



City of Pembroke Pines, FL

601 City Center Way
Pembroke Pines, FL
33025
www.ppines.com

Agenda Request Form

Agenda Number: 11.

File ID: 22-0251

Type: Bid

Status: Passed

Version: 1

**Agenda
Section:**

In Control: City Commission

File Created: 03/24/2022

Short Title: Award of RFQ # PSPW-21-08 Design Services for The
Polk Building Renovation

Final Action: 04/06/2022

Title: MOTION TO APPROVE THE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE
EVALUATION COMMITTEE AND TO AWARD RFQ # PSPW-21-08
"DESIGN SERVICES FOR THE POLK BUILDING RENOVATION" TO
SALTZ MICHELSON ARCHITECTS, INC. AND TO DIRECT THE CITY
MANAGER TO NEGOTIATE A CONTRACT FOR SERVICES.

***Agenda Date:** 04/06/2022

Agenda Number: 11.

Internal Notes:

Attachments: 1. PSPW-21-08 Bid Tabulation, 2. 03-24-2022 Meeting One Minutes, 3. 03-24-2022 Second Meeting Minutes, 4. Meeting Two Summary Rankings and Score Sheets, 5. Submittal by Saltz Michelson Architects, Inc., 6. PSPW-21-08 Design Services for Polk Building Renovation

Code Sections:

1 City Commission 04/06/2022 approve Pass
Action Text: A motion was made to approve on the Consent Agenda
Aye: - 5 Mayor Ortis, Vice Mayor Schwartz, Commissioner Castillo,
Commissioner Siple, and Commissioner Good Jr.
Nay: - 0

MOTION TO APPROVE THE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE AND TO AWARD RFQ # PSPW-21-08 "DESIGN SERVICES FOR THE POLK BUILDING RENOVATION" TO SALTZ MICHELSON ARCHITECTS, INC. AND TO DIRECT THE CITY MANAGER TO NEGOTIATE A CONTRACT FOR SERVICES.

PROCUREMENT PROCESS TAKEN:

- Chapter 35 of the City's Code of Ordinances is titled "PROCUREMENT PROCEDURES, PUBLIC FUNDS."

- Section 35.15 defines a Request for Qualifications as "A written solicitation for competitive sealed offers with the title, date and hour of the public opening designated. A request for qualifications shall include, but is not limited to, general information, functional or general specifications, statement of work, instructions for offer and evaluation criteria. All requests for qualifications shall state the relative importance of the evaluation criteria. The city may engage in competitive negotiations with responsible offerors determined to be reasonably susceptible of being selected for award for the purpose of clarification to assure full understanding of and conformance to the solicitation requirements. Offerors shall be accorded fair and equal treatment with respect to any opportunity for discussion and revision of offers, and such revisions may be permitted after submissions and prior to award for the purpose of obtaining the best and final offer."

- Section 35.18 of the City's Code of Ordinances is titled "COMPETITIVE BIDDING OR COMPETITIVE PROPOSALS REQUIRED; EXCEPTIONS."

- Section 35.18(A) states, "A purchase of or contracts for commodities or services that is estimated by the Chief Procurement Officer to cost more than \$25,000 shall be based on sealed competitive solicitations as determined by the Chief Procurement Officer, except as specifically provided herein."

- Section 35.19 of the City's Code of Ordinances is titled "SEALED COMPETITIVE BIDDING PROCEDURE."

- Section 35.19(A) states, "All sealed competitive solicitations as defined in §35.18 shall be presented to the City Commission for their consideration prior to advertisement."

- Florida Statute (F.S.) 287.055 is known as the "Consultant's Competitive Negotiation Act" (CCNA).

- F.S. Section 287.055(2)(a) defines Professional services as "those services within the scope of the practice of architecture, professional engineering, landscape architecture, or registered surveying and mapping, as defined by the laws of the state, or those performed by any architect, professional engineer, landscape architect, or registered surveyor and mapper in connection with his or her professional employment or

practice.”

- F.S. Section 287.055(2)(f) states “Project” means that fixed capital outlay study or planning activity described in the public notice of the state or a state agency under paragraph (3)(a). A project may include:

1. A grouping of minor construction, rehabilitation, or renovation activities.

2. A grouping of substantially similar construction, rehabilitation, or renovation activities.

- F.S. Section 287.055(3)(a)(1) states “Each agency shall publicly announce, in a uniform and consistent manner, each occasion when professional services must be purchased for a project the basic construction cost of which is estimated by the agency to exceed the threshold amount provided in s.287.017 for CATEGORY FIVE (\$325,000) or for a planning or study activity when the fee for professional services exceeds the threshold amount provided in s.287.017 for CATEGORY TWO (\$35,000), except in cases of valid public emergencies certified by the agency head. The public notice must include a general description of the project and must indicate how interested consultants may apply for consideration.”

- Section 35.21 of the City's Code of Ordinances is titled "AWARD OF CONTRACT."

- Section 35.21(A) of the City's Code of Ordinances is titled "City Commission approval."

- Section 35.21(A)(1) states, "An initial purchase of, or contract for, commodities or services, in excess of \$25,000, shall require the approval of the City Commission, regardless of whether the competitive bidding or competitive proposal procedures were followed."

SUMMARY EXPLANATION AND BACKGROUND:

1. On August 4, 2021, the City Commission authorized the advertisement of RFQ # PSPW-21-08 "Design Services for the Polk Building Renovation", which was advertised on August 12, 2021.

2. The purpose of this solicitation was to provide all professional services necessary to deliver complete and permitted design documents for the renovation of the Polk Building (Building #67) located at 8200 South Palm Drive, Pembroke Pines, FL 33025. The building will be used to house the City's Utility Customer Service and Billing Division, GIS Division, and will also serve as a secondary Emergency Operations Center. This project will provide the City with a much improved critical infrastructure, which includes a hardened building with a backup power source and centralized SCADA data access during and after a disaster. This will enable staff to simultaneously monitor system-wide operational data and customer emergency calls, thereby ensuring a centralized and efficiently-coordinated deployment of the field crews that will respond to emergency calls during and after a natural disaster or similar event.

3. On September 28, 2021, the City opened six (6) proposals from the following vendors (listed alphabetically):

- CPH, Inc.
- Diaz, Carreno, Scotti & Partners, Inc.
- M.C. Harry Associates, Inc.
- Robert Reid Wedding Architects and Planners, AIA, Inc.
- RVL Architecture & Design, P.A.
- Saltz Michelson Architects, Inc.

4. On March 24, 2022, the City convened an evaluation committee that was tasked with selecting, in order of preference, no less than three firms deemed to be the most highly qualified to perform the required services. In determining whether a firm is qualified, the evaluation committee evaluated the qualifications of the proposers based on the weighted criteria below:

- Adequacy of Personnel/Ability of Professional Personnel (15 points)
- Whether a firm is a Certified Minority Business Enterprise (5 points)
- Past Record/Past Performance (20 points)
- Capabilities (25 points)
- Experience (of the firm or individual) (35 points)

5. Prior to the committee meeting, the Procurement Department was informed that M.C. Harry Associates, Inc. and Diaz, Carreno, Scotti & Partners, Inc. would be withdrawing their bids and removing themselves from the evaluation process.

6. At the March 24, 2022 meeting, the evaluation committee made a motion, which passed unanimously, to deem the remaining four firms qualified and to shortlist them all to the second meeting.

7. On March 24, 2022, the City re-convened the evaluation committee for the second evaluation meeting. The four short-listed firms gave presentations followed by a question/answer session regarding their: 1) Qualifications; 2) Approach to the project; and 3) Ability to furnish the required services.

8. The evaluation committee scored and ranked the vendors based on the weighted criteria provided for in the solicitation documents and listed below:

- Adequacy of Personnel/Ability of Professional Personnel (30 points)
- Whether a firm is a Certified Minority Business Enterprise (5 points)
- Past Record/Past Performance (30 points)
- Willingness to meet time and budget requirements (10 points)
- Recent, current, and projected workloads of the firms (20 points)
- Location (5 points)

9. At the March 24, 2022 meeting, the evaluation committee ranked the vendors as shown below:

Rank	Vendor Name
1	Saltz Michelson Architects, Inc.
2	CPH, Inc.
3	Robert Reid Wedding Architects and Planners, AIA, Inc.
4	RVL Architecture & Design, P.A.

10. Based on the scoring results, the evaluation committee unanimously approved a motion to recommend the City Commission to award RFQ # PSPW-21-08 "Design Build Services for the Polk Building Renovation" to the first ranked vendor, Saltz Michelson Architects, Inc., and to direct the City Manager to enter into a contract for services. If negotiations fail, move on to the next highest ranked firm until an agreement can be made.

11. An agenda item will be brought back to present to Commission with the negotiated contract executed by the vendor.

12. Saltz Michelson Architects, Inc. has also completed the Equal Benefits Certification Form and has stated that the "Contractor currently complies with the requirements of this section."

13. Request Commission to approve the findings and recommendation of the evaluation committee and to award RFQ # PSPW-21-08 "Design Build Services for the Polk Building Renovation" to Saltz Michelson Architects, Inc. and to direct the City Manager to enter into a contract for services.

FINANCIAL IMPACT DETAIL:

- a) **Initial Cost:** None at this time. A negotiated contract will be brought back to the Commission, and executed by the vendor.
- b) **Amount budgeted for this item in Account No:** The Public Services Department will not proceed with the work until the funds are available.
- c) **Source of funding for difference, if not fully budgeted:** Not Applicable.
- d) **5 year projection of the operational cost of the project:** Not Applicable.
- e) **Detail of additional staff requirements:** Not Applicable.