

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

8. Approve Ranking List, Authorize Negotiations, and Award PS-5174-04/AJR – Master Agreement for Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repair Services to Connect Consulting, Inc., of Wellington.

PS-5174-04/AJR will provide professional Hydrogeologic and well construction oversight services and turn key well construction services to permit, design, construct, and/or repair and test new and existing wells and associated well head appurtenances and pumps.

This project was publicly advertised and the County received six submittals (listed in alphabetical order):

- Barnes, Ferland and Associates, Inc.;
- Black & Veatch Corporation, Orlando;
- Camp Dresser & McKee, Maitland;
- Connect Consulting, Inc.;
- Hartman & Associates, Inc., Orlando;
- Leggette, Brashears, & Graham, Inc., Tampa.

The Evaluation Committee, which consisted of Robert G. Adolphe, P.E., Director of Environmental Services; Robert Dehler, Principal Coordinator, Utilities; Gary Rudolph, Utilities Manager; Jeffrey F. Thompson, P.E., Senior Engineer; and Dennis Westrick, P.E., Manager PEI evaluated the submittals and short-listed three firms.

The Evaluation Committee interviewed the following three short-listed firms:

- Barnes, Ferland and Associates, Inc.;
- Black & Veatch Corporation, Orlando;
- Connect Consulting, Inc.

Consideration was given to the following criteria:

- Proposed Approach to Performing the Work/Strategy;
- Similar Project Experience;
- Innovative Ideas;
- Quality of Presentation.

The Evaluation Committee recommends that the Board approve the ranking below and authorize staff to negotiate with the top ranked firm in accordance with F.S. 287.055, the Consultants Competitive Negotiation Act (CCNA):

1. Connect Consulting, Inc.;
2. Black & Veatch Corporation, Orlando;
3. Barnes, Ferland and Associates, Inc.

Authorization for performance of services by the Consultant under this agreement shall be in the form of written Work Orders issued and executed by the County and signed by the Consultant. The work and dollar amount for each Work Order will be within the constraints of the approved project budget and negotiated on an as-needed basis for the project. The estimated contract value is \$500,000.00/year. The term of the agreement shall commence upon execution and shall run for a period of three (3) years and, at the sole option of the County, may be renewed for two (2) periods not to exceed one (1) year each.

Environmental Services/ Planning Engineering and Inspections Division and Fiscal Services/Purchasing and Contracts Division recommend that the Board approve the ranking, authorize staff to negotiate, and authorize the Chairman to execute a Master Agreement as prepared by the County Attorney's Office.

**B.C.C. - SEMINOLE COUNTY, FL
PS TABULATION SHEET**

PS NUMBER: PS-5174-04/AJR
 PS TITLE : Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repair Services
 DATE: December 29, 2004 TIME: 2:00 P.M.

ALL SUBMITTALS ACCEPTED BY SEMINOLE COUNTY ARE SUBJECT TO THE COUNTY'S TERMS AND CONDITIONS AND ANY AND ALL ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS SUBMITTED BY THE PROPOSERS ARE REJECTED AND SHALL HAVE NO FORCE AND EFFECT. PS DOCUMENTS FROM THE PROPOSERS LISTED HEREIN ARE THE ONLY SUBMITTALS RECEIVED TIMELY AS OF THE ABOVE OPENING DATE AND TIME. ALL OTHER PS DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO THIS SOLICITATION, IF ANY, ARE HEREBY REJECTED AS LATE.

RESPONSE -1-	RESPONSE -2-	RESPONSE -3-	RESPONSE -4-	RESPONSE -5-
Barnes, Ferland and Associates, Inc. 3655 Maguire Blvd., Suite 150 Orlando FL 32803 Patrick Barnes, President 407-896-8608 – Phone 407-896-1822 – Fax	Black & Veatch Corporation 201 S. Orange Ave., Suite 500 Orlando FL 32801 David J. Carlson, V.P. 407-419-3500 – Phone 407-419-3501 – Fax	Camp Dresser & McKee 2301 Maitland Center Parkway, Suite 300 Maitland FL 32751 Charles J. Voss, Vice President 407-660-2552 – Phone 407-875-1161 – Fax	Connect Consulting, Inc. 14596 Rolling Rock Place Wellington FL 33414 Gary E. Eichler, P.G., Vice President 561-204-4073 – Phone 561-204-4107 – Fax	Hartman and Associates, Inc. 201 E. Pine Street, Suite 1000 Orlando FL 32801 Charles W. Drake, P.G., Vice President 407-839-3955 – Phone 407-839-3790 – Fax
RESPONSE -6-				
Leggette, Brashears, & Graham, Inc. 10014 N. Dale Mabry Hwy., Suite 205 Tampa FL 33618 David A. Wiley, Principal 813-968-5882 – Phone 813-968-9244 – Fax				

Tabulated by Amy J. Rossi, CPPB

Evaluation Committee Meeting: 01/19/2005 at 3:30pm, located at 500 West Lake Mary Blvd., Large Conference Room

Short Listed Firms: Barnes, Ferland and Associates, Inc., Black & Veatch Corporation, Connect Consulting, Inc.

Presentations Date: February 2, 2005 starting at 1:00pm, Environmental Services 500 W. Lake Mary Blvd, Large Conference Room, Sanford, Florida.

Recommendation: Connect Consulting, Inc. (BCC Date: March 08, 2005)

Posted 2/03/2005 (7:30 A.M.)

QUALIFICATION TEAM
CONSENSUS REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

SUMMARY SCORES AND RANKINGS

<u>FIRMS</u>	<u>SCORE</u>	<u>RANKING</u>
Connect Consulting	89.38	1
Black & Veatch Corp	86.56	2
Barnes, Ferland, & Associates	78.78	3

The Evaluation Committee makes the following recommendation:

SIGNATURES:

B. Adolphe 
R. Dehler 
G. Rudolph 
J. Thompson 
D. Westrick 

PRESENTATIONS FOR PS-5174-04/AJR Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repair Services

	B. Adolphe			R. Dehler		G. Rudolph		J. Thompson		D. Westrick			
CRITERIA	WEIGHT	POINTS	WTD PTS	POINTS	WTD PTS	POINTS	WTD PTS	POINTS	WTD PTS	POINTS	WTD PTS	AVERAGE	ST DEV
Barnes, Ferland, & Associates													
Proposed Approach to Performing the Work/Strategy	50.00%	82	41	70	35	82	41	80	40	70	35	76.80	3.13
Similar Project Experience	20.00%	85	17	75	15	78	15.6	75	15	75	15	77.60	0.87
Innovative Ideas	20.00%	84	16.8	80	16	85	17	85	17	80	16	82.80	0.52
Quality of Presentaiton	10.00%	90	9	85	8.5	90	9	75	7.5	75	7.5	83.00	0.76
	100.00%		83.8		74.5		82.6		79.5		73.5	WEIGHTED AVERAGE	78.78
Black & Veatch Corp													
Proposed Approach to Performing the Work/Strategy	50.00%	86	43	85	42.5	85	42.5	90	45	85	42.5	86.20	1.08
Similar Project Experience	20.00%	88	17.6	85	17	88	17.6	85	17	85	17	86.20	0.33
Innovative Ideas	20.00%	84	16.8	90	18	84	16.8	90	18	85	17	86.60	0.63
Quality of Presentaiton	10.00%	90	9	85	8.5	90	9	90	9	90	9	89.00	0.22
	100.00%		86.4		86		85.9		89		85.5	WEIGHTED AVERAGE	86.56
Connect Consulting													
Proposed Approach to Performing the Work/Strategy	50.00%	88	44	90	45	90	45	95	47.5	90	45	90.60	1.30
Similar Project Experience	20.00%	89	17.8	90	18	90	18	90	18	90	18	89.80	0.09
Innovative Ideas	20.00%	88	17.6	85	17	90	18	85	17	85	17	86.60	0.46
Quality of Presentaiton	10.00%	90	9	80	8	90	9	95	9.5	85	8.5	88.00	0.57
	100.00%		88.4		88		90		92		88.5	WEIGHTED AVERAGE	89.38



MEMORANDUM

TO: Peter Maley, Purchasing Supervisor

FROM: Gary Rudolph, Utilities Manager *GR*

THRU: Bob Adolphe, P.E., Environmental Services Director *BA*

DATE: January 21, 2005

SUBJECT: Justification of Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repair Services

The purpose of this memorandum is to report the recommendations of the evaluation committee that met on January 19, 2005 at 3:30 PM.

Proposals from nine firms were evaluated by the committee. Barnes, Ferland, and Associates, Inc., Black and Veatch, and Connect Consulting (listed in alphabetical order) have been recommended to be short listed for formal presentations/discussions:

The following matrix summarizes the attributes of each firm related to the specified project criteria:

Criteria	Barnes, Ferland, & Associates	Black & Veatch	Connect Consulting
Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)	Good general overview of well construction/CEI/project work	Good understanding of project, broad based approach	Detailed approach covered all aspects of scope.
Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)	Firm has lots of overall experience. Been around a long time doing this kind of work	Good base of staff on coverage of well design and CEI.	Lots of experience in the Central Florida Area
Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)	Good experience on similar new well projects	Good well construction and CEI experience.	Many projects listed. Lots of experience in all aspects of project.
Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)	Sufficient detail provided indicating staff available for project.	Sufficient detail provided indicating staff available for project.	Sufficient detail provided indicating staff available for project.

If you have any questions, please give me a call at extension 2020.

Signatures:

Bob Adolphe, P.E. *Bob Adolphe* Jeff Thompson, P.E. *Jeff Thompson*

Dennis Westrick, P.E. *Dennis Westrick* Gary Rudolph *Gary Rudolph*

Robert Dehler *Robert Dehler*

Copy: File

EVALUATION FOR PS-5174-04/AJR Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repair Services**QUALIFICATION TEAM
CONSENSUS REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION****SUMMARY SCORES AND RANKINGS**

<u>FIRMS</u>	<u>SCORE</u>	<u>RANKING</u>
Connect Consulting	88.17	1
Black & Veatch Corp	83.19	2
Patrick Barnes / Barnes, Ferland, & Asst.	82.53	3
CDM	81.71	4
Leggette, Brashears, & Graham	80.66	5
Hartman & Associate	75.87	6

EVALUATION FOR PS-5174-04/AJR Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repair Services

	B. Adolphe			R. Dehler		G. Rudolph		J. Thompson		D. Westrick			
Black & Veatch Corp													
CRITERIA	<u>WEIGHT</u>	<u>POINTS</u>	<u>WTD PTS</u>	<u>AVERAGE</u>	<u>ST DEV</u>								
Approach to Project/Innovative Solutions	45.00%	86	38.7	90	40.5	76	34.2	90	40.5	80	36	84.40	2.80
Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm	20.00%	83	16.6	85	17	76	15.2	95	19	85	17	84.80	1.36
Similar Recent Project Experience	25.00%	85	21.25	79	19.75	75	18.75	85	21.25	75	18.75	79.80	1.25
Workload/Ability to Perform	10.00%	85	8.5	80	8	75	7.5	90	9	85	8.5	83.00	0.57
	100.00%		85.05		85.25		75.65		89.75		80.25	WEIGHTED AVERAGE	83.19
CDM													
CRITERIA	<u>WEIGHT</u>	<u>POINTS</u>	<u>WTD PTS</u>	<u>AVERAGE</u>	<u>ST DEV</u>								
Approach to Project/Innovative Solutions	45.00%	84	37.8	90	40.5	77	34.65	80	36	85	38.25	83.20	2.24
Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm	20.00%	85	17	75	15	75	15	85	17	85	17	81.00	1.10
Similar Recent Project Experience	25.00%	86	21.5	75	18.75	76	19	95	23.75	69	17.25	80.20	2.57
Workload/Ability to Perform	10.00%	85	8.5	75	7.5	76	7.6	90	9	75	7.5	80.20	0.69
	100.00%		84.8	80	81.75	75	76.25		85.75		80	WEIGHTED AVERAGE	81.71
Connect Consulting													
CRITERIA	<u>WEIGHT</u>	<u>POINTS</u>	<u>WTD PTS</u>	<u>AVERAGE</u>	<u>ST DEV</u>								
Approach to Project/Innovative Solutions	45.00%	88	39.6	90	40.5	80	36	95	42.75	95	42.75	89.60	2.78
Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm	20.00%	86	17.2	89	17.8	80	16	95	19	95	19	89.00	1.27
Similar Recent Project Experience	25.00%	88	22	80	20	82	20.5	95	23.75	90	22.5	87.00	1.52
Workload/Ability to Perform	10.00%	85	8.5	75	7.5	75	7.5	95	9.5	85	8.5	83.00	0.84
	100.00%		87.3		85.8		80		95		92.75	WEIGHTED AVERAGE	88.17
Hartman & Associate													
CRITERIA	<u>WEIGHT</u>	<u>POINTS</u>	<u>WTD PTS</u>	<u>AVERAGE</u>	<u>ST DEV</u>								
Approach to Project/Innovative Solutions	45.00%	83	37.35	60	27	74	33.3	65	29.25	75	33.75	71.40	4.06
Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm	20.00%	85	17	69	13.8	75	15	95	19	75	15	79.80	2.05
Similar Recent Project Experience	25.00%	86	21.5	75	18.75	73	18.25	90	22.5	70	17.5	78.80	2.18
Workload/Ability to Perform	10.00%	85	8.5	79	7.9	75	7.5	80	8	85	8.5	80.80	0.43
	100.00%		84.35		67.45		74.05		78.75		74.75	WEIGHTED AVERAGE	75.87
Leggette, Brashears, & Graham													
CRITERIA	<u>WEIGHT</u>	<u>POINTS</u>	<u>WTD PTS</u>	<u>AVERAGE</u>	<u>ST DEV</u>								
Approach to Project/Innovative Solutions	45.00%	75	33.75	80	36	79	35.55	90	40.5	78	35.1	80.40	2.56
Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm	20.00%	80	16	75	15	78	15.6	90	18	85	17	81.60	1.19
Similar Recent Project Experience	25.00%	80	20	75	18.75	78	19.5	85	21.25	80	20	79.60	0.91
Workload/Ability to Perform	10.00%	85	8.5	74	7.4	75	7.5	90	9	89	8.9	82.60	0.76
	100.00%		78.25		77.15		78.15		88.75		81	WEIGHTED AVERAGE	80.66
Patrick Barnes / Barnes, Ferland, & Asst.													
CRITERIA	<u>WEIGHT</u>	<u>POINTS</u>	<u>WTD PTS</u>	<u>AVERAGE</u>	<u>ST DEV</u>								
Approach to Project/Innovative Solutions	45.00%	83	37.35	90	40.5	73	32.85	85	38.25	79	35.55	82.00	2.88
Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm	20.00%	85	17	80	16	72	14.4	90	18	85	17	82.40	1.36
Similar Recent Project Experience	25.00%	85	21.25	78	19.5	70	17.5	95	23.75	85	21.25	82.60	2.32
Workload/Ability to Perform	10.00%	85	8.5	80	8	75	7.5	100	10	85	8.5	85.00	0.94
	100.00%		84.1		84		72.25		90		82.3	WEIGHTED AVERAGE	82.53

INTERVIEW RATING FORM

February 2, 2005

Interview for (work): Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repair Service

Name of the Firm: Barnes, Ferland & Associates

QUALIFICATIONS FACTORS	Points (0-100)	Weights
Proposed Approach to Performing the Work/Strategy will be onsite during critical drilling operations Very nice project work of well construction. city of T-ville rehab process / Have ASIR EXP. Heavy on well construction - Did provide T-ville rehab info when asked. Primarily looked at drilling new wells.	82	(50%)
Similar Project Experience Provided multiple drilling exp. during presentations. well cost control shows work @ Seminole Consumers SIBUT on Refurbishment.	78	(20%)
Innovative Ideas Discussed geophysical logging - Polymer based drilling activities additives. Drilling well costs data base Networking available for real time support.	85	(20%)
Quality of Presentation Did a nice presentation use of Power Point, Good job of hitting Qualifications Factors	90	(10%)
Comments and Notes: <u>Tom's mobile preferred mobile used by DISTRICT.</u>		

Rater's name: Gary Rudolph

Signature: 

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

INTERVIEW RATING FORM

Date: February 2, 2005

Interview for (work): Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repair Service

Name of the Firm: Black & Veatch

EXPERIENCE WITH THIS STATUS.

QUALIFICATIONS FACTORS	Points (0-100)	Weights
Proposed Approach to Performing the Work/Strategy Engineering ^{BT} + field expertise - ↳ connect consultancy Brought in Security / Single Source responsibility	85	(50%)
Similar Project Experience Provided state wide areas worked in. Has worked for the county in lots of the 16 tasks identified in diff. water systems.	88	(20%)
Innovative Ideas IN well construction NICE SOLUTION ON Well Repair/maint/mod. E- Permit process. Reduce data input. OLD SCHOOL QA/QC, / Build with us spare parts.	84	(20%)
Quality of Presentation NICE PRESENTATION - GOOD USE OF POWER POINT.	90	(10%)

Comments and Notes: mod flow - choice of structure.

Rater's name: Gary Rudolph Signature: Gary Rudolph

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

INTERVIEW RATING FORM

Date: February 2, 2005

Interview for (work): Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repair Service

Name of the Firm: Connect Consulting

QUALIFICATIONS FACTORS	Points (0-100)	Weights
Proposed Approach to Performing the Work/Strategy Very good approach on repairment of portion of tasks. HAS ABILITY FOR TURNKEY OR DESIGN/CONSTRUCTION. USE FEEL. SUPPORT AS NEEDED Direct field work as needed	90	(50%)
Similar Project Experience LOTS OF EXP IN CENTRAL FLORIDA - ^{LOTS OF} Seminole County support	90	(20%)
Innovative Ideas - APT without wasting water ^{MANAGEMENT} Provided many ideas on how to put problem wells back into service as a good potable well. work well with STRUMPS.	90	(20%)
Quality of Presentation NICE POWER POINT PRESENTATION.	90	(10%)
Comments and Notes: <u>OUTSTANDING JOB!</u>		

Rater's name: Gary Rudolph

Signature: Gary Rudolph

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

INTERVIEW RATING FORM

Date: February 2, 2005

Interview for (work): Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repair Service

Name of the Firm: Barnes, Ferland & Associates

QUALIFICATIONS FACTORS	Points (0-100)	Weights
Proposed Approach to Performing the Work/Strategy Good Org Chart, Approach focused on new well construction not enough on well rehab methods for existing wells Presented services performed for OUC, SFA, Ormond Bch & Titusville	<u>70</u>	(50%)
Similar Project Experience Firm formed in 1994 - from DRMP 30 person firm, specializing in H2O Resources > 100 years experience Lots of experience (14 municipal clients), incl. ASRs, APTs 20-year COPs for City of Ormond Beach, working on 5 others Designed > 50 municipal supply wells incl. OUC ASRs for City of WPB, SFWMD, STRWMD (Orange Co) & (Ormond Bch)	<u>75</u> (combined)	(20%)
Innovative Ideas - Identified Critical Issues wrt County's CUPs Recent RAI's * Cost Management * Fit model to application i.e. "right-sizing" - Sonic televiwer logging - for use in identifying fracture zones/flow	<u>80</u>	(20%)
? Turn Key well construction Sucs. - both Orange Co. & Ormond Bch	<u>75</u>	(10%)
Quality of Presentation Focused a lot on CUP issues such as wetland impacts, upcomng, modeling etc. Discussed addtl well wells at Markham, Country Club Summary - listed items for a successful well constr. project * daily construction logs	<u>75</u>	(10%)
Comments and Notes: <u>Focused too much on CUP RAI issues</u> <u>No mention of other existing issues such as Apple Valley, Marroe WTP wells</u>		

Rater's name: J. Dennis Westrick

Signature: J. Dennis Westrick

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

2

INTERVIEW RATING FORM

Date: February 2, 2005

Interview for (work): Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repair Service

Name of the Firm: Black & Veatch

QUALIFICATIONS FACTORS	Points (0-100)	Weights
Proposed Approach to Performing the Work/Strategy Outlined each task & provided detail of effort required for each Good overall approach, not a lot of experience cited for well rehab & repair of existing wells Presented turn-key as alternative delivery option	85	(50%)
Similar Project Experience Bob Moresio - B&V's Project Mgr. Excellent team w/ technical & regulatory background Paul Petrey - has water well construction license (driller) - formerly w/ Diversified Well Drilling Good team matrix addressing each task in scope of svcs Many varied clients throughout FL, incl. APTs - Sarasota City Provided design & CEI svcs. for SC's SESEA (Consumers)	85	(20%)
Innovative Ideas - Recommend drilling small dia. test wells Can use Paul Petrey to expedite well drilling permitting process w/ SJRWMD Focused on saving costs, pre-qualifying contractors Streamline process for CUP, now using e-permitting Manual check of computer GW modelling	85	(20%)
Quality of Presentation Good graphic on SC Service Areas & WTPs Another good exhibit for former FWS Wells Overall - very good graphics Mentioned NWSA saline intrusion monitoring wells	90	(10%)
Comments and Notes: Bob Moresio very familiar w/ Gary Eichler Good responses to questions * No current contract w/ SJRWMD		

Rater's name: J. Dennis Westrick

Signature: J. Dennis Westrick

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

INTERVIEW RATING FORM

①

Date: February 2, 2005

Interview for (work): Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repair Service

Name of the Firm: Connect Consulting

QUALIFICATIONS FACTORS	Points (0-100)	Weights
Proposed Approach to Performing the Work/Strategy Good, no excellent Approach germane to the County's issues Work closely w/ client, especially operations staff Very creative, can handle large and/or small projects Applies logical & thorough analysis & research before recommending a field solution, uses creative permitting	90	(50%)
Similar Project Experience Teamed w/ CH2M Hill & excellent Field Support Team Presented Case Studies - Well 35 (Deltona), SER 4 Markham Well Field Markham Well 3 Poinciana (fire well) NWSA saline intrusion monitoring wells (3)	90	(20%)
Innovative Ideas Identify needs, develop technical approach then delivery schedule, budget Avoid UDTL issues *Execute* be responsive, cost saving approach Work w/ client & WMD thruout each project Out-of-the-box thinking such as dual zone monitoring wells	85	(20%)
Quality of Presentation Very concise & specific w/ examples of well rehab/repair as well as new well construction Presentation focused on well rehab/restoration	85	(10%)
Comments and Notes: <u>Team has lots of experience with well construction, especially for repair of existing wells</u> <u>Good responses to questions</u>		
Rater's name: <u>J. Dennis Westrick</u>	Signature: 	

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

INTERVIEW RATING FORM


Date: February 2, 2005

Interview for (work): Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repair Service

Name of the Firm: Barnes, Ferland & Associates

QUALIFICATIONS FACTORS	Points (0-100)	Weights
Proposed Approach to Performing the Work/Strategy	<u>82</u>	(50%)
CRITICAL ISSUE - RAT		
FRACTURE ZONE IDENTIFIED		
KNOWLEDGE OF ASR WELL		
BOTH HYDROLOG & ENGR SERVICES		
TOTH LOCAL MODEL - NO LARGER MODEL APPLICATION	<u>85</u>	(20%)
Similar Project Experience		
MUNICIPAL SUPPLY WELLS		
ASR WORK -		
FAIR AMOUNT OF LOCAL EXP, NO SC		
LOCAL COMPANY		
USGS CHIEF FOR AREA - RON FERLAND - CITY OF GAINESVILLE	<u>84</u>	(20%)
Innovative Ideas		
EXTRAPOLATE COSTS THROUGH LAST DATA		
USE OF DRILLING ADDITIVES		
COST MGT.		
Quality of Presentation	<u>90</u>	(10%)
WELL ORGANIZED		
TECH GLITCH OVERCOME		
SATISFACTORY		
Comments and Notes: _____		

Rater's name: BOB ADOLPHE

Signature: 

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

INTERVIEW RATING FORM

Date: February 2, 2005


Interview for (work): Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repair Service

Name of the Firm: Black & Veatch

QUALIFICATIONS FACTORS	Points (0-100)	Weights
Proposed Approach to Performing the Work/Strategy	<u>86</u>	(50%)
<u>CONSTRUCTION OVERSIGHT</u>		
<u>LINK GROUNDWATER/SURFACE WATER</u>		
<u>BIOLOGICAL IMPACT STUDIES</u>		
<u>TURNKEY WITH ALL LICENSES</u>		
<u>LOCALISED TEAM MEMBERS</u>		
Similar Project Experience	<u>88</u>	(20%)
<u>REGULATORY CHIEF FOR SOUND - MARIANA</u>		
<u>LOTS OF EXPERIENCE SIMILAR PROJECTS</u>		
<u>PROVIDED CUP SERVICES IN EACH OF GEOGRAPHIC AREAS</u>		
<u>LICENSED WELL DRILLER CONTRACTOR</u>		
Innovative Ideas	<u>87</u>	(20%)
<u>SAVE DRILLING COSTS-</u>		
<u>PERMITTING WOULD ASSIST IN SUBMISSION</u>		
Quality of Presentation	<u>90</u>	(10%)
<u>SATISFACTORY</u>		

Comments and Notes: _____

Rater's name: BOB ADOLPHE

Signature: 

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

INTERVIEW RATING FORM

Date: February 2, 2005

Interview for (work): Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repair Service

Name of the Firm: Connect Consulting

QUALIFICATIONS FACTORS	Points (0-100)	Weights
Proposed Approach to Performing the Work/Strategy	<u>88</u>	(50%)
INCORPORATE INEXPENSIVE METHODOLOGY TO REHAB WELLS TURNKEY IF NECESSARY COMPLIANCE A KEY PART OF REHAB STRATEGY EXHAUSTIVE DATA LOGGING, ANALYSIS TO CONCLUDE REPAIR SCENARIO. TEAMING WITH PE SUPPORT FOR DESIGN		
Similar Project Experience	<u>89</u>	(20%)
MARKHAM, SER 7 HANOVER WATER QUALITY SUCCESSFUL REHAB OF SER 7 UNDER DIFFICULT CONDITIONS SALT WATER MONITORING WELLS, ART'S AT MARKHAM		
Innovative Ideas	<u>88</u>	(20%)
SUCCESSFUL USE OF SLEEVING TO ISOLATE PRODUCTION ZONES DEVELOPED A DUAL ZONE WELL		
Quality of Presentation	<u>90</u>	(10%)
VIDEO TO CAMERA INTO BOREHOLE SATISFACTORY		
Comments and Notes: _____		

Rater's name: Bob Adolphe

Signature: _____

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

INTERVIEW RATING FORM

Date: February 2, 2005

Interview for (work): Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repair Service

Name of the Firm: Barnes, Ferland & Associates

QUALIFICATIONS FACTORS	Points (0-100)	Weights
Proposed Approach to Performing the Work/Strategy <i>Smaller firm, hands on, MARKHAM & ASZ, (DRILL WORK WAS THE FOCUS) NOT MUCH ON WELL PUMP & WECC PROBLEM REPAIRS.</i>	70	(50%)
Similar Project Experience - Firm 1994 <i>- PG & PE firm.</i>	75	(20%)
<i>- USGS CHIEF - Quality Assurance group - 14 different clients - 50 supply wells</i>		
Innovative Ideas (Impact modeling) well field management, <i>Collect data of water quality, field checking during construction well field history data collect & time binded. Cost management.</i>	80	(20%)
Quality of Presentation <i>Quality Praentation, Nice drilling & well field records.</i>	85	(10%)
Comments and Notes: _____ _____ _____		

Rater's name: G. Robert Peltier

Signature: *[Handwritten Signature]*

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

INTERVIEW RATING FORM

Date: February 2, 2005

Interview for (work): Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repair Service

Name of the Firm: Black & Veatch

QUALIFICATIONS FACTORS	Points (0-100)	Weights
Proposed Approach to Performing the Work/Strategy <i>Touched based on both new & old systems. Repair & Maintenance of wells & well fields. Using older well as monitoring wells, TALK ABOUT Hydrogeology.</i>	85	(50%)
Similar Project Experience <i>Regulatory Experience plus Geo services plus well driller license. Well Construction & Repair.</i>	85	(20%)
Innovative Ideas <i>Cost saving, Reduction in Exposure (water quality)</i> <i>Good overall approach to project. (E-permitting)</i> <i>Quality & control of data. water supply planning.</i> <i>TALK ABOUT THE TREATMENT OF WATER IN THE TREAT. (SECURITY) REACT QUICKLY & EFFECTIVE!</i>	90	(20%)
Quality of Presentation <i>Covered all issues in scope. nice flow to presentation</i> <i>TEAM ALL PARTICIPATED -</i>	85	(10%)
Comments and Notes: _____ _____ _____		

Rater's name: G. Robert Parker Signature: 

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

INTERVIEW RATING FORM

Date: February 2, 2005

Interview for (work): Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repair Service

Name of the Firm: Connect Consulting

QUALIFICATIONS FACTORS	Points (0-100)	Weights
Proposed Approach to Performing the Work/Strategy <i>Prioritized need of utility, review Team. Can work on large & small Projects. Good relationship with water management dist.</i>	90	(50%)
Similar Project Experience <i>Has worked on a few projects for US. SEU #4 pump replaced within 24 hours repaired and back in service. Currently working on CU renewal for county.</i>	90	(20%)
Innovative Ideas <i>HANDS-ON Service, works closely with Staff. Works closely with water management dist on wells @ Poinciana.</i>	85	(20%)
Quality of Presentation <i>Hit the Mark on what utility needed. Simple but clear.</i>	80	(10%)

Comments and Notes: _____

Rater's name: _____

G. Robert DeTurck

Signature: _____

[Handwritten Signature]

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

INTERVIEW RATING FORM


Date: February 2, 2005

Interview for (work): Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repair Service

Name of the Firm: Barnes, Ferland & Associates

QUALIFICATIONS FACTORS	Points (0-100)	Weights
Proposed Approach to Performing the Work/Strategy Proposed Impact model rather than developing a separate model to save both money and time. Aware of Siemens Issue. Communication w/ staff + District. Tightly written specifications are VERY important - good. Both P.G.s + P.E.s on staff. Built an extensive network of external support firms to meet our needs.	80	(50%)
Similar Project Experience Sotwells OUC City of Titusville (Chloride issues) This section of the presentation seemed to be very similar to the written proposal (which we've already read). New and/or more detailed information would have been useful. Developed Customized Rehab Program.	75	(20%)
Innovative Ideas Sonic logging of fracture zones. Converting test wells to production wells. Wireless telemetry of ASR data to remove extraneous data. Salvaged OUC well where 40-ft cavern was hit. Cost Management - history for keeping drillers honest.	85	(20%)
Quality of Presentation Mr. Barnes did an excellent job. Mr. Watson's presentation was a little less polished - pace was too slow and he was clearly nervous - Toastmasters would help.	75	(10%)
Comments and Notes: <u>Focus of presentation was a little off-target</u>		

Rater's name: Jeffrey F. Thompson

Signature: 

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

INTERVIEW RATING FORM


Date: February 2, 2005

Interview for (work): Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repair Service

Name of the Firm: Black & Veatch

QUALIFICATIONS FACTORS	Points (0-100)	Weights
Proposed Approach to Performing the Work/Strategy	90	(50%)
<i>Bob Moresi's experience w/ SSRWMD + Gary Eichler + Paul Petrey (Water Well License) Perform a "sanity check" on APT data. Mr. Moresi has a good relationship w/ SSRWMD and did an outstanding job explaining B&V's proposed approach to call the ECF model or specific applications into question!</i>		
Similar Project Experience	85	(20%)
<i>B&V has a considerable amount of experience in the area. Illustrated specific experience throughout Seminole County</i>		
Innovative Ideas	90	(20%)
<i>With Mr. Petrey's experience, B&V can focus on cost issues with drillers. Expanding experience. Wellhead security. Single Source responsibility</i>		
Quality of Presentation	90	(10%)
<i>Presentation was very polished and professional</i>		
Comments and Notes: <i>All team members spoke and did a good job to present a clear plan.</i>		

Rater's name: Jeffrey F. Thompson

Signature: 

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

INTERVIEW RATING FORM


Date: February 2, 2005

Interview for (work): Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repair Service

Name of the Firm: Connect Consulting

QUALIFICATIONS FACTORS	Points (0-100)	Weights
Proposed Approach to Performing the Work/Strategy Work w/ staff to prioritize needs, efficient and timely completion of work. Proven short response time. Very close/frequent communication w/ staff. Presented case studies and the solutions that were implemented. Able to salvage improperly constructed wells for substantially lower cost than replacement. Great relationship with District. Ability to work on small and large projects.	95	(50%)
Similar Project Experience Gary has extensive experience with Seminole County wells, Matt has experience w/ water quality, Brenda has environmental engineering experience.	90	(20%)
Innovative Ideas Assembly of drilling rig inside pump house, dual-zone well.	85	(20%)
Quality of Presentation Excellent job - thorough, clear and well presented. Potential improvement would be to have all team members present participate for a section.	95	(10%)
Comments and Notes: <u>Overall, an outstanding presentation clearly illustrating the depth of experience and qualifications Connect would bring to the County.</u>		

Rater's name: Jeffrey F. Thompson

Signature: 

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

- Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repairs Services

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: L. B. G. INC.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: BOB ADOLPH

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

NO EXPANSIVE CUP OR MODELING INFO
NO STRATEGY - COOKBOOK ONLY

Score 75
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

SPOTTY RESULTS FROM PREVIOUS ASSOCIATE

Score 80
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

COMPANY NO PREVIOUS SEM CO.
SOME POOR RESULTS BY ASSOCIATES

Score 80
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

GOOD CHART

Score 85
(100-0)

Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repairs Services

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ HAI Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: BOB ADOLPH

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

STARTS ON APPROACH
OR CUP INFORMATION
COULD USE MORE DISCUSSION ON REHAB

Score ~~83~~ 83
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

GOOD QUALIFICATIONS
VARIOUS DISCIPLINES INCLUDING WELL DRILLING

Score 85
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

BRACKISH SURFACE PROGRAM
SEMINOLE CO. EXPERIENCE

Score ~~86~~ 86
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

GOOD CHART

Score 85
(100-0)

Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repairs Services

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: CCI

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: BOB ADOLPHE

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

COMPLETE DESCRIPTION OF WELL CONCERNS
GOOD DISCUSSION REPAIR & REHAB, REDEVELOPMENT
CUP STRATEGY - APT

Score 88
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

INCLUDED ENG SUPPORT - CH2M HILL

Score 86
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

MANAY LOCAL UTILITIES
600 SEMINOLE COUNTY Exp.

Score 88
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

GOOD CHART

Score 85
(100-0)

Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repairs Services

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: CDM

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Bob Adolph

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

PT BY PT FOR CUPS
DISCUSSION ON MODELING - GOOD
STRATEGY

Score ~~84~~ 84
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

WELL QUALIFIED
LISTING OF SUBCONSULTANTS

Score 85
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

ASR PROJECT
GOOD LOCAL EXP.

Score 86
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

GOOD CHART - OK

Score 85
(100-0)

Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repairs Services

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: BLACK & VEATCH

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: BOB ADOLPHE

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

CUP APPROACH - DISCUSSION STRATEGY
OVERVIEW OF S/C

Score 86
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

TEAM - MEMBER WORK FOR S/C
APPEARS QUALIFIED

Score 83
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

COMPLETE LIST.

Score 85
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

GOOD CHART

Score 85
(100-0)

- Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repairs Services

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: BFA

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: ROBERT DEHLEN

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Well construction Oversight, water supply planning, CUP Hydrogeologic study, Modeling, APT, Data evaluation, Permitting, Biological Impact analysis, in time manner.

* MEET WITH county staff to determine specific goals

Score 90
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

50 municipal supply wells (construction management) (1995)

Score 80
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

Alt. Springs - 20 year CUP & Ormond Beach.
DUE - well design (2000)

Score 78
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

has no projects which would adversely affect ability to complete projects

Score 80
(100-0)

Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repairs Services

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: LEGETTE, BRASHEARS & GRAHAM, INC.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: ROBERT PEHLEN

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

WHY LIST TO PROVIDED: CONSTRUCTION OVERSIGHT, PERMITTING, WELL DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION, WELL REPAIR AND MODIFICATION, TESTING, WELL HEAD APPURTENANCES/PUMP EVAL DESIGN, REPAIR ALL TURKEY (WATER QUALITY TESTING) (COST CONTROL)

Score 80++
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

WATER SUPPLY PLANNING, CAP PERMITTING, WELL REHAB. MODELING CONTAMINATION ASSESSMENT / REMEDIATION

Score 75
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

1999 - TAMPA BAY OPTIMIZED REGIONAL OPERATIONS PLAN
1993 -> CURRENT - CITY OF PUNERIN WELL FIELD MANAGEMENT
1998 - 2003 -> MARION OAKS - (FWS) MODELING

Score 75
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

45% AVAILABLE

Score 74
(100-0)

Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repairs Services

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: TETRA TECH, INC.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: ROBERT DEALER

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

"SINCE THERE IS NOT A SPECIFIC PROJECT OUTLINED,
A SPECIFIC PROJECT APPROACH CAN NOT BE PROVIDED"

Score 60
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

EXPERIENCED IN DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF INJECTION WELLS,
CURRENTLY PROVIDING INSPECTION SERVICES TO THE CITY OF
PALM BAY.

Score 69
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

PALM BAY - TEST/PRODUCTION WELLS / RD
PORT ST. LUCIE - DESIGN/BIDDING & CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT / RD
CITY OF BANTON - EXPANSION OF RAW WATER WELLS.
3 MORE (BUT NO DATES)?

Score 75
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

62% AVAILABLE NOW; PROJECTED TO INCREASE TO 70%

Score 79
(100-0)

Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repairs Services

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: CCI / (CH2MHill)?

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: ROBERT DEHLER

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Numerous, recent & specific projects have just been handled by CCI (they have clear understanding)

Score 90
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

2000-2004 Peltona - well evaluations/repair/modifications (20 T&E)
1977 - current Palm Coast - hydrogeologic investigations
1976 - current St Augustine - contaminated well fields

see includes
Client
contacts.

Score 89
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

CH2MHill shall handle engineering tasks.

Score 80
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

Around 50% with CH2MHill

Score 75
(100-0)

- Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repairs Services

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: CDM

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: ROBERT DEHLEN

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

SERVICES TO INCLUDE PERMITTING, DESIGN, CONSTRUCTION, REPAIR OF
EXISTING WELLS. ALL ASPECTS OF WELL & CUP PERMITTING.
HYDROGEOLOGIC ASSESSMENT, TESTING, BIOLOGICAL ASSESSMENTS

(DETAILED PLANS) CONDUCT SITE VISITS

INCLUDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF QUALITY
O&M PLANS *

Score 90
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

WATER SUPPLY PLANNING, CUP PERMITTING, WELL REHAB, MODELING
ETC.

Score 75
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

2001 -> PRESENT - WATER SUPPLY EXPANSION & CUP - ST. JOHNS COUNTY
2001 -> 2002 - FLORIAN AQUIFER / PRODUCTION WELLS - FLORIAN PERMIT
FL.

2002 -> 2004 ASR WELL SEMINOLE COUNTY

Score 75
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

LARGE FIRM 45% AVAILABILITY

Score 80
(100-0)

Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repairs Services

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: B. & V.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: ROBERT DECKER

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings

80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.

70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is

60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications

Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Assignment will involve general, as-needed services and will include consulting and eng. services related to the County's water supply system. Services will involve hydrogeologic and well construction services associated with new and existing wells. etc. (STRICT SAFETY PROGRAM) (water quality monitoring)

Score 90
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

SEUL-2001

CITY OF LAKELAND (NO DATES)

DS Waters Weking Springs NPL assessment and construction

OK - SOUTHWEST WTP. / SKY LAKE WTP.

CCU - WESTERN REGIONAL

Score 85
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

Formerly head of permit enforcement/compliance (SSRWMD)

Gary Eichler of CC

Score 79
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

75% available

Score 80
(100-0)

Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repairs Services

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Barnes, Ferland & Assoc., Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: J. Dennis Westrick

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Knowledgeable of County's current CUP renewal status
Approach given was general & standard tasks
No innovative solutions offered other than purported
cost savings & efficiency if selected due to recent experience
48 hour APTs proposed
No mention of FWS systems.

Score 79 35.55
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

Hydrogeologists on staff have >120yrs experience
BFA has managed constr. of more than 50 wells, most in Central FL
Staff has familiarity w/ Central FL geology and current SJRWMD regs
Full-range, local firm, good mix of PG's & PE's
* Very detailed Team Org Chart, no GA or Water Well Contractor licenses

Score 85 17.00
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

Developed GW flow models for Ormond Bch, Titusville, Alt. Spgs, OUC et.
Selected by SJRWMD & working w/ OC Utilities & Ormond on ASR
Successfully completed similar projects for Alt. Spgs, OUC, SEA feasibility,
Maitland, Titusville, Palm Beach - 20 year CUPs for Alt Springs &
No current or past experience w/ Seminole County
Detailed Table provided for recent & current clients

Score 85 Ormond Beach 21.25
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

Proposed project team has 30 to 75% availability

Score 85 8.5
(100-0)

82.30

- Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repairs Services

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Legette, Brashears & Graham, Inc

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: J. Dennis Westrick

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Outlined well inspection work, evaluation services, also Well maintenance SVCs.
- very detailed on chemical treatment methods (mild & aggressive)
 A Primary service provided by LBG is CUP services - gave approach
Project mgmt approach is realistic & functional
Project approach was general but comprehensive.

Stated awareness

No mention of County or recently acquired FWS facilities, Score 78
No mention of current CUPs, renewal, RAIs etc- (100-0)

35.11

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

Tampa firm w/ Orlando office, oldest GW firm in US
Ray Silberstein, formerly w/ Groundwater Engineering - familiar w/ Markham test
Havinger & Assoc (JCF) proposed as Sub for geophysical, vides etc wells
Nine (9) hydrogeologists/engineers available (combined Tampa/Orlando)
Majority of staff has > 20 years experience
Core services also includes water supply planning with
emphasis on alternative water resource development
Can also perform contamination investigations

Score 85
(100-0)

17.00

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

Historically worked in SW FL region w/ > 100 APTs
South Pasco County - investigation and performance evals of existing wells
City of Dunedin - exploratory wells, aquifer monitoring & testing plan, modeling, well field
Spring Hill & Marion Oaks (FWS) - GW modeling, well rehab, well const. mgmt plan
and testing

No current or past projects w/ County

Score 80
(100-0)

20.00

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

Current workload is at about 50% chargeability, well below 90% goal
stated that have at least 45% availability

8.9

Score 89
(100-0)

81.00

Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repairs Services

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Hartman & Associates Inc (Tetra-Tech)

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: J. Dennis Westrick

- INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
- 90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
 - 80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
 - 70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
 - 60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
 - Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

No specific approach presented, instead talked about water supply issues
Offered innovative solutions based on understanding client needs
Experienced in salt-water intrusion modeling
Have conducted preliminary investigations for use of surficial aquifer
& stormwater ponds for alternative water supply 33.75
 * Presented option for converting Well 7 at SER to a brackish supply well
 Score 75
 (100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

Full-service engineering & hydrogeological firm, Chuck Drake w/b PM
Experience ranging from surficial wells to deep wells to injection wells
Team members each have over 20 years experience, Drake & Dufresne
have taught courses on "Wells & Wellfield Mgmt" - Six (6) PG's in Orlando 15.00
Knowledgeable about brackish water supply wells
Liaenz & Dufresne have done many APTs
ABS, Inc ass'ly but no resume or mention in text/letter Score 75
 (100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

City of Palm Bay - test well for BQ plus APTs
City of Port St. Lucie - 2 new wells, Barlow - 72hr APT
Clermont - Wellfield expansion (3 wells)
North Miami Beach - test well & wellfield (5 new wells) expansion 17.50
 * No mention of well rehab work
 Score 70
 (100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

Current workload indicates 62% billability, increasing to 70% over next quarter
Workload chart shows declining project activity
 Score 85
 (100-0)

8.75
 71.75

Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repairs Services

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Connect Consulting

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: J. Dennis Westrick

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Good concise approach to specific issues facing Seminole County
CCI specializes in types of services requested
 * Recognized what County needs wrt dealing w/ older cable-tooled wells,
Excellent list of specialized hydrogeological expertise
Very familiar w/ STRWMD ELF Regional GWS model, CUP requirements
Knowledgeable of former FWS systems, especially Apple Valley
 Approach detailed issues w/ old wells, new well construction
 emergency repairs, well rehab, well conversion

Score 95
(100-0)

42.75

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

* Teamed w/ CH2MHill, good mix of PG's & PE's
Subconsultants very good - Freeman Well Drillers and Hausinger & Assoc.
Good engineers Deep Venture & Advanced Geophys. Svcs.
 * Very familiar w/ County WTPs & well fields
 * Excellent Field Support Team

Score 95
(100-0)

19.00

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

* CCI has performed eight (8) similar projects for SC
Responded ASAP on SER Well No. 4
Modified well heads at Hanover Wds WTP for Well Nos 1 & 2.
Lots of APT experience, including Markham WTP
On-call work for City of Palm Coast, FWS, Deltona
FGUA, St. Augustine, Marco Island, & Volusia Count

Score 90
(100-0)

22.5

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

Project team has 30 to 70% availability w/ Gary
Eichler 60% available & Matt Alvarez 40% available

Score 85
(100-0)

8.5

92.75

Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repairs Services

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: CDM

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: J. Dennis Westrick

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

90 - 100	Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
80 - 89	Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
70 - 79	Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
60 - 69	Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
Below 60	Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Technical approach fairly mundane
 * Offered Design-Build w/ 3 well drillers (Rowe, Diversified & Boert Longyear)
 Knowledgeable of CUP issues, MFL's etc
 Good options presented for Production Well Rehab/Repair
 * 72-hour APTs proposed, recommend site visits, oversight by PG's
 No mention of FWS systems or CUP specifics
 * Proposed conservation when doing APT's

Score 85
(100-0) 38.25

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

Local full-service firm w/ lots of resources in FL & nationwide
 Proposing Lee Wiseman as PM
 Good mix of PG's, PE's & Ph.D's
 Licensed GC, good modeling mix
 Utilizes Employee Utilization Forecast System
 Currently working for County - Cassel Creek & NW RWTP

Score 85
(100-0) 17.00

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

Cited Sanford ASR project, good modeling experience
 Completed Water Supply Alternatives Study & 20-year CUP for St. Johns Co
 ASR program w/ Seminole County at Wilson Elem. site
 Weak on similar project experience
 CDM has done lots of work w/ SC, especially Struwr projects w/ Public Wks

Score 69
(100-0) 17.25

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

Key staff reported to be immediately available
 Lee Wiseman 20% available, other staff 30 to 50%

7.5

Score 75
(100-0)

80.00

Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repairs Services

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Black & Veatch

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: J. Dennis Westrick

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Unique CJP experience w/ Bob Moresi, Design-Build leader
Understand SC's H₂O Supply Systems
Somewhat generic approach *BUCI - construction Contracting Div of B&V
24-Hour APTs
 * Good emphasis on Site Safety w/ in-house OSHA training program
Recognized FWS systems, Dale Jenkins familiar w/ FWS in Tampa area 36.00
 Score 80
 (100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

Project team to be led by Bob Moresi, former head of SJRWMD permit enforcement/compliance Dept.
Teamed w/ Connect Consulting (Gary Eichler)
Worked on over 50 wells / WTPs
Has GC & Water Well Contractor licenses on team
 * Design consultant for SER WTP expansion & wells 7 & 8
Org Chart shows only PM plus five(s) not including Principal-in-Charge 17.00
 Score 85
 (100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

Team hydrogeologists, have practiced in Central FL since '70's
Good experience w/ numerous clients incl. OUC (see Table Pg 2-5)
SER WTP w/ Seminole County, City of Lakeland WTP/wells
OUC's SW WTP - five(s) new wells, Sky Lake WTP - two(2) new wells
Orange County Western Regional WTP Lower Florida
 * Designed wells 6 & 8 at SER 16.88
 Score 75
 (100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

Currently working at 75% capacity, decreases to < 50% by mid-year
Full-service firm w/ lots of staff to draw upon
Completing a no. of large projects over next 2 to 3 mos.

Score 85
(100-0)

8.50

78.38

Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repairs Services

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Connect Consulting, INC

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Grant Lee Rudolph

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Firm provided detailed description of numerous
construction / Repair services with how they get it
done. Resources available for standard support as well
as emergency support given.

Score 80 36
 (100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

LOTS OF EXPERIENCE shown in the Central Florida area.
STAFF IDENTIFIED has numerous projects done in this area.
This proposal is a team they are showing all staff - Person
through construction in our package.

Score 80 16
 (100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

many similar projects provided. Connect has experience
at all levels of well construction / Repair / modification

Score 82 20.5
 (100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

Firm has provided sufficient detail
indicating they have staff to support
proposal.

Score 75 7.5
 (100-0)
80

- Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repairs Services

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Leggette, Brashears, & Graham Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Gary Lee Rudolph

- INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
 - 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
 - 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
 - 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
 - Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Very good detail on how to evaluate existing
wells + the process used to refurb/repair. Didn't
indicate detail on lining existing wells.

Score 79 35.55
 (100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

LOTS of REPAIRS shown in Resumes of all
staff. Good experience at construction design, not
a lot of Refurb well identified

Score 78 15.6
 (100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

SHOWED PRIMARILY CONSTRUCTION OF NEW WELLS
NOT A LOT OF REPAIRS / REPAIRS WERE SHOWN

Score 78 19.50
 (100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

Firm provided sufficient information indicating
they have the time to support this initiative

Score 75 7.5
 (100-0) 78.15

- Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repairs Services

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Hartman + Associates

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Gary Rudolph

- INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
- 90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
 - 80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
 - 70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
 - 60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
 - Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Provided approach to deal with potential water shortage in
Sanitreat service area. Not a lot of detail on existing
well rehab.

Score 74 33.3
 (100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

IT IS OBVIOUS FIRM HAS EXPERIENCE in this
type of work but not a lot of specifics
given on well rehab/renovation.

Score 75 15.0
 (100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

Name listed except in staff resume. No specifics
given on diff. ways to rehabilitate existing wells

Score 73 18.25
 (100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

Firm has provided sufficient detail indicating
they have resources to complete assigned
tasks.

Score 75 7.5
 (100-0)

74.05

Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repairs Services

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: COM

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Gary Lee Rudolph

- INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
 - 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
 - 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
 - 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
 - Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Good detail on SJRWing interface. Not a lot of detail on refurb/repair of existing wells, mainly highlighted in proposal.

Score 77 34.65
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

STAFF SYSTEMS QUALIFIED TO COMPLETE TASKS AS OUTLINED IN SCOPE.

Score 75 15.0
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

Very limited experience provided in submittal w. aspects of scope. (3)

Score 76 19
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

Sufficient detail provided indicating staff is available to support scope

Score 75 7.5
(100-0) 76.15

Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repairs Services

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: BLACK & VEATCH

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Gary Lee Rudolph

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

GOOD PRESENTATION OF A BROAD RANGE
APPROACH. ALL THE BASES CONSIDERED AND
REAL INNOVATIVE SOLUTIONS GIVEN

Score 76 34.2
 (100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

FIRM HAS A GOOD BASE OF STAFF WITH
EXPERIENCE IN WELL DESIGN AND CRT - NOT A LOT
OF CONSTRUCTION OR REPAIRS EXP. PROVIDED

Score 76 15.2
 (100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

MOSTLY NEW WELL CONSTRUCTION GIVEN.
AGAIN - VERY BASED ON WELL REPAIRS AND
INSTALL ON HOW IT GETS DONE.

Score 75 18.75
 (100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

FIRM SHOWED SUFFICIENT STAFF AVAILABILITY
TO COMPLETE TASKS

Score 7.5 7.5
 (100-0)

75.65

- Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repairs Services

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: BARNES, Ferland & Associates, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Gary Lee Rudolph

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

SHOWED DETAIL ON DESIGN CONSTRUCTION
OF NEW WELLS - NO DETAIL ON REPAIRS/REPLACEMENT
OF EXISTING WELLS. NO INNOVATIVE SOLUTIONS
GIVING AT ALL

Score 73 32.85
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

GOOD WELL CONSTRUCTION EXP. NOT ALOT OF
REPAIR/REPLACEMENT GIVEN

Score 72 14.4
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

AGAIN LOTS OF NEW CONSTRUCTION WORK BUT NOT
BALANCED WITH REPAIR/REPLACEMENT
SERVICES

Score 70 17.5
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

FIRM HAS PROVIDED SUFFICIENT DETAIL THAT
INDICATES THERE IS ADEQUATE RESOURCES TO SUPPORT
THE INITIATIVE

Score 75 7.5
(100-0) 72.25

Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repairs Services

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Black & Veatch Corporation

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Jeffrey F. Thompson

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

An excellent and thorough approach covering each aspect of the contract with perhaps slightly too much emphasis on engineering aspects and not quite enough detail on geological, well repair and well maintenance.

Score 90
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

PM - 32yrs including SSRUMD
Gary Ezler

Score 95
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

Seminole County, Lakeland, OUC
Experience includes several engineering aspects, but seems to be weaker on hands-on field problem solving. - at least this aspect was not emphasized in the experience section

Score 85
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

25% overall, no detail for PM
PM is P.G.

Score 90
(100-0)

89.75

3

- Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repairs Services

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Camp Dresser & McKee

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Jeffrey F. Thompson

- INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
- 90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
 - 80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
 - 70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
 - 60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
 - Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Although the approach was very good, it didn't reach the same level of thoroughness as some of the other submittals.

Score 80
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

Firm is clearly qualified to perform this work

Score 85
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

St. Johns County, Atlantic Beach, Seminole County ASR - good!

Score 95
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

20% for PM, 40% for CVP assistance engineers, 50% for P.G.
PM is P.E.

Score 90
(100-0)

85.75

5

Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repairs Services

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Connect Consulting, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Jeffrey F. Thompson

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

An outstanding and innovative approach illustrating the extreme depth of knowledge and level of responsibility needed by the County.

Score 95
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

Connect's proposed personnel are very highly qualified.

Score 95
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

Palm Coast, Seminole County, Deltona, St. Augustine, Volusia County
Overall, lots of experience in this area and with the SJRWMD.
Hands-on experience

Score 95
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

Project manager shown as 60% available
PM is P.G.

Score 95
(100-0)

95.0

1

- Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repairs Services

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Hartman and Associates, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Jeffrey F. Thompson

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

At two pages this was the briefest approach submitted and frankly not of equivalent depth. It was difficult to determine how HAI/TT would approach some of our needs.

Score 65
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

This was the most impressive aspect of the proposal with four Professional Geologists assigned - all with very impressive records.

Score 95
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

Palm Bay, Port St. Lucie, Bartow, Clermont

Score 90
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

Based on graph (no % given, per detail) it appears there would be sufficient ability to perform.

P.G. is PM

In my opinion, vice presidents should not be listed as PMs unless in a very small firm.

Score 80
(100-0)

78.75

6

Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repairs Services

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Leggette, Brashears & Graham, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Jeffrey F. Thompson

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Company background is interesting
Excellent understanding of what the County is looking for
Very comprehensive and impressive

Score 90
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

Personnel are extremely qualified

Score 90
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

Pasco Co., Denedin
I would have liked to see more experience in our area listed, though some of that was shown in the resume section

Score ~~90~~ 85
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

50% overall; ~~the other 50% in the past individuals with availability~~
P.G. is PM - good.

Score 90
(100-0)

88.75

4

Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repairs Services

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Patrick Barnes - Barnes, Ferland and Associates, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Jeffrey F. Thompson

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Demonstrated a very good understanding of scope and needs of County.
Overall, some of the sections were a little more vague than I would have
preferred.

Score 85
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

Personnel appear to be very qualified.

Score 90
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

OUC, Orange Co. JEA. - Very good.
Comprehensive experience.

Score 95
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

40-70% for PM
This is the kind of availability data we should require - Excellent!
P.G. is PM

Score 100
(100-0)

90.0
2

**CONSULTANT SERVICES AGREEMENT (PS-5174-04/AJR)
HYDROGEOLOGIC AND WELL CONSTRUCTION OVERSIGHT**

THIS AGREEMENT is made and entered into this _____ day of _____, 20____, by and between **CONNECT CONSULTING, INC.**, duly authorized to conduct business in the State of Florida, whose address is 14596 Rolling Rock Place, Wellington, Florida 33414, hereinafter called the "CONSULTANT" and **SEMINOLE COUNTY**, a political subdivision of the State of Florida, whose address is Seminole County Services Building, 1101 East First Street, Sanford, Florida 32771, hereinafter called the "COUNTY".

W I T N E S S E T H:

WHEREAS, the COUNTY desires to retain the services of a competent and qualified consultant to provide hydrogeologic and well construction oversight services in Seminole County; and

WHEREAS, the COUNTY has requested and received expressions of interest for the retention of services of consultants; and

WHEREAS, the CONSULTANT is competent and qualified to furnish consulting services to the COUNTY and desires to provide professional services according to the terms and conditions stated herein,

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual understandings and covenants set forth herein, the COUNTY and the CONSULTANT agree as follows:

SECTION 1. SERVICES. The COUNTY does hereby retain the CONSULTANT to furnish professional services and perform those tasks as further described in the Scope of Services attached hereto as Exhibit "A" and made a part hereof. Required services shall be specifically enumerated, described and depicted in the Work Orders authorizing performance of the specific project, task or study. This Agreement standing alone does not authorize the performance of any work or require the COUNTY to place any orders for work.

SECTION 2. TERM. This Agreement shall take effect on the date of its execution by the COUNTY and shall run for a period of three (3) years and, at the sole option of COUNTY, may be renewed for two (2) successive periods not to exceed one (1) year each. Expiration of the term of this Agreement shall have no effect upon Work Orders issued pursuant to this Agreement and prior to the expiration date. Obligations entered therein by both parties shall remain in effect until completion of the work authorized by the Work Order.

SECTION 3. AUTHORIZATION FOR SERVICES. Authorization for performance of professional services by the CONSULTANT under this Agreement shall be in the form of written Work Orders issued and executed by the COUNTY and signed by the CONSULTANT. A sample Work Order is attached hereto as Exhibit "B". Each Work Order shall describe the services required, state the dates for commencement and completion of work and establish the amount and method of payment. The Work Orders will be issued under and shall incorporate the terms of this Agreement. The COUNTY makes no covenant or promise as to the number of available projects, nor that, the CONSULTANT will perform any project for the COUNTY during the life of this Agreement. The COUNTY reserves the right to contract with other parties for the services contemplated by this Agreement when it is determined by the COUNTY to be in the best interest of the COUNTY to do so.

SECTION 4. TIME FOR COMPLETION. The services to be rendered by the CONSULTANT shall be commenced, as specified in such Work Orders as may be issued hereunder, and shall be completed within the time specified therein. In the event the COUNTY determines that significant benefits would accrue from expediting an otherwise established time schedule for completion of services under a given Work Order, that Work Order may include a negotiated schedule of incentives based on time

savings.

SECTION 5. COMPENSATION. The COUNTY agrees to compensate the CONSULTANT for the professional services called for under this Agreement on either a "Fixed Fee" basis or on a "Time Basis Method". If a Work Order is issued under a "Time Basis Method," then CONSULTANT shall be compensated in accordance with the rate schedule attached as Exhibit "C". If a Work Order is issued for a "Fixed Fee Basis," then the applicable Work Order Fixed Fee amount shall include any and all reimbursable expenses. Annual compensation paid to the CONSULTANT shall not exceed COUNTY budgeted amounts for the CONSULTANT'S services.

SECTION 6. REIMBURSABLE EXPENSES. If a Work Order is issued on a "Time Basis Method," then reimbursable expenses are in addition to the hourly rates. Reimbursable expenses are subject to the applicable "Not-to-Exceed" or "Limitation of Funds" amount set forth in the Work Order. Reimbursable expenses may include actual expenditures made by the CONSULTANT, his employees or his professional associates in the interest of the Project for the expenses listed in the following paragraphs:

(a) Expenses of transportation, when traveling in connection with the Project, based on Sections 112.061(7) and (8), Florida Statutes, or their successor; long distance calls and telegrams; and fees paid for securing approval of authorities having jurisdiction over the Project.

(b) Expense of reproductions, postage and handling of drawings and specifications.

(c) If authorized in writing in advance by the COUNTY, the cost of other expenditures made by the CONSULTANT in the interest of the Project.

SECTION 7. PAYMENT AND BILLING.

(a) If the Scope of Services required to be performed by a Work Order is clearly defined, the Work Order shall be issued on a "Fixed

Fee" basis. The CONSULTANT shall perform all work required by the Work Order but, in no event, shall the CONSULTANT be paid more than the negotiated Fixed Fee amount stated therein.

(b) If the Scope of Services is not clearly defined, the Work Order may be issued on a "Time Basis Method" and contain a Not-to Exceed amount. If a Not-to-Exceed amount is provided, the CONSULTANT shall perform all work required by the Work Order; but, in no event, shall the CONSULTANT be paid more than the Not-to-Exceed amount specified in the applicable Work Order.

(c) If the Scope of Services is not clearly defined, the Work Order may be issued on a "Time Basis Method" and contain a Limitation of Funds amount. The CONSULTANT is not authorized to exceed that amount without the prior written approval of the COUNTY. Said approval, if given by the COUNTY, shall indicate a new Limitation of Funds amount. The CONSULTANT shall advise the COUNTY whenever the CONSULTANT has incurred expenses on any Work Order that equals or exceeds eighty percent (80%) of the Limitation of Funds amount.

(d) For Work Orders issued on a "Fixed Fee Basis," the CONSULTANT may invoice the amount due based on the percentage of total Work Order services actually performed and completed; but, in no event, shall the invoice amount exceed a percentage of the Fixed Fee amount equal to a percentage of the total services actually completed. The COUNTY shall pay the CONSULTANT ninety percent (90%) of the approved amount on Work Orders issued on a "Fixed Fee Basis".

(e) For Work Orders issued on a "Time Basis Method" with a Not-to-Exceed amount, the CONSULTANT may invoice the amount due for actual work hours performed but, in no event, shall the invoice amount exceed a percentage of the Not-to-Exceed amount equal to a percentage of the total services actually completed. The COUNTY shall pay the CONSULTANT

ninety percent (90%) of the approved amount on Work Orders issued on a "Time Basis Method" with a Not-to-Exceed amount.

(f) Each Work Order issued on a "Fixed Fee Basis" or "Time Basis Method" with a Not-to-Exceed amount shall be treated separately for retainage purposes. If the COUNTY determines that work is substantially complete and the amount retained is considered to be in excess, the COUNTY may, at its sole and absolute discretion, release the retainage or any portion thereof.

(g) For Work Orders issued on a "Time Basis Method" with a Limitation of Funds amount, the CONSULTANT may invoice the amount due for services actually performed and completed. The COUNTY shall pay the CONSULTANT one hundred percent (100%) of the approved amount on Work Orders issued on a "Time Basis Method" with a Limitation of Funds amount.

(h) Payments shall be made by the COUNTY to the CONSULTANT when requested as work progresses for services furnished, but not more than once monthly. Each Work Order shall be invoiced separately. CONSULTANT shall render to COUNTY, at the close of each calendar month, an itemized invoice properly dated, describing any services rendered, the cost of the services, the name and address of the CONSULTANT, Work Order Number, Contract Number and all other information required by this Agreement.

The original invoice shall be sent to:

Director of County Finance
Seminole County Board of County Commissioners
Post Office Box 8080
Sanford, Florida 32772

A duplicate copy of the invoice shall be sent to:

Environmental Services
520 W. Lake Mary Blvd., Suite 200
Sanford, Florida 32773

(i) Payment shall be made after review and approval by COUNTY within thirty (30) days of receipt of a proper invoice from the

CONSULTANT.

SECTION 8. GENERAL TERMS OF PAYMENT AND BILLING.

(a) Upon satisfactory completion of work required hereunder and, upon acceptance of the work by the COUNTY, the CONSULTANT may invoice the COUNTY for the full amount of compensation provided for under the terms of this Agreement including any retainage and less any amount already paid by the COUNTY. The COUNTY shall pay the CONSULTANT within thirty (30) days of receipt of proper invoice.

(b) The COUNTY may perform or have performed an audit of the records of the CONSULTANT after final payment to support final payment hereunder. This audit would be performed at a time mutually agreeable to the CONSULTANT and the COUNTY subsequent to the close of the final fiscal period in which the last work is performed. Total compensation to the CONSULTANT may be determined subsequent to an audit as provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of this Section, and the total compensation so determined shall be used to calculate final payment to the CONSULTANT. Conduct of this audit shall not delay final payment as provided by subsection (a) of this Section.

(c) In addition to the above, if federal funds are used for any work under the Agreement, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access to any books, documents, papers, and records, of the CONSULTANT which are directly pertinent to work performed under this Agreement for purposes of making audit, examination, excerpts and transcriptions.

(d) The CONSULTANT agrees to maintain all books, documents, papers, accounting records and other evidences pertaining to work performed under this Agreement in such a manner as will readily conform to the terms of this Agreement and to make such materials available at

the CONSULTANT'S office at all reasonable times during the Agreement period and for five (5) years from the date of final payment under the contract for audit or inspection as provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of this Section.

(e) In the event any audit or inspection conducted after final payment, but within the period provided in paragraph (d) of this Section reveals any overpayment by the COUNTY under the terms of the Agreement, the CONSULTANT shall refund such overpayment to the COUNTY within thirty (30) days of notice by the COUNTY.

SECTION 9. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CONSULTANT.

(a) The CONSULTANT shall be responsible for the professional quality, technical accuracy, competence, methodology, accuracy and the coordination of all of the following which are listed for illustration purposes and not as a limitation: documents, analysis, reports, data, plans, plats, maps, surveys, specifications, and any and all other services of whatever type or nature furnished by the CONSULTANT under this Agreement. The CONSULTANT shall, without additional compensation, correct or revise any errors or deficiencies in his plans, analysis, data, reports, designs, drawings, specifications, and any and all other services of whatever type or nature.

(b) Neither the COUNTY'S review, approval or acceptance of, nor payment for, any of the services required shall be construed to operate as a waiver of any rights under this Agreement nor of any cause of action arising out of the performance of this Agreement and the CONSULTANT shall be and always remain liable to the COUNTY in accordance with applicable law for any and all damages to the COUNTY caused by the CONSULTANT'S negligent or wrongful performance of any of the services furnished under this Agreement.

(c) The CONSULTANT shall, prior to commencing services pursuant to this Agreement, execute the Truth in Negotiations Certificate attached to this Agreement as Exhibit "D".

SECTION 10. OWNERSHIP OF DOCUMENTS. All deliverable analysis, reference data, survey data, plans and reports or any other form of written instrument or document that may result from the CONSULTANT'S services or have been created during the course of the CONSULTANT'S performance under this Agreement shall become the property of the COUNTY after final payment is made to the CONSULTANT.

SECTION 11. TERMINATION.

(a) The COUNTY may, by written notice to the CONSULTANT terminate this Agreement or any Work Order issued hereunder, in whole or in part, at any time, either for the COUNTY'S convenience or because of the failure of the CONSULTANT to fulfill its Agreement obligations. Upon receipt of such notice, the CONSULTANT shall:

(1) immediately discontinue all services affected unless the notice directs otherwise, and

(2) deliver to the COUNTY all data, drawings, specifications, reports, estimates, summaries, and any and all such other information and materials of whatever type or nature as may have been accumulated by the CONSULTANT in performing this Agreement, whether completed or in process.

(b) If the termination is for the convenience of the COUNTY, the CONSULTANT shall be paid compensation for services performed to the date of termination. If this Agreement calls for the payment based on a Fixed Fee amount, the CONSULTANT shall be paid no more than a percentage of the Fixed Fee amount equivalent to the percentage of the completion of work, as determined solely and conclusively by the COUNTY, contemplated by this Agreement.

(c) If the termination is due to the failure of the CONSULTANT to fulfill its Agreement obligations, the COUNTY may take over the work and prosecute the same to completion by other Agreements or otherwise. In such case, the CONSULTANT shall be liable to the COUNTY for all reasonable additional costs occasioned to the COUNTY thereby. The CONSULTANT shall not be liable for such additional costs if the failure to perform the Agreement arises without any fault or negligence of the CONSULTANT; provided, however, that the CONSULTANT shall be responsible and liable for the actions of its subcontractors, agents, employees and persons and entities of a similar type or nature. Such causes may include acts of God or of the public enemy, acts of the COUNTY in either its sovereign or contractual capacity, fires, floods, epidemics, quarantine restrictions, strikes, freight embargoes, and unusually severe weather; but, in every case, the failure to perform must be beyond the control and without any fault or negligence of the CONSULTANT.

(d) If, after notice of termination for failure to fulfill its Agreement obligations, it is determined that the CONSULTANT had not so failed, the termination shall be conclusively deemed to have been effected for the convenience of the COUNTY. In such event, adjustment in the Agreement price shall be made as provided in subsection (b) of this Section.

(e) The rights and remedies of the COUNTY provided for in this Section are in addition and supplemental to any and all other rights and remedies provided by law or under this Agreement.

SECTION 12. AGREEMENT AND WORK ORDER IN CONFLICT. Whenever the terms of this Agreement conflict with any Work Order issued pursuant to it, the Agreement shall prevail.

SECTION 13. EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYMENT. The CONSULTANT agrees that it will not discriminate against any employee or applicant for

employment for work under this Agreement because of race, color, religion, sex, age, disability, or national origin and will take steps to ensure that applicants are employed, and employees are treated during employment, without regard to race, color, religion, sex, age, disability, or national origin. This provision shall include, but not be limited to, the following: employment, upgrading, demotion or transfer; recruitment advertising; layoff or termination; rates of pay or other forms of compensation; and selection for training, including apprenticeship.

SECTION 14. NO CONTINGENT FEES. The CONSULTANT warrants that it has not employed or retained any company or person, other than a bona fide employee working solely for the CONSULTANT to solicit or secure this Agreement and that it has not paid or agreed to pay any person, company, corporation, individual or firm, other than a bona fide employee working solely for the CONSULTANT, any fee, commission, percentage, gift, or other consideration contingent upon or resulting from award or making of this Agreement. For the breach or violation of this provision, the COUNTY shall have the right to terminate the Agreement at its sole discretion, without liability and to deduct from the Agreement price, or otherwise recover, the full amount of such fee, commission, percentage, gift, or consideration.

SECTION 15. CONFLICT OF INTEREST.

(a) The CONSULTANT agrees that it will not contract for or accept employment for the performance of any work or service with any individual, business, corporation or government unit that would create a conflict of interest in the performance of its obligations pursuant to this Agreement with the COUNTY.

(b) The CONSULTANT agrees that it will neither take any action nor engage in any conduct that would cause any COUNTY employee to

violate the provisions of Chapter 112, Florida Statutes, relating to ethics in government.

(c) In the event that CONSULTANT causes or in any way promotes or encourages a COUNTY officer, employee, or agent to violate Chapter 112, Florida Statutes, the COUNTY shall have the right to terminate this Agreement.

SECTION 16. ASSIGNMENT. This Agreement, or any interest herein, shall not be assigned, transferred, or otherwise encumbered, under any circumstances, by the parties hereto without prior written consent of the other party and in such cases only by a document of equal dignity herewith.

SECTION 17. SUBCONTRACTORS. In the event that the CONSULTANT, during the course of the work under this Agreement, requires the services of any subcontractors or other professional associates in connection with services covered by this Agreement, the CONSULTANT must first secure the prior express written approval of the COUNTY. If subcontractors or other professional associates are required in connection with the services covered by this Agreement, CONSULTANT shall remain fully responsible for the services of subcontractors or other professional associates.

SECTION 18. INDEMNIFICATION OF COUNTY. The CONSULTANT agrees to hold harmless, replace, and indemnify the COUNTY, its commissioners, officers, employees, and agents against any and all claim, losses, damages or lawsuits for damages, arising from the negligent, reckless, or intentionally wrongful provision of services hereunder by the CONSULTANT, whether caused by the CONSULTANT or otherwise.

SECTION 19. INSURANCE.

(a) GENERAL. The CONSULTANT shall at the CONSULTANT'S own cost, procure the insurance required under this Section.

(1) The CONSULTANT shall furnish the COUNTY with a Certificate of Insurance signed by an authorized representative of the insurer evidencing the insurance required by this Section (Professional Liability, Workers' Compensation/Employer's Liability and Commercial General Liability). The COUNTY, its officials, officers, and employees shall be named additional insured under the Commercial General Liability policy. The Certificate of Insurance shall provide that the COUNTY shall be given not less than thirty (30) days written notice prior to the cancellation or restriction of coverage. Until such time as the insurance is no longer required to be maintained by the CONSULTANT, the CONSULTANT shall provide the COUNTY with a renewal or replacement Certificate of Insurance not less than thirty (30) days before expiration or replacement of the insurance for which a previous certificate has been provided.

(2) The Certificate shall contain a statement that it is being provided in accordance with the Agreement and that the insurance is in full compliance with the requirements of the Agreement. In lieu of the statement on the Certificate, the CONSULTANT shall, at the option of the COUNTY submit a sworn, notarized statement from an authorized representative of the insurer that the Certificate is being provided in accordance with the Agreement and that the insurance is in full compliance with the requirements of the Agreement. **The Certificate shall have this Agreement number clearly marked on its face.**

(3) In addition to providing the Certificate of Insurance, if required by the COUNTY, the CONSULTANT shall, within thirty (30) days after receipt of the request, provide the COUNTY with a certified copy of each of the policies of insurance providing the coverage required by this Section.

(4) Neither approval by the COUNTY nor failure to disapprove the insurance furnished by a CONSULTANT shall relieve the CONSULTANT of the CONSULTANT'S full responsibility for performance of any obligation including CONSULTANT indemnification of COUNTY under this Agreement.

(b) INSURANCE COMPANY REQUIREMENTS. Insurance companies providing the insurance under this Agreement must meet the following requirements:

(1) Companies issuing policies other than Workers' Compensation, must be authorized to conduct business in the State of Florida and prove same by maintaining Certificates of Authority issued to the companies by the Department of Insurance of the State of Florida. Policies for Workers' Compensation may be issued by companies authorized as a group self-insurer by Section 440.57, Florida Statutes.

(2) In addition, such companies other than those authorized by Section 440.57, Florida Statutes, shall have and maintain a Best's Rating of "A" or better and a Financial Size Category of "VII" or better according to A.M. Best Company.

(3) If, during the period which an insurance company is providing the insurance coverage required by this Agreement, an insurance company shall: 1) lose its Certificate of Authority, 2) no longer comply with Section 440.57, Florida Statutes, or 3) fail to maintain the requisite Best's Rating and Financial Size Category, the CONSULTANT shall, as soon as the CONSULTANT has knowledge of any such circumstance, immediately notify the COUNTY and immediately replace the insurance coverage provided by the insurance company with a different insurance company meeting the requirements of this Agreement. Until such time as the CONSULTANT has replaced the unacceptable insurer with an insurer acceptable to the COUNTY the CONSULTANT shall be deemed to be in default

of this Agreement.

(c) SPECIFICATIONS. Without limiting any of the other obligations or liability of the CONSULTANT, the CONSULTANT shall, at the CONSULTANT'S sole expense, procure, maintain and keep in force amounts and types of insurance conforming to the minimum requirements set forth in this subsection. Except as otherwise specified in the Agreement, the insurance shall become effective prior to the commencement of work by the CONSULTANT and shall be maintained in force until the Agreement completion date. The amounts and types of insurance shall conform to the following minimum requirements.

(1) Workers' Compensation/Employer's Liability.

(A) The CONSULTANT'S insurance shall cover the CONSULTANT for liability which would be covered by the latest edition of the standard Workers' Compensation Policy, as filed for use in Florida by the National Council on Compensation Insurance, without restrictive endorsements. The CONSULTANT will also be responsible for procuring proper proof of coverage from its subcontractors of every tier for liability which is a result of a Workers' Compensation injury to the subcontractor's employees. The minimum required limits to be provided by both the CONSULTANT and its subcontractors are outlined in subsection (c) below. In addition to coverage for the Florida Workers' Compensation Act, where appropriate, coverage is to be included for the United States Longshoremen and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, Federal Employers' Liability Act and any other applicable federal or state law.

(B) Subject to the restrictions of coverage found in the standard Workers' Compensation Policy, there shall be no maximum limit on the amount of coverage for liability imposed by the Florida Workers' Compensation Act, the United States Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, or any other coverage customarily insured

under Part One of the standard Workers' Compensation Policy.

(C) The minimum amount of coverage under Part Two of the standard Workers' Compensation Policy shall be:

\$100,000.00	(Each Accident)
\$100,000.00	(Disease-Policy Limit)
\$100,000.00	(Disease-Each Employee)

(2) Commercial General Liability.

(A) The CONSULTANT'S insurance shall cover the CONSULTANT for those sources of liability which would be covered by the latest edition of the standard Commercial General Liability Coverage Form (ISO Form CG 00 01), as filed for use in the State of Florida by the Insurance Services Office, without the attachment of restrictive endorsements other than the elimination of Coverage C, Medical Payment and the elimination of coverage for Fire Damage Legal Liability.

(B) The minimum limits to be maintained by the CONSULTANT (inclusive of any amounts provided by an Umbrella or Excess policy) shall be as follows:

	<u>LIMITS</u>
General Aggregate	\$Three (3) Times the Each Occurrence Limit
Products/Completed Operations Aggregate	\$900,000.00
Personal & Advertising Injury Limit	\$300,000.00
Each Occurrence Limit	\$300,000.00

(3) Professional Liability Insurance. The CONSULTANT shall carry limits of not less than ONE MILLION AND NO/100 DOLLARS (\$1,000,000.00).

(d) COVERAGE. The insurance provided by CONSULTANT pursuant to this Agreement shall apply on a primary basis and any other insurance or self-insurance maintained by the COUNTY or the COUNTY'S officials, officers, or employees shall be excess of and not contributing with the

insurance provided by or on behalf of the CONSULTANT.

(e) OCCURRENCE BASIS. The Workers' Compensation Policy and the Commercial General Liability required by this Agreement shall be provided on an occurrence rather than a claims-made basis. The Professional Liability insurance policy must either be on an occurrence basis, or, if a claims-made basis, the coverage must respond to all claims reported within three (3) years following the period for which coverage is required and which would have been covered had the coverage been on an occurrence basis.

(f) OBLIGATIONS. Compliance with the foregoing insurance requirements shall not relieve the CONSULTANT, its employees or agents of liability from any obligation under a Section or any other portions of this Agreement.

SECTION 20. ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION (ADR).

(a) In the event of a dispute related to any performance or payment obligation arising under this Agreement, the parties agree to exhaust COUNTY ADR procedures prior to filing suit or otherwise pursuing legal remedies. COUNTY ADR procedures for proper invoice and payment disputes are set forth in Section 55.1, "Prompt Payment Procedures," Seminole County Administrative Code. Contract claims include all controversies, except disputes addressed by the "Prompt Payment Procedures," arising under this Agreement with ADR procedures set forth in Section 220.102, "Contract Claims," Seminole County Code.

(b) CONSULTANT agrees that it will file no suit or otherwise pursue legal remedies based on facts or evidentiary materials that were not presented for consideration in the COUNTY ADR procedures set forth in subsection (a) above of which the CONSULTANT had knowledge and failed to present during the COUNTY ADR procedures.

(c) In the event that COUNTY ADR procedures are exhausted and a suit is filed or legal remedies are otherwise pursued, the parties shall exercise best efforts to resolve disputes through voluntary mediation. Mediator selection and the procedures to be employed in voluntary mediation shall be mutually acceptable to the parties. Costs of voluntary mediation shall be shared equally among the parties participating in the mediation.

SECTION 21. REPRESENTATIVES OF THE COUNTY AND THE CONSULTANT.

(a) It is recognized that questions in the day-to-day conduct of performance pursuant to this Agreement will arise. The COUNTY, upon request by the CONSULTANT, shall designate in writing and shall advise the CONSULTANT in writing of one (1) or more of its employees to whom all communications pertaining to the day-to-day conduct of this Agreement shall be addressed. The designated representative shall have the authority to transmit instructions, receive information and interpret and define the COUNTY'S policy and decisions pertinent to the work covered by this Agreement.

(b) The CONSULTANT shall, at all times during the normal work week, designate or appoint one or more representatives of the CONSULTANT who are authorized to act in behalf of and bind the CONSULTANT regarding all matters involving the conduct of the performance pursuant to this Agreement and shall keep the COUNTY continually and effectively advised of such designation.

SECTION 22. ALL PRIOR AGREEMENTS SUPERSEDED. This document incorporates and includes all prior negotiations, correspondence, conversations, agreements or understandings applicable to the matters contained herein and the parties agree that there are no commitments, agreements or understandings concerning the subject matter of this Agreement that are not contained or referred to in this document.

Accordingly, it is agreed that no deviation from the terms hereof shall be predicated upon any prior representations or agreements, whether oral or written.

SECTION 23. MODIFICATIONS, AMENDMENTS OR ALTERATIONS. No modification, amendment or alteration in the terms or conditions contained herein shall be effective unless contained in a written document executed with the same formality and of equal dignity herewith.

SECTION 24. INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR. It is agreed that nothing herein contained is intended or should be construed as in any manner creating or establishing a relationship of co-partners between the parties, or as constituting the CONSULTANT (including its officers, employees, and agents) the agent, representative, or employee of the COUNTY for any purpose, or in any manner, whatsoever. The CONSULTANT is to be and shall remain forever an independent contractor with respect to all services performed under this Agreement.

SECTION 25. EMPLOYEE STATUS. Persons employed by the CONSULTANT in the performance of services and functions pursuant to this Agreement shall have no claim to pension, workers' compensation, unemployment compensation, civil service or other employee rights or privileges granted to the COUNTY'S officers and employees either by operation of law or by the COUNTY.

SECTION 26. SERVICES NOT PROVIDED FOR. No claim for services furnished by the CONSULTANT not specifically provided for herein shall be honored by the COUNTY.

SECTION 27. PUBLIC RECORDS LAW. CONSULTANT acknowledges COUNTY'S obligations under Article I, Section 24, Florida Constitution and Chapter 119, Florida Statutes, to release public records to members of the public upon request. CONSULTANT acknowledges that COUNTY is required to comply with Article I, Section 24, Florida Constitution and Chapter

119, Florida Statutes, in the handling of the materials created under this Agreement and that said statute controls over the terms of this Agreement.

SECTION 28. COMPLIANCE WITH LAWS AND REGULATIONS. In providing all services pursuant to this Agreement, the CONSULTANT shall abide by all statutes, ordinances, rules, and regulations pertaining to, or regulating the provisions of, such services, including those now in effect and hereafter adopted. Any violation of said statutes, ordinances, rules, or regulations shall constitute a material breach of this Agreement, and shall entitle the COUNTY to terminate this Agreement immediately upon delivery of written notice of termination to the CONSULTANT.

SECTION 29. NOTICES. Whenever either party desires to give notice unto the other, it must be given by written notice, sent by registered or certified United States mail, with return receipt requested, addressed to the party for whom it is intended at the place last specified and the place for giving of notice shall remain such until it shall have been changed by written notice in compliance with the provisions of this Section. For the present, the parties designate the following as the respective places for giving of notice, to-wit:

FOR COUNTY:

Environmental Services
500 W. Lake Mary Blvd.
Sanford, Florida 32773

FOR CONSULTANT:

Connect Consulting, Inc.
14596 Rolling Park Place
Wellington, Florida 33414

SECTION 30. RIGHTS AT LAW RETAINED. The rights and remedies of the COUNTY, provided for under this Agreement, are in addition and supplemental to any other rights and remedies provided by law.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have made and executed this Agreement on the date below written for execution by the COUNTY.

ATTEST:

CONNECT CONSULTING, INC.

, Secretary

By: _____
GARY E. EICHLER, P.G.
Vice-President

(CORPORATE SEAL)

Date: _____

ATTEST:

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
SEMINOLE COUNTY, FLORIDA

MARYANNE MORSE
Clerk to the Board of
County Commissioners of
Seminole County, Florida.

By: _____
CARLTON HENLEY, Chairman

Date: _____

For use and reliance
of Seminole County only.

As authorized for execution by
the Board of County Commissioners
at their _____, 20____
regular meeting.

Approved as to form and
legal sufficiency.

County Attorney

AC/lpk
2/4/05
ps-5174

3 Attachments:

- Exhibit "A" - Scope of Services
- Exhibit "B" - Sample Work Order
- Exhibit "C" - Rate Schedule
- Exhibit "D" - Truth in Negotiations Certificate

EXHIBIT A

Request for Proposals

Hydrogeologic and Well Construction/Repair Services

Scope of Work: Seminole County is seeking qualifications from firms to provide professional hydrogeologic and well construction oversight services and turn key well construction services to permit, design, construct, and/or repair and test new and existing wells and associated well head appurtenances and pumps.

Also included under this contract are professional hydrogeologic services related to and/or in support of water supply planning, consumptive use permitting, hydrogeologic studies, ground water modeling, aquifer performance testing, monitoring data evaluation, permit compliance monitoring, biological impact assessments and any other related assignments that the County requests.

WORK ORDER

Board of County Commissioners
SEMINOLE COUNTY, FLORIDA

Work Order Number: _____

Master Agreement No.: _____ Dated: _____

Contract Title: _____

Project Title: _____

Consultant: _____

Address: _____

ATTACHMENTS TO THIS WORK ORDER:

- drawings/plans/specifications
- scope of services
- special conditions
- _____

METHOD OF COMPENSATION:

- fixed fee basis
- time basis-not-to-exceed
- time basis-limitation of funds

TIME FOR COMPLETION: The services to be provided by the CONTRACTOR shall commence upon execution of this Agreement by the parties and shall be completed within "X" (days, months, years) of the effective date of this agreement. Failure to meet the completion date may be grounds for Termination for Default.

Work Order Amount: _____ DOLLARS (\$ _____)

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have made and executed this Work Order on this _____ day of _____, 20____, for the purposes stated herein. (THIS SECTION TO BE COMPLETED BY THE COUNTY)

ATTEST:

(Company Name)

By: _____, President

Date: _____

(CORPORATE SEAL)

ATTEST:

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
SEMINOLE COUNTY, FLORIDA

By: _____
DARYL G. MCLAIN, Chairman

Date: _____

MARYANNE MORSE
Clerk to the Board of County Commissioners of
Seminole County, Florida

For use and reliance of Seminole County only.
Approved as to Form and legal sufficiency.

As authorized for execution by the Board of
County Commissioners at their
20____ regular meeting.

County Attorney

WORK ORDER TERMS AND CONDITIONS

- a) Execution of this Work Order by the COUNTY shall serve as authorization for the CONSULTANT to provide, for the stated project, professional services as set out in the Scope of Services attached as Exhibit "A" to the Master Agreement cited on the face of this Work Order and as further delineated in the attachments listed on this Work Order.
- b) Term: This work order shall take effect on the date of its execution by the County and expires upon final delivery, inspection, acceptance and payment unless terminated earlier in accordance with the Termination provisions herein.
- c) The CONSULTANT shall provide said services pursuant to this Work Order, its Attachments, and the cited Master Agreement (as amended, if applicable) which is incorporated herein by reference as if it had been set out in its entirety.
- d) Whenever the Work Order conflicts with the cited Master Agreement, the Master Agreement shall prevail.
- e) METHOD OF COMPENSATION - If the compensation is based on a:
- (i) FIXED FEE BASIS, then the Work Order Amount becomes the Fixed Fee Amount and the CONSULTANT shall perform all work required by this Work Order for the Fixed Fee Amount. The Fixed Fee is an all-inclusive Firm Fixed Price binding the CONSULTANT to complete the work for the Fixed Fee Amount regardless of the costs of performance. In no event shall the CONSULTANT be paid more than the Fixed Fee Amount.
 - (ii) TIME BASIS WITH A NOT-TO-EXCEED AMOUNT, then the Work Order Amount becomes the Not-to-Exceed Amount and the CONSULTANT shall perform all the work required by this Work Order for a sum not exceeding the Not-to-Exceed Amount. In no event is the CONSULTANT authorized to incur expenses exceeding the not-to-exceed amount without the express written consent of the COUNTY. Such consent will normally be in the form of an amendment to this Work Order. The CONSULTANT's compensation shall be based on the actual work required by this Work Order and the Labor Hour Rates established in the Master Agreement.
 - (iii) TIME BASIS WITH A LIMITATION OF FUNDS AMOUNT, then the Work Order Amount becomes the Limitation of Funds amount and the CONSULTANT is not authorized to exceed the Limitation of Funds amount without prior written approval of the COUNTY. Such approval, if given by the COUNTY, shall indicate a new Limitation of Funds amount. The CONSULTANT shall advise the COUNTY whenever the CONSULTANT has incurred expenses on this Work Order that equals or exceeds eighty percent (80%) of the Limitation of Funds amount. The CONSULTANT's compensation shall be based on the actual work required by this Work Order and the Labor Hour Rates established in the Master Agreement.
- f) Payment to the CONSULTANT shall be made by the COUNTY in strict accordance with the payment terms of the referenced Master Agreement.
- g) It is expressly understood by the CONSULTANT that this Work Order, until executed by the COUNTY, does not authorize the performance of any services by the CONSULTANT and that the COUNTY, prior to its execution of the Work Order, reserves the right to authorize a party other than the CONSULTANT to perform the services called for under this Work Order; if it is determined that to do so is in the best interest of the COUNTY.
- h) The CONSULTANT shall sign the Work Order first and the COUNTY second. This Work Order becomes effective and binding upon execution by the COUNTY and not until then. A copy of this Work Order will be forwarded to the CONSULTANT upon execution by the COUNTY.

Exhibit "C"
Rate Schedule

Truth in Negotiations Certificate

This is to certify that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, the wage rates and other factual unit costs supporting the compensation (as defined in section 287.055 of the Florida Statutes (otherwise known as the "Consultants' Competitive Negotiations Act" or CCNA) and required under CCNA subsection 287.055 (5) (a)) submitted to Seminole County Purchasing and Contracts Division, Contracts Section, either actually or by specific identification in writing, in support of PS- _____ - _____* are accurate, complete, and current as of _____ (Date)**.

This certification includes the wage rates and other factual unit costs supporting any Work Orders or Amendments issued under the agreement between the Consultant and the County.

Firm _____

Signature _____

Name _____

Title _____

Date of execution*** _____

* Identify the proposal, request for price adjustment, or other submission involved, giving the appropriate identifying number (e.g., PS No.).

** Insert the day, month, and year when wage rates were submitted or, if applicable, an earlier date agreed upon between the parties that is as close as practicable to the date of agreement on compensation.

*** Insert the day, month, and year of signing.

(End of certificate)