

**11. Award four (4) agreements for RFP-4233-04/TLR – General Consulting Service for Transportation Planning/Technical Transportation Planning to: Glatting, Jackson, Kercher, Anglin, Lopez, Rinehart, Inc., of Orlando; GMB Engineers & Planners, Inc., of Orlando; Leftwich Consulting Engineers, Inc. of Orlando; and Tindale-Oliver & Associates of Tampa (estimated \$150,000.00 per year all consultants combined).**

RFP-4233-04/TLR will provide expertise and technical skills, on an as needed basis, to assist Seminole County staff in the implementation of the County's Comprehensive Plan as it relates to Transportation Planning.

This project was publicly advertised and the County received eight (8) responses (listed in alphabetical order):

- F.R. Aleman & Associates, Orlando
- Ghyabi & Associates., DeLand
- Glatting ,Jackson, Kercher, Anglin, Lopez, Rinehart, Inc., Orlando
- GMB Engineers & Planners, Inc., Orlando
- Leftwich Consulting Engineers, Inc., Orlando
- Reynolds, Smith & Hills, Orlando
- Tindale-Oliver & Associates, Tampa
- Traffic Planning & Design, Maitland

The Evaluation Committee, which consisted of Tony Walter, Assistant Planning Manager; Alice Gilmartin, Principal Coordinator; and Matt West, Planning Manager, evaluated the submittals. Consideration was given to the following criteria:

- Experience/Qualifications
- Methodology
- Ability to Perform
- Price

The Evaluation Committee recommends that the Board award to the top four (4) ranked firms.

- GMB Engineers & Planners, Inc., Orlando
- Glatting ,Jackson, Kercher, Anglin, Lopez, Rinehart, Inc., Orlando
- Tindale-Oliver & Associates, Tampa
- Leftwich Consulting Engineers, Inc., Orlando

Authorization for performance of services by the consultants under this agreement shall be in the form of written Work Orders issued and executed by the County and signed by the Consultant(s). 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. This agreement is in effect for a period of one (1) year with two (2) additional renewable periods of one (1) year each. The total estimated value of services per year is \$150,000.00.

Planning and Development Department/Planning Division and Fiscal Services Department/Purchasing and Contracts Division recommend that the Board approve the awards and authorize the Chairman to execute the Agreements as prepared by the County Attorney's Office.

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

RFP NUMBER: RFP-4233-04/TLR

RFP TITLE: General Consulting Services for Transportation Planning/ Technical Transportation Planning

DUE DATE: November 17, 2004, 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. RFP DOCUMENTS FROM THE PROPOSERS LISTED HEREIN ARE THE ONLY SUBMITTALS RECEIVED TIMELY AS OF THE ABOVE OPENING DATE AND TIME. ALL OTHER RFP DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO THIS SOLICITATION, IF ANY, ARE HEREBY REJECTED AS LATE.

<b>RESPONSE -1-</b>	<b>RESPONSE -2-</b>	<b>RESPONSE -3-</b>	<b>RESPONSE -4-</b>
F.R. Aleman & Associates, Inc. 1080 Woodcock Road, Suite 277 Orlando, Florida 32803  Frank R. Aleman, P.E. 407-894-5651 Phone 407-894-5255 Fax	Ghyabi & Assoc./GMAK 214 East New York Avenue DeLand, Florida 32724  Gary D. Huttman, AICP 386-469-0006 Phone 386-469-0017 Fax	Glatting, Jackson, Kercher, Anglin, Lopez, Rinehart, Inc. 33 E. Pine Street Orlando, Florida 32801  William C. Kercher, Jr 407-843-6552 Phone 407-839-1789 Fax	GMB Engineers & Planners, Inc. 3751 Maguire Boulevard, Suite 111 Orlando, Florida 32803  Babuji Ambikapathy, P.E., AICP 407-898-5424 Phone 407-898-5425 Fax
<b>RESPONSE -5-</b>	<b>RESPONSE -6-</b>	<b>RESPONSE -7-</b>	<b>RESPONSE -8-</b>
Leftwich Consulting Engineers, Inc. 12151 Science Drive, #101 Orlando, Florida 32826  D. Scot Leftwich 407-281-8100 Phone 407-282-7100 Fax	Reynolds, Smith & Hills, Inc. 3670 Maguire Boulevard, Suite 300 Orlando, Florida 32803  James R. Avitabile, P.E. 407-893-5800 Phone 407-893-5858 Fax	Tindale-Oliver & Associates 1000 N. Ashley Drive, Ste. 100 Tampa, Florida 33602  Steven A. Tindale, P.E., AICP 813-224-8862 Phone 813-224-8862 Fax	Traffic Planning & Design 535 Versailles Drive, Suite 200 Maitland, Florida 32751  Turgut Dervish 407-628-9955 Phone 407-628-8850 Fax

**EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS**

**EXPERIENCE/QUALIFICATIONS**

- Qualifications of firm & sub-consultants and their role and participation in this project (20)
- Educational background and training of key personnel that are related to required services (5)
- Related work experience (10)
- References and past performance related to providing quality services (10)
- Minority Business Enterprise status (5)

**METHODOLOGY**

- Project approach (20)
- Rates based on disciplines (15)

**ABILITY TO PERFORM**

- Location of firm (5)
- Workload; ability and capacity of the Proposer to perform and comply with required scope of services (10)

Tabulated by: (11/18/2004) Diane Reed Procurement Technician  
Evaluation Meeting, December 9, 2004 at 11am County Services Building Purchasing Conference Room, 1101 East 1<sup>st</sup> Street, Sanford  
Recommendation of Award: Glatting Jackson; GMB; Leftwich; Reynolds, Smith & Hills; Tindale-Oliver; and Traffic Planning & Design – to BCC on 01/11/05

**EVALUATION FOR RFP-4233-04/TLR Transportation Planning****QUALIFICATION TEAM  
CONSENSUS REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION****SUMMARY SCORES AND RANKINGS**

<b><u>FIRMS</u></b>	<b><u>SCORE</u></b>	<b><u>RANKING</u></b>
FR Aleman & Assoc	76.48	8
Ghyabi & Assoc.	82.60	7
Glatting Jackson	87.70	2
GMB	92.60	1
Leftwich	86.96	4
RSH	85.27	5
Tindale	87.50	3
Traffic Planning	84.32	6

**The Evaluation Committee makes the following recommendation:  
Award to the top six ranked firms:**

**Committee Members:**

Alice Gilmartin  
Tony Walter  
Matt West

# EVALUATION FOR RFP-4233-04/TLR Transportation Planning

	Alice Gilmartin			Tony Walter		Matt West			
<b>F.R. Aleman &amp; Assoc.</b>									
<b><u>CRITERIA</u></b>	<b><u>WEIGHT</u></b>	<b><u>POINTS</u></b>	<b><u>WTD PTS</u></b>	<b><u>POINTS</u></b>	<b><u>WTD PTS</u></b>	<b><u>POINTS</u></b>	<b><u>WTD PTS</u></b>	<b><u>AVERAGE</u></b>	<b><u>ST DEV</u></b>
Experience	50.00%	85	42.5	70	35	95	47.5	83.33	6.29
Project approach	20.00%	75	15	79	15.8	85	17	79.67	1.01
rates	15.00%	50.84	7.626	50.84	7.626	50.84	7.626	50.84	0.00
ability to perform	15.00%	60	9	75	11.25	90	13.5	75.00	2.25
	100.00%		74.126		69.676		85.626	WEIGHTED AVERAGE	76.48
<b>Ghyabi &amp; Assoc.</b>									
<b><u>CRITERIA</u></b>	<b><u>WEIGHT</u></b>	<b><u>POINTS</u></b>	<b><u>WTD PTS</u></b>	<b><u>POINTS</u></b>	<b><u>WTD PTS</u></b>	<b><u>POINTS</u></b>	<b><u>WTD PTS</u></b>	<b><u>AVERAGE</u></b>	<b><u>ST DEV</u></b>
Experience	50.00%	75	37.5	85	42.5	98	49	86.00	5.77
Project approach	20.00%	60	12	75	15	85	17	73.33	2.52
rates	15.00%	79.56	11.934	79.56	11.934	79.56	11.934	79.56	0.00
ability to perform	15.00%	80	12	89	13.35	91	13.65	86.67	0.88
	100.00%		73.434		82.784		91.584	WEIGHTED AVERAGE	82.60
<b>Glatting, Jackson</b>									
<b><u>CRITERIA</u></b>	<b><u>WEIGHT</u></b>	<b><u>POINTS</u></b>	<b><u>WTD PTS</u></b>	<b><u>POINTS</u></b>	<b><u>WTD PTS</u></b>	<b><u>POINTS</u></b>	<b><u>WTD PTS</u></b>	<b><u>AVERAGE</u></b>	<b><u>ST DEV</u></b>
Experience	50.00%	100	50	85	42.5	92	46	92.33	3.75
Project approach	20.00%	96	19.2	95	19	85	17	92.00	1.22
rates	15.00%	67.89	10.1835	67.89	10.1835	67.89	10.1835	67.89	0.00
ability to perform	15.00%	85	12.75	79	11.85	95	14.25	86.33	1.21
	100.00%		92.1335		83.5335		87.4335	WEIGHTED AVERAGE	87.70
<b>GMB Engineers</b>									
<b><u>CRITERIA</u></b>	<b><u>WEIGHT</u></b>	<b><u>POINTS</u></b>	<b><u>WTD PTS</u></b>	<b><u>POINTS</u></b>	<b><u>WTD PTS</u></b>	<b><u>POINTS</u></b>	<b><u>WTD PTS</u></b>	<b><u>AVERAGE</u></b>	<b><u>ST DEV</u></b>
Experience	50.00%	95	47.5	89	44.5	91	45.5	91.67	1.53
Project approach	20.00%	95	19	90	18	87	17.4	90.67	0.81
rates	15.00%	96.86	14.529	96.86	14.529	96.86	14.529	96.86	0.00
ability to perform	15.00%	95	14.25	89	13.35	98	14.7	94.00	0.69
	100.00%		95.279		90.379		92.129	WEIGHTED AVERAGE	92.60
<b>Leftwich</b>									
<b><u>CRITERIA</u></b>	<b><u>WEIGHT</u></b>	<b><u>POINTS</u></b>	<b><u>WTD PTS</u></b>	<b><u>POINTS</u></b>	<b><u>WTD PTS</u></b>	<b><u>POINTS</u></b>	<b><u>WTD PTS</u></b>	<b><u>AVERAGE</u></b>	<b><u>ST DEV</u></b>
Experience	50.00%	95	47.5	89	44.5	89	44.5	91.00	1.73
Project approach	20.00%	95	19	89	17.8	80	16	88.00	1.51
rates	15.00%	84.04	12.606	84.04	12.606	84.04	12.606	84.04	0.00
ability to perform	15.00%	60	9	75	11.25	90	13.5	75.00	2.25
	100.00%		88.106		86.156		86.606	WEIGHTED AVERAGE	86.96

## EVALUATION FOR RFP-4233-04/TLR Transportation Planning

	Alice Gilmartin			Tony Walter		Matt West			
<b>Reynolds, Smith &amp; Hills</b>									
<b><u>CRITERIA</u></b>	<b><u>WEIGHT</u></b>	<b><u>POINTS</u></b>	<b><u>WTD PTS</u></b>	<b><u>POINTS</u></b>	<b><u>WTD PTS</u></b>	<b><u>POINTS</u></b>	<b><u>WTD PTS</u></b>	<b><u>AVERAGE</u></b>	<b><u>ST DEV</u></b>
Experience	50.00%	90	45	85	42.5	90	45	88.33	1.44
Project approach	20.00%	95	19	80	16	90	18	88.33	1.53
rates	15.00%	71.24	10.686	71.24	10.686	71.24	10.686	71.24	0.00
ability to perform	15.00%	85	12.75	75	11.25	95	14.25	85.00	1.50
	100.00%		87.436		80.436		87.936	WEIGHTED AVERAGE	85.27
<b>Tindale-Oliver</b>									
<b><u>CRITERIA</u></b>	<b><u>WEIGHT</u></b>	<b><u>POINTS</u></b>	<b><u>WTD PTS</u></b>	<b><u>POINTS</u></b>	<b><u>WTD PTS</u></b>	<b><u>POINTS</u></b>	<b><u>WTD PTS</u></b>	<b><u>AVERAGE</u></b>	<b><u>ST DEV</u></b>
Experience	50.00%	85	42.5	80	40	90	45	85.00	2.50
Project approach	20.00%	85	17	80	16	90	18	85.00	1.00
rates	15.00%	100	15	100	15	100	15	100.00	0.00
ability to perform	15.00%	85	12.75	80	12	95	14.25	86.67	1.15
	100.00%		87.25		83		92.25	WEIGHTED AVERAGE	87.50
<b>Traffic Planning</b>									
<b><u>CRITERIA</u></b>	<b><u>WEIGHT</u></b>	<b><u>POINTS</u></b>	<b><u>WTD PTS</u></b>	<b><u>POINTS</u></b>	<b><u>WTD PTS</u></b>	<b><u>POINTS</u></b>	<b><u>WTD PTS</u></b>	<b><u>AVERAGE</u></b>	<b><u>ST DEV</u></b>
Experience	50.00%	85	42.5	79	39.5	90	45	84.67	2.75
Project approach	20.00%	80	16	79	15.8	70	14	76.33	1.10
rates	15.00%	96.46	14.469	96.46	14.469	96.46	14.469	96.46	0.00
ability to perform	15.00%	85	12.75	80	12	80	12	81.67	0.43
	100.00%		85.719		81.769		85.469	WEIGHTED AVERAGE	84.32

**RFP-4233-04/TLR General Consulting Services for Transportation  
Planning/Technical Transportation Planning**

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: F.R Aleman

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Alice Gilman

**EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS**

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.**

The following considerations will be utilized in the evaluation of the proposals:

**EXPERIENCE/QUALIFICATIONS (50%)**

- Qualifications of firm & sub-consultants and their role and participation in this project (20)
- Educational background and training of key personnel that are related to required services (5)
- Related work experience (10)
- References and past performance related to providing quality services (10)
- Minority Business Enterprise status (5)

Not much local County experience except for  
Cartier Burgess

Score 85  
(100-0)

**METHODOLOGY (20%)**

- Project approach (20)

- Very verbose  
- would have appreciated better organization of  
material

Score 75  
(100-0)

**METHODOLOGY (15%)**

- Rates based on disciplines (15) – Will be determined by Purchasing at the Eval. Mtg.

Score 7.6 50.84  
(100-0)

**ABILITY TO PERFORM (15%)**

- Location of firm (5)
- Workload; ability and capacity of the Proposer to perform and comply with required scope of services (10)

Indicated prime has local Orlando office - no mention  
of how many of the staff are local firm.

Subs: - both local + non local.

- Did not find availability chart

Score 60  
(100-0)

Total Score \_\_\_\_\_ (0-100) Ranking 76.48



**RFP-4233-04/TLR General Consulting Services for Transportation  
Planning/Technical Transportation Planning**

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Ghyabi & Assoc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Oliver Selwa

**EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS**

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.**

The following considerations will be utilized in the evaluation of the proposals:

**EXPERIENCE/QUALIFICATIONS (50%)**

- Qualifications of firm & sub-consultants and their role and participation in this project (20)
- Educational background and training of key personnel that are related to required services (5)
- Related work experience (10)
- References and past performance related to providing quality services (10)
- Minority Business Enterprise status (5)

Is DRMP - a sub to this contract - list personnel  
from DRMP but do not indicate they are a sub.

Limited S.C. experience

Score 75  
(100-0)

**METHODOLOGY (20%)**

- Project approach (20)

Agmt - not clear on subs.

Little info on approach

Score 60  
(100-0)

**METHODOLOGY (15%)**

- Rates based on disciplines (15) – Will be determined by Purchasing at the Eval. Mtg.

Score 11.9, 79.56  
(100-0)

**ABILITY TO PERFORM (15%)**

- Location of firm (5)
- Workload; ability and capacity of the Proposer to perform and comply with required scope of services (10)

Local firm

Industries available

**Score** 80  
**(100-0)**

**Total Score** \_\_\_\_\_ **(0-100) Ranking** 82.6

**RFP-4233-04/TLR General Consulting Services for Transportation  
Planning/Technical Transportation Planning**

**SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME:** Glatting Jackson

**QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER:** Alice Gilmarlin

**EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS**

**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.**

The following considerations will be utilized in the evaluation of the proposals:

**EXPERIENCE/QUALIFICATIONS (50%)**

- Qualifications of firm & sub-consultants and their role and participation in this project (20)
- Educational background and training of key personnel that are related to required services (5)
- Related work experience (10)
- References and past performance related to providing quality services (10)
- Minority Business Enterprise status (5)

Firm has long history doing innovative work for several  
counties

Score 100  
(100-0)

**METHODOLOGY (20%)**

- Project approach (20)

Good Quality Control factor in Project Approach

Score 96  
(100-0)

**METHODOLOGY (15%)**

- Rates based on disciplines (15) – Will be determined by Purchasing at the Eval. Mtg.

Score 10.2, 67.89  
(100-0)

**ABILITY TO PERFORM (15%)**

- Location of firm (5)
- Workload; ability and capacity of the Proposer to perform and comply with required scope of services (10)

Local firm

Table not read clear on availability

**Score 85**  
**(100-0)**

**Total Score** \_\_\_\_\_ **(0-100) Ranking** 87.7

**RFP-4233-04/TLR General Consulting Services for Transportation  
Planning/Technical Transportation Planning**

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: GMB

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Oliver Delavante

**EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS**

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.**

The following considerations will be utilized in the evaluation of the proposals:

**EXPERIENCE/QUALIFICATIONS (50%)**

- Qualifications of firm & sub-consultants and their role and participation in this project (20)
- Educational background and training of key personnel that are related to required services (5)
- Related work experience (10)
- References and past performance related to providing quality services (10)
- Minority Business Enterprise status (5)

- Familiarity with hybrid Seminole County FSRMS model  
- Did travel time & budget for proj. Very familiar with area

Score 95  
(100-0)

**METHODOLOGY (20%)**

- Project approach (20)

Knowledge of actual work

Score 95  
(100-0)

**METHODOLOGY (15%)**

- Rates based on disciplines (15) – Will be determined by Purchasing at the Eval. Mtg.

Score 14.5 96.86  
(100-0)

**ABILITY TO PERFORM (15%)**

- Location of firm (5)
- Workload; ability and capacity of the Proposer to perform and comply with required scope of services (10)

Local firm

Appears to be available

**Score** 95  
**(100-0)**

**Total Score** \_\_\_\_\_ **(0-100) Ranking** 926

**RFP-4233-04/TLR General Consulting Services for Transportation  
Planning/Technical Transportation Planning**

**SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME:** Leftwich Consulting

**QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS**

**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.**

The following considerations will be utilized in the evaluation of the proposals:

**EXPERIENCE/QUALIFICATIONS (50%)**

- Qualifications of firm & sub-consultants and their role and participation in this project (20)
- Educational background and training of key personnel that are related to required services (5)
- Related work experience (10)
- References and past performance related to providing quality services (10)
- Minority Business Enterprise status (5)

Strong skills S.C. experience

Score 95  
(100-0)

**METHODOLOGY (20%)**

- Project approach (20)

short to the point - good approach

Score 95  
(100-0)

**METHODOLOGY (15%)**

- Rates based on disciplines (15) – Will be determined by Purchasing at the Eval. Mtg.

Score 12.6 84.04  
(100-0)

**ABILITY TO PERFORM (15%)**

- Location of firm (5)
- Workload; ability and capacity of the Proposer to perform and comply with required scope of services (10)

Local firm

Availability

Score 60  
(100-0)

Total Score \_\_\_\_\_ (0-100) Ranking 86.90



**RFP-4233-04/TLR General Consulting Services for Transportation  
Planning/Technical Transportation Planning**

**SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME:** Reynolds, Smith and Hills

**QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER:** Oliver Schuchman

**EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS**

**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.**

The following considerations will be utilized in the evaluation of the proposals:

**EXPERIENCE/QUALIFICATIONS (50%)**

- Qualifications of firm & sub-consultants and their role and participation in this project (20)
- Educational background and training of key personnel that are related to required services (5)
- Related work experience (10)
- References and past performance related to providing quality services (10)
- Minority Business Enterprise status (5)

- Have studies + external studies similar to what we may need

- Project Manager Not local

Score 90  
(100-0)

**METHODOLOGY (20%)**

- Project approach (20)

great

Score 95  
(100-0)

**METHODOLOGY (15%)**

- Rates based on disciplines (15) – Will be determined by Purchasing at the Eval. Mtg.

Score 107.71.24  
(100-0)

**ABILITY TO PERFORM (15%)**

- Location of firm (5)
- Workload; ability and capacity of the Proposer to perform and comply with required scope of services (10)

small office local, not local  
indicates availability

Score 85  
(100-0)

Total Score \_\_\_\_\_ (0-100) Ranking 83.10

**RFP-4233-04/TLR General Consulting Services for Transportation  
Planning/Technical Transportation Planning**

**SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME:** Traffic Planning & Design, Inc.

**QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER:** Alice Gilman

**EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS**

**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.**

The following considerations will be utilized in the evaluation of the proposals:

**EXPERIENCE/QUALIFICATIONS (50%)**

- Qualifications of firm & sub-consultants and their role and participation in this project (20)
- Educational background and training of key personnel that are related to required services (5)
- Related work experience (10)
- References and past performance related to providing quality services (10)
- Minority Business Enterprise status (5)

Did not list any projects in S.C.  
- does a lot of small traffic studies

Score 85  
(100-0)

**METHODOLOGY (20%)**

- Project approach (20)

not a lot of detail on project approach

Score 80  
(100-0)

**METHODOLOGY (15%)**

- Rates based on disciplines (15) – Will be determined by Purchasing at the Eval. Mtg.

Score 14.5, 96.46  
(100-0)

**ABILITY TO PERFORM (15%)**

- Location of firm (5)
- Workload; ability and capacity of the Proposer to perform and comply with required scope of services (10)

Local firm

Indicates availability

Score 85  
(100-0)

Total Score \_\_\_\_\_ (0-100) Ranking 85.27

**RFP-4233-04/TLR General Consulting Services for Transportation  
Planning/Technical Transportation Planning**

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Tindale-Oliver

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

**EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS**

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.**

The following considerations will be utilized in the evaluation of the proposals:

**EXPERIENCE/QUALIFICATIONS (50%)**

- Qualifications of firm & sub-consultants and their role and participation in this project (20)
- Educational background and training of key personnel that are related to required services (5)
- Related work experience (10)
- References and past performance related to providing quality services (10)
- Minority Business Enterprise status (5)

Very Verbose - no statement of work in S.C.

But have extensive experience

- No evidence of local work

Score 86  
(100-0)

**METHODOLOGY (20%)**

- Project approach (20)

Standard language - nothing noted as unusual

Score 85  
(100-0)

**METHODOLOGY (15%)**

- Rates based on disciplines (15) – Will be determined by Purchasing at the Eval. Mtg.

Score 15, 100  
(100-0)

**ABILITY TO PERFORM (15%)**

- Location of firm (5)
- Workload; ability and capacity of the Proposer to perform and comply with required scope of services (10)

Local office  
more power available  
- again no statement provided  
**Score** 86  
**(100-0)**

**Total Score** \_\_\_\_\_ **(0-100) Ranking** 87.5

**RFP-4233-04/TLR General Consulting Services for Transportation  
Planning/Technical Transportation Planning**

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: F.R Aleman

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Tony Holtz

**EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS**

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.**

The following considerations will be utilized in the evaluation of the proposals:

**EXPERIENCE/QUALIFICATIONS (50%)**

- Qualifications of firm & sub-consultants and their role and participation in this project (20) ✓
- Educational background and training of key personnel that are related to required services (5) ✓
- Related work experience (10) ✓
- References and past performance related to providing quality services (10) ✓
- Minority Business Enterprise status (5) ?

Heavy Engineering background, light on Planning..  
Experience is primarily South Florida, Didn't see a lot of Comp Plan  
experience.  
Strong Sub's.

Score 70  
(100-0)

**METHODOLOGY (20%)**

- Project approach (20)

Didn't clearly explain who would be working on projects ~  
how they would be selected  
Good, Tech, Comp Plan is short

Score 79  
(100-0)

**METHODOLOGY (15%)**

- Rates based on disciplines (15) – Will be determined by Purchasing at the Eval. Mtg.

Score 7.6 50.84  
(100-0)

**ABILITY TO PERFORM (15%)**

- Location of firm (5)
- Workload; ability and capacity of the Proposer to perform and comply with required scope of services (10)

---

---

---

---

**Score** 75  
**(100-0)**

**Total Score** \_\_\_\_\_ **(0-100) Ranking** \_\_\_\_\_

224



**RFP-4233-04/TLR General Consulting Services for Transportation  
Planning/Technical Transportation Planning**

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Ghyabi & Assoc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Tony Walke

**EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS**

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.**

The following considerations will be utilized in the evaluation of the proposals:

**EXPERIENCE/QUALIFICATIONS (50%)**

- Qualifications of firm & sub-consultants and their role and participation in this project (20)
- Educational background and training of key personnel that are related to required services (5)
- Related work experience (10)
- References and past performance related to providing quality services (10)
- Minority Business Enterprise status (5)

Good Summary of Qualifications, well balance train expertise & experience  
good local Govt experience

Score 85  
(100-0)

**METHODOLOGY (20%)**

- Project approach (20)

I like proposed layout demonstration good report writing skills  
Approach short, but assume from experience of Team this is OK

Score 75  
(100-0)

**METHODOLOGY (15%)**

- Rates based on disciplines (15) – Will be determined by Purchasing at the Eval. Mtg.

Score 11.9, 79.56  
(100-0)

**ABILITY TO PERFORM (15%)**

- Location of firm (5) ✓
- Workload; ability and capacity of the Proposer to perform and comply with required scope of services (10) ✓

*clear and to the point*

**Score 89**  
**(100-0)**

**Total Score** \_\_\_\_\_ **(0-100) Ranking** \_\_\_\_\_

249

**RFP-4233-04/TLR General Consulting Services for Transportation  
Planning/Technical Transportation Planning**

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Glatting Jackson

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Tom Watts

**EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS**

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.**

The following considerations will be utilized in the evaluation of the proposals:

***EXPERIENCE/QUALIFICATIONS (50%)***

- Qualifications of firm & sub-consultants and their role and participation in this project (20) ✓
- Educational background and training of key personnel that are related to required services (5) ✓
- Related work experience (10)
- References and past performance related to providing quality services (10) ✓
- Minority Business Enterprise status (5) ✓

Good experience with County and in region, reduces learning curve  
became more involved with sound experience

Score 85  
(100-0)

***METHODOLOGY (20%)***

- Project approach (20) ✓  
Proactive QA/QC, I liked ability to match their P.M.  
with project potential for time & money savings

Score 95  
(100-0)

***METHODOLOGY (15%)***

- Rates based on disciplines (15) – Will be determined by Purchasing at the Eval. Mtg.

Score 10.2, 67.89  
(100-0)

**ABILITY TO PERFORM (15%)**

- Location of firm (5) ✓
- Workload; ability and capacity of the Proposer to perform and comply with required scope of services (10)

*past experience indicates they are satisfactory in this category*

**Score 79**  
**(100-0)**

**Total Score \_\_\_\_\_ (0-100) Ranking \_\_\_\_\_**

254

**RFP-4233-04/TLR General Consulting Services for Transportation  
Planning/Technical Transportation Planning**

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: GMB

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Tony Walter

**EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS**

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.**

The following considerations will be utilized in the evaluation of the proposals:

**EXPERIENCE/QUALIFICATIONS (50%)**

- Qualifications of firm & sub-consultants and their role and participation in this project (20) ✓
- Educational background and training of key personnel that are related to required services (5) ✓
- Related work experience (10) ✓
- References and past performance related to providing quality services (10) ✓
- Minority Business Enterprise status (5)

Project Experiences identified who worked on project  
staff has extensive regional experience including contracts with Orange  
and Volusia Co., little or no learning curve

Score 89  
(100-0)

**METHODOLOGY (20%)**

- Project approach (20)

Approach very detailed  
Clear roles who will be working on project

Score 90  
(100-0)

**METHODOLOGY (15%)**

- Rates based on disciplines (15) – Will be determined by Purchasing at the Eval. Mtg.

Score 14.5, 96.86  
(100-0)

**ABILITY TO PERFORM (15%)**

- Location of firm (5)
- Workload; ability and capacity of the Proposer to perform and comply with required scope of services (10)

Clear explanation of availability of staff

**Score 89**  
**(100-0)**

**Total Score \_\_\_\_\_ (0-100) Ranking \_\_\_\_\_**

248

**RFP-4233-04/TLR General Consulting Services for Transportation  
Planning/Technical Transportation Planning**

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Leftwich Consulting

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Tony Walter

**EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS**

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.**

The following considerations will be utilized in the evaluation of the proposals:

**EXPERIENCE/QUALIFICATIONS (50%)**

- Qualifications of firm & sub-consultants and their role and participation in this project (20)
- Educational background and training of key personnel that are related to required services (5)
- Related work experience (10)
- References and past performance related to providing quality services (10)
- Minority Business Enterprise status (5)

Very good Local & Regional Experience, Known for modeling expertise  
As a team abroad spectrum of experience

Score 89  
(100-0)

**METHODOLOGY (20%)**

- Project approach (20)

Solid project approach

Score 89  
(100-0)

**METHODOLOGY (15%)**

- Rates based on disciplines (15) – Will be determined by Purchasing at the Eval. Mtg.

Score 12.6 84.04  
(100-0)

**ABILITY TO PERFORM (15%)**

- Location of firm (5) ✓
- Workload; ability and capacity of the Proposer to perform and comply with required scope of services (10)

Current Availability 80% of my me ??

**Score 75**  
**(100-0)**

**Total Score \_\_\_\_\_ (0-100) Ranking \_\_\_\_\_**

253



**RFP-4233-04/TLR General Consulting Services for Transportation  
Planning/Technical Transportation Planning**

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Reynolds, Smith and Hills

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Tony Walts

**EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS**

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.**

The following considerations will be utilized in the evaluation of the proposals:

**EXPERIENCE/QUALIFICATIONS (50%)**

- Qualifications of firm & sub-consultants and their role and participation in this project (20) ✓
- Educational background and training of key personnel that are related to required services (5) ✓
- Related work experience (10) ✓
- References and past performance related to providing quality services (10) ✓
- Minority Business Enterprise status (5)

Likely still my Qualification Chart, easy to determine who does what  
No local project experience listed

Score 88  
(100-0)

**METHODOLOGY (20%)**

- Project approach (20)  
understand what is needed

Score 75  
(100-0)

**METHODOLOGY (15%)**

- Rates based on disciplines (15) – Will be determined by Purchasing at the Eval. Mtg.

Score 10.7, 71.24  
(100-0)

**ABILITY TO PERFORM (15%)**

- Location of firm (5)
- Workload; ability and capacity of the Proposer to perform and comply with required scope of services (10)

---

---

---

---

**Score 75**  
**(100-0)**

**Total Score** \_\_\_\_\_ **(0-100) Ranking** \_\_\_\_\_

240

**RFP-4233-04/TLR General Consulting Services for Transportation  
Planning/Technical Transportation Planning**

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Tindale-Oliver

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Tony Watts

**EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS**

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.**

The following considerations will be utilized in the evaluation of the proposals:

**EXPERIENCE/QUALIFICATIONS (50%)**

- Qualifications of firm & sub-consultants and their role and participation in this project (20) ✓
- Educational background and training of key personnel that are related to required services (5) ✓
- Related work experience (10) ✓
- References and past performance related to providing quality services (10) ✓
- Minority Business Enterprise status (5) ✓

Good experience with municipalities, variety of project types, included  
reference to transportation financing, good discussion of Public Investment  
an experience Oregon in several Co's municipalities (except St. Cloud)

Score 80  
(100-0)

**METHODOLOGY (20%)**

- Project approach (20)

Like report concept, approach touched on all areas of interest.

Score 80  
(100-0)

**METHODOLOGY (15%)**

- Rates based on disciplines (15) – Will be determined by Purchasing at the Eval. Mtg.

Score 15, 100  
(100-0)

**ABILITY TO PERFORM (15%)**

- Location of firm (5)
- Workload; ability and capacity of the Proposer to perform and comply with required scope of services (10)

*Time Commitment chart showed attention to detail, realistic  
only concern is identification of each person location and how they  
align with the Contract*

**Score 80**  
**(100-0)**

**Total Score \_\_\_\_\_ (0-100) Ranking \_\_\_\_\_**

**RFP-4233-04/TLR General Consulting Services for Transportation  
Planning/Technical Transportation Planning**

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Traffic Planning & Design, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Tony Walter

**EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS**

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.**

The following considerations will be utilized in the evaluation of the proposals:

**EXPERIENCE/QUALIFICATIONS (50%)**

- Qualifications of firm & sub-consultants and their role and participation in this project (20) ✓
- Educational background and training of key personnel that are related to required services (5) ✓
- Related work experience (10) ✓
- References and past performance related to providing quality services (10)
- Minority Business Enterprise status (5) ✓

good Local Back Ground  
various experiences, public & private

Score 79  
(100-0)

**METHODOLOGY (20%)**

- Project approach (20)

good Listing on Page 12 of areas of expertise that this Contract  
may encompass

Score 79  
(100-0)

**METHODOLOGY (15%)**

- Rates based on disciplines (15) – Will be determined by Purchasing at the Eval. Mtg.

Score 14.5, 96.46  
(100-0)

**ABILITY TO PERFORM (15%)**

- Location of firm (5)
- Workload; ability and capacity of the Proposer to perform and comply with required scope of services (10)

---

---

---

---

**Score** 20  
**(100-0)**

**Total Score** \_\_\_\_\_ **(0-100)** **Ranking** \_\_\_\_\_

238.

**RFP-4233-04/TLR General Consulting Services for Transportation  
Planning/Technical Transportation Planning**

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Glatting Jackson

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: M. West

**EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS**

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.**

The following considerations will be utilized in the evaluation of the proposals:

***EXPERIENCE/QUALIFICATIONS (50%)***

- Qualifications of firm & sub-consultants and their role and participation in this project (20)
- Educational background and training of key personnel that are related to required services (5)
- Related work experience (10)
- References and past performance related to providing quality services (10)
- Minority Business Enterprise status (5)

---

---

---

Score 92  
(100-0)

***METHODOLOGY (20%)***

- Project approach (20)

---

---

---

Score 85  
(100-0)

***METHODOLOGY (15%)***

- Rates based on disciplines (15) – Will be determined by Purchasing at the Eval. Mtg.

Score 10.2 67.89  
(100-0)

**ABILITY TO PERFORM (15%)**

- Location of firm (5)
- Workload; ability and capacity of the Proposer to perform and comply with required scope of services (10)

---

---

---

---

Score 95  
(100-0)

**Total Score** \_\_\_\_\_ (0-100) **Ranking** \_\_\_\_\_



**RFP-4233-04/TLR General Consulting Services for Transportation  
Planning/Technical Transportation Planning**

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: F.R Aleman

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Matthew West

**EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS**

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.**

The following considerations will be utilized in the evaluation of the proposals:

***EXPERIENCE/QUALIFICATIONS (50%)***

- Qualifications of firm & sub-consultants and their role and participation in this project (20)
- Educational background and training of key personnel that are related to required services (5)
- Related work experience (10)
- References and past performance related to providing quality services (10)
- Minority Business Enterprise status (5)

Score 95  
(100-0)

***METHODOLOGY (20%)***

- Project approach (20)

Score 85  
(100-0)

***METHODOLOGY (15%)***

- Rates based on disciplines (15) – Will be determined by Purchasing at the Eval. Mtg.

Score 7.6 50.84  
(100-0)

**ABILITY TO PERFORM (15%)**

- Location of firm (5)
- Workload; ability and capacity of the Proposer to perform and comply with required scope of services (10)

---

---

---

---

Score 90  
(100-0)

**Total Score** \_\_\_\_\_ (0-100) **Ranking** \_\_\_\_\_

**RFP-4233-04/TLR General Consulting Services for Transportation  
Planning/Technical Transportation Planning**

**SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME:** GMB

**QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS**

**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.**

The following considerations will be utilized in the evaluation of the proposals:

***EXPERIENCE/QUALIFICATIONS (50%)***

- Qualifications of firm & sub-consultants and their role and participation in this project (20)
- Educational background and training of key personnel that are related to required services (5)
- Related work experience (10)
- References and past performance related to providing quality services (10)
- Minority Business Enterprise status (5)

---

---

---

---

Score 91  
(100-0)

***METHODOLOGY (20%)***

- Project approach (20)

---

---

---

---

Score 87  
(100-0)

***METHODOLOGY (15%)***

- Rates based on disciplines (15) – Will be determined by Purchasing at the Eval. Mtg.

Score 14.5, 96 86  
(100-0)

**ABILITY TO PERFORM (15%)**

- Location of firm (5)
- Workload; ability and capacity of the Proposer to perform and comply with required scope of services (10)

---

---

---

---

Score 98  
(100-0)

**Total Score** \_\_\_\_\_ (0-100) **Ranking** \_\_\_\_\_

**RFP-4233-04/TLR General Consulting Services for Transportation  
Planning/Technical Transportation Planning**

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Ghyabi & Assoc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

**EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS**

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.**

The following considerations will be utilized in the evaluation of the proposals:

***EXPERIENCE/QUALIFICATIONS (50%)***

- Qualifications of firm & sub-consultants and their role and participation in this project (20)
- Educational background and training of key personnel that are related to required services (5)
- Related work experience (10)
- References and past performance related to providing quality services (10)
- Minority Business Enterprise status (5)

*In house*

Score 95  
(100-0)

***METHODOLOGY (20%)***

- Project approach (20)

Score 85  
(100-0)

***METHODOLOGY (15%)***

- Rates based on disciplines (15) – Will be determined by Purchasing at the Eval. Mtg.

Score 11.9, 79.56  
(100-0)

**ABILITY TO PERFORM (15%)**

- Location of firm (5)
- Workload; ability and capacity of the Proposer to perform and comply with required scope of services (10)

---

---

---

---

Score 91  
(100-0)

**Total Score** \_\_\_\_\_ **(0-100) Ranking** \_\_\_\_\_

**RFP-4233-04/TLR General Consulting Services for Transportation  
Planning/Technical Transportation Planning**

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Traffic Planning & Design, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

**EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS**

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.**

The following considerations will be utilized in the evaluation of the proposals:

***EXPERIENCE/QUALIFICATIONS (50%)***

- Qualifications of firm & sub-consultants and their role and participation in this project (20)
- Educational background and training of key personnel that are related to required services (5)
- Related work experience (10)
- References and past performance related to providing quality services (10)
- Minority Business Enterprise status (5)

---

---

---

Score 90  
(100-0)

***METHODOLOGY (20%)***

- Project approach (20)

No approach discussed that I could  
find

---

---

Score 70  
(100-0)

***METHODOLOGY (15%)***

- Rates based on disciplines (15) – Will be determined by Purchasing at the Eval. Mtg.

Score 14.5, 96.46  
(100-0)

**ABILITY TO PERFORM (15%)**

- Location of firm (5)
- Workload; ability and capacity of the Proposer to perform and comply with required scope of services (10)

---

---

---

---

Score 80  
(100-0)

**Total Score** \_\_\_\_\_ **(0-100) Ranking** \_\_\_\_\_



**RFP-4233-04/TLR General Consulting Services for Transportation  
Planning/Technical Transportation Planning**

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Leftwich Consulting

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

**EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS**

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.**

The following considerations will be utilized in the evaluation of the proposals:

**EXPERIENCE/QUALIFICATIONS (50%)**

- Qualifications of firm & sub-consultants and their role and participation in this project (20)
- Educational background and training of key personnel that are related to required services (5)
- Related work experience (10)
- References and past performance related to providing quality services (10)
- Minority Business Enterprise status (5)

---

---

---

---

Score 89  
(100-0)

**METHODOLOGY (20%)**

- Project approach (20)

---

---

---

---

Score 80  
(100-0)

**METHODOLOGY (15%)**

- Rates based on disciplines (15) – Will be determined by Purchasing at the Eval. Mtg.

Score 12.6, 84.04  
(100-0)

**ABILITY TO PERFORM (15%)**

- Location of firm (5)
- Workload; ability and capacity of the Proposer to perform and comply with required scope of services (10)

---

---

---

---

Score 90  
(100-0)

**Total Score** \_\_\_\_\_ **(0-100) Ranking** \_\_\_\_\_

**RFP-4233-04/TLR General Consulting Services for Transportation  
Planning/Technical Transportation Planning**

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Tindale-Oliver

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

**EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS**

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.**

The following considerations will be utilized in the evaluation of the proposals:

***EXPERIENCE/QUALIFICATIONS (50%)***

- Qualifications of firm & sub-consultants and their role and participation in this project (20)
- Educational background and training of key personnel that are related to required services (5)
- Related work experience (10)
- References and past performance related to providing quality services (10)
- Minority Business Enterprise status (5)

---

---

---

Score 90  
(100-0)

***METHODOLOGY (20%)***

- Project approach (20)

---

---

---

Score 90  
(100-0)

***METHODOLOGY (15%)***

- Rates based on disciplines (15) – Will be determined by Purchasing at the Eval. Mtg.

Score 15, 100  
(100-0)

**ABILITY TO PERFORM (15%)**

- Location of firm (5)
- Workload; ability and capacity of the Proposer to perform and comply with required scope of services (10)

---

---

---

---

Score 95  
(100-0)

**Total Score** \_\_\_\_\_ **(0-100)** **Ranking** \_\_\_\_\_

**RFP-4233-04/TLR General Consulting Services for Transportation  
Planning/Technical Transportation Planning**

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Reynolds, Smith and Hills

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

**EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS**

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.**

The following considerations will be utilized in the evaluation of the proposals:

***EXPERIENCE/QUALIFICATIONS (50%)***

- Qualifications of firm & sub-consultants and their role and participation in this project (20)
- Educational background and training of key personnel that are related to required services (5)
- Related work experience (10)
- References and past performance related to providing quality services (10)
- Minority Business Enterprise status (5)

Score 90  
(100-0)

***METHODOLOGY (20%)***

- Project approach (20)

Score 90  
(100-0)

***METHODOLOGY (15%)***

- Rates based on disciplines (15) – Will be determined by Purchasing at the Eval. Mtg.

Score 10.7, 71.24  
(100-0)

**ABILITY TO PERFORM (15%)**

- Location of firm (5)
- Workload; ability and capacity of the Proposer to perform and comply with required scope of services (10)

---

---

---

---

Score 95  
(100-0)

**Total Score** \_\_\_\_\_ (0-100) **Ranking** \_\_\_\_\_

**CONSULTANT SERVICES AGREEMENT (RFP-4233-04/TLR)  
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING**

**THIS AGREEMENT** is made and entered into this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_, by and between **GMB ENGINEERS & PLANNERS, INC.**, duly authorized to conduct business in the State of Florida, whose address is 3751 Maguire Boulevard, Suite 111, Orlando, Florida 32803, 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 transportation planning consultant 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 consultant 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.

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 one (1) year 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.

**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:

Seminole County Planning and Development  
1101 E. First Street  
Sanford, Florida 32771

(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.

**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:

\$ 500,000.00	(Each Accident)
\$1,000,000.00	(Disease-Policy Limit)
\$ 500,000.00	(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
Personal & Advertising Injury Limit	\$1,000,000.00
Each Occurrence Limit	\$1,000,000.00

(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 Profes-

sional 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:**

Planning and Development  
1101 E. First Street  
Sanford, Florida 32771

**FOR CONSULTANT:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**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:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_, Secretary  
(CORPORATE SEAL)

By: \_\_\_\_\_, President  
Date: \_\_\_\_\_

ATTEST:

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
SEMINOLE COUNTY, FLORIDA

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

By: \_\_\_\_\_ Chairman  
Date: \_\_\_\_\_

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

AC/lpk  
10/27/04  
rfp-4233

3 Attachments:  
Exhibit "A" - Scope of Services  
Exhibit "B" - Sample Work Order  
Exhibit "C" - Rate Schedule

GENERAL CONSULTING SERVICES FOR  
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING/TECHNICAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING WORK TASKS  
EXHIBIT "A"  
GENERAL SCOPE OF SERVICE

The consultant (s) shall provide expertise and technical skills, on an as needed basis, to assist Seminole County staff in the implementation of the County's Comprehensive Plan, as it relates to Transportation Planning and technical transportation planning work tasks and the fulfillment of the transportation planning work program activities o include public involvement for these tasks. The County may select one or more consultants to perform one or more of the elements described.

Work is assigned by work order based on the needs and requirements of Seminole County, in all cases, the consultant (s) will work with and receive guidance from Seminole County staff to develop the appropriate requirements, guidelines and criteria for each project. The consultant(s) will in all cases develop a scope of work based on the appropriate requirements guidelines and criteria along with a proposed fee for performing the work, with required attachments, to the appropriate county staff for approval and issuance of a work order prior to commencing work.

General assignments that may be performed by the consultant(s) under this contract solicitation may, include, but are not limited to:

Transportation Planning Studies

- Updates to the Multi-Modal Transportation Element
- Transportation Element Support Documentation
- Capital Improvements Planning
- Financial/Fiscal Analysis
- Economic Development related to Transportation Planning
- Socio-Economic Data Estimates and Projections
- Traffic Analysis Studies
- Transit Studies
- Transportation related Data Collection
- TSM/TDM/ITS' Studies/Plans
- Land Development Code Regulations
- Plan Amendment Evaluations
- Corridor/Small Area Studies
- Preparation of Multi-Modal Levels of Service for Seminole County and Implementation of Procedures
- Trail/Pedestrian/Bicycle Master Planning
- Trail/Pedestrian/Bicycle Facility Designs
- Traffic Calming related Work Tasks
- Preparation of Design Guidelines/Standards
- Review for Compliance to Design Guidelines/Standards
- GIS/Mapping/Graphic Arts

Transportation Technical Studies

- Socio-Economic Data/ZData 1 and 2 Estimates and Projections
- Transportation Systems Modeling
- Traffic/Impact Studies

- Review of transportation studies or traffic impact studies submitted to the County
- Work related to Level-of-Service Evaluations
- Transit Analysis Work tasks
- Traffic Operations/Transit Data Collection
- TSM/TDM/ITS' Studies/Plans
- Road Impact Fee/Concurrency Work Tasks or Updates
- Plan Amendment Evaluations
- Transportation Corridor Studies
- GIS/Mapping/Graphic Arts

#### Public Involvement

- Prepare and Present Presentations for Various Group to include, but not limited to, the Seminole County Board of County Commissioners, County Advisory Boards, Citizen Interest Groups for work related to Transportation Planning and Transportation Technical Studies
- Prepare Public Involvement Materials as Needed by County Staff for work related to Transportation Planning and Transportation Technical Studies
- Represent the County at Public Meetings for work related to Transportation Planning and Transportation Technical Studies

#### Anticipated disciplines for the Transportation Planning/Technical Planning

- Engineer (Civil, Traffic, Transportation) (may be sub-contracted)
- Transit and Transportation Planner
- Graphic Designer
- GIS Specialist
- Capital Improvement/ Financial Analyst
- Traffic Analyst/Modeling and Data Collection
- Socio/Economic Data Analyst

**Board of County Commissioners  
SEMINOLE COUNTY, FLORIDA**

# WORK ORDER

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: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_, Secretary  
(CORPORATE SEAL)

----- \*\*\*\*\* ----- \*\*\*\*\* ----- \*\*\*\*\* ----- \*\*\*\*\* -----

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
SEMINOLE COUNTY, FLORIDA

**WITNESSES:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Contracts Analyst, print name)

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Peter W. Maley, Contracts Supervisor

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Contracts Analyst, print name)

As authorized by Section 330.3, Seminole  
County Administrative Code

**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.

**RFP-4233-04/TLR General Consulting Services for Transportation Planning/Technical Planning****GMB ENGINEERS & PLANNERS, INC.**

<i>Anticipated Discipline</i>	<i>Hourly Rate</i>
Engineer	\$89.13
Transit & Transportation Planner	\$107.96
Graphics Designer	\$54.74
GIS Specialist	\$88.09
Capital Improvement/Financial Analyst	\$76.99
Traffic Analyst/Modeling & Data Collection	\$70.75
Socio/Economic Data Analyst	\$75.00

**CONSULTANT SERVICES AGREEMENT (RFP-4233-04/TLR)  
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING**

**THIS AGREEMENT** is made and entered into this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_, by and between **GLATTING, JACKSON, KERCHER, ANGLIN, LOPEZ, RINEHART, INC.**, duly authorized to conduct business in the State of Florida, whose address is 33 E. Pine Street, Orlando, Florida 32801, 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 transportation planning consultant 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 consultant 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.



## RFP-4233-04/TLR General Consulting Services for Transportation Planning/Technical Planning

GLATTING JACKSON KERCHER ANGLIN LOPEZ  
RINEHART, INC.

<i>Anticipated Discipline</i>	<i>Hourly Rate</i>
Engineer	\$146.97
Transit & Transportation Planner	\$134.55
Graphics Designer	\$90.05
GIS Specialist	\$87.98
Capital Improvement/Financial Analyst	\$170.78
Traffic Analyst/Modeling & Data Collection	\$88.60
Socio/Economic Data Analyst	\$83.84

**CONSULTANT SERVICES AGREEMENT (RFP-4233-04/TLR)**  
**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING**

**THIS AGREEMENT** is made and entered into this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_, by and between **TINDALE-OLIVER & ASSOCIATES**, duly authorized to conduct business in the State of Florida, whose address is 1000 N. Ashley Drive, Suite 100, Tampa, Florida 33602, 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 transportation planning consultant 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 consultant 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.

**RFP-4233-04/TLR General Consulting Services for Transportation Planning/Technical Planning****TINDALE-OLIVER & ASSOCIATES**

<i>Anticipated Discipline</i>	<i>Hourly Rate</i>
Engineer	\$110.00
Transit & Transportation Planner	\$100.00
Graphics Designer	\$55.00
GIS Specialist	\$65.00
Capital Improvement/Financial Analyst	\$75.00
Traffic Analyst/Modeling & Data Collection	\$75.00
Socio/Economic Data Analyst	\$65.00

**CONSULTANT SERVICES AGREEMENT (RFP-4233-04/TLR)  
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING**

THIS AGREEMENT is made and entered into this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_, by and between **LEFTWICH CONSULTING ENGINEERS, INC.**, duly authorized to conduct business in the State of Florida, whose address is 12151 Science Drive, #101, Orlando, Florida 32826, 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 transportation planning consultant 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 consultant 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.

## RFP-4233-04/TLR General Consulting Services for Transportation Planning/Technical Planning

## LEFTWICH CONSULTING ENGINEERS, INC.

<i>Anticipated Discipline</i>	<i>Hourly Rate</i>
Engineer	\$184.65
Transit & Transportation Planner	\$147.97
Graphics Designer	\$54.01
GIS Specialist	\$48.10
Capital Improvement/Financial Analyst	\$81.37
Traffic Analyst/Modeling & Data Collection	\$68.81
Socio/Economic Data Analyst	\$63.61