

City of Pembroke Pines, FL

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

Agenda Request Form

Agenda Number: 2.

File ID: 20-0545 Type: Bid Status: Passed

Version: 1 Agenda In Control: City Commission

Section:

File Created: 07/08/2020

Short Title: Evaluation Committee Recomendation for PSEN-19-10 Final Action: 08/05/2020

"Street Lighting Inventory and Illumination Levels

Study"

Title: MOTION TO APPROVE THE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE AND TO AWARD RFQ # PSEN-19-10 "STREET LIGHTING INVENTORY AND ILLUMINATION LEVELS STUDY" TO A&P CONSULTING TRANSPORTATION ENGINEERS, CORP. AND TO DIRECT THE CITY MANAGER TO NEGOTIATE A CONTRACT FOR SERVICES, IN ACCORDANCE WITH FLORIDA STATUTE 287.055, CONSULTANTS COMPETITIVE NEGOTIATION ACT (CCNA).

*Agenda Date: 08/05/2020

Agenda Number: 2.

Internal Notes:

Attachments: 1. 2020-06-03 - 2nd Evaluation Committee - Meeting Minutes, 2. 2020-06-03 - 2nd Evaluation

Committee - Summary Rankings and Score Sheets, 3. 2020-05-12 - 1st Evaluation Committee -

Meeting Minutes, 4. Conflict of Interest Forms, 5. Bid Tabulation, 6. A&P Consulting

Transportation Engineers, Corp. - Bid Submittal, 7. RFQ # PSEN-19-10 Street Lighting Inventory

and Illumination Levels Study, 8. Commission Approval to Advertise

1 City Commission 08/05/2020 approve

Pass

Action Text: A motion was made to approve on the Consent Agenda

Aye: - 5 Mayor Ortis, Vice Mayor Siple, Commissioner Good Jr., Commissioner

Schwartz, and Commissioner Chanzes

Nay: - 0

MOTION TO APPROVE THE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE AND TO AWARD RFQ # PSEN-19-10 "STREET LIGHTING INVENTORY AND ILLUMINATION LEVELS STUDY" TO A&P CONSULTING TRANSPORTATION ENGINEERS, CORP. AND TO DIRECT THE CITY MANAGER TO NEGOTIATE A CONTRACT FOR SERVICES, IN ACCORDANCE WITH FLORIDA STATUTE 287.055, CONSULTANTS COMPETITIVE NEGOTIATION ACT (CCNA).

PROCUREMENT PROCESS TAKEN:

- Chapter 35 of the City's Code of Ordinance 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."
- 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(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 January 15, 2020, the City Commission authorized the advertisement of PSEN-19-10 "Street Lighting Inventory and Illumination Levels Study", which was advertised on January 21, 2020.
- 2. The purpose of this solicitation was to seek qualification statements from qualified firms to conduct a Street Lighting Inventory and Illumination Levels Study, and also develop a policy on illumination levels for the City.
- 3. On March 3, 2020 the City opened three (3) proposals from the following vendors:

Vendor Name:

- A&P Consulting Transportation Engineers, Corp.
- Twig Technologies
- A.D.A Engineering, Inc.
- 4. On May 12, 2020, the City convened an evaluation committee that was tasked with selecting, in order of preference, no less than three firms that they deemed to be the most highly qualified to perform the required services. In determining whether a firm is qualified, the Evaluation Committee shall evaluate the qualifications of the proposers based on the weighted criteria listed below:
 - 1) Adequacy of Personnel/Ability of Professional Personal (25%)
 - 2) Whether a firm is a Certified Minority Business Enterprise (5%)
 - 3) Past Record/Past Performance (25%)
 - 4) Capabilities (25%)
 - 5) Experience of the firm or individual (20%)

In the event a score, for an individual evaluator, resulted in a tie, the ranking for the tied vendors would have been broken based on the volume of work previously awarded to each firm by the City (the least amount of previously awarded work would result in the most favorable ranking) as outlined in Florida Statute 287.055(4)(b). In the event the results were still a tie, the score would have been broken by giving preference to a business that certified that it has implemented a drug-free workplace program on the Vendor Drug-Free Workplace Certification Form, as outlined in Florida Statute 287.087. In the event the results were still a tie, the score would have

been broken by publicly drawing lots, as outlined in Chapter 35 of the City's Code of Ordinances. The same procedures would also be used in the event the aggregate scores of the overall committee resulted in a tie.

- 5. At the May 12, 2020 meeting, the evaluation committee made a motion, which passed unanimously, to deem all responding firms, A&P Consulting Transportation Engineers, Corp., Twig Technologies, and A.D.A Engineering, Inc., qualified and to schedule a second meeting for questions and answers, allowing 15 minutes for each firm to have discussions with the Committee.
- 6. On June 3, 2020, the City re-convened the evaluation committee. The evaluation committee had discussions with each of the three (3) firms regarding their: (1) Qualifications, (2) Approach to the project; and (3) Ability to furnish the required services.
- 7. After having discussions with the firms, the evaluation committee scored and ranked the firms based on the weighted criteria provided for in the solicitation documents and listed below:
 - Adequacy of Personnel/Ability of Professional Personal (25%)
 - Whether a firm is a Certified Minority Business Enterprise (5%)
 - Past Record/Past Performance (25%)
 - Willingness to meet time and budget requirements (20%)
 - Recent, Current, and projected workloads of the firms (15%)
 - Location (5%)
 - Local Vendor Preference/Veteran Owned Small Business Preference (5%)
- 8. At the June 3, 2020, meeting, the evaluation committee ranked the vendors as shown below:

Rank Vendor Name

- 1 A&P Consulting Transportation Engineers, Corp.
- 2 Twig Technologies
- 3 A.D.A Engineering, Inc.
- 9. Based on the scoring results, the evaluation committee unanimously approved a motion to recommend the City Commission to award RFQ #PSEN-19-10 "Street Lighting Inventory and Illumination Levels Study", to the first ranked vendor, A&P Consulting Transportation Engineers, Corp., and to direct the City Manager to negotiate a contract for services.
- 10. An agenda item will be brought back to present to the Commission the negotiated contract executed by the vendor.
- 11. Should the City be unable to negotiate a satisfactory contract with the firm considered to be the most qualified at a price the agency determines to be fair, competitive, and reasonable, negotiations with that firm will be formally terminated and the City will undertake negotiations with the next most highly qualified firm.
- 12. A&P Consulting Transportation, Corp. has also completed the Equal Benefits Certification

Form and has stated that the "Contractor currently complies with the requirements of this section."

13. Request City Commission to approve the findings and recommendations of the evaluation committee and to award RFQ #PSEN-19-10 "Street Lighting Inventory and Illumination Levels Study" to A&P Consulting Transportation Engineers, Corp., and to direct the City Manager to negotiate a contract for services in accordance with Florida Statute 287.055, Consultants Competitive Negotiation Act (CCNA).

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: Funds are currently budgeted for this project in account # 100-541-6003-31100 (Professional Services Engineering).
- 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.