CITY OF ORLANDO

2nd ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
RQS18-0511
Request for Qualification Statements for
Continuing Wastewater Engineering Services
October 16, 2018 – 9 a.m.
Tarpon & Marlin Conference Rooms (4th 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:
Hector Sanchez, Project Manager II (Chair)
Charles Shultz, Wastewater Assistant Division Manager
Paul Deuel, Wastewater Assistant Division Manager
Charles Conklin, Project Manager II
LaChisha Lewis, Compliance Investigator II, Executive Offices/MWBE Office

Other City Personnel Present:
Fabio Henao, Purchasing Agent II (Facilitator)
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.

Presentation Schedule of Shortlisted Firms:

Time	Date	Company Name	Meeting Room	Floor
9:00 – 9:25 am	10/16/18	Barnes, Ferland and Associates	**Tarpon** Conference Room	4th
9:30 – 9:55 a.m.	10/16/18	Carollo Engineers, Inc.	**Marlin** Conference Room	4th
10:00 – 10:25 am	10/16/18	CPH, Inc.	**Tarpon** Conference Room	4th
10:30 – 10:55 a.m.	10/16/18	Tetra Tech, Inc.	**Marlin** Conference Room	4th
11:00 – 11:25 a.m.	10/16/18	Wright-Pierce, Inc.	**Tarpon** Conference Room	4th
11:30 – 11:55 a.m.	10/16/18	WSP USA, Inc.	**Marlin** Conference Room	4th

After presentations, the Facilitator asked the Committee for approval of the first Meeting Minutes of October 3, 2018. These Minutes had been distributed by email to all Committee Members. A motion was made by Charles Shultz and seconded by Hector Sanchez, 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. WSP USA, Inc.
2. Tetra Tech, Inc.
3. Barnes, Ferland and Associates
4. Carollo Engineers, Inc.
5. Wright-Pierce, Inc.
6. CPH, Inc.

A motion was made by Charles Shultz and seconded by Charles Conklin, 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. Discussions ensued and the motion carried unanimously.

A motion was made by Paul Deuel and seconded by Hector Sanchez, to adjourn at 12:21 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

These minutes are considered to be the official minutes of the RQS18-0511 Advisory Committee Meeting held on October 16, 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:

Hector Sanchez (Chair)
Project Manager II

Attachments:

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

Final Scoring / Ranking
RQS18-0511 Continuing Wastewater Engineering Services

Committee Members -->	Hector Sanchez	Charles Shultz	Paul Deuel	Charlie Conklin	LaChisha Lewis

Consolidated Ranking:

	Hector Sanchez	Charles Shultz	Paul Deuel	Charlie Conklin	LaChisha Lewis	Total	Ranking
Barnes, Ferland and Associates	4	1	4	3	2	14	3
Carollo Engineers, Inc.	5	6	2	4	4	21	4
CPH, Inc.	5	2	6	5	6	24	6
Tetra Tech, Inc.	1	5	3	1	3	13	2
Wright-Pierce, Inc.	3	4	5	6	5	23	5
WSP USA, Inc.	2	3	1	2	1	9	1

Individual Scoring / Ranking:

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Barnes, Ferland and Associates	Carollo Engineers, Inc.	CPH, Inc.	Tetra Tech, Inc.	Wright-Pierce, Inc.	WSP USA, Inc.
A	**25**	22	23	25	26	26	24
B	**15**	15	14	14	14	14	13
C	**16**	16	15	15	15	15	15
D	**15**	13	13	12	13	13	12
E	**10**	10	10	9	10	9.5	9
F	**4**	4	4	4	4	3	4
G	**5**	0	0	0	0	0	4
H	**10**	10	10	10	10	10	10
TOTAL POINT VALUE	**100**	**90**	**89**	**89**	**92**	**90.5**	**91**
Hector Sanchez Ranking		**4**	**5**	**5**	**1**	**3**	**2**

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Barnes, Ferland and Associates	Carollo Engineers, Inc.	CPH, Inc.	Tetra Tech, Inc.	Wright-Pierce, Inc.	WSP USA, Inc.
A	**25**	25	23	25	24	24	23
B	**15**	15	13	15	13	13	13
C	**16**	16	15	15	15	15	15
D	**15**	14	12	15	13	14	13
E	**10**	10	10	10	10	10	10
F	**4**	4	4	4	4	3	4
G	**5**	0	0	0	0	0	4
H	**10**	10	8	9.5	9.5	10	8
TOTAL POINT VALUE	**100**	**94**	**85**	**93.5**	**88.5**	**89**	**90**
Charles Shultz Ranking		**1**	**6**	**2**	**5**	**4**	**3**

Final Scoring / Ranking
RQS18-0511 Continuing Wastewater Engineering Services

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Barnes, Ferland and Associates	Carollo Engineers, Inc.	CPH, Inc.	Tetra Tech, Inc.	Wright-Pierce, Inc.	WSP USA, Inc.
A	**25**	22	25	22	23.5	23.5	23
B	**15**	15	15	15	15	15	15
C	**16**	16	15	15	15	15	15
D	**15**	15	15	15	15	15	15
E	**10**	10	10	10	10	10	10
F	**4**	4	4	4	4	3	4
G	**5**	0	0	0	0	0	4
H	**10**	10	10	10	10	10	10
TOTAL POINT VALUE	**100**	**92**	**94**	**91**	**92.5**	**91.5**	**96**
Paul Deuel		**4**	**2**	**6**	**3**	**5**	**1**
Ranking							

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Barnes, Ferland and Associates	Carollo Engineers, Inc.	CPH, Inc.	Tetra Tech, Inc.	Wright-Pierce, Inc.	WSP USA, Inc.
A	**25**	22	24	21	23.5	24	24
B	**15**	14	14	14	14	12	13
C	**16**	16	15	15	15	15	15
D	**15**	14	14	14	15	13	12
E	**10**	8	6	8	8	7	7
F	**4**	4	4	4	4	3	4
G	**5**	0	0	0	0	0	4
H	**10**	10	10	10	10	10	10
TOTAL POINT VALUE	**100**	**88**	**87**	**86**	**89.5**	**84**	**89**
Charlie Conklin		**3**	**4**	**5**	**1**	**6**	**2**
Ranking							

NO.	POSSIBLE POINTS	Barnes, Ferland and Associates	Carollo Engineers, Inc.	CPH, Inc.	Tetra Tech, Inc.	Wright-Pierce, Inc.	WSP USA, Inc.
A	**25**	25	24.5	22	25	24	25
B	**15**	15	15	15	15	15	15
C	**16**	16	15	15	15	15	15
D	**15**	15	15	15	15	15	15
E	**10**	10	10	10	10	10	10
F	**4**	4	4	4	4	3	4
G	**5**	0	0	0	0	0	4
H	**10**	10	10	7	10	9	8
TOTAL POINT VALUE	**100**	**95**	**93.5**	**88**	**94**	**91**	**96**
LaChisha Lewis		**2**	**4**	**6**	**3**	**5**	**1**
Ranking							

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL SCORING

RQS18-0511 Continuing Wastewater 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	Barnes, Ferland and Associates, Inc.	Carollo Engineers, Inc.	CPH, Inc.	Tetra Tech, Inc.	Wright-Pierce, Inc.	WSP USA, Inc.
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	22	23	25	26	26	24
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	15	14	14	14	14	13
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	16	15	15	15	15	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	13	13	12	13	13	12
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	9	10	9.5	9
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	4	4	4	4	3	4
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0	0	0	0	0	4
H. Respondent's demostrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
TOTAL POINTS	100	90	89	89	92	90.5	91
RANK	(1-6)	4th	5th	5th	1st	3rd	2nd

COMMITTEE MEMBER NAME: Hector Sanchez DATE: 10/16/2018

COMMITTEE MEMBER 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 SCORING
RQS18-0511 Continuing Wastewater 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	Barnes, Ferland and Associates, Inc.	Carollo Engineers, Inc.	CPH, Inc.	Tetra Tech, Inc.	Wright-Pierce, Inc.	WSP USA, Inc.
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	22	25	22	23.5	23.5	23
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	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	16	15	15	15	15	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	15	15	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	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	4	4	4	4	3	4
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0	0	0	0	0	4
H. Respondent's demostrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
TOTAL POINTS	100	92	94	91	92.5	91.5	96
RANK	(1-6)	4	2	6	3	5	1

COMMITTEE MEMBER NAME: Paul K. Pena DATE: 10/16/18

COMMITTEE MEMBER SIGNATURE: Paul K. Pena

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 SCORING

RQS18-0511 Continuing Wastewater 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	Barnes, Ferland and Associates, Inc.	Carollo Engineers, Inc.	CPH, Inc.	Tetra Tech, Inc.	Wright-Pierce, Inc.	WSP USA, Inc.
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	25	24.5	22	25	24	25
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	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	16	15	15	15	15	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	15	15	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	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	4	4	4	4	3	4
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0	0	0	0	0	4
H. Respondent's demostrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	10	10	7	10	9	8
TOTAL POINTS	100	95	93.5	88	94	91	96
RANK	(1-6)	2	4	6	3	5	1

COMMITTEE MEMBER NAME: Chisha Lewis DATE: 10/16/18

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.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FINAL SCORING

RQS18-0511 Continuing Wastewater 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	Barnes, Ferland and Associates, Inc.	Carollo Engineers, Inc.	CPH, Inc.	Tetra Tech, Inc.	Wright-Pierce, Inc.	WSP USA, Inc.
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	25	23	25	24	24	23
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	15	13	15	13	13	13
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	16	15	15	15	15	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	14	12	15	13	14	13
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
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	4	4	4	4	3	4
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0	0	0	0	0	4
H. Respondent's demostrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	10	8	9.5	9.5	10	8
TOTAL POINTS	100	94	85	93.5	88.5	89	90
RANK	(1-6)	1	6	2	5	4	3

COMMITTEE MEMBER NAME: Chuck Swartz DATE: 10-16-2018

COMMITTEE MEMBER SIGNATURE: C Swartz

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 SCORING

RQS18-0511 Continuing Wastewater 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	Barnes, Ferland and Associates, Inc.	Carollo Engineers, Inc.	CPH, Inc.	Tetra Tech, Inc.	Wright-Pierce, Inc.	WSP USA, Inc.
A. Respondent's experience and qualifications.	25	22	24	21	23.5	24	24
B. The experience and qualifications of the sub-consultants.	15	14	14	14	14	12	13
C. Participation of City-certified or recognized MBE/WBE firms and VBE firms in the performance of the work.	16	16	15	15	15	15	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	14	14	14	15	13	12
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	8	6	8	8	7	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	4	4	4	4	3	4
G. Volume of work previously awarded to Respondent by the City.	5	0	0	0	0	0	4
H. Respondent's demostrated understanding of the project's scope of work and approach to successful project completion.	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
TOTAL POINTS	100	88	87	86	89.5	84	89
RANK	(1-6)	3	4	5	1	6	2

COMMITTEE MEMBER NAME: Charlie Conklin DATE: 10/16/18

COMMITTEE MEMBER SIGNATURE: Charles Conklin

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.