



# CITY OF ORLANDO

## 2nd ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

RQS18-0366

Request for Qualification Statements for  
Continuing Stormwater Engineering Services

August 8 & 9, 2018 – 8 a.m.

Tarpon, Blowfish & Marlin Conference Rooms (4<sup>th</sup> Floor)  
City Hall, 400 S. Orange Ave., Orlando, FL

The purpose of this meeting was to hold discussions with shortlisted firms, review, score, and rank each of those firms on its qualification statement and clarifying interview session.

### Committee Members Present:

Eva “Nicki” Wesson, Project Manager II (Chair)  
James D. Hunt, Deputy Public Works Director  
Lisa Henry, Streets and Stormwater Division Manger  
Richard Lee, Stormwater Assistant Division Manager  
LaChisha Lewis, Compliance Investigator II, Executive Offices/MWBE Office

### Other City Personnel Present:

Fabio Henao, Purchasing Agent II (Facilitator)  
Richard Allen, City Surveyor (Technical Advisor)  
Anthony McCall, Purchasing Agent II

### Members of the Public Present:

None

### Actions/Discussion/Motions:

City staff introduced themselves and signed the attendance roster. The meeting(s) was publicly posted for more than 48 hours in advance, and there was a quorum present. Day one for presentations was recessed on August 8, 2018, at 11:54 a.m., and reconvened on August 9, 2018, at 8 a.m.

### Presentation Schedule of Shortlisted Firms:

<u>Time</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Company Name</u>	<u>Meeting Room</u>	<u>Floor</u>
8:00 – 8:50 am	8/8/18	CDM Smith, Inc.	<u>Tarpon</u> Conference Room	<u>4<sup>th</sup></u>
9:00 – 9:50 a.m.	8/8/18	Cribb Philbeck Weaver Group, Inc.	<u>Blowfish</u> Conference Room	<u>4<sup>th</sup></u>
10:00 – 10:50 am	8/8/18	E-Sciences, Inc.	<u>Tarpon</u> Conference Room	<u>4<sup>th</sup></u>
11:00 – 11:50 pm	8/8/18	Geosyntec Consultants, Inc.	<u>Blowfish</u> Conference Room	<u>4<sup>th</sup></u>
8:00 – 8:50 pm	8/9/18	GTC Engineering Corporation	<u>Tarpon</u> Conference Room	<u>4<sup>th</sup></u>
9:00 – 9:50 a.m.	8/9/18	RS&H, Inc.	<u>Marlin</u> Conference Room	<u>4<sup>th</sup></u>
10:00 – 10:50 am	8/9/18	Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.	<u>Tarpon</u> Conference Room	<u>4<sup>th</sup></u>

After presentations, the Facilitator asked the Committee for approval of the first Meeting Minutes of July 25, 2018. These Minutes had been distributed by email to all Committee Members. A motion was made by Lisa Henry and seconded by James Hunt, to accept those Minutes as written. The motion carried unanimously.

The Facilitator handed out the pre-determined scores (calculated as per solicitation requirements) to each Respondent. These scores did not change from the first meeting.

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. CDM Smith, Inc.
2. GTC Engineering Corporation
3. Geosyntec Consultants, Inc.
4. RS&H, Inc.
5. Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.
6. E-Sciences, Inc.
7. Cribb Philbeck Weaver Group, Inc.

A motion was made by Eva "Nicki" Wesson and seconded by James Hunt, to accept the rankings and to recommend to City Council for authorization for the Chief Procurement Officer (CPO) to negotiate and execute contracts, and all subsequent renewals, for Continuing Contracts with the top six (6) ranked firms. There were no members of the public present. The motion carried unanimously.


A motion was made by Lisa Henry and seconded by James Hunt, to adjourn at 1:13 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

These minutes are considered to be the official minutes of the RQS18-0366 Advisory Committee Meeting held on August 8 & 9, 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:

  
Eva "Nicki" Wesson (Chair)  
Project Manager II

Attachments:

Predetermined Scores  
Consolidated Scoring and Rating Spreadsheet  
Individual Scoring and Rating Sheets

Final Scoring/Ranking  
RQS18-0366 Continuing Stormwater Engineering Services

<b>Committee Members --&gt;</b>	Nicki Wesson	Lisa Henry	Jim Hunt	Richard Lee	LaChisha Lewis
---------------------------------	--------------	------------	----------	-------------	----------------

**Consolidated Ranking:**

	Nicki Wesson	Lisa Henry	Jim Hunt	Richard Lee	LaChisha Lewis	Total	Ranking
CDM Smith, Inc.	4	1	1	2	1	9	1
Cribb Philbeck Weaver Group	7	6	7	6	7	33	7
E-Sciences, Inc.	6	3	4	7	4	24	6
Geosyntec Consultants, Inc.	1	5	2	5	6	19	3
GTC Engineering Corporation	2	2	3	1	2	10	2
RS&H, Inc.	3	4	6	4	5	22	4
Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.	5	7	5	3	3	23	5

**Individual Scoring / Ranking:**

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	CDM Smith, Inc.	Cribb Philbeck Weaver Group	E-Sciences, Inc.	Geosyntec Consultants, Inc.	GTC Engineering Corporation	RS&H, Inc.	Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.
A	25	25	15	20	23	25	25	23
B	15	15	14	15	15	15	15	15
C	16	14	14	15	15	14	14	15
D	15	15	13	10	15	15	15	14
E	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
F	4	3	2	4	2	4	4	4
G	5	0	5	3	5	1	0	0
H	10	10	8	10	10	10	10	10
<b>TOTAL POINT VALUE</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>91</b>

Final Scoring/Ranking  
RQS18-0366 Continuing Stormwater Engineering Services

<b>Nicki Wesson</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Ranking</b>							

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	CDM Smith, Inc.	Cribb Philbeck Weaver Group	E-Sciences, Inc.	Geosyntec Consultants, Inc.	GTC Engineering Corporation	RS&H, Inc.	Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.
A	25	25	21	23	22	24	23	22
B	15	15	14	14	14	14	14	14
C	16	14	14	15	15	14	14	15
D	15	15	13	14	13	15	15	14
E	10	10	9	8	8	9	9	8
F	4	3	2	4	2	4	4	4
G	5	0	5	3	5	1	0	0
H	10	10	8	8	8	9	9	8
<b>TOTAL POINT VALUE</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>Lisa Henry</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Ranking</b>								

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	CDM Smith, Inc.	Cribb Philbeck Weaver Group	E-Sciences, Inc.	Geosyntec Consultants, Inc.	GTC Engineering Corporation	RS&H, Inc.	Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.
A	25	25	20	22	24	24	22	22
B	15	15	14	14	14	14	14	14
C	16	14	14	15	15	14	14	15
D	15	15	14	13	14	14	13	14
E	10	10	9	8	9	9	8	7
F	4	3	2	4	2	4	4	4
G	5	0	5	3	5	1	0	0
H	10	10	5	8	8	9	9	9
<b>TOTAL POINT VALUE</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>Jim Hunt</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Ranking</b>								

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	CDM Smith, Inc.	Cribb Philbeck Weaver Group	E-Sciences, Inc.	Geosyntec Consultants, Inc.	GTC Engineering Corporation	RS&H, Inc.	Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.
A	25	25	19	20	19	25	24	24
B	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15
C	16	14	14	15	15	14	14	15
D	15	15	14	13	14	14	15	15
E	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
F	4	3	2	4	2	4	4	4
G	5	0	5	3	5	1	0	0
H	10	10	9	7	9	10	8	8
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	92	88	87	89	93	90	91
Richard Lee		2	6	7	5	1	4	3
Ranking								

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	CDM Smith, Inc.	Cribb Philbeck Weaver Group	E-Sciences, Inc.	Geosyntec Consultants, Inc.	GTC Engineering Corporation	RS&H, Inc.	Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.
A	25	25	20	21	21	22	20	23
B	15	15	13	15	15	15	15	14
C	16	14	14	15	15	14	14	15
D	15	15	13	14	12	15	15	15
E	10	10	6	9	7	10	10	10
F	4	3	2	4	2	4	4	4
G	5	0	5	3	5	1	0	0
H	10	10	7	5	6	8	7	7
TOTAL POINT VALUE	100	92	80	86	83	89	85	88
LaChisha Lewis		1	7	4	6	2	5	3
Ranking								

**EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING**  
**RQS18-0366 Continuing Stormwater Engineering Services**

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	CDM Smith, Inc.	Cribb Philbeck Weaver Group, Inc.	E Sciences, Inc.	Geosyntec Consultants, Inc.	GTC Engineering Corporation	RS&H, Inc.	Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc. (VHB)
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	25	15	20	23	25	25	23
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	15	14	15	15	15	15	15
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	14	14	15	15	14	14	15
D. 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.	15	15	13	10	15	15	15	14
E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando.	4	3	2	4	2	4	4	4
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0	5	3	5	1	0	0
H. Respondent's Demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	10	8	10	10	10	10	10
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>91</b>
<b>RANK</b>	<b>(1-7)</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>

COMMITTEE MEMBER NAME: Nicki Wesson DATE: 8/9/18

COMMITTEE MEMBER SIGNATURE: Nicki Wesson

Notes regarding Exhibit B: 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.

**EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING**  
**RQS18-0366 Continuing Stormwater Engineering Services**

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	CDM Smith, Inc.	Cribb Philbeck Weaver Group, Inc.	E Sciences, Inc.	Geosyntec Consultants, Inc.	GTC Engineering Corporation	RS&H, Inc.	Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc. (VHB)
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	25	21	23	22	24	23	22
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	15	14	14	14	14	14	14
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	14	14	15	15	14	14	15
D. 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.	15	15	13	14	13	15	15	14
E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	10	9	8	8	9	9	8
F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando.	4	3	2	4	2	4	4	4
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0	5	3	5	1	0	0
H. Respondent's Demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	10	8	8	8	9	9	8
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>RANK</b>	<b>(1-7)</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>

COMMITTEE MEMBER NAME: Lisa Henry DATE: 8/9/2018

COMMITTEE MEMBER SIGNATURE: [Signature]

Notes regarding Exhibit B: 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.

**EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING**  
**RQS18-0366 Continuing Stormwater Engineering Services**

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	CDM Smith, Inc.	Cribb Philbeck Weaver Group, Inc.	E Sciences, Inc.	Geosyntec Consultants, Inc.	GTC Engineering Corporation	RS&H, Inc.	Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc. (VHB)
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	25	20	22	24	24	22	22
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	15	14	14	14	14	14	14
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	14	14	15	15	14	14	15
D. 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.	15	15	14	13	14	14	13	14
E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	10	9	8	9	9	8	7
F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando.	4	3	2	4	2	4	4	4
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0	5	3	5	1	0	0
H. Respondent's Demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	10	5	8	8	9	9	9
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>RANK</b>	<b>(1-7)</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>

COMMITTEE MEMBER NAME: Sim Hunt

DATE: 08/09/2018

COMMITTEE MEMBER SIGNATURE: [Signature]

Notes regarding Exhibit B: 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.



**EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING**  
**RQS18-0366 Continuing Stormwater Engineering Services**

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	CDM Smith, Inc.	Cribb Philbeck Weaver Group, Inc.	E Sciences, Inc.	Geosyntec Consultants, Inc.	GTC Engineering Corporation	RS&H, Inc.	Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc. (VHB)
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	25	19	20	19	25	24	24
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	14	14	15	15	14	14	15
D. 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.	15	15	14	13	14	14	15	15
E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando.	4	3	2	4	2	4	4	4
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0	5	3	5	1	0	0
H. Respondent's Demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	10	9	7	9	10	8	8
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>100</b>	92	88	87	89	93	90	91
<b>RANK</b>	<b>(1-7)</b>	2	6	7	5	1	4	3

COMMITTEE MEMBER NAME: Richard Lee DATE: 8/9/18

COMMITTEE MEMBER SIGNATURE: Richard Lee

Notes regarding Exhibit B: 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.

**EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL RANKING**  
**RQS18-0366 Continuing Stormwater Engineering Services**

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	CDM Smith, Inc.	Cribb Philbeck Weaver Group, Inc.	E Sciences, Inc.	Geosyntec Consultants, Inc.	GTC Engineering Corporation	RS&H, Inc.	Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc. (VHB)
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	25	20	21	21	22	20	23
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	15	13	15	15	15	15	14
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	14	14	15	15	14	14	15
D. 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.	15	15	13	14	12	15	15	15
E. Ability of Respondent's and subconsultants' personnel to devote necessary time to the project and work successfully with City staff and any other stakeholders.	10	10	6	9	7	10	10	10
F. Proximity of the location of Respondent's office, where the majority of its work will be performed on this project, to the City of Orlando.	4	3	2	4	2	4	4	4
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0	5	3	5	1	0	0
H. Respondent's Demonstrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	10	7	5	6	8	7	7
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>RANK</b>	<b>(1-7)</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>

COMMITTEE MEMBER NAME: Chisha Lewis DATE: 8/9/18

COMMITTEE MEMBER SIGNATURE: Chisha Lewis

Notes regarding Exhibit B: 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.