CITY OF ORLANDO

2nd ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
RQS18-0306
Request for Qualification Statements for
Re-Solicitation of Orlando Citywide Pedestrian Traffic Signals
July 10, 2018 – 10 a.m.
Tarpon and Blowfish Conference Rooms (4th Floor)
City Hall, 400 S. Orange Ave., Orlando, FL

The 2nd Committee Meeting of the Advisory Committee is for Presentations of shortlisted firms and the recommendation of award.

Committee Members Present:
Jeremy Crowe, Project Manager II (Chair)
Cade Braud, Traffic Operations Engineer
Cesar Leirias, Civil Engineer IV
Mark Tobin, Signal Systems Engineer
Byron Raysor, MBE Project Manager

Other City Personnel Present:
Fabio Henao, Purchasing Agent II (Facilitator)
Teddi McCorkle, Assistant CPO

Members of the Public Present:
None

Actions/Discussion/Motions:
City staff introduced themselves and signed the attendance roster. The meeting time/location was publicly posted for more than 48 hours in advance, and there was a quorum present. After presentations took place, the Committee agreed on taking a recess of approximately 60 minutes and reconvene at the Tarpon Conference Room at 1:30 pm.

Presentation Schedule of Shortlisted Firms:

Time	Date	Company Name	Meeting Room	Floor
10:00 -- 10:30 a.m.	7/10/18	AVCON, Inc.	Tarpon Conference Room	4th
10:40 -- 11:10 a.m.	7/10/18	Comprehensive Engineering Services, Inc.	Blowfish Conference Room	4th
11:20 -- 11:50 a.m.	7/10/18	Traffic & Mobility Consultants LLC	Tarpon Conference Room	4th
12:00 – 12:30 p.m.	7/10/18	Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.	Blowfish Conference Room	4th

The Facilitator asked the Committee for approval of the first Meeting Minutes of June 26, 2018. These Minutes had been distributed by email to all Committee Members. A motion was made by Mark Tobin and seconded by Byron Raysor, to accept those Minutes as written. The motion carried unanimously.

Committee Members were advised that Qualification Statements must be independently scored by each Member; that Committee Members should not indicate to the group what scores he/she gives to a particular firm; and that Committee Members must not attempt to influence other Committee Members in their scoring.

The Meeting was turned over to the technical Chair and discussion ensued, and, then, Committee members individually scored/ranked the shortlisted firm according to the criteria outlined in the Request for Qualification Statements.

The consolidated results are as follows:

1. Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.
2. AVCON, Inc.
3. Comprehensive Engineering Services, Inc.
4. Traffic & Mobility Consultants LLC

A motion was made by Jeremy Crowe and seconded by Mark Tobin, to accept the ranking and to recommend to City Council for authorization for the Chief Procurement Officer (CPO) to negotiate a contract with the top ranked firm in ranked order until successful. There were no members of the public present. The motion carried unanimously.

A motion was made by Byron Raysor and seconded by Mark Tobin, to adjourn at 2:23 pm. The motion carried unanimously.

These minutes are considered to be the official minutes of the RQS18-0306 Advisory Committee Meeting held on July 10, 2018, and no other notes, tapes, or other recordings taken by anyone takes precedence.

Submitted by:

Fabio Henao. (Facilitator)
Purchasing Agent II

Reviewed and Accepted by:

Jeremy Crowe (Chair)
Project Manager II
Transportation Dept

Attachments:
Committee Scoring / Ranking

Request for Qualification Statements RQS18-0306
Re-Solicitation of orlando Citywide Pedestrian Traffic Signals
Shortlisting

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Jeremy Crowe	Cade Braud	Cesar Leirias	Mark Tobin	Byron Raysor

CONSOLIDATED RANKING:

	Jeremy Crowe	Cade Braud	Cesar Leirias	Mark Tobin	Byron Raysor	Total	Ranking
AVCON, Inc.	**3**	**2**	**3**	**1**	**1**	**10**	**2**
Comprehensive Engineering Services, Inc.	**2**	**3**	**2**	**3**	**3**	**13**	**3**
Traffic & Mobility Consultants LLC	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**20**	**4**
Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.	**1**	**1**	**1**	**2**	**2**	**7**	**1**

INDIVIDUAL SCORING AND RANKING:

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	AVCON, Inc.	Comprehensive Engineering Services, Inc.	Traffic & Mobility Consultants LLC	Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.
A	**35**	30	31	28	32
B	**20**	18	17	17	18
C	**25**	22	21	22	21
D	**10**	6	8	4	6
E	**10**	7	8	6	9
TOTAL POINT VALUE	**100**	**83**	**85**	**77**	**86**
Jeremy Crowe		**3**	**2**	**4**	**1**
Ranking					

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	AVCON, Inc.	Comprehensive Engineering Services, Inc.	Traffic & Mobility Consultants LLC	Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.
A	**35**	30	27.5	25	32.5
B	**20**	15	17	20	20
C	**25**	25	22.5	20	22.5
D	**10**	9	8	7	10
E	**10**	10	10	10	10
TOTAL POINT VALUE	**100**	**89**	**85**	**82**	**95**
Cade Braud		**2**	**3**	**4**	**1**
Ranking					

Request for Qualification Statements RQS18-0306
Re-Solicitation of orlando Citywide Pedestrian Traffic Signals
Shortlisting

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	AVCON, Inc.	Comprehensive Engineering Services, Inc.	Traffic & Mobility Consultants LLC	Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.
A	**35**	32	31	28	34
B	**20**	15	17	18	20
C	**25**	20	20	20	20
D	**10**	8	8	7	10
E	**10**	9	10	10	10
TOTAL POINT VALUE	**100**	**84**	**86**	**83**	**94**
Cesar Leirias		**3**	**2**	**4**	**1**
Ranking					

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	AVCON, Inc.	Comprehensive Engineering Services, Inc.	Traffic & Mobility Consultants LLC	Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.
A	**35**	32	30	28	30
B	**20**	18	16	18	16
C	**25**	23	23	20	24
D	**10**	10	10	10	10
E	**10**	10	8	8	10
TOTAL POINT VALUE	**100**	**93**	**87**	**84**	**90**
Mark Tobin		**1**	**3**	**4**	**2**
Ranking					

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	AVCON, Inc.	Comprehensive Engineering Services, Inc.	Traffic & Mobility Consultants LLC	Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.
A	**35**	33	33	32	33
B	**20**	18	18	18	18
C	**25**	23	23	23	23
D	**10**	8	7	7	8
E	**10**	8	7	6	7
TOTAL POINT VALUE	**100**	**90**	**88**	**86**	**89**
Byron Raysor		**1**	**3**	**4**	**2**
Ranking					

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

RQS18-0306 Re-Solicitation of Orlando Citywide Pedestrian Traffic Signals

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the short-listed Respondents based upon their Qualification Statements and their interviews in accordance with the following rating factors.

CATEGORY	Max. Points	AVCON, Inc.	Comprehensive Engineering Services, Inc.	Traffic & Mobility Consultants LLC	Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	35	30	27.5	25	32.5
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	15	17	20	20
C.The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	25	22.5	20	22.5
D. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project, meet time requirements, and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders, as well as make effective public presentations.	10	9	8	7	10
E. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	10	10	10	10
TOTAL POINTS	100	89	85	82	95
RANK	(1-4)	2	3	4	1

COMMITTEE MEMBER NAME: CADE BRAUD DATE: 7/10/18

(Print Name)

COMMITTEE MEMBER SIGNATURE: _____

Notes regarding Exhibit "G": Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors to determine the final ranking of the short-listed Respondents. Each member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each member will rank the Respondents based upon the member's score for each Respondent. The ranking established by each member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Respondents' total scores from each member will be added and compared. The Respondent with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Respondents. If the total scores from each of the tied Respondents also result in a tie, the City's Chief Procurement Officer, or designee, may instruct the Advisory Committee to conduct further deliberations, evaluations, and rescoring until a ranking without a tie for the top ranked firm is achieved.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

RQS18-0306 Re-Solicitation of Orlando Citywide Pedestrian Traffic Signals

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the short-listed Respondents based upon their Qualification Statements and their interviews in accordance with the following rating factors.

CATEGORY	Max. Points	AVCON, Inc.	Comprehensive Engineering Services, Inc.	Traffic & Mobility Consultants LLC	Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	35	30	31	28	32
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	18	17	17	18
C.The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	22	21	22	21
D. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project, meet time requirements, and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders, as well as make effective public presentations.	10	6	8	4	6
E. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	7	8	6	9
TOTAL POINTS	100	83	85	77	86
RANK	(1-4)	3	2	4	1

COMMITTEE MEMBER NAME: Jeremy M. Crowe DATE: 7-10-18

(Print Name)

COMMITTEE MEMBER SIGNATURE: _____

Notes regarding Exhibit "G": Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors to determine the final ranking of the short-listed Respondents. Each member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each member will rank the Respondents based upon the member's score for each Respondent. The ranking established by each member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Respondents' total scores from each member will be added and compared. The Respondent with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Respondents. If the total scores from each of the tied Respondents also result in a tie, the City's Chief Procurement Officer, or designee, may instruct the Advisory Committee to conduct further deliberations, evaluations, and rescoring until a ranking without a tie for the top ranked firm is achieved.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

RQS18-0306 Re-Solicitation of Orlando Citywide Pedestrian Traffic Signals

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the short-listed Respondents based upon their Qualification Statements and their interviews in accordance with the following rating factors.

CATEGORY	Max. Points	AVCON, Inc.	Comprehensive Engineering Services, Inc.	Traffic & Mobility Consultants LLC	Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	35	32	30	28	30
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	18	16	18	16
C.The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	23	23	20	24
D. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project, meet time requirements, and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders, as well as make effective public presentations.	10	10	10	10	10
E. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	10	8	8	10
TOTAL POINTS	100	93	87	84	90
RANK	(1-4)	1	3	4	2

COMMITTEE MEMBER NAME: MARK D TOBIN DATE: 7-10-18

(Print Name)

COMMITTEE MEMBER SIGNATURE: Mark D Tobin

Notes regarding Exhibit "G": Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors to determine the final ranking of the short-listed Respondents. Each member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each member will rank the Respondents based upon the member's score for each Respondent. The ranking established by each member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Respondents' total scores from each member will be added and compared. The Respondent with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Respondents. If the total scores from each of the tied Respondents also result in a tie, the City's Chief Procurement Officer, or designee, may instruct the Advisory Committee to conduct further deliberations, evaluations, and rescoring until a ranking without a tie for the top ranked firm is achieved.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

RQS18-0306 Re-Solicitation of Orlando Citywide Pedestrian Traffic Signals

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the short-listed Respondents based upon their Qualification Statements and their interviews in accordance with the following rating factors.

CATEGORY	Max. Points	AVCON, Inc.	Comprehensive Engineering Services, Inc.	Traffic & Mobility Consultants LLC	Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	35	33	33	32	33
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	18	18	18	18
C.The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	23	23	23	23
D. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project, meet time requirements, and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders, as well as make effective public presentations.	10	8	7	7	8
E. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	8	7	6	7
TOTAL POINTS	100	90	88	86	89
RANK	(1-4)	1	3	4	2

COMMITTEE MEMBER NAME: Byron Raysor DATE: 7/10/18

(Print Name)

COMMITTEE MEMBER SIGNATURE: Byr Ray

Notes regarding Exhibit "G": Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors to determine the final ranking of the short-listed Respondents. Each member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each member will rank the Respondents based upon the member's score for each Respondent. The ranking established by each member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Respondents' total scores from each member will be added and compared. The Respondent with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Respondents. If the total scores from each of the tied Respondents also result in a tie, the City's Chief Procurement Officer, or designee, may instruct the Advisory Committee to conduct further deliberations, evaluations, and rescoring until a ranking without a tie for the top ranked firm is achieved.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING

RQS18-0306 Re-Solicitation of Orlando Citywide Pedestrian Traffic Signals

The Advisory Committee will evaluate and score the short-listed Respondents based upon their Qualification Statements and their interviews in accordance with the following rating factors.

CATEGORY	Max. Points	AVCON, Inc.	Comprehensive Engineering Services, Inc.	Traffic & Mobility Consultants LLC	Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	35	32	31	28	34
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	20	15	17	18	20
C.The Respondent and subconsultants' records of successful performances on past projects including factors such as cost control, work quality and demonstrated ability to adhere to schedules and budgetary requirements for such projects.	25	20	20	20	20
D. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project, meet time requirements, and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders, as well as make effective public presentations.	10	8	8	7	10
E. Respondent's demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	9	10	10	10
TOTAL POINTS	100	84	86	83	94
RANK	(1-4)	3	2	4	1

COMMITTEE MEMBER NAME: CESAR VEIRAS DATE: 7/10/2018

(Print Name)

COMMITTEE MEMBER SIGNATURE: _____

Notes regarding Exhibit "G": Each Advisory Committee member will evaluate the above factors to determine the final ranking of the short-listed Respondents. Each member will assign an item score ranging from zero (0) points to the maximum points allowed for each rating factor. The item scores will then be added to determine the total score. The maximum possible total score for this evaluation table is one hundred (100). Each member will rank the Respondents based upon the member's score for each Respondent. The ranking established by each member will be accumulated to determine the final ranking. Each member's top-ranked firm will be assigned one (1) point, second-ranked firm two (2) points and so on. After accumulating the members' scores, the firm with the lowest score shall be ranked first, the next lowest score shall be ranked second, and so on. In the event of a tie, the tied Respondents' total scores from each member will be added and compared. The Respondent with the highest point total will be ranked highest of the tied Respondents. If the total scores from each of the tied Respondents also result in a tie, the City's Chief Procurement Officer, or designee, may instruct the Advisory Committee to conduct further deliberations, evaluations, and rescoring until a ranking without a tie for the top ranked firm is achieved.