

# MANATEE COUNTY GOVERNMENT

## INTENT TO NEGOTIATE

<b>SUBJECT</b>	Capital Improvement Project Management Software & Implementation	<b>DATE POSTED</b>	MC <u>9/21/17 6:0</u> DS <u>9/21/17 6:0</u> CC
<b>PURCHASING REPRESENTATIVE</b>	Greg Davis, 749-3037	<b>DATE CONTRACT SHALL BE AWARDED</b>	Upon Completion of Successful Negotiations
<b>DEPARTMENT</b>	Public Works	<b>CONSEQUENCES IF DEFERRED</b>	None
<b>SOLICITATION</b>	RFP #17-0995GD	<b>AUTHORIZED BY DATE</b>	<u>Sharon (D) 9/21/2017</u>

### NOTICE OF INTENT TO NEGOTIATE

Notice of Intent to Negotiate with e-Builder – Plantation, FL

### 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 **Capital Improvement Project Management Software and Implementation**, as required by Manatee County. The Capital Improvement Project Management Software & Implementation will be an integrated - system solution that combines project management or project planning, with many other aspects for managing capital construction projects.

#### SOLICITATIONS:

The RFP was released on [mymanatee.org](http://mymanatee.org) and Demand Star and also provided to the Manatee County Chamber of Commerce for release to its members. Seven (7) proposals were received from:

1. Aurigo Software Technologies – Austin, TX
2. e-Builder – Plantation, FL
3. CapitalSoft Inc. – Newark, DE
4. CIPPlanner – San Ramon, CA
5. Cyret Technologies – Manassas, VA
6. EPM Solutions – San Ramon, CA
7. PMWeb, Inc. – Wakefield, MA

#### Manatee County Firms that were directly solicited:

None

#### Manatee County Firms that submitted proposals:

None

#### Local firms that submitted proposals include:

None

<b>ATTACHMENTS</b> (List in order of attached)	<b>FUNDING SOURCE</b> (Acct Number & Name)	Term Agreement <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Funds Verified <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Funds
<b>COST</b> \$ 400,000 (Development & Implementation)	<b>AMT/FREQ OF RECURRING COSTS</b> (Attach Fiscal Impact Statement)	N/A

- Continued on Page Two -

**EVALUATION COMMITTEE (VOTING) MEMBERS:**

- Chad Butzow, Deputy Director, Field Operational Services, Public Works Department
- Joy Leggett Murphy, Land Acquisition Division Manager, Property Management Department
- Greg Davis, Chair, Contracts Negotiator, Financial Management Department, Procurement Division

**Non-voting member:** Jeffrey Streitmatter, Project Management Division Manager, Public Works Department  
Michael Olmstead, GIS System Analyst Public Works Department; and  
Suzie McGuire, Sr. Manager IT Department

**EVALUATION RESULTS:**

The Evaluation Committee (Committee) convened two (2) meetings (Evaluation Committee Meetings No. 1 & No.2) in June 2017 and reviewed procedural guidelines and responsibilities. Committee members began discussions on the seven (7) proposals received in response to the formal solicitation announcement. Three members of the Public, Mr. Dan Calia; Mr. Mark Fritzing from e-Builder and Mr. Marcus Carter from EPM Solutions were present during Evaluation Committee No.1 and had no comments. No members of Public were in attendance at Committee meeting No.2. During these meetings the Committee proceeded to discuss the qualifications presented in the seven (7) proposals against the evaluative criteria defined in the RFP. Based on the content of the written proposals submitted the Committee decided unanimously to invite Aurigo and e-Builder for Orals presentations. After discussions the Committee members determined proposals from CapitalSoft, CIPPlanner, Cyret Technologies, EPM Solutions and PM Web were deemed to not be acceptable for further consideration.

The Evaluation Committee convened an Oral briefings (Evaluation Committee Meetings No. 3 & No.4) in July and August 2017. At this time e-Builder and Aurigo respectively presented their approach to addressing the RFP requirements. Both companies provided further clarifications to their proposed solutions. Additionally, each of the two (2) Proposers provided demonstrations of their proposed solution attributes.

The Evaluation Committee reconvened Evaluation Committee Meeting No. 5 in August 2017. No members of the public were present. The Committee Chairman stated the intent of the meeting was to discuss the results of Orals and vote on the way forward. The Committee discussed information and clarifications provided by Aurigo and e-Builder. As a result the Committee decided to ask for additional clarifications from Oral briefings, as well as requesting the two (2) remaining Proposers for Best and Final Offer.

The Evaluation Committee reconvened Evaluation Committee Meeting No. 6 in August 2017. No members of the Public were in attendance. The Committee Chairman presented Aurigo and e-Builder responses submitted to the Oral clarifications and Best and Final Offer. Based on the content of the written proposals submitted, Oral presentations and Best and Final Offer the Committee felt it had adequate information to proceed to a vote. The Committee voted unanimously to recommend engaging in negotiations with **e-Builder**.

The resulting agreement will be managed by the Public Works Department

**ESTIMATED COST OF SERVICES:** \$400,000 Development & Implementation.

**FUNDING:** Public Works Department, Account Key 001002070 - 534000

*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 actors 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.*