

MANATEE COUNTY GOVERNMENT

INTENT TO NEGOTIATE

SUBJECT	Architectural/Engineering Consulting Service For Community Development Block Grants (CDBG)	DATE POSTED	MC _____ DS _____ CC _____
PURCHASING REPRESENTATIVE	Greg Davis, 749-3037	DATE CONTRACT SHALL BE AWARDED	Upon Completion of Successful Negotiation
DEPARTMENT	Neighborhood Services	CONSEQUENCES IF DEFERRED	None
SOLICITATION	RFP #16-2410GD	AUTHORIZED BY DATE	Melissa M. Wendel, CPPO <i>J. E. Gause</i>

NOTICE OF INTENT TO NEGOTIATE

Notice of Intent to Negotiate with Fawley/Bryant, King Engineering Associates and Ugarte & Associates

ENABLING/REGULATING AUTHORITY

Federal/State law(s), administrative ruling(s), Manatee County Comp Plan/Land Development Code, ordinances, resolutions, policy.

Manatee County Code of Laws

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

PROJECT BACKGROUND:

Manatee County issued a Request for Proposal to provide Architectural/Engineering Services for various Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) projects, as required by Manatee County. Architectural/Engineering Services and Construction are being funded through a Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and shall include all services required to assist the County in compliance with the Grant Documents and in accordance with Housing and Urban Development (HUD) regulations.

SOLICITATIONS:

The RFP was released on mymanatee.org and Demand Star and also provided to the Manatee County Chamber of Commerce for release to its members. 3 Sealed proposals were received on August 26, 2016.

Manatee County Firms that were directly solicited:

Ugarte & Associates Palmetto, FL

Manatee County Firms that submitted proposals:

Ugarte & Associates Palmetto, FL

Local firms that submitted proposals include:

Fawley/Bryant Sarasota, FL

King Engineering Associates Sarasota, FL

ATTACHMENTS (List in order of attached)	FUNDING SOURCE (Acct Number & Name)	Term Agreement	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Funds Verified
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Insufficient Funds
COST \$ 80,000	AMT/FREQ OF RECURRING COSTS (Attach Fiscal Impact Statement)	N/A	

EVALUATION COMMITTEE (VOTING) MEMBERS:

Tom Yarger	Construction Services Division Manager, Property Management Department
Jeff Streitmatter	Project Management Division Manager, Public Works Department
Greg Davis	Chairman, Contracts Negotiator, Financial Management Department, Purchasing Division

Non-Voting Staff Attending: None

EVALUATION RESULTS:

The Evaluation Committee convened on August 24, 2016. During this meeting evaluation committee procedural guidelines were reviewed.

The Evaluation Committee members began discussions on the three (3) proposals received in response to the formal solicitation announcement. The Committee proceeded to discuss the qualifications presented in the Fawley/Bryant, King Engineering Associates and Ugarte & Associates proposals against the evaluative criteria defined in the RFP. The Committee also discussed the Section D Evaluation Rating scores for each proposal as defined in the RFP.

Based on the content of the written proposals submitted by Fawley/Bryant, King Engineering Associates and Ugarte & Associates, the Committee felt it had adequate information to proceed to a vote. The Committee voted unanimously to recommend all 3 companies, below, to move forward into negotiations.

Fawley/Bryant - Sarasota, FL

King Engineering Associates – Sarasota, FL

Ugarte & Associates – Palmetto, FL

The resulting agreement will be managed by the Neighborhood Services

ESTIMATED COST OF SERVICES: \$80,000 (FY15/FY16 MCPW CDBG)

FUNDING: Neighborhood Services Department - Account Key 172 9012219

The above justifications are a generalized summary of major observations intended only to provide a sufficiently detailed overview of the main observations of a majority of Committee Members. Each Committee Member may have considered one or more facts or factors more or less important than the other Committee Members when voting, and this summary of the Evaluation Committee's decision is not an attempt to exhaustively describe each of the relevant factors which motivated each of the Committee Members to select the rankings described.