## PUBLIC NOTICE

**REVISED AGENDA**

**PROFESSIONAL SERVICES EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEETING**

**Thursday, June 28, 2018, 10:00 a.m.**

Eighth Floor, Conference Room 851
Jacksonville, FL 32202

### Committee Members:
- **Gregory Pease**, Chairman
- **Patrick Greve**, Member, Treasury
- **Jeff Close**, Member, OGC

### Subcommittee Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Title &amp; Action</th>
<th>MOTION</th>
<th>CONTRACT EXP</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| P-15-18 | **Kathleen Collins**
Aerial Imagery Services
Property Appraiser Office | It is the consensus of the committee that of the three (3) companies/firms responding to the Request for Proposal (RFP) all were found to be responsive, interested, qualified and available to provide the services required by the RFP. The ranking of first, second and third, designates the order of qualification of these firms to perform the required services and alphabetically they are:
1) Pictometry
2) The Sanborn Company.
We recommend that the above list is forwarded to the Mayor for final selection so that fee and contract negotiations may begin with Pictometry, the number one ranked company. |

| P-13-13 | **William Joyce**
Contract Amendment No. 3
Contamination Assessment & Remediation Services Countywide
Department of Public Works | That Contract No. 6354-15 originally executed September 16, 2014 between the City of Jacksonville and CDM Smith, Inc., for Contamination Assessment & Remediation Services Countywide, be amended to exercise the second and final two-year renewal option extending the period of service from November 30, 2018 to November 30, 2020 with no renewal options remaining. The maximum indebtedness shall remain a not-to-exceed amount of $3,200,000.00. All other terms and conditions shall remain the same except for such changes as the Office of General Counsel may deem appropriate to ensure compliance with the City's ordinances, Procurement policies and procedures and applicable federal and state laws. |

| P-18-18 | **Bibinia Centeno**
Approval to Proceed with Evaluation of the Proposals Received
Casually Actuarial Services
Risk Management |

| P-67-17 | **William Joyce**
PROTEST (C&ES)
CEI Services for Fire Stations and Misc.
Vertical Construction
Department of Public Works | That the Committee approves proceeding with the evaluation of the two (2) proposals received in accordance with Section 126.302 (f) of the Procurement Code. |
It is the consensus of the committee that of the three (3) companies/firms responding to the Request for Proposal (RFP) all were found to be responsive, interested, qualified and available to provide the services required by the RFP. The ranking of first, second and third, designates the order of qualification of these firms to perform the required services and alphabetically they are:

2) Construction & Engineering Services Consultants, Inc.
3) Keville Enterprises, Inc.
1) VIA Consulting Services, Inc.

We recommend that the above list is forwarded to the Mayor for final selection so that fee and contract negotiations may begin with VIA Consulting Services, Inc., the number one ranked company.

MEETING ADJOURNED: __________
June 18, 2018

TO: Greg Pease, Chairman  
    Professional Services Evaluation Committee (PSEC)

FROM: Kathleen Collins, Chief Financial Officer  
      Office of the Property Appraiser

        Justin Gicalone, Field Operations Division Chief  
        Office of the Property Appraiser

RE: P-15-18 Aerial Imagery Services Subcommittee Report

The subcommittee received three (3) proposals for the Aerial Imagery Services and found all to be responsive, interested, qualified and available to provide the services required by the Request for Proposal (RFP).

The proposals were evaluated using the selection criteria outlined in the Purchasing Code as augmented by the RFP.

Based on the above, the following firms listed alphabetically were determined to be the most qualified of those submitting proposals. The ranking of first, second and third designates the order of qualification of these firms to perform the required services:

3) Geomni  
   1) Pictometry  
   2) The Sanborn Company

We recommend that the above list is forwarded to the Mayor for final selection.

Attachment: Scoring Matrix
# Evaluation Matrix

**EVALUATION SCALE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUALIFIED</th>
<th>EXTREMELY QUALIFIED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT NO.** P-15-18

**PROJECT TITLE:** AERIAL IMAGERY SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM</th>
<th>COMPETENCE</th>
<th>CURRENT WORKLOAD</th>
<th>FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY</th>
<th>ABILITY TO OBSERVE COMPLIANCE WITH PLANS</th>
<th>PROFESSIONAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS RECORD</th>
<th>PROXIMITY TO PROJECT</th>
<th>Past &amp; Present Demonstrated Commitment to Small &amp; Minority Businesses &amp; Contributions Toward A Diverse Market Place</th>
<th>ABILITY TO DESIGN AN APPROACH AND WORK PLAN</th>
<th>TIME &amp; BUDGET</th>
<th>VOLUME OF CURRENT AND PRIOR WORK FOR USING AGENCIES</th>
<th>OVERALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAXIMUM SCORE</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geomni</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>45.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictometry</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>85.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sanborn Map Company, Inc.</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>84.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Greg Pease, Chief, Procurement Division
THRU: John Pappas, P.E., Director, Department of Public Works
FROM: Bill Joyce, P.E., Acting Chief, Engineering and Construction Management Division
       Jeffrey S. Foster, P.G., SW Environmental Engineer Manager, SWD
DATE: June 15, 2018
SUBJECT: P-13-13 Contamination Assessment & Remediation Services Countywide
          Contract 6354-15, Amendment 3
          Consultant Services Account No. Various purchase orders

Contract number 6354-15, Amendment 2 between the City and COM Smith is set to expire on November 30, 2018. All work has been performed satisfactorily for the past time durations of the base contract and amendment. Section 1.2 of the Contract allows for two (2), two (2) year renewals. Therefore, PWEN requests the extension of the contract for the 2nd and last of the two (2) year renewals. There is no rate increase associated with this contract amendment renewal request. The contract is designated to be under the Equal Business Opportunity Program with a 15% JSEB Participation Goal.

Accordingly, this is to recommend that Contract number 6354-15, originally executed September 16, 2014, amended for the time period from November 30, 2016 through November 30, 2018 between the City and CDM Smith, Inc. for Contamination & Assessment & Remediation Services, Countywide be amended to extend the Period of Services from December 1, 2018 through December 1, 2020. The maximum indebtedness will remain at $3,200,000.00, with all other terms and conditions of the Agreement as previously amended shall remain unchanged. Nothing contained herein shall be amended, modified, or otherwise revised, without prior approval from PSEC and the Mayor.

Please notify PWEN when this item will be placed on the agenda so a member of PWEN can attend.

Cc: Lori West, PWEN
    Alex Baker, Procurement
June 6, 2018

Mr. Jeff Foster, P.E.
City of Jacksonville
214 N. Hogan Street, 10th Floor
Jacksonville, FL 32202

Subject: Contract 6354-15 – Contamination Assessment and Remediation Services Countywide

Dear Mr. Foster:

CDM Smith Inc. would like to utilize the second 2-year renewal option for Contract 6354-15 Contamination Assessment and Remediation Services Countywide to extend the period of service from November 30, 2018 to November 30, 2020. All other terms and conditions of the contract will remain unchanged.

Please let us know if you need further information to execute this request.

Sincerely,

Patrick R. Victor, P.E., D.WRE
Vice President
CDM Smith Inc.
October 20, 2016

The Honorable Lenny Curry, Mayor
City of Jacksonville
4th Floor, St. James Building
Jacksonville, FL 32202

Dear Mayor Curry:

Ref: P-13-13 Contamination Assessment & Remediation Services Countywide (Amendment No. 2)
Department of Public Works/Solid Waste Division

The Professional Services Evaluation Committee met today in Board Room 851 on the eighth floor of the Ed Ball Building, for the purpose of amending the above-referenced contract.

The following motion/recommendation was adopted:

That Contract No. 6354-15 originally executed September 15, 2014 between the City and CDM Smith, Inc. for Contamination Assessment & Remediation Services Countywide, is amended by: (I) Increasing the maximum Indebtedness by $2,000,000.00, to a new maximum of $3,200,000.00; and (II) exercising the first of two (2) 2-year renewal options extending the period of service from November 30, 2016 thru November 30, 2018 with one renewal option remaining at terms mutually agreeable. All other terms and conditions, as previously amended, shall remain the same. Nothing contained herein shall be amended, modified, or otherwise revised, without prior approval from the PSEC and the Mayor.

If the foregoing meets your approval, please affix your signature and return to my office.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory Pease, Chief
Procurement Division
Chairman, Professional Services Evaluation Committee

APPROVED:

Lenny Curry, Mayor

This 20th day of October, 2016

FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT
214 N. Hogan Street, Suite 800 | Jacksonville, FL 32202 | Phone: 904.255.8800 | Fax: 904.255.8837 | www.coj.net
MEMORANDUM

Date: June 21, 2018

To: Gregory Pease, Chairman
    Professional Services Evaluation Committee

From: Twane Duckworth, Chief
      Risk Management Division

Bibinia Centeno, Finance Manager
Risk Management Division

Subject: Review of RFP Submittal for P-18-18 Proposal to Provide Casualty Actuarial Services

The Risk Management Division received only two (2) proposals to provide Casualty Actuarial Services.

Per Section 126.302(f) of the Procurement Code if:

"PSEC receives responses from less than three proposers, it shall resolicit proposals from proposers previously solicited and from additional persons, unless it determines, in writing, that no advantage would be obtained by resoliciting. Notwithstanding the number of responses received, PSEC may proceed to consider those proposers responding to the resolicitation or to the initial solicitation if it determines, in writing, that no advantage would be obtained by resoliciting."

The existing contract for the Casualty Actuarial Services will expire on September 30, 2018 and there are no extension provisions in the contract beyond this date. We notified 2 firms we thought were interested in proposing. The current two proposers are small actuarial firms interested in working with the City of Jacksonville whereas the national actuarial firms that bid in 2013 did not see fit to bid for the current Casualty Actuarial Services proposal. The observation is that rebidding would not entice the national actuarial firms to submit proposals and would probably result in the same two small actuarial firms proposing again. It is recommended that the current two proposers be accepted for consideration of this RFP.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Professional Services Evaluation Committee

FROM: Gregory Pease, Chief Procurement

DATE: June 28, 2018

SUBJECT: PROTEST - RFP No.: P-67-17
Title: CEI Services for Fire Stations & Miscellaneous Vertical Construction Projects

The attached bid protest filed by C&ES Consultants, Inc., is presented for action by the Professional Services Evaluation Committee, on Thursday, June 28, 2018 at 10:00 AM.

The Professional Services Evaluation Committee action is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UPHELD:</th>
<th>DENIED:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief of Procurement or Designee</td>
<td>Chief of Procurement or Designee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Counsel or Designee</td>
<td>General Counsel or Designee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Department or Designee</td>
<td>Finance Department or Designee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACTION OF COMMITTEE
Date ____________

Approved Disapproved

Signature of Authentication ____________________________
June 13, 2018

Attn: Gregory Pease
Chief of Procurement
214 North Hogan Street, Suite 899
Jacksonville, FL 32202

RE: Notice of Protest
RFP # P-67-17 CEI Services for Fire Stations & Miscellaneous Vertical Construction

Dear Mr. Pease,

This letter is intended to be a formal Notice of Protest in response to the recent scoring and ranking of RFP# P-67-17 and is within the required 48-hour period of filing a timely Notice of Protest.

The rankings released Tuesday, 6/12/18, of the first, second, and third firms were designated as follows:
1. Via Consulting Services, Inc.
2. Construction & Engineering Services Consultants, Inc.

The following items speak to particulars that warrant this protest:

A. Competence - We feel we could have earned a higher score in this section based on the experience of the proposed staff, the number of projects we have completed, and the number of COJ vertical projects we have completed which include:
   - Duval County Unified Courthouse
   - State Attorney’s Office
   - Murray Hill Arts Center
   - Fleet Management Facility – Phase 1 Renovations
   - Fleet Management Facility Generator
   - Animal Care & Protective Services HVAC
   - CTC Accessibility Improvements
   - Wallace Small Senior Center Renovations
   - Riverview Senior Center Renovations
   - Baymeadows Park

We have a strong experienced professional team assigned to this project with respect to facilities inspection, and construction management experience for example our Proposed Program Manager, Lynn Westbrook, P.E., is a former Public Works Director and was in charge of overseeing all the buildings in Jacksonville. His proposed assistant, Michael Bryd, AIA, oversaw much of the Construction of the New Duval Unified Courthouse and the State Attorney’s Office.

C. Financial Responsibility - Our firm has a bonding capability of over $10 Million, and Steven J. Davis has a personal credit line of more than $1 Million. With such financial capabilities, we feel we could have earned a higher score in this section.

D. Ability to Observe Compliance with Plans - Please validate our score is so low in this section. Our ability to observe compliance with plans is evidenced through our previous project experience and our proposed personnel experience. We have inspected all types of facilities, such as:
- J. Wayne & Delores Barr Weaver Center
- Silver Street
- Operation New Hope Multi-Family Housing
- Clara White Mission Transitional Housing Renovation Phases I & II
- Northpoint Town Center Business/Retail Suites
- Emmett Reed Community Center Hurricane Damage Mitigation
- 5 New Construction Single Family Homes
- Hurricane Damage Mitigation at Bradham Brooks Library
- I.M. Sulzbacher Center for Homeless Men's Dormitory, Kitchen Renovations, Veteran's Center and Respite Center

G. Past & Present Commitment to Small & Minority Businesses - In this section, we feel we could have earned a higher score a 10 because no one has given back to the community more than C&ES and Steven J. Davis. In the past, we have received maximum points in this section. Also, we have designed and implemented an Inspector Trainee Program that we are funding and utilizing to help disadvantaged locals develop in the inspection trade.

H. Design Approach - Please validate why we scored so low in this category. Our team of engineers and inspectors visited majority of the proposed site locations and walked the project site in its entirety. This was done on our part to gain an in depth understanding of COJ's individual needs of each location. We took photos, walked the site, observed various potential issues and concerns that may impede construction schedules, reviewed traffic control in each area. We also developed strategies to address each issue/concern that we observed.

I. Willingness to Meet Time & Budget - Every vertical project that C&ES has worked on was completed on time. Our low score in this section is challenging for us to understand. Furthermore, we have been performing CEI services for all Jaxport Facilities Improvements (Blount Island, Talleyrand, and Cruise Terminal) since 2010. Every time we perform these inspections, we finish at least 1 month ahead of schedule.

J. Volume of Work - For this section, I'd like to request documentation in order to compare our workload dollar amount versus Via Consulting Services workload dollar amount.

In addition to the above concerns, I'd like to also point out that the firm ranked number 1, Via Consulting Services, has included a cover letter seemingly appears they are pursuing an FDOT project versus a vertical construction project. How could they have possibly scored higher than C&ES when their response doesn't properly address the specifics of the vertical projects. In some cases, they even address their experience as FDOT inspectors. This is all the more evident in their personnel resumes; all of C&ES' resumes exhibit detailed building and vertical construction experience.

There appears to be a bias with this evaluation. After reviewing Via's proposal that they submitted in response to this RFP, it seems that we are more qualified to perform the scope of services that were outlined in the RFP.

Thank you for your time in re-evaluating the proposals. We feel have strongly addressed all the issues and concerns in the RFP. Based on our team qualifications and a second review by our staff of professionals, our proposal appears to exceed Via's by far. We request that the City would take a second look at the proposals for re-evaluation. We also request an extension of 3 business days to provide supplemental protest documentation.

Sincerely,

Steven J. Davis, President/CEO

C&ES CONSULTANTS, INC.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATING CATEGORY</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIRM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAXIMUM POINTS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEVILLE</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;ES</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Evaluation Matrix

## Grading Committee Member:
**TOM FALLIN**

### Rating Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIRM</strong></td>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>Current Work Load</td>
<td>Financial Responsibility</td>
<td>Ability to Observe Company Policy</td>
<td>Professional/Professional</td>
<td>Knowledge/Qualifications</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>Quality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Maximum Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CE&amp;S</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>75</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keville Enterprises</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIA CS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:

- **DATE PRINTED:** 4/30/2018
- **DATE REVIEWED:** 4/26/2018
VOLUME OF WORK FOR USING AGENCIES BY PRIME CONSULTANT WITHIN THE LAST FIVE YEARS

Please list the original contract amounts in the Fiscal Year the contracts were executed and amendments to the contracts in the Fiscal Year that the amendments were executed. For Annual Contracts, show totals of Purchase Orders issued in each Fiscal Year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New World Avenue</td>
<td>$463,831.19</td>
<td>90% Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dune Restoration Sand</td>
<td>$20,785.05</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement of Old Kings Road Bridge</td>
<td>$158,953.49</td>
<td>80% Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal Springs Drainage</td>
<td>$281,130.36</td>
<td>95% Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EverBank Amphitheater and Covered Field</td>
<td>$382,111.88</td>
<td>95% Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alhambra Outfalls Repair</td>
<td>$85,947.65</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Storm Dune Restoration Planting</td>
<td>$63,053.83</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EverBank Stadium Renovations</td>
<td>$70,586.70</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imeson Park Boulevard</td>
<td>$251,762.96</td>
<td>$79,349.99 Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. James Building Entrance Upgrades</td>
<td>$55,439.78</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valens Drive Low Impact Drainage</td>
<td>$88,237.36</td>
<td>$51,378.11 Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunche Drive Stormwater</td>
<td>$57,084.25</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YEARLY TOTALS:</strong></td>
<td>$986,942.24</td>
<td>$1,122,710.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VOLUME OF WORK FOR USING AGENCIES BY PRIME CONSULTANT WITHIN THE LAST FIVE YEARS

Please list the original contract amounts in the Fiscal Year the contracts were executed and amendments to the contracts in the Fiscal Year that the amendments were executed. For Annual Contracts, show totals of Purchase Orders issued in each Fiscal Year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Sweeping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amendment $26,364</td>
<td>Amendment $26,364</td>
<td>Amendment $26,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various Projects City Wide</td>
<td>FY11/12 Original Contract $1,000,000</td>
<td>Amendment $1,000,000</td>
<td>Amendment $1,000,000</td>
<td>Amendment $500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Inspection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM/ Inspection JAXPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,673</td>
<td>$4,264</td>
<td>$89,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| YEARLY TOTALS: | $1,000,000 | $1,000,000 | $32,037 | $1,030,628 | $735,364 |

* The City required that we include the original contract amount, however this amount was not awarded within the last 5 years, but the City required that we include the original contract amount. We feel this information should not have a negative effect on our overall rating for Volume of Work.

**The amended amount for FY16/17 has not been used, a total of $464,357 remains and should not negatively affect C&ES.
The subcommittee received three (3) proposals for evaluation for the subject project and found it to be responsive, interested, qualified and available to provide the services required by the RFP. A request was submitted to and approved by the Professional Services Evaluation Committee to allow grading of the two proposals.

The proposals were evaluated using the criteria outlined in the Purchasing Code as augmented by the RFP (see attached matrix).

Based on the above, the following firms listed alphabetically were determined to be the most qualified of those submitting proposals. The ranking of first, second, and third designates the order of qualification of these firms to perform the required services.

1. VIA Consulting Services, Inc.
2. Construction & Engineering Services Consultants, Inc.

We recommend that the above list be forwarded to the Mayor for final selection.

JPP/lw

Attachment: Scoring Matrix

cc: Lori West, PW Contract Specialist
## Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM</th>
<th>COMPETENCE</th>
<th>CURRENT WORKLOAD</th>
<th>FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY</th>
<th>ABILITY TO OBEERVE COMPLIANCE WITH PLANS</th>
<th>PROFESSIONAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS RECORD</th>
<th>PROXIMITY TO PROJECT</th>
<th>PAST &amp; PRESENT DEMONSTRATED COMMITMENT TO SMALL &amp; MINORITY BUSINESSES &amp; CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARD A DIVERSE MARKET PLACE</th>
<th>ABILITY TO DESIGN AN APPROACH AND WORK PLAN</th>
<th>VOLUME OF CURRENT AND PRIOR WORK FOR USING AGENCIES</th>
<th>OVERALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAES Consultants, Inc.</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keville Enterprises, Inc.</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Consulting Services, Inc.,</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Average**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10.00</th>
<th>10.00</th>
<th>5.00</th>
<th>10.00</th>
<th>5.00</th>
<th>10.00</th>
<th>10.00</th>
<th>20.00</th>
<th>10.00</th>
<th>10.00</th>
<th>100.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Points Assessed</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>