2) 250 ton Trane Air Cooled Chillers. These were handled promptly by the President of the Company, Joe Ellis. Timely coordination with the units Manufacturer enabled resolution to the complete satisfaction of the Owner.
7.	Did the installation occur as a live installation or with an empty area?The work occurred while the facility was operational, where temporary chillers supplemented the facility during

	the conversion.
8.	Were there any problems during the performance of the work? ☐ Yes or ■ No If yes, please explain:
9.	Did the firm resolve issues in a satisfactory manner? ■ Yes or □ No
).	Were the firm's employees/workers courteous and did they perform in a professional manner while on the job? ■ Yes □ No
l.	How well did firm's staff perform? □1 □2 □3 □4 ■5 (On a scale from 1-5 with 5 being the highest)
2.	Did the firm meet your expectations? ☐ Yes or ■ No Please explain: Ellis Mechanical Corporation, by far, exceeded our expectations with their promptness, ingenuity, resourcefulness, and their continuous cooperation.
3.	According to Contract requirements, scope, terms and conditions, please rate the overall performance of the firm. □1 □2 □3 □4 ■5 (On a scale from 1-5 with 5 being the highest)
1.	Was the project completed on budget? ■ Yes or □ No If no, please explain:
5.	Were there any issues with safe performance of the work? ☐ Yes or ■No If yes, please explain:
5.	Was there any lost time? ☐ Yes or ■ No If yes, please explain:
7.	Were there any injuries? □ Yes or ■ No If yes, please explain:
3.	Was there any property damage to adjacent structures? ☐ Yes or ■ No If yes, please explain:
9.	Contract Value? \$1,014,927.66
).	Overall, would you enter into Contract with this firm again? ■ Yes or □ No
1.	Is there anything else you would like to share about the project or the firm's capabilities?

Questionnaire completed by: Wallace K. Stephens, President - Parker Stephens, Incorporated Date: February 25, 2016



February 18, 2016

Lake County School Board 220 N. Central Avenue Umatilla, FL 32784

Dear Mr. Kranke:

The City of Orlando has publicly solicited proposals regarding **RFP16-0150**, **RFP for Orlando City Hall Energy Efficiency Upgrades and HVAC Retrofit** in which <u>Ellis Mechanical Corporation</u>, has provided you as a reference. We would greatly appreciate your input in completing this Reference Questionnaire.

The Procurement and Contracts Division requests return of the Questionnaire by **Thursday February 25 at 5:00 p.m**. Please fax or email your completed Questionnaire to the attention of: Teddi McCorkle at <u>TeamC@cityoforlando.net</u> or by fax (407) 246-2869.

Thank you for your time in assisting us with this feedback.

1. Briefly describe the nature of the services provided.

	new units and existing units from rooftops to floors. Anything to do with refrigeration needs.
2.	Contract Value: <u>1-Million & Over</u>
3.	Was the project completed on time? □XX Yes or □ No If no, please explain:
4.	How would you rate the overall Service Level provided by the firm? □1 □2 □3 XX □4 □5 (On a scale from 1-5 with 5 being the highest)
5.	How would you rate the quality and timeliness of service? $\Box 1 \ \Box 2 \ \Box 3 \ XX \Box 4 \ \Box 5$
6.	Were there any warranty issues after the installation? Yes or No If so, how where they handled? There are always issues but they were handle and resolve in a timely manner.
7.	Did the installation occur as a live installation or with an empty area? Both-New & Existing
8.	Were there any problems during the performance of the work? ☐ Yes or XX☐ No If yes, please explain:
9.	Did the firm resolve issues in a satisfactory manner? XX □ Yes or □ No

Work consisted on installation of

10.	Were the firm's employees/workers courteous and did they perform in a professional manner while on the job? XX□ Yes □ No
11.	How well did firm's staff perform? □1 □2 □3 XX □4 □5 (On a scale from 1-5 with 5 being the highest)
12.	Did the firm meet your expectations? XX□ Yes or □ No Please explain:
13.	According to Contract requirements, scope, terms and conditions, please rate the overall performance of the firm. □1 □2 □3 XX □4 □5 (On a scale from 1-5 with 5 being the highest)
14.	Was the project completed on budget? XX □ Yes or □ No If no, please explain:
15.	Were there any issues with safe performance of the work? ☐ Yes or XX☐ No If yes, please explain:
16.	Was there any lost time? ☐ Yes or XX☐ No If yes, please explain:
17.	Were there any injuries? ☐ Yes or XX☐ No If yes, please explain:
18.	Was there any property damage to adjacent structures? ☐ Yes or XX☐ No If yes, please explain:
19.	Contract Value? They Really can discuss Dollar Values
20.	Overall, would you enter into Contract with this firm again? XX□ Yes or □ No
21.	Is there anything else you would like to share about the project or the firm's capabilities? We just enter into a New Contract with this firm.

Questionnaire completed by: Over the phone with (Silvia Coste)

(Name and Title) Mr. Kranke.

Date: 2/26/16

PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTS DIVISION



February 18, 2016

Lockheed Martin 5600 Sand Lake Road Orlando, FL

Dear Mr. Silver:

The City of Orlando has publicly solicited proposals regarding RFP16-0150, RFP for Orlando City Hall Energy Efficiency Upgrades and HVAC Retrofit in which Ellis Mechanical Corporation, has provided you as a reference. We would greatly appreciate your input in completing this Reference Questionnaire.

The Procurement and Contracts Division requests return of the Questionnaire by **Thursday February 25 at 5:00 p.m**. Please fax or email your completed Questionnaire to the attention of: Teddi McCorkle at <u>TeamC@cityoforlando.net</u> or by fax (407) 246-2869.

Thank you for your time in assisting us with this feedback.

1.	Briefly describe the nature of the services provided. <u>Ellis Mechanical provides HVAC</u> , piping, and plumbing construction <u>services for Jacobs at the Lockheed Martin property.</u>
2.	Contract Value: \$2.1M (since 2013).
3.	Was the project completed on time? ✓ Yes or ☐ No If no, please explain:
4.	How would you rate the overall Service Level provided by the firm? □1 □2 □3 □4 ☑5 (On a scale from 1-5 with 5 being the highest)
5.	How would you rate the quality and timeliness of service? $\Box 1$ $\Box 2$ $\Box 3$ $\Box 4$ $\Box 5$
6.	Were there any warranty issues after the installation? \square Yes or \square No If so, how where they handled?
7.	Did the installation occur as a live installation or with an empty area? Their work occurs as either a live installation or in an empty area.
8.	Were there any problems during the performance of the work? ☐ Yes or ☑ No If yes, please explain:

P-----

9. Did the firm resolve issues in a satisfactory manner? ✓ Yes or ☐ No

10.	Were the firm's employees/workers courteous and did they perform in a professional manner while on the job? $\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ $
11.	How well did firm's staff perform? □1 □2 □3 □4 ☑5 (On a scale from 1-5 with 5 being the highest)
12.	Did the firm meet your expectations? ☑ Yes or □ No Please explain:
13.	According to Contract requirements, scope, terms and conditions, please rate the overall performance of the firm. 1 1 2 3 14 5 (On a scale from 1-5 with 5 being the highest)
14.	Was the project completed on budget? ✓ Yes or ☐ No If no, please explain:
15.	Were there any issues with safe performance of the work? ☐ Yes or ☑ No If yes, please explain:
16.	Was there any lost time? ☐ Yes or ☑ No If yes, please explain:
17.	Were there any injuries? ☐ Yes or ☑ No If yes, please explain:
18.	Was there any property damage to adjacent structures? ☐ Yes or ☑ No If yes, please explain:
19.	Contract Value? Refer to Item #2.
20.	Overall, would you enter into Contract with this firm again? ☑ Yes or ☐ No
res ov Me	Is there anything else you would like to share about the project or the firm's capabilities? I have been working with this company for approximately 10 years, and they have always been sponsive to any immediate need that may arise. Their personnel are always professional and an erall, outstanding company that is always there when called upon. I highly recommend Ellis echanical for any job, and we are extremely lucky to have a company like this as part of the cobs team.
Qu	destionnaire completed by: <u>Jason Silver, Project Manager</u> Date: <u>2/23/16</u> (Name and Title)

February 18, 2016

Seminole State College 100 Weldon Blvd Sanford, FL

Dear Mr. Snyder:

The City of Orlando has publicly solicited proposals regarding RFP16-0150, RFP for Orlando City Hall Energy Efficiency Upgrades and HVAC Retrofit in which Ellis Mechanical Corporation, has provided you as a reference. We would greatly appreciate your input in completing this Reference Questionnaire.

The Procurement and Contracts Division requests return of the Questionnaire by Thursday February 25 at 5:00 p.m. Please fax or email your completed Questionnaire to the attention of: Teddi McCorkle at TeamC@cityoforlando.net or by fax (407) 246-2869.

Thank you for your time in assisting us with this feedback.

1.	Briefly describe the nature of the services providedReplacement of hot water lines on the Sanford Lake Mary campus during the early morning hours. Emergency repairs of broken underground water lines. Fire hydrant replacements and repairs on campus.
2.	Contract Value: Several projects / \$1.8 million, \$45,000.00, multiple projects at \$10,000 or less.
3.	Was the project completed on time? x Yes or □ No If no, please explain:
4.	How would you rate the overall Service Level provided by the firm? $\Box 1 \ \Box 2 \ \Box 3 \ x4 \ \Box 5$ (On a scale from 1-5 with 5 being the highest)
5.	How would you rate the quality and timeliness of service? □1 □2 □3 x4 □5
6.	Were there any warranty issues after the installation? x Yes or \(\subseteq \) No If so, how where they handled? They responded responsibility and cared for the issues
7.	Did the installation occur as a live installation or with an empt.y area?All where live
	PROCUDEMENT AND CONTRACTS DIVISION

HVAC Retrofit

8.	Were there any problems during the performance of the work? ☐ Yes or x No If yes, please explain:
9.	Did the firm resolve issues in a satisfactory manner? x Yes or □ No
10.	Were the firm's employees/workers courteous and did they perform in a professional manner while on the job? x Yes □ No
11.	How well did firm's staff perform? □1 □2 □3 x4 □5 (On a scale from 1-5 with 5 being the highest)
12.	Did the firm meet your expectations? x Yes or □ No Please explain:
13.	According to Contract requirements, scope, terms and conditions, please rate the overall performance of the firm. 1 1 2 13 x4 15 (On a scale from 1-5 with 5 being the highest)
14.	Was the project completed on budget? x Yes or □ No If no, please explain:
15.	Were there any issues with safe performance of the work? ☐ Yes or x No If yes, please explain:
16.	Was there any lost time? ☐ Yes or x No If yes, please explain:
17.	Were there any injuries? □ Yes or x No If yes, please explain:
18.	Was there any property damage to adjacent structures? ☐ Yes or ☐ No If yes, please explain:
19.	Contract Value? Answered in question #2
20.	Overall, would you enter into Contract with this firm again? x Yes or □ No
21.	Is there anything else you would like to share about the project or the firm's capabilities?

HVAC Retrofit

Locally owned and operated firm with genuine concern for their customers.

Questionnaire completed by: GARY SNYDER

(Name and Title)

SEMINOLE STATE COLLEGE

FACILITIES PLANT MANAGER

MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 30, 2013

TO: Procurement and Contracts Division Staff

FROM: David Billingsley, CPSM, C.P.M., Chief Procurement Officer

SUBJECT: Public Input

The Florida Legislature recently enacted a new state law, s. 286.1114, which requires that all local government boards and committees that are subject to the sunshine law provide an opportunity for reasonable public input prior to taking official action on any item (with the exception of administrative items such as approval of minutes and quasijudicial proceedings). Such comment must be allowed at the meeting where the board or committee takes action on the item or at a meeting in reasonable proximity to that date. Boards and Committees may adopt rules or policies governing the public input.

Procurement Advisory Committees are affected by this statue since they are sunshine committees and are making an award recommendation to City Council. Procurement Advisory Committees must adopt procedures for all meetings after October 1, 2013.

The statute provides that each committee can provide for its own implementation rules. As such, Procurement Advisory Committees should make a motion at the first meeting to follow these rules. For a particular procurement, the committee may modify or amend the procedures applicable to that solicitation. For example, if the procurement has a large public interest, the committee could establish longer comment periods.

Attached are recommended procedures for public input during Procurement Advisory Committees meetings.

Public Input Procedures For Procurement Advisory Committees

- A. After each motion (and a second) but before committee discussion on all non-ministerial motions, public comment will be permitted. Ministerial motions would be those that are not substantive actions, including most procedural motions, motions to approve minutes, and motions to adjourn.
- B. Each speaker is limited to 5 minutes. The Committee Chairperson may grant more time to a speaker, provided that if any other committee member objects to the granting of more time, the committee as a whole will vote on the extension.
- C. Public comment is limited to 30 minutes per motion.
- D. Groups are to be asked (not required) to appoint a spokesperson to avoid redundancy and stay within allotted time periods.
- E. If there are more speakers than would allow each to get their full 5 minutes, time periods will be reduced proportionally to not less than 1 minute per speaker unless the committee votes to extend the comment period. If there are more speakers than minutes in the comment period, by act of the Chairperson without objection from a member of the committee, or after a committee vote if there is an objection, the maximum comment period may be extended. As a practical matter, committees should try to extend the time where possible to allow everyone a chance to speak. If this is not possible due to time constraints or number of requests, comments should be taken in random order from all those requesting to speak until time expires.
- F. Each person addressing the committee should give their name and address for the record (minutes). Per the statute, a form asking to speak can be used (which may help with drafting the minutes and establishing priority to speak).
- G. Remarks should be addressed to the committee as a whole, not to individual members of the committee. This is not a question and answer period. The public may comment on the issues before the committee, but the committee is not required to respond to questions.
- H. Minutes should reflect that public comment was solicited even where no public comment was given, i.e. "The chairperson asked if there was anyone from the public who would like to speak, but no requests were received" or similar words should appear in the minutes.