

MANATEE COUNTY GOVERNMENT INTENT TO NEGOTIATE

SUBJECT	Consultant Services for Federally Funded Projects	DATE POSTED	MC <u>WSE 10/11/16</u> DS <u>WSE 10/11/16</u> CC <u>N/A</u>
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 #16-2409GD	AUTHORIZED BY DATE	Melissa M. Wendel, CPPO <u>[Signature]</u>

NOTICE OF INTENT TO NEGOTIATE

Notice of Intent to Negotiate with Wade Trim, Inc. and Florida Housing Coalition

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 Consultant Services for Federally Funded projects, as required by Manatee County. Consultant Services for Federally Funded projects are being funded through federally funded grants. These grants require preparation of various assessments/plans/reports such as:

- Environmental Assessments
- Annual Action Plans
- Five year Consolidated Plans
- Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Reports (CAPER)
- Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice, or
- Other similar documents that are required for recipients of federal funding by the Federal Government.

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. Four (4) Sealed proposals were received on August 26, 2016.

Manatee County Firms that were directly solicited:

Angie Brewer Associates Bradenton, FL

Manatee County Firms that submitted proposals:

Angie Brewer Associates, Bradenton, FL

Local firms that submitted proposals include:

Angie Brewer Associates Bradenton, FL

Wade Trim, Inc. Tampa, 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 \$ 30,000	AMT/FREQ OF RECURRING COSTS (Attach Fiscal Impact Statement)	N/A

EVALUATION COMMITTEE (VOTING) MEMBERS:

Bill O'Shea	Community Development Project Manager, Neighborhood Services 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 in September 2016. During this meeting evaluation committee procedural guidelines were reviewed.

The Evaluation Committee members began discussions on the four (4) proposals received in response to the formal solicitation announcement. The Committee proceeded to discuss the qualifications presented in the Angie Brewer Associates, The Ferguson Group, Florida Housing Coalition, and Wade Trim, Inc. proposals against the evaluative criteria defined in the RFP.

The Committee also discussed the RFP Evaluation Rating scores for each proposal as defined in the RFP. Based on the content of the written proposals submitted by Angie Brewer Associates, The Ferguson Group, Florida Housing Coalition, and Wade Trim, Inc., the Committee felt it had adequate information to proceed to a vote. The Committee voted unanimously to recommend two (2) companies below to move forward into negotiations.

Wade Trim Inc. – Tampa, FL

Florida Housing Coalition – Tallahassee, FL

The resulting agreement will be managed by the Neighborhood Services Department

ESTIMATED COST OF SERVICES: \$30,000 (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.