

**AGENDA REQUEST FOR
GOVERNING BOARD MEETING
March 13, 2018**

MEMORANDUM

TO: Governing Board

THROUGH: Ann B. Shortelle, Ph.D.
Executive Director

FROM: Michael A. Register, Director
Division of Water Supply Planning and Assessment

SUBJECT: Engineering and Environmental Services Contracts

RECOMMENDATION

Approval of consultant rankings for Request for Qualifications for Engineering and Environmental Services; authorize contract negotiations with the top-ranked firms listed for each discipline; and authorize the Executive Director or designee to execute the final contracts in accordance with District policy up to \$3,750,000.

Consultants:

Discipline A: Hydrological Modeling and Analysis (top 5 respondents)

- 1) Collective Water Resources
- 2) Intera, Inc.
- 3) Cardno, Inc.
- 4) Jones Edmunds & Associates, Inc.
- 5) Dynamic Solutions, LLC

Discipline B: Environmental Assessment (top 4 respondents)

- 1) Cardno, Inc.
- 2) Janicki Environmental, Inc.
- 3) HSW Engineering, Inc.
- 4) Greenman-Pedersen, Inc.

Discipline C: Independent Scientific/Technical Peer Review and Expert Services

- 1) Applied Technology & Management, Inc. (top 8 respondents)
- 2) Tetra Tech, Inc.
- 3) HSW Engineering, Inc.
- 4) Cardno, Inc.
- 5) Intera, Inc.
- 6) Louis H. Motz, Sole Proprietor
- 7) Dynamic Solutions, LLC
- 8) Greenman-Pedersen, Inc.

Discipline D: Detailed engineering design, construction monitoring, and other related services for water resources projects (top 6 respondents)

- 1) Kimley-Horn & Associates, Inc.
- 2) Jones Edmunds & Associates, Inc.
- 3) Four Waters Engineering, Inc.
- 4) Black and Veatch Corporation
- 5) CDM Smith, Inc.
- 6) Reiss Engineering, Inc.

Amount: \$3,750,000 (\$2,750,000 for the initial 36-month period; \$1,000,000 for the 24-month renewal period; all funds shared between 16 contracts)

Account Name: General Program / Initiative Costs

Funding Source: District Sources

Budget Authority: FY2017-2018 **Adopted Budget:** \$450,000

Budget Authority: Succeeding fiscal year amounts are contingent on Governing Board approval of each fiscal year budget.

EOG Program/Activity Code: 1.1.0 District Water Management Planning and
2.3.0 Surface Water Projects

Completion: 36 months; **Renewable:** One 24-month renewal period

RFQ Opening: January 18, 2018 **Responses Received:** 27

Special Notes: Solicitation schedule, final scores and rankings and evaluation criteria are included.

All work will be accomplished through District-issued work orders

BACKGROUND

The District has several programs that support the District's mission to ensure the sustainable use and protection of water resources for the benefits of the people of the District and the state of Florida. The following is a list of these programs:

1. Minimum Flows and Levels Determination
2. Minimum Flows and Levels Prevention and Recovery
3. Alternative Water Supply Development Projects
4. North Florida Regional Water Supply Planning
5. Central Springs and East Coast Water Supply
6. Central Florida Water Initiative

To support these programs/projects, and other core mission elements, the District performs a multitude of projects involving hydrologic analysis and computer modeling, environmental assessment, technical peer review, and engineering design and construction monitoring. Due to the amount of work required for the projects and the desire for outside expertise and peer review related to this work, the District desires to enter into agreements with environmental and professional engineering firms, which have expertise in the following four disciplines:

1. Hydrological Modeling and Analysis

2. Environmental Assessment
3. Independent Scientific/Technical Peer Review and Expert Services
4. Detailed engineering design, construction monitoring, and other related services for water resources projects

DISCUSSION

Contemplated projects may be located in any of the 18 counties that comprise the District and areas outside of the District boundaries that may influence waters of the District.

These contracts will provide the District with the ability to accomplish various technical work and studies that District's staff could not otherwise perform, either due to insufficient manpower, technical expertise, or other resources. The work will include various tasks related hydrologic modeling and analysis, environmental assessment, scientific peer review, and engineering design/construction monitoring.

Work shall be performed solely based on Work Orders, which shall be issued as needed by the District. Each work order will specify the scope, specific work requirements, task duration, deliverables and budget.

The committee is recommending multiple awards under each discipline to provide ample technical expertise to meet the proposed work under each discipline. Work orders scopes and budgets will vary and the District expects that most of these work orders will be less than \$100,000.

Request for Qualifications (RFQ) 32518 for Engineering and Environmental Services was advertised on DemandStar, the state of Florida Vendor Bid System, and Vendor Registry. Responses were opened January 19, 2018, and of the 4,750 potential respondents notified, 103 downloaded or requested the solicitation documents and 27 responded (refer to list below); all respondents met the minimum qualifications.

- Amec Foster Wheeler Environment & Infrastructure, Inc.
- Applied Technology & Management, Inc.
- Balmoral Group, LLC
- Black and Veatch Corporation
- Cardno, Inc.
- CDM Smith, Inc.
- Collective Water Resources, LLC
- Dewberry Engineers, Inc.
- Dunn, Salsano & Vergara Consulting, LLC
- Dynamic Solutions, LLC
- Environmental Consulting & Tech., Inc.
- Four Waters Engineering, Inc.
- Greenman-Pedersen, Inc.
- HSW Engineering, Inc.
- Hydro Solutions Consulting, LLC
- Intera, Inc.
- Janicki Environmental, Inc.
- Jones Edmunds & Associates, Inc.

- Kimley-Horn & Associates, Inc.
- Inovia Consulting Group
- Louis H. Motz, Sole Proprietor
- Reiss Engineering, Inc.
- Tetra Tech, Inc.
- Water & Air Research, Inc.
- Water Resource Associates, LLC
- Water Resources Management Associates, Inc.
- Woodard & Curan, Inc.

When the District requires services under a given discipline, work orders will be awarded to the consultant(s) based on the following preferential order:

1. Consultant with the most applicable qualifications and experience that best meets the requirements of that work order (statement of work);
2. If two or more of Consultants have the requisite qualifications and experience for a work order, the District will award the work order to Consultant with the least volume of work previously awarded under this contract; or
3. By lot

Solicitation and evaluation schedule:

Advertise	December 19, 2017
Responses due	January 18, 2018, 2:00 pm
Evaluation Team Meetings	February 1, 8, and 15, 2018
Issue Notice of Intended Decision	February 16, 2018
Negotiations	March 14 and 15, 2018, 9:00 am

Minimum Qualifications:

- All lead engineers must be currently licensed as a professional engineer through the Florida Department of Business and Professional Regulation
- Have two client references
- Letter of commitment from a principal of each subcontractor

Evaluation results:

Committee members scored and ranked each Submittal under each individual Discipline using the evaluation forms included in the solicitation. Using these scores, each Committee member ranked the responses using "1" for the Response receiving the highest number of points.

Responses with an equal number of points received the same numerical ranking (i.e., tie for second: 1, 2, 2, 4). The District totaled the numerical rankings for each Response and considered the Response with the lowest total to be the most highly qualified Respondent(s).

This was done for each Discipline.

1. If two or more of Consultants have the requisite qualifications and experience for a work order, the District will award the work order to Consultant with the least volume of work previously awarded under this contract; or
2. By lot

Solicitation and evaluation schedule:

Advertise	December 19, 2017
Responses due	January 18, 2018, 2:00 pm

Evaluation Team Meetings February 1, 8, and 15, 2018
 Issue Notice of Intended Decision February 16, 2018
 Negotiations March 14 and 15, 2018, 9:00 am

Minimum Qualifications:

- All lead engineers must be currently licensed as a professional engineer through the Florida Department of Business and Professional Regulation
- Have two client references
- Letter of commitment from a principal of each subcontractor

Evaluation results:

Committee members scored and ranked each Submittal under each individual Discipline using the evaluation forms included in the solicitation. Using these scores, each Committee member ranked the responses using "1" for the Response receiving the highest number of points. Responses with an equal number of points received the same numerical ranking (i.e., tie for second: 1, 2, 2, 4). The District totaled the numerical rankings for each Response and considered the Response with the lowest total to be the most highly qualified Respondent(s). This was done for each Discipline.

RFQ 32518 - ENGINEERING & ENVIRNMTL SRVCS	Total of Ordinal Scores	Final Standing - Ordinal Ranked Scores	Written Score
RESPONDENT	A. Hydrological Model & Analysis	A. Hydrological Model & Analysis	A. Hydrological Model & Analysis
Collective Water Resources, LLC	10	1	42.36
Intera, Inc.	13	2	42.65
Cardno, Inc.	13	2	42.35
Jones Edmunds & Associates, Inc.	16	4	41.19
Dynamic Solutions, LLC	24	5	40.20
Kimley-Horn & Associates, Inc.	37	6	37.28
Water Resources Mgmt Assoc., Inc.	40	7	35.44
CDM Smith, Inc.	45	8	34.17
Water Resource Associates, LLC	45	8	34.25
Louis H. Motz, Sole Proprietor	49	10	31.92
Woodard & Curan, Inc.	49	10	32.97
Balmoral Group, LLC	55	12	30.02
Environmental Consulting & Tech., Inc.	59	13	30.13

RFQ 32518 - ENGINEERING & ENVIRNMTL SRVCS	Total of Ordinal Scores	Final Standing - Ordinal Ranked Scores	Written Score
RESPONDENT	B. Environmental Assessment	B. Environmental Assessment	B. Environmental Assessment
Cardno, Inc.	8	1	43.70
Janicki Environmental, Inc.	10	2	43.02
HSW Engineering, Inc.	21	3	40.45
Greenman-Pedersen, Inc.	21	3	39.37
Amec Foster Wheeler Env. & Infra., Inc.	24	5	37.96
Dunn, Salsano & Vergara Cons., LLC	28	6	36.78
Water & Air Research, Inc.	31	7	36.37
Hydro Solutions Consulting, LLC	40	8	33.05
Environmental Consulting & Tech., Inc.	46	9	31.03
Woodard & Curan, Inc.	46	9	31.70
Water Resource Associates, LLC	53	11	26.90

RFQ 32518 - ENGINEERING & ENVIRNMTL SRVCS	Total of Ordinal Scores	Final Standing - Ordinal Ranked Scores	Written Score
RESPONDENT	C. Sci/Tech Peer Rev & Exp Svcs	C. Sci/Tech Peer Rev & Exp Svcs	C. Sci/Tech Peer Rev & Exp Svcs
Applied Technology & Mgmt, Inc.	14	1	43.12
Tetra Tech, Inc.	18	2	42.74
HSW Engineering, Inc.	19	3	42.98
Cardno, Inc.	21	4	42.03
Intera, Inc.	22	5	42.44
Louis H. Motz, Sole Proprietor	26	6	40.37
Dynamic Solutions, LLC	32	7	38.59
Greenman-Pedersen, Inc.	35	8	38.09
Amec Foster Wheeler Env. & Infra., Inc.	48	9	34.26
Woodard & Curan, Inc.	51	10	31.79
Environmental Consulting & Tech., Inc.	56	11	30.36
Water Resource Associates, LLC	56	11	30.49
Balmoral Group, LLC	57	13	29.75

RFQ 32518 - ENGINEERING & ENVIRNMTL SRVCS	Total of Ordinal Scores	Final Standing - Ordinal Ranked Scores	Written Score
RESPONDENT	D. Eng Des, Con Mon & Other Srvc	D. Eng Des, Con Mon & Other Srvc	D. Eng Des, Con Mon & Other Srvc
Kimley-Horn & Associates, Inc.	14	1	41.58
Jones Edmunds & Associates, Inc.	16	2	40.04
Four Waters Engineering, Inc.	23	3	39.87
Black and Veatch Corporation	27	4	37.90
CDM Smith, Inc.	30	5	37.89
Reiss Engineering, Inc.	30	5	37.00
Black and Veatch Corporation	27	4	37.90
CDM Smith, Inc.	30	5	37.89
Reiss Engineering, Inc.	30	5	37.00
HSW Engineering, Inc.	36	7	36.36
Hydro Solutions Consulting, LLC	35	8	35.92
Woodard & Curan, Inc.	47	9	33.85
Cardno, Inc.	49	10	34.15
Water Resources Mgmt Assoc., Inc.	50	10	33.34
Inovia Cons. Group (L&W Eng, Inc.)	50	12	33.90
Dewberry Engineers, Inc.	59	13	30.92
Environmental Consulting & Tech., Inc.	59	13	31.64
Water Resource Associates, LLC	71	15	26.26

EVALUATION CRITERIA: DISCIPLINE A – HYDROLOGIC MODELING AND ANALYSIS

Responses shall include information or documentation regarding, and will be evaluated using, the evaluation criteria set forth below. The evaluation rating scale is as follows:

More adequate8 –10 Less adequate1 – 4
 Adequate5 – 7 Not covered in submittal.....0

CRITERIA – Discipline A: Hydrologic Modeling and Analysis Projects		SCORE	WEIGHT	TOTAL
1	<p>Respondent’s and subconsultants overall qualifications and capabilities to conduct work as presented in the Statement of Work</p> <p>a) Description of the Respondent and their overall qualifications and capabilities</p> <p>b) Description of subconsultant(s) and their overall qualifications and capabilities</p> <p>c) Subconsultants Form (for discipline A)</p> <p>d) <u>A “Letter of Commitment” from a principal of each subcontractor stating that the subcontractor is committed to being a part of Respondent’s team.</u></p> <p>e) Understanding of requested services</p> <p>f) Team organizational structure and specific names, functions, and availability of key personnel</p> <p>g) Project management approach and capabilities</p> <p>h) Willingness to meet time and budget requirements</p> <p>i) Has Respondent been certified by the state of Florida’s Office of Supplier Diversity as a woman-, veteran-, or minority-owned business enterprise</p> <p>j) Has Respondent been certified as a small business, and if so, who provided the certification.</p> <p>k) Number of employees currently employed by Respondent and its subconsultants; and Respondent’s and its subconsultant’s average annual volume of work for the past three years.</p>		20%	
2	<p>Technical qualifications and experience of key personnel on Hydrological Modeling and Analysis projects</p>		37%	

Attachment: Ranking and Scores March 2018 (Engineering and Environmental Services Contract)

3	<p>Relevant experience and performance on Hydrological Modeling and Analysis projects — emphasis on projects conducted within the past five years</p> <p>a) Client References Form</p>		30%	
4	<p>Location of Respondent’s project manager within the District’s 18-county boundary or, if outside of the boundary, relative to the District’s Palatka Headquarters or one of its Service Centers (Jacksonville, Maitland or Palm Bay)</p> <p>Higher consideration will be given to Respondents whose Project Manager is located within the District’s 18-county boundary or, if outside of the boundary, relative to the District’s Palatka Headquarters or one of its Service Centers (Jacksonville, Maitland or Palm Bay. The website maps.live.com using the “Shortest” Route Type, will be utilized by District to determine mileage to a District office.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the District’s boundaries or within 0-100 miles of a District office = 10 points • Not within the District’s boundaries and 101-200 miles from a District office = 5 points • Not within the District’s boundaries and >200 miles from a District office = 0 points 		3%	
5	<p>Volume of District work previously awarded to Respondent</p> <p>Submit documentation as to the volume of work (in dollars) awarded by the District to firm in the past three years, including contracts, work orders, and purchase orders. Points will be allocated from 0 to 10 with Respondents with higher previous awarded contract totals since January 18, 2015, through the submittal date of this RFQ, receiving fewer award points. Respondents with no previous work awards may receive the highest allocation of points (10), while the Respondent with the highest previous work awarded will receive zero points. The District shall rely on its official financial records to resolve any discrepancies. Checks issued by the District on or prior to the date submittals are received shall be included in this total even if Respondent has not yet received the payment.</p> <p>The formula for allocation of previous work award points will be calculated as follows: The Respondent with the highest total of</p>		10%	

Attachment: Ranking and Scores March 2018 (Engineering and Environmental Services Contract)

	previous work awarded represents the Allocation Basis Total (ABT); then, the ABT less the Previous Work Awarded divided by the ABT will be multiplied by 10 (the highest number of points awarded); points allocated will be rounded and expressed in single decimal point level.			
	TOTAL		100%	

EVALUATION CRITERIA: DISCIPLINE B – ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Responses shall include information or documentation regarding, and will be evaluated using, the evaluation criteria set forth below. The evaluation rating scale is as follows:

More adequate8 –10 Less adequate1 – 4
 Adequate5 – 7 Not covered in submittal.....0

	CRITERIA – Discipline B: Environmental Assessment	SCORE	WEIGHT	TOTAL
1	<p>Respondent’s and subconsultants overall qualifications and capabilities to conduct work as presented in the Statement of Work</p> <p>l) Description of the Respondent and their overall qualifications and capabilities</p> <p>m) Description of subconsultant(s) and their overall qualifications and capabilities</p> <p>n) Subconsultants Form (for discipline B)</p> <p>o) <u>A “Letter of Commitment” from a principal of each subcontractor stating that the subcontractor is committed to being a part of Respondent’s team.</u></p> <p>p) Understanding of requested services</p> <p>q) Team organizational structure and specific names, functions, and availability of key personnel</p> <p>r) Project management approach and capabilities</p> <p>s) Willingness to meet time and budget requirements</p> <p>t) Has Respondent been certified by the state of Florida’s Office of Supplier Diversity as a woman-, veteran-, or minority-owned business enterprise</p> <p>u) Has the applicant been certified as a small business, and if so, who provided the certification?</p> <p>v) Number of employees currently employed by Respondent and its subconsultants; and Respondent’s and its subconsultant’s average annual volume of work for the past three years</p>		20%	
2	<p>Technical qualifications and experience of key personnel on Environmental Assessment projects</p>		37%	
3	<p>3. Relevant experience and performance on Environmental Assessment projects — emphasis on projects conducted</p>		30%	

Attachment: Ranking and Scores March 2018 (Engineering and Environmental Services Contract)

	<p>within the past five years</p> <p>b) Client References Form</p>			
4	<p>Location of Respondent’s project manager within the District’s 18-county boundary or, if outside of the boundary, relative to the District’s Palatka Headquarters or one of its Service Centers (Jacksonville, Maitland or Palm Bay)</p> <p>Higher consideration will be given to Respondents whose Project Manager is located within the District’s 18-county boundary or, if outside of the boundary, relative to the District’s Palatka Headquarters or one of its Service Centers (Jacksonville, Maitland or Palm Bay. The website maps.live.com using the “Shortest” Route Type, will be utilized by District to determine mileage to a District office.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the District’s boundaries or within 0-100 miles of a District office = 10 points • Not within the District’s boundaries and 101-200 miles from a District office = 5 points • Not within the District’s boundaries and >200 miles from a District office = 0 points 		3%	
5	<p>Volume of District work previously awarded to Respondent</p> <p>Submit documentation as to the volume of work (in dollars) awarded by the District to firm in the past three years, including contracts, work orders, and purchase orders. Points will be allocated from 0 to 10 with Respondents with higher previous awarded contract totals since January 18, 2015, through the submittal date of this RFQ, receiving fewer award points. Respondents with no previous work awards may receive the highest allocation of points (10), while the Respondent with the highest previous work awarded will receive zero points. The District shall rely on its official financial records to resolve any discrepancies. Checks issued by the District on or prior to the date submittals are received shall be included in this total even if Respondent has not yet received the payment.</p> <p>The formula for allocation of previous work award points will be calculated as follows: The Respondent with the highest total of previous work awarded represents the Allocation Basis Total (ABT); then, the ABT less the Previous Work Awarded divided</p>		10%	

	by the ABT will be multiplied by 10 (the highest number of points awarded); points allocated will be rounded and expressed in single decimal point level.			
	TOTAL		100%	

EVALUATION CRITERIA: DISCIPLINE C – INDEPENDENT SCIENTIFIC/TECHNICAL PEER REVIEW AND EXPERT SERVICES

Responses shall include information or documentation regarding, and will be evaluated using, the evaluation criteria set forth below. The evaluation rating scale is as follows:

More adequate8 –10 Less adequate1 – 4
 Adequate5 – 7 Not covered in submittal.....0

CRITERIA – Discipline C: Independent Scientific/Technical Peer Review and Expert Services		SCORE	WEIGHT	TOTAL
1	<p>Respondent’s and subconsultants overall qualifications and capabilities to conduct work as presented in the Statement of Work</p> <p>w) Description of the Respondent and their overall qualifications and capabilities</p> <p>x) Description of subconsultant(s) and their overall qualifications and capabilities</p> <p>y) Subconsultants Form (for discipline C)</p> <p>z) <u>A “Letter of Commitment” from a principal of each subcontractor stating that the subcontractor is committed to being a part of Respondent’s team</u></p> <p>aa) Understanding of requested services</p> <p>bb) Team organizational structure and specific names, functions, and availability of key personnel</p> <p>cc) Project management approach and capabilities</p> <p>dd) Willingness to meet time and budget requirements</p> <p>ee) Has Respondent been certified by the state of Florida’s Office of Supplier Diversity as a woman-, veteran-, or minority-owned business enterprise</p> <p>ff) Has the applicant been certified as a small business, and if so, who provided the certification?</p> <p>gg) Number of employees currently employed by Respondent and its subconsultants; and Respondent’s and its subconsultant’s average annual volume of work for the past three years</p>		20%	
2	<p>Technical qualifications and experience of key personnel on independent Scientific/Technical Peer Review and Expert Services</p>		37%	

Attachment: Ranking and Scores March 2018 (Engineering and Environmental Services Contract)

3	<p>Relevant experience and performance on Independent Scientific/Technical Peer Review and Expert Services — emphasis on projects conducted within the past five years</p> <p>c) Client References Form</p>		30%	
4	<p>Location of Respondent’s project manager within the District’s 18-county boundary or, if outside of the boundary, relative to the District’s Palatka Headquarters or one of its Service Centers (Jacksonville, Maitland or Palm Bay)</p> <p>Higher consideration will be given to Respondents whose Project Manager is located within the District’s 18-county boundary or, if outside of the boundary, relative to the District’s Palatka Headquarters or one of its Service Centers (Jacksonville, Maitland or Palm Bay. The website maps.live.com using the “Shortest” Route Type, will be utilized by District to determine mileage to a District office.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the District’s boundaries or within 0-100 miles of a District office = 10 points • Not within the District’s boundaries and 101-200 miles from a District office = 5 points • Not within the District’s boundaries and >200 miles from a District office = 0 points 		3%	
5	<p>Volume of District work previously awarded to Respondent</p> <p>Submit documentation as to the volume of work (in dollars) awarded by the District to firm in the past three years, including contracts, work orders, and purchase orders. Points will be allocated from 0 to 10 with Respondents with higher previous awarded contract totals since January 18, 2015, through the submittal date of this RFQ, receiving fewer award points.</p> <p>Respondents with no previous work awards may receive the highest allocation of points (10), while the Respondent with the highest previous work awarded will receive zero points. The District shall rely on its official financial records to resolve any discrepancies. Checks issued by the District on or prior to the date submittals are received shall be included in this total even if Respondent has not yet received the payment.</p> <p>The formula for allocation of previous work award points will be</p>		10%	

Attachment: Ranking and Scores March 2018 (Engineering and Environmental Services Contract)

	<p>calculated as follows: The Respondent with the highest total of previous work awarded represents the Allocation Basis Total (ABT); then, the ABT less the Previous Work Awarded divided by the ABT will be multiplied by 10 (the highest number of points awarded); points allocated will be rounded and expressed in single decimal point level.</p>			
	TOTAL		100%	

EVALUATION CRITERIA: DISCIPLINE D – DETAILED ENGINEERING DESIGN, CONSTRUCTION MONITORING

Responses shall include information or documentation regarding, and will be evaluated using, the evaluation criteria set forth below. The evaluation rating scale is as follows:

More adequate8 –10 Less adequate1 – 4
 Adequate5 – 7 Not covered in submittal.....0

CRITERIA – Discipline D: Detailed Engineering Design, Construction Monitoring, and other related services for water resources projects		SCORE	WEIGHT	TOTAL
1	<p>Respondent’s and subconsultants overall qualifications and capabilities to conduct work as presented in the Statement of Work</p> <p>hh) Description of the Respondent and their overall qualifications and capabilities</p> <p>ii) Description of subconsultant(s) and their overall qualifications and capabilities</p> <p>jj) Subconsultants Form (for discipline D)</p> <p>kk) <u>A “Letter of Commitment” from a principal of each subcontractor stating that the subcontractor is committed to being a part of Respondent’s team</u></p> <p>ll) Understanding of requested services</p> <p>mm) Team organizational structure and specific names, functions, and availability of key personnel</p> <p>nn) Project management approach and capabilities</p> <p>oo) Willingness to meet time and budget requirements</p> <p>pp) Has Respondent been certified by the state of Florida’s Office of Supplier Diversity as a woman-, veteran-, or minority-owned business enterprise</p> <p>qq) Has the applicant been certified as a small business, and if so, who provided the certification?</p> <p>rr) Number of employees currently employed by Respondent and its subconsultants; and Respondent’s and its subconsultant’s average annual volume of work for the past three years</p>		20%	
2	<p>Technical qualifications and experience of key personnel on Engineering Design/Construction Monitoring projects</p>		37%	

Attachment: Ranking and Scores March 2018 (Engineering and Environmental Services Contract)

3	<p>Relevant experience and performance on Detailed engineering design and construction monitoring projects — emphasis on projects conducted within the past five years</p> <p>d) Client References Form</p>		30%	
4	<p>Location of Respondent’s project manager within the District’s 18-county boundary or, if outside of the boundary, relative to the District’s Palatka Headquarters or one of its Service Centers (Jacksonville, Maitland or Palm Bay)</p> <p>Higher consideration will be given to Respondents whose Project Manager is located within the District’s 18-county boundary or, if outside of the boundary, relative to the District’s Palatka Headquarters or one of its Service Centers (Jacksonville, Maitland or Palm Bay. The website maps.live.com using the “Shortest” Route Type, will be utilized by District to determine mileage to a District office.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the District’s boundaries or within 0-100 miles of a District office = 10 points • Not within the District’s boundaries and 101-200 miles from a District office = 5 points • Not within the District’s boundaries and >200 miles from a District office = 0 points 		3%	
5	<p>Volume of District work previously awarded to Respondent</p> <p>Submit documentation as to the volume of work (in dollars) awarded by the District to firm in the past three years, including contracts, work orders, and purchase orders. Points will be allocated from 0 to 10 with Respondents with higher previous awarded contract totals since January 18, 2015, through the submittal date of this RFQ, receiving fewer award points. Respondents with no previous work awards may receive the highest allocation of points (10), while the Respondent with the highest previous work awarded will receive zero points. The District shall rely on its official financial records to resolve any discrepancies. Checks issued by the District on or prior to the date submittals are received shall be included in this total even if Respondent has not yet received the payment.</p>		10%	

	<p>The formula for allocation of previous work award points will be calculated as follows: The Respondent with the highest total of previous work awarded represents the Allocation Basis Total (ABT); then, the ABT less the Previous Work Awarded divided by the ABT will be multiplied by 10 (the highest number of points awarded); points allocated will be rounded and expressed in single decimal point level.</p>			
	TOTAL		100%	