

## **PROFESSIONAL SERVICES**

- 27. Approve ranking list, authorize negotiations and award PS-0123-05/DRR- Master Agreement for Professional Services for CEI Services for CR 46A, Phase III, CR15 Country Club Road to Old Lake Mary Road to HDR Construction Control, Inc. of Orlando. (\$660,000.00).**

PS-0123-05/DRR will provide construction engineering and inspection services to ensure that the project is constructed in reasonable conformity with the plans, specifications and contract provisions.

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

- CPH Engineers, Inc., Sanford;
- Dick Corporation, Jacksonville;
- Earth Tech Consulting, Inc., Orlando;
- HDR Construction Control, Inc., Orlando;
- JEA Construction Engineering Services, Inc., Winter Park;
- Neel-Schaffer, Inc., Maitland;
- Parsons Brinckerhoff Construction Services, Inc., Orlando;
- Reynolds, Smith and Hills CS, Inc., Orlando;
- Volkert Construction Services, Inc., Altamonte Springs.

The Evaluation Committee, which consisted of Mark Flomerfelt, P.E., Stormwater Manager; Bill Glennon, P.E., Principal Engineer; Gary Johnson, P.E., Director, Public Works; Stephen Krug, P.E., Principal Engineer; and Jerry McCollum, P.E., County Engineer evaluated the submittals and short-listed the following three firms:

- Earth Tech Consulting, Inc., Orlando;
- HDR Construction Control, Inc., Orlando;
- JEA Construction Engineering Services, Inc., Winter Park.

The Evaluation Committee interviewed the three short-listed firms giving consideration to the following criteria:

- Project Approach including Innovative Ideas;
- Project Team Qualifications;
- Similar Project Experience.

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

1. HDR Construction Control, Inc., Orlando;
2. Earth Tech Consulting Inc., Orlando;
3. JEA Construction Engineering Services, Inc., Winter Park.

Authorization for performance of services by the Consultant under this agreement shall be in the form of written Work Orders issued and executed by the County and signed by the Consultant. The work and dollar amount for each Work Order will be within the constraints of the approved project budget and negotiated on an as-needed basis for the project. Funds are available in accounts 077515.560670 CIP 0114-01 (\$138,600.00) and 077521.560670 CIP 0114-01 (\$521,400.00).

Public Works/Engineering Division and Fiscal Services/Purchasing and Contracts Division recommend that the Board approve the ranking, authorize the Chairman to execute a Master Agreement as prepared by the County Attorney's office.

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

PS NUMBER: PS-0123-05/DRR  
PS TITLE : Construction Engineering and Inspection Services for  
CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club Road to Old  
Lake Mary Road  
DATE: October 12, 2005 TIME: 2:00 P.M.

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

RESPONSE -1-	RESPONSE -2-	RESPONSE -3-	RESPONSE -4-	RESPONSE -5-
CPH Engineers, Inc 500 W. Fulton St Sanford, FL 32771  David A. Gierach, P.E. 407-322-6841 PH 407-330-0639 FX	Dick Corporation 8936 Western Way, Suite 10 Jacksonville, FL 32256  Daniel P. Sokol, P.E. 904-363-0911 x224 PH 904-363-1421 FX	Earth Tech Consulting, Inc. 30 S. Keller Rd, #500 Orlando, FL 32810  David W. Gorden 407-660-1719 PH 407-660-0250 FX	HDR Construction Control, Inc. 315 East Robinson St Ste. 400 Orlando, FL 32801  William H. Wadsworth, P.E. 407-948-9965 PH 407-420-4242 FX	JEA Construction Engineering Services, Inc. 1685 Lee Road, Ste 250 Winter Park, FL 32789  Kathy Caldwell, P.E. 407-647-1001 PH 407-647-8080 FX
RESPONSE -6-	RESPONSE -7-	RESPONSE -8-	RESPONSE -9-	
Neel-Schaffer, Inc. 2600 Lake Lucien Dr, Ste 117 Maitland, FL 32751  David L. Wright, P.E. 407-647-6623 PH 407-539-0575 FX	Parsons Brinckerhoff Construction Services, Inc. 100 E. Pine St, Ste 500 Orlando, FL 32801  G. Dewey Martin III, P.E. 407-587-7800 PH 407-587-7960 FX	Reynolds, Smith and Hills CS, Inc. 3670 Maguire Blvd, Ste 300 Orlando, FL 32803  Dale A. Barnes, P.E. 407-893-5800 PH 407-893-5858 FX	Volkert Construction Services, Inc. 151 South Wymore Rd Altamonte Springs, FL 32714  Jack W. Roberts, P.E. 407-682-2045 PH 407-682-7861 FX	

Tabulated by D. Reed – Posted October 13, 2005 (5:00 P.M.)

Short-listing Evaluation Committee Meeting: October 31, 2005, 9:00 am Reflections, 520 Lake Mary Blvd, Sanford, FL, Lake Jesup Conference Rm

The committee agreed to short-list the following three firms: Earth Tech Consulting Inc.  
HDR Construction Control, Inc.  
JEA Construction Engineering Services, Inc.

Presentations: November 22, 2005, 1:30 pm Reflections, 520 Lake Mary Blvd, Sanford, FL, Lake Jesup Conference Room

Recommendation: HDR Construction Control, Inc.

Board of County Commissioners Agenda date: December 20, 2005

# EVALUATION RANKINGS

PS-0123-05/DRR- CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III CR15 Country Club to Old Lake Mary Rd

	M. Flomerfelt	B. Glennon	G. Johnson	S. Krug	J. McCollum	TOTAL POINTS	RANKING
CPH ENGINEERS, INC.	8	8	7	8	8	39	8
DICK CORPORATION	9	9	9	9	9	45	9
EARTH TECH CONSULTING INC.	2	3	2	3	1	11	2
HDR CONSTRUCTION CONTROL, INC	1	1	1	1	2	6	1
JEA CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING SERVICES, INC	3	2	6	2	3	16	3
NEEL-SCHAFER, INC	7	5	5	7	4	28	6
PARSONS-BRINCKERHOFF CONSTRUCTION SERV	5	7	4	6	7	29	7
REYNOLDS, SMITH & HILLS CS, INC	6	4	3	4	6	23	4
VOLKERT CONSTRUCTION SERVICES, INC	4	6	8	5	5	28	5

The Evaluation Committee agrees to short-list the top three ranked firms:

Earth Tech  
HDR  
JEA

Mark Flomerfelt

Bill Glennon

Gary Johnson

Jerry McCollum

Steve Krug

PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to  
Old Lake Mary Rd

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: CPH Engineers, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: S. KRUG

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

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

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)

VERY GENERAL  
DESCRIBED PLAN-SET.  
CONSTRUCTABILITY ISSUES? NONE LISTED

Score 60 24  
(100-0)

Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)

FDOT CERTIFICATIONS?  
INDIVIDUAL PROJECT TEAM MEMBER EXPERIENCE?

Score 60 18  
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

RECENT EXPERIENCE OF PROJECT TEAM?

Score 60 15  
(100-0)

Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

Score 5 5  
(100-0)

TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)

62

RANKING

\_\_\_\_\_

PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to  
Old Lake Mary Rd

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Dick Corporation

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: S. Krug

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

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

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)

- UTILITY COORD → NOT FAMILIAR W/ COUNTY SPECS.
- CLAIM MANAGEMENT.
- TOPICALLY HITS MOST CONST. MANAGEMENT ISSUES,  
LACKS DETAIL ON HOW TO ACCOMPLISH.
- GENERIC.

Score 61  
(100-0) 24.4

Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)

- FDOT CERTIFICATIONS?
- OHIO EXPERIENCE

Score 60  
(100-0) 18

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

- FDOT PROJECT EXPERIENCE?
- EXPERIENCE IN FL?

Score 60  
(100-0) 15

Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

TAX

Score 2  
(100-0)

TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)

59.4

RANKING

\_\_\_\_\_

PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to  
Old Lake Mary Rd

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Earth Tech Consulting, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: S. KRUG

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

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

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)

- NPDES ✓ PERMIT COORD AS-BUILTS
- UTILITY RELOCATION, NOT
- PUBLIC AWARENESS
- EXPERIENCE WORKING W/ CSX ON CROSSINGS.
- GOOD UNDERSTANDING OF PROJECT & ISSUES.

Score 91  
(100-0)

Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)

- FDOT CERTIFICATIONS
- 
- 
- 

Score 91  
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

- SEVERAL SEMCO. PROJECTS
- 
- 
- 

Score 91  
(100-0)

Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

Orlando.

Score 5  
(100-0)

TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)

91.45

RANKING

\_\_\_\_\_

PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to  
Old Lake Mary Rd

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: HDR Construction Control, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: S. Kruger

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

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

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)

PR-CON, SCHEDULE, PROACTIVE COORDINATION.  
CONSTRUCTABILITY, UTILITIES, MOT  
DETAILED UNDERSTANDING OF PROJECT ISSUES,  
NIPDES.  
CSX.  
GOOD UNDERSTANDING OF PROJECT SCOPE & ISSUES.  
Score 95  
(100-0)

Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)

FDOT CERTS  
  
  
  
Score 95  
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

SEMCO EXPERIENCE  
FDOT EXPERIENCE.

Score 95  
(100-0)

Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

ORLANDO

Score 5  
(100-0)

TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)

95.25

RANKING



PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to  
Old Lake Mary Rd

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: JEA Construction Engineering Services, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: S. KRUG.

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

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

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)

UTILITIES, NPDES, PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT  
MOT,  
GOOD DETAIL.

Score 88  
(100-0)

35.2

Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)

- FDOT CERTS.

Score 95  
(100-0)

28.5

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

- FDOT & SEMCO EXPERIENCE

Score 95  
(100-0)

23.75

Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

WINTER PARK

Score 5  
(100-0)

TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)

87.45

RANKING

\_\_\_\_\_

PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to  
Old Lake Mary Rd

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Neel-Schaffer, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: S. KRUG

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

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

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)

- PUBLIC INFORMATION
- MOT?
- UTILITIES & SUGGESTIONS?
- IDENTIFIED ISSUES ARE PROJECT SPECIFIC, YET VAGUE?

Score 80  
(100-0)

32

Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)

- 2 PERSON PROJECT TEAM??
- FDOT CERTS?
- NEED MORE DETAIL AND STAFFING PROJECT

Score 70  
(100-0)

21

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

- FIRM HAS SIMILAR PROJECT EXP.
- NEED MORE DETAIL

Score 80  
(100-0)

26

Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

MAITLAND

Score 5  
(100-0)

TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)

78

RANKING

\_\_\_\_\_

PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to Old Lake Mary Rd

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Parsons Brinckerhoff Construction Services, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: S. Krug

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

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

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)

- PROACTIVE, STORMWATER CONTROL
- CSX, MOT, UTILITY COORDINATION
- SCHOOL ISSUES
- PUBLIC INFO.
- GOOD SURFACE DETAIL.

Score 85  
(100-0)

Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)

- FDOT CERTS.
- COMBINED TEAM?

59.5

Score 85  
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

- FDOT EXPERIENCE

Score 80  
(100-0)

20

Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

ORLANDO.

Score 5  
(100-0)

TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)

84.5

RANKING

\_\_\_\_\_

**PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to Old Lake Mary Rd**

**SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME:** Reynolds, Smith and Hills CS, Inc.

**QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER:** S. KRUG

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

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

**Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.**

**Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)**

- NOT PUBLIC RELATIONS, CSX  
- NPDES  
- GOOD UNDERSTANDING OF PROJECT ISSUES.

Score 90  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)**

- FDOT CERTS  
- SEMCO EXP.

Score 90  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)**

- SEMCO EXP.  
- FDOT EXP.

Score 90  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)**

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

ORLANDO

Score 90.5  
(100-0)

**TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)**

5

**RANKING**

**PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to Old Lake Mary Rd**

**SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME:** Volkert Construction Services, Inc.

**QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER:** S. KRUG

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

**Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.**

**Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)**

- MOT, CSX, DETAILING.  
- UTILITIES  
- GOOD DETAIL, FAMILIARITY W/ SEMCO  
CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT PRACTICES???  
- PRO ACTIVE

**Score** 88  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)**

- FDOT CERTS.

**Score** 88  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)**

- FDOT EXP.

**Score** 88  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)**

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

ALTAMONTE SPRINGS

**Score** 5  
(100-0)

**TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)**

88.6

**RANKING**

\_\_\_\_\_

**PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to Old Lake Mary Rd**

**SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME:** CPH Engineers, Inc.

**QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER:** Gary Johnson

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

**Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.**

**Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)**

Good understanding of roadway, drainage elements  
Detailed discussion of soils, dewatering, construction issues -  
Brief HCT comments  
No utility discussion

30

Score 75  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)**

Adequate

30

Score 100  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)**

Lake Mary (Rinkhart)  
SC - Lake Emma  
Sanford - St. Johns Hwy

21.25

Score 85  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)**

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

Seminole

5

Score 100  
(100-0)

**TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)**

86.25

**RANKING**

7

**PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to Old Lake Mary Rd**

**SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME:** Dick Corporation

**QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER:** Gary Johnson

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

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

**Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.**

**Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)**

No specifics from this project  
Totally generic approach

**Score** 60  
(100-0)

24

**Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)**

Adequate

**Score** 100  
(100-0)

30

**Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)**

No local exp. Ohio?

**Score** 60  
(100-0)

15

**Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)**

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

Jacksonville

**Score** 2  
(100-0)

2

**TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)**

71

**RANKING**

9

**PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to Old Lake Mary Rd**

**SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME:** Earth Tech Consulting, Inc.

**QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER:** Gary Johnson

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

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

**Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.**

**Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)**

Comprehensive approach w/ many details  
Excellent project understanding  
Permits, public awareness, PBSJ/Airport Rd, MOT

36

Score 90  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)**

Adequate

30

Score 100  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)**

Extensive SC road CEI work

25

Score 100  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)**

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

Orange

Score 100  
(100-0)

5

**TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)**

96

**RANKING**

2



**PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to Old Lake Mary Rd**

**SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME:** HDR Construction Control, Inc.

**QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER:** Gary Johnson

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

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

**Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.**

**Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)**

Outstanding presentation of approach/understanding issues.  
Detailed constructability/coordination review, esp. CSX, demarking  
  
  
**Score** 95  
(100-0) **38**

**Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)**

Adequate  
  
  
**Score** 100  
(100-0) **30**

**Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)**

SC - Dodd Rd  
FDOT - A1A Streetscape  
  
**Score** 95  
(100-0) **23.75**

**Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)**

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

Orange  
**Score** 100  
(100-0) **5**

**TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)**

96.75

**RANKING**

1

**PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to Old Lake Mary Rd**

**SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME:** JEA Construction Engineering Services, Inc.

**QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER:** Gary Johnson

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

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

**Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.**

**Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)**

Good understanding approach includes all issues but  
minimal details  
Good discussion of wetland issues

32

Score 80  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)**

Adequate

30

Score 100  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)**

SC - East Lake Brantley  
Mostly FDOT

21.25

Score 85  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)**

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

5

Orange

Score 100  
(100-0)

**TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)**

88.25

**RANKING**

6

**PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to Old Lake Mary Rd**

**SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME:** Neel-Schaffer, Inc.

**QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER:** Gary Johnson

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

**Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.**

**Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)**

Adequate approach/understanding, w/some details  
Mentions right work, noise issues  
Phase 2 & 2 storm drain issues

32

Score 80  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)**

Adequate

30

Score 100  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)**

SC - SR434 Access Mgt  
- LMB  
- Grantline

22.5

Score 90  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)**

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

5

Orange

Score 100  
(100-0)

**TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)**

89.5

**RANKING**

5

**PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to Old Lake Mary Rd**

**SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME:** Parsons Brinckerhoff Construction Services, Inc.

**QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER:** Gary Johnson

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

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

**Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.**

**Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)**

Comprehensive approach shows good understanding of project  
Good discussion of construction issues, MOT  
High seasonal groundwater acknowledged

34

Score 85  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)**

Adequate

30

Score 100  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)**

No SC projects  
Leon County - 2 roads  
OOCEA

22.5

Score 90  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)**

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

Orange

5

Score 100  
(100-0)

**TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)**

91.5

**RANKING**

4

**PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to Old Lake Mary Rd**

**SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME:** Reynolds, Smith and Hills CS, Inc.

**QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER:** Gary Johnson

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

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

**Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.**

**Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)**

Good understanding, complete approach, but not a lot of details  
Mentions fiber, conduits, etc.  
Sheet pile wall issue

34

Score 85  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)**

Adequate

30

Score 100  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)**

SC-419, Montgomery, Seminola  
DOT/Turnpike

25

Score 100  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)**

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

Orange

Score 100  
(100-0)

5

**TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)**

94

**RANKING**

3

**PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to Old Lake Mary Rd**

**SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME:** Volkert Construction Services, Inc.

**QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER:** Gary Johnson

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

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

**Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.**

**Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)**

Complete approach, good project understanding  
Emphasis on contacts, utilities, homeowners, no construction  
issues identified  
Details on excavation, soil issues

**Score** 75  
(100-0)

30

**Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)**

Adequate

**Score** 100  
(100-0)

30

**Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)**

No SC  
Mostly DOT

**Score** 80  
(100-0)

20

**Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)**

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

Seminole

**Score** 100  
(100-0)

5

**TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)**

85

**RANKING**

8

PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to  
Old Lake Mary Rd

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: CPH Engineers, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Jerry McCollum

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

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

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)

Very General - Good (-)  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Score 72  
(100-0)

28.8

Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)

Good  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Score 75  
(100-0)

22.50

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

Good  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Score 75  
(100-0)

18.75

Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

Score 100  
(100-0)

5.0

TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)

75.05

RANKING

8

PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to  
Old Lake Mary Rd

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Dick Corporation

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Jerry McCall

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

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

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)

Vague at best  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Score 65 20.0  
(100-0)

Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)

Good (-)  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Score 70 21.0  
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

Good (-)  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Score 70 17.5  
(100-0)

Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

Jacksonville  
\_\_\_\_\_

Score 40 2.0  
(100-0)

TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)

66.5

RANKING

9



PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to Old Lake Mary Rd

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Earth Tech Consulting, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: J McCollum

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

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

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

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

60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications

Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)

Very detailed (pav. type, public road, MUT, milling issue and new field and tie-in)

Score 84  
(100-0)

33.6

Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)

Very good - Numerous past jobs for County

Score 82  
(100-0)

24.6

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

Very good - Performed very well on other County jobs

Score 82  
(100-0)

20.5

Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

Score 100  
(100-0)

5.0

TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)

83.7

RANKING

1

PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to Old Lake Mary Rd

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: HDR Construction Control, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: J McCallum

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

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

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)

Very detailed covered most  
issues and good constructibility  
review

Score 80  
(100-0)

32.0

Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)

Very good - Dred Rd

Score 80  
(100-0)

24.0

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

Very good - Dred Rd.

Score 80  
(100-0)

20.0

Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

Score 100  
(100-0)

5.0

TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)

81.0

RANKING

2

PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to  
Old Lake Mary Rd

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: JEA Construction Engineering Services, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: J McCallum

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

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

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)

Good (++) . Covered most issues.

Score 78  
(100-0)

31.2

Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)

Very good - Currently working on E. Lake Brantley

Score 80  
(100-0)

24.0

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

Good (++) - Done good job on E. Lake Brantley

Score 78  
(100-0)

19.5

Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

Score 100  
(100-0)

5.0

TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)

79.7

RANKING

3

PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to  
Old Lake Mary Rd

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Neel-Schaffer, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: J McCollum

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

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

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)

General - Good

Score 75  
(100-0)

30.0

Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)

Good (++) - Part of  
team worked on other Company's

Score 78  
(100-0)

23.4

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

Very good  
Have completed 2 recent  
projects

Score 80  
(100-0)

20.0

Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

Score 100  
(100-0)

5.0

TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)

78.4

RANKING

4

PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to  
Old Lake Mary Rd

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Parsons Brinckerhoff Construction Services, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: J McCall

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

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

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)

Good (+) - General but good  
on MUT issues.

Score 76  
(100-0)

30.4

Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)

Good

Score 75  
(100-0)

22.5

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

Good

Score 75  
(100-0)

18.75

Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

Score 100  
(100-0)

5.0

TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)

76.65

RANKING

7

**PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to Old Lake Mary Rd**

**SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME:** Reynolds, Smith and Hills CS, Inc.

**QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER:** J Mac Collum

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

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

**Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.**

**Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)**

Good but general

Score 75  
(100-0)

30.0

**Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)**

Good (++)

Score 78  
(100-0)

23.4

**Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)**

Good (++) - H. W. Co.  
done several Co.  
projects

Score 78  
(100-0)

19.5

**Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)**

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

Score 100  
(100-0)

5.0

**TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)**

77.9

**RANKING**

6

**PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to Old Lake Mary Rd**

**SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME:** Volkert Construction Services, Inc.

**QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER:** J McCallum

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

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

**Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.**

**Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)**

Good (+) - Good definition  
utilities / subject

Score 78  
(100-0)

31.2

**Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)**

Good (+)

Score 76  
(100-0)

22.8

**Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)**

Good (+)

Score 76  
(100-0)

19.0

**Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)**

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

Score 100  
(100-0)

5.0

**TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)**

78.0

**RANKING**

5

PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to  
Old Lake Mary Rd

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: CPH Engineers, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: M. R. 10/26/05

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

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

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)

Project Approach Limited Detail

Score 68  
(100-0)

Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)

Terwilliger + 20  
NASSO + 10?  
Dossow -  
Tung - 30+

Score 75  
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

LK Emma RD - S.C.  
Riviera RD - City  
Nicholson Ave - Osceola Co

Score 75  
(100-0)

Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

Score 5  
(100-0)

TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)

73.45

RANKING

\_\_\_\_\_



PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to  
Old Lake Mary Rd

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Dick Corporation

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: [Signature]

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

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)

Limited info

Score 65  
(100-0)

Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)

SOKOL RESIDENT 14 yrs  
FARCAS PROJ EN 6 yrs  
SASALA INSP 6 mo  
LEANSAT INSP 2 yrs

Score 65  
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

STARK Co. - BLN6  
OHIO Transfer  
CHYADORA Co.

Score 70  
(100-0)

Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

Score 2  
(100-0)

TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)

RANKING

64

PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to  
Old Lake Mary Rd

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Earth Tech Consulting, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: [Signature]

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

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

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)

went to Businesses to ask @ Access  
Point etc  
Spoke w/ CEX, Did thorough Review of  
Plans w/ Comments

Score 92  
(100-0)

Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)

Good - RES  
SALES - PA  
Smith - SRT  
HAWORTH - INSP

Score 90  
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

ReoBuro III, Howell Branch RD  
427 E, 3, 5  
AND SIMILAR FIRST EXP

Score 85  
(100-0)

Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

Score 5  
(100-0)

TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)

90.05

RANKING

\_\_\_\_\_

21  
36.8  
27.0  
21.25  
5  
90.05

PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to  
Old Lake Mary Rd

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: HDR Construction Control, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: [Signature]

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

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

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)

Good Stormwater Approach  
Understanding of Demographics w/ utility  
RELOCATION  
SCHOOL AND BUSINESS IDENTIFIED AS NOT PLAN

Score 91  
(100-0)

Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)

GARRAFFA  
SEVEN - 30 yrs  
HI BORNE ± 35 yrs  
STACKS - 15 yrs  
USEY - 20 yrs

Score 92  
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

DODD ROAD, CAMUOTA BYPASS, 417 - @ 46A  
SR 429 OTHER

Score 85  
(100-0)

Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

Score 5  
(100-0)

TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)

90.25

RANKING

21  
36.4  
27.6  
21.25  
5  
90.25

PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to Old Lake Mary Rd

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: JEA Construction Engineering Services, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: MJ 10/26/05

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

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

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)

Not, wetland NO significant issues  
Good understanding of Data  
-DID on site Interviews w/ Businesses

Score 87  
(100-0)

34.8

Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)

Hassounet 17 yr  
Aust. 10  
Schepers 3+  
Leonard  
Mo-wad 10+

Score 88  
(100-0)

26.4

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

E. W. Brandt, Elder Care  
US 1 Brevard  
SR 26  
SR 518

Score 82  
(100-0)

20.5  
81.7  
85

Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

Score 5  
(100-0)

86.7

TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)

86.7

RANKING

\_\_\_\_\_

PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to  
Old Lake Mary Rd

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Neel-Schaffer, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: M. J. [Signature]

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

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

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)

Good UNDERSTANDING of Project

Jones HRS EXP W/ CRX R.R.

Score 75  
(100-0)

Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)

Pittman - Research Engr - 40 yrs  
Monroe - Insp - LMB exp  
Staff has good mix of experience

Score 78  
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

LMB, SR434 Access, GrandLine RD  
Other FDOT Projects

Score 75  
(100-0)

Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

Score (5)  
(100-0)

TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)

RANKING

77.15

11  
30.4  
23.4  
18.75  
5  
77.15

PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to  
Old Lake Mary Rd

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Parsons Brinckerhoff Construction Services, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: [Signature] 10/25/05

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

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

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)

went thru job ID, school issues

Score 75  
(100-0)

Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)

LePore 15 yr  
FABISZAK 19 yr  
Godsman 24 yr  
Hysle 29 yr

Score 85  
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

SR 60A, SR 207 D-2, ORANGE AVE - LEON CO.  
↳ 24m CONCR #

Score 80  
(100-0)

Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

Score 5  
(100-0)

TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)

80.5

RANKING

\_\_\_\_\_

30  
25.5  
20  
5  
80.5

PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to  
Old Lake Mary Rd

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Reynolds, Smith and Hills CS, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: NKC 10/25/05

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

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)

Reviewed Proposal in some detail  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Score 78  
(100-0)

31.2

Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)

Joe St. 36+  
Hollister 18  
Indel?  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Score 82  
(100-0)

24.6

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

ReDBug II, LNBH Montbony, Eon/Hig  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Score 78  
(100-0)

19.5  
75.3  
5

Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Score 5  
(100-0)

TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)

80.3

RANKING

\_\_\_\_\_

PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to  
Old Lake Mary Rd

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Volkert Construction Services, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: MWR

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

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

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)

Carefully visited site, w/ photos

Score 86  
(100-0)

34.4

Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)

CHANDLER 35  
HANLEY 0  
DAVIS 26  
HARKE

Score 85  
(100-0)

25.5

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

I-75 Manatee  
SR 544 Polk  
SP 9 WALTON CO.

Score 78  
(100-0)

19.5

Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

Score 5  
(100-0)

79.4

5  
84.4

TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)

84.4

RANKING

\_\_\_\_\_



**PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to Old Lake Mary Rd**

**SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME:** CPH Engineers, Inc.

**QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER:** Bill Glennon

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

**Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.**

**Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)**

Approach was on general side  
need more detail

**Score** 30  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)**

good team - FDOT Cert

**Score** 19  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)**

Needs more FDOT experience

**Score** 10  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)**

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

Seminole

**Score** 5  
(100-0)

**TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)**

72

**RANKING**

\_\_\_\_\_

**PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to  
Old Lake Mary Rd**

**SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME:** Dick Corporation

**QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER:** Bill Glennon

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

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

**Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.**

**Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)**

too general  
poor

**Score** 25  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)**

?

**Score** 15  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)**

No FDOT

**Score** 15  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)**

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

Jacksonville

**Score** 0  
(100-0)

**TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)**

55

**RANKING**

**PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to Old Lake Mary Rd**

**SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME:** Earth Tech Consulting, Inc.

**QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER:** Bill Glenney

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

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

**Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.**

**Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)**

Cool detail  
Outlined major points

**Score** 34  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)**

Strong Team  
well qualified

**Score** 28  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)**

A lot of County experience

**Score** 25  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)**

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

Orlando

**Score** 5  
(100-0)

**TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)**

92

**RANKING**

\_\_\_\_\_

**PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to Old Lake Mary Rd**

**SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME:** HDR Construction Control, Inc.

**QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER:** Bill Glennon

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

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

**Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.**

**Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)**

Excellent proposal  
subsu. /  
utilizes

**Score** 38  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)**

Very experience Project Engineer  
strong team  
strong FDOT experience

**Score** 28  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)**

Excellent  
FDOT & County

**Score** 25  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)**

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

Orlando

**Score** 5  
(100-0)

**TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)**

96

**RANKING**

**PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to Old Lake Mary Rd**

**SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME:** JEA Construction Engineering Services, Inc.

**QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER:** Bill Gleason

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

**Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.**

**Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)**

Good proposal

**Score** 37  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)**

Strong Team  
Both County & FDOT Experience  
Strong Senior

**Score** 28  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)**

Good County & FDOT Experience

**Score** 23  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)**

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

Orlando

**Score** 5  
(100-0)

**TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)**

93

**RANKING**

\_\_\_\_\_

**PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to Old Lake Mary Rd**

**SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME:** Neel-Schaffer, Inc.

**QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER:** Bill Glennan

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

**Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.**

**Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)**

proposal was too generic  
need more detail

**Score** 30  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)**

Good Inspector  
Management need more FDOT experience

**Score** 22  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)**

Lack of exp experience

**Score** 17  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)**

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

Orlando / Maitland

**Score** 5  
(100-0)

**TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)**

74

**RANKING**

\_\_\_\_\_

**PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to Old Lake Mary Rd**

**SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME:** Parsons Brinckerhoff Construction Services, Inc.

**QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER:** Bill Glannon

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

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

**Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.**

**Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)**

Too general  
Vague

Score 28  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)**

Lack of experience

Score 20  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)**

PBCS has done past projects with County  
Good PWT experience

Score 20  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)**

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

Orlando

Score 5  
(100-0)

**TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)**

73

**RANKING**

\_\_\_\_\_

**PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to Old Lake Mary Rd**

**SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME:** Reynolds, Smith and Hills CS, Inc.

**QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER:** Bill Coleman

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

**Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.**

**Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)**

Good proposal

**Score** 37  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)**

Inspector staff is good

**Score** 22  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)**

Port County & FDOT experience

**Score** 23  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)**

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

Orlando

**Score** 5  
(100-0)

**TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)**

97

**RANKING**



**PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to Old Lake Mary Rd**

**SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME:** Volkert Construction Services, Inc.

**QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER:** Bill Glenn

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

**Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.**

**Criteria: Approach to Project / Understanding the Project (40%)**

Good proposal

**Score** 33  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)**

Need more FDOT experience

**Score** 22  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)**

FDOT no County work

**Score** 18  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Location of Firm (5%)**

(Firms located within the counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive 5pts for location. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 pts).

Orlando

**Score** 5  
(100-0)

**TOTAL SCORE (100 Points)**

78

**RANKING**

**PRESENTATION RANKINGS**

**PS-0123-05/DRR- CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III CR15 Country Club to Old Lake Mary Rd**

	M. Flomerfelt	B. Glennon	G. Johnson	S. Krug	J. McCollum	TOTAL POINTS	RANKING
EARTH TECH CONSULTING INC.	2	3	1	3	2	11	2
HDR CONSTRUCTION CONTROL, INC	1	1	2	1	1	6	1
JEA CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING SERVICES, INC	3	2	3	2	3	13	3

**The Evaluation Committee recommends award to the top ranked firm:**

**HDR Construction Control, Inc.**




Mark Flomerfelt




Bill Glennon



Gary Johnson



Jerry McCollum



Steve Krug

PRESENTATION

PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to Old Lake Mary Rd

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: EARTH TECH CONSULTING, INC.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Gary Johnson

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

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

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Project Approach including Innovative Ideas (60%)

Emphasis on coordination & safety, public information, business access  
Recognized "split" project, CSX, traffic (detour) issues  
Innovations - digital video, concerns w/elliptical conc. pipe  
Infiltration traffic - off duty corp, temporary spd. bumper  
High ground water - add borings, geotech report to bid pkg.  
Score 90 54  
(100-0)

Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)

Extensive sc/Const. experience  
Multiple certifications  
Score 100 30  
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (10%)

Multiple SC projects, CR 427 three phases  
> 50 yrs total sc experience, last 13 years  
Red Bug, Snowhill bridge  
Score 100 10  
(100-0)

TOTAL SCORE (100-0 Points) 94

RANKING 1

PRESENTATION

PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to Old Lake Mary Rd

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: HDR CONSTRUCTION CONTROL, INC.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Gary Johnson

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

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

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Project Approach including Innovative Ideas (60%)

2 Key Issues: CSX RR Xing - good understanding of coord/sched. issues  
Utilities - 90% relocated, but Sanford plans unclear  
- stormwater coord. w/ Airport Rd  
ERP - permit expires in May '06

Score 90  
(100-0)

54

Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)

Adequate

Score 90  
(100-0)

27

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (10%)

SR 417/46A interchange  
CEI on 3 signalized RR Xings in Pasco Cty.  
Dodd Rd. - eliminated \$120K claim

Score 100  
(100-0)

10

TOTAL SCORE (100-0 Points)

91

RANKING

2

## PRESENTATION

PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to Old Lake Mary Rd

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: JEA CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING SERVICES

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Gary Johnson

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

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

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Project Approach including Innovative Ideas (60%)

Marnage analogy - comprehensive approach, ties to Airport Blvd.  
Recognized high water table, special permit requirements  
Detailed constructability review, Innovation - One office for QA + Elder Ck.  
Public Information - 24" WM dewatering alternative

Score 80 48  
(100-0)

Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)

45 CEI staff, certifications  
Dist 5 CEI  
~~SC - East Lake Brantley, SR 46A Ph. I + II~~

Score 100 30  
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (10%)

CR 46A, Ph. II (Wong)  
SC - East Lake Brantley, SR 46A I + II

Score 100 10  
(100-0)

TOTAL SCORE (100-0 Points)

88

RANKING

3

PRESENTATION

PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to  
Old Lake Mary Rd

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: EARTH TECH CONSULTING, INC.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Mark Flomenberg 11/22/05

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

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

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Project Approach including Innovative Ideas (60%)

MADE EXPLANATION - NEED TO REVIEW / POND 1 REVISIONS  
PROJECT SAFETY - FMPs - SCHOOL KIDS & PROJECT  
CLAIMS PREVENTION - CONSTRUCTION / RELATIONS / POLS  
SIMILAR PROJECT SPLIT / TEMP SW AS NEEDED FOR KIDS  
ACCESS TO -  
ABC & PLANS SAVE TIME / CSX CROSSING DETOUR GOOD  
KNOCKING ON DOORS - SCHOOL / CHASS  
BUSINESS OWNERS / TOM - STATEWIDE GO-ARMS  
Score 95 (100-0)

Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)

DAVE SMITH - SA INSP  
BROWN SUMERS -

DAVE COOSON - REVIEWED

Score 87  
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (10%)

3 Prior CSX PROJECTS

JOHN CANTRELL / CSX

Score 88  
(100-0)

DIVISION VIDEO / GPS LOCATE POND  
CONS\*

TOTAL SCORE (100-0 Points)

85.9

RANKING

2

PRESENTATION

PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to Old Lake Mary Rd

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: HDR CONSTRUCTION CONTROL, INC.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: [Signature] 11/22/05

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

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

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Project Approach including Innovative Ideas (60%)

CSX - scheme w/ CSX - worked w/ RRR from 6-blade  
Floman) needs / 5306  
West side / east side lot of Relocation  
\* Late start MISTAKE DATE -  
Plan utility contacts - Sanford uneasy w/ Relocate  
HDR is ever for CSX crossing  
size street issue / Doing Daily Inspection (100-0)  
Score 89

Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)

Dean - Proj Appr / Team DID CEI for Expsy  
Randy - SR Insp  
Seneca - Resident  
Plan work w/ SJWMA  
ERP May 2001  
Score 89  
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (10%)

DOOD ROAD / CEI for Expsy  
CEI on Franklin St for OLECO

Business Sions

Wayway for PDS / most KMS Bussed  
ADVANCE WARNING of CSX WORK  
Score 92  
(100-0)

TOTAL SCORE (100-0 Points)

89

RANKING

1

PRESENTATION

PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to Old Lake Mary Rd

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: JEA CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING SERVICES

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: [Signature] 11/22/08

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

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

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Project Approach including Innovative Ideas (60%)

Teamwork to avoid conflicts - Look ahead  
→ SUGGESTION - 1 COX TIE IN - 3-5 PM CLOSING  
DETAILS OF PLANS - QUESTIONS NOTED  
REDUCE AMOUNT OF COSTS  
TEMP/ASE - VS sheet pile work

Score 84  
(100-0)

Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)

Jamal - Presider  
Austin - Sr Insp  
Donna - PIO/ADMIN  
Debbie - Insp  
Sheepers

Score 85  
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (10%)

ELDER RD POND  
46A PHASE II & I  
EAST LK Bentley

Score 86  
(100-0)

TOTAL SCORE (100-0 Points)

RANKING

84.6

3



PRESENTATION

PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to Old Lake Mary Rd

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: EARTH TECH CONSULTING, INC.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Jerry McCollum

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

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

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Project Approach including Innovative Ideas (60%)

*Innovative ideas, out-of-the-box, cost savings, CD prep, material comp*  
Maint. current sidewalk, MTU for pipe crossings  
minor side streets, Use ACB at RR crossing. Rerouting  
of tracks for RR crossing. P.I. issues.  
Rainbar impacts and drawings. Muck issues.  
Revise plans for dirt on ramp pit.  
Very detailed - Very good  
water table issues.

Score 85  
(100-0)

51.0

Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)

Very experienced team with  
numerous previous Co. projects  
Very good

Score 82  
(100-0)

24.6

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (10%)

Various Co. projects  
Very good

Score 82  
(100-0)

8.2

TOTAL SCORE (100-0 Points)

83.8

RANKING

(2)

PRESENTATION

PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to Old Lake Mary Rd

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: HDR CONSTRUCTION CONTROL, INC.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Jerry McCollum

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

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

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Project Approach including Innovative Ideas (60%)

Key Issues: RR, MOT, Utilities, Env (Erosion)  
CSX - 13 trains / day. Have done 3 X's in past. Cont. Ins. + CSX Flyman  
S-306 structure. Util - How Sanford does? 20' line in  
How works - Need to fix (CPH now has plans). Eside utility issues.  
Drainage critical because at Airport Project. Late start date  
Very detailed on critical issues  
Excellent - Need renew permit  
Score 87 52.2  
(100-0)

Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)

Very experienced team did SR 417 / Dodd Rd  
Excellent job on Dodd Rd.  
Very good (+)  
Score 83 24.9  
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (10%)

Did work on XWAY at CR 46A at  
Dodd Rd.  
Very good (-)  
Score 80 8.0  
(100-0)

TOTAL SCORE (100-0 Points)

85.1

RANKING

①

Renew  
SJWMO  
permit

PRESENTATION

PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to Old Lake Mary Rd

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: JE A CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING SERVICES

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Jerry McCollum

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

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

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Project Approach including Innovative Ideas (60%)  
MSE vs. Sheet Piles, Innov. Reduce CEI - Elder Creek overlap  
Demolition

MUT - Lynx / School buses / ped. - drop offs / businesses

Wetlands - 4 areas - / High water table - Pond - Meet

Airport done, CSX crossing issues - Prange Structure

S-306 - Pay Flagston MUT Imp Sum

Quantities off / Pond 2 no Quantities - Milling resurf. issues

? No Signal @ V.H.W.

Very detailed, Very good

Score 85 51.0  
(100-0)

Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)

Very experienced. Very good, job on  
E. Lake Brantley

Score 82 24.6  
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (10%)

Elder Creek, E. Lake Brantley, Fox Co  
District 5 CEI

Very good (-)

Score 80  
(100-0)

TOTAL SCORE (100-0 Points)

83.6

RANKING

(3)

PRESENTATION

PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to  
Old Lake Mary Rd

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: EARTH TECH CONSULTING, INC.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: William M. Glennon

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

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

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Project Approach including Innovative Ideas (60%)

- Airport Boulevard coordination unheeded.  
- led access for students @ Edgewood Elem.  
- kitchen cost of CSX

Score 85  
(100-0)

Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)

Resident - Pine Garden  
Drum scales } 40 courses in CTQP  
Pan

Score 95  
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (10%)

Fl operator 30 years  
13 years w/ Seminole County  
Similar to Red Bay & Howell Branch  
3 previous projects with County.

Score 95  
(100-0)

TOTAL SCORE (100-0 Points)

RANKING

89  
3

## PRESENTATION

PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to  
Old Lake Mary Rd

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: HDR CONSTRUCTION CONTROL, INC.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: William M. Glennon

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

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

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Project Approach including Innovative Ideas (60%)

*13 train priority for King @ 60 MPH*  
*RR xing = 5306 regular round & stored shops, special Passmore, HDR Jacksonville GEC*  
*Utilities => City of Sanford Adj; flung not clear, expect new lines; a lot on east side also*  
*MOT => Late Start Milestone date for that side, No Road closures*  
*Environ Serv => ERI expires in May, Know Susan Davis*

*Item 2 No quantities*

Score 95  
(100-0)

Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)

*Dean Hillborn } Field*  
*Randy Smith } Field*  
*Long Sellers => Resident*

Score 95  
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (10%)

*3 major RR xing projects => both for Admin + Engrg.*  
*Paved Road => successful w/ difficult contractor*

Score 95  
(100-0)

TOTAL SCORE (100-0 Points)

95

RANKING

1

PRESENTATION

PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to  
Old Lake Mary Rd

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: JE A CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING SERVICES

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: William M. Glennon

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

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

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Project Approach including Innovative Ideas (60%)

MOT  
Wetland => 4 Wetland, Permit, Turbidity testing (2x per day)  
Constructability => Subsoil Ex test, lot 2 Ex not shown  
Utilities  
Innovative => Cost Savings w/ Elder Creek  
Coordinate w/ Airport / CEI  
CSX => construction prior, close road 3-5 days, Flagman, S-306  
Traffic Signal @ Vahlen Rd  
Score 90  
(100-0)

Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)

Jamnal => Resident  
Berry => Sr / Proj Admin  
Nancy => Office  
Score 90  
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (10%)

Nancy 96 + PHZ  
Berry => EUBrentley  
Jamnal => Elk Ranch  
Score 95  
(100-0)

TOTAL SCORE (100-0 Points)

RANKING

90.5

7

**PRESENTATION**  
**PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to Old Lake Mary Rd**

**SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME:** EARTH TECH CONSULTING, INC.

**QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER:** S. KRUG

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

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

**Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.**

**Criteria: Project Approach including Innovative Ideas (60%)**

CENTER OF COMMUNICATION FOR PROJECT  
QC. PROTECT SAFETY - PUBLIC, SCHOOLS, WORKERS  
CLAIMS AVOIDANCE, SIDEWALK, CSX REQUIREMENTS.  
SWPPP, WETLANDS, PUBLIC INFORMATION  
S-152/153 ROADWAY SHIFT?  
CORRECT CONST. ERRORS.  
SAFE UTILITIES?

Score 91  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)**

FDOT / ACI CERTS  
SEMI CO. EXPERIENCE - SEVERAL TRS.

Score 91  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (10%)**

SEVERAL SEM CO. PROJECTS.

Score 91  
(100-0)

**TOTAL SCORE (100-0 Points)**

91

**RANKING**

3

PRESENTATION

PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to Old Lake Mary Rd

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: HDR CONSTRUCTION CONTROL, INC.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: SKRUG

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

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

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Project Approach including Innovative Ideas (60%)

KEY ISSUES, RR, UTILITIES, MOT, SUPP#  
COX → EXPERIENCE 3-306 INSTALLATION.  
\* HDR IS GENERAL ENGINEERING CONSULTANT FOR COX \*  
UTILITIES: 90% RELOCATES COMPLETE, CITY OF SANF, CONTACTED.  
- LANE START MILESTONE DATE - EAST SIDE.  
MOT ✓, SCHOOL COORD. CLAIMS AVOIDANCE  
REVIEWED E.I.R.P FROM STRUND.  
STRUND CONTACTS ✓  
Score 95  
(100-0)

Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)

SEN CO PROJECTS:  
FAMILIAR W/ SITE, 417 CEI CREW  
  
  
  
Score 95  
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (10%)

- DODD RD.  
- EXPRESSWAY WORK  
- PASCO / VINNELLAS CO.  
  
  
Score 95  
(100-0)

TOTAL SCORE (100-0 Points)

95

RANKING

1



**PRESENTATION**

**PS-0123-05/DRR – CEI Services for CR 46A Phase III, CR 15 Country Club to Old Lake Mary Rd**

**SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: JEA CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING SERVICES**

**QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: S. KRUG.**

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

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

**Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.**

**Criteria: Project Approach including Innovative Ideas (60%)**

TEAMWORK - PARTNERING - PROACTIVE - NO SURPRISES  
REVIEWED SANFORD UTILITIES, CONSTRUCTABILITY REVIEW  
NOT - SAFETY, SCHOOLS, LYNX  
NPDES / SWPP, STRUWID REQUIREMENTS  
✓ COORDINATION CSX, AIRPORT BLVD. 5-306  
PUBLIC INFORMATION  
DEMUCKING @ 24" W.M.,

Score 93  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Project Team Qualifications (30%)**

SEN CO. PROJECTS  
FDOT CERTS.

Score 93  
(100-0)

**Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (10%)**

SEN CO. PROJECTS, FDOT WORK

Score 93  
(100-0)

**TOTAL SCORE (100-0 Points)**

**RANKING**

93

2

**CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING AND INSPECTION SERVICES AGREEMENT**  
**(PS-0123-05/DRR)**  
**C.R. 46A PHASE III, C.R. 15 COUNTRY CLUB ROAD TO OLD LAKE MARY ROAD**

**THIS AGREEMENT** is made and entered into this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_, by and between **HDR CONSTRUCTION CONTROL, INC.**, duly authorized to conduct business in the State of Florida, whose address is 315 E. Robinson Street, Suite 400, 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 construction engineering and inspection services for C.R. 46A Phase III, C.R. 15 Country Club Road to Old Lake Mary Road 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 construction engineering and inspection services to the COUNTY and desires to provide professional services according to the terms and conditions stated herein,

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

**SECTION 1. SERVICES.** The COUNTY does hereby retain the CONSULTANT to furnish professional services and perform those tasks as further described in the Scope of Services attached hereto as Exhibit "A" and made a part hereof. Required services shall be specifically enumerated, described and depicted in the Work Orders authorizing

performance of the specific project, task or study. This Agreement standing alone does not authorize the performance of any work or require the COUNTY to place any orders for work.

**SECTION 2. TERM.** This Agreement shall take effect on the date of its execution by the COUNTY and shall run for a period of two (2) years. 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. The total annual amount paid to the CONSULTANT pursuant to this Agreement, including reimbursable expenses, shall not exceed the annual amount budgeted by the COUNTY for construction engineering and inspection services for this project.

**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 Engineering Department  
520 W. Lake Mary Boulevard, Suite 200  
Sanford, Florida 32773

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

**SECTION 8. GENERAL TERMS OF PAYMENT AND BILLING.**

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

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

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

(d) The CONSULTANT agrees to maintain all books, documents, papers, accounting records and other evidences pertaining to work performed under this Agreement in such a manner as will readily conform to the terms of this Agreement and to make such materials available at the CONSULTANT'S office at all reasonable times during the Agreement period and for five (5) years from the date of final payment under the contract for audit or inspection as provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of this Section.

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

#### **SECTION 9. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CONSULTANT.**

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

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



with applicable law for any and all damages to the COUNTY caused by the CONSULTANT'S negligent or wrongful performance of any of the services furnished under this Agreement.

**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 Professional Liability insurance policy must either be on an occurrence basis, or, if a claims-made basis, the coverage must respond to all claims reported within three (3) years following the period for which coverage is required and which would have been covered had the coverage been on an occurrence basis.

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

#### **SECTION 20. ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION.**

(a) In the event of a dispute related to any performance or payment obligation arising under this Agreement, the parties agree to exhaust COUNTY protest procedures prior to filing suit or otherwise pursuing legal remedies. COUNTY procedures for proper invoice and payment disputes are set forth in Section 22.15, "Prompt Payment Procedures," Seminole County Administrative 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 protest procedures set forth in subsection (a) above of which the CONSULTANT had knowledge and failed to present during the COUNTY protest procedures.

(c) In the event that COUNTY protest 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:**

Engineering Department  
520 W. Lake Mary Boulevard, Suite 200  
Sanford, Florida 32773

**For CONSULTANT:**

HDR Construction Control, Inc.  
315 E. Robinson Street, Suite 400  
Orlando, Florida 32801

**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:

HDR CONSTRUCTION CONTROL, INC.

\_\_\_\_\_  
, Secretary

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
WILLIAM H. WADSWORTH, P.E.  
Sr. Vice-President

(CORPORATE SEAL)

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

ATTEST:

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
SEMINOLE COUNTY, FLORIDA

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

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
CARLTON HENLEY, Chairman

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

For use and reliance  
of Seminole County only.

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  
11/29/05  
ps-0123

3 Attachments:

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

## **EXHIBIT "A"**

### **CE&I SCOPE OF SERVICES**

#### **GENERAL**

It shall be the responsibility of the CONSULTANT to provide services as necessary to administer the construction contract in the manner so as to determine that the project is constructed in reasonable conformity with the plans, specifications and contract provisions.

#### **SURVEY CONTROL**

The CONSULTANT shall (1) make and record such measurements as are necessary to calculate and document quantities for items; and (2) perform incidental engineering surveys as may be necessary to carry out the services covered by the Agreement.

#### **TESTING**

The CONSULTANT, or approved subconsultant, shall perform sampling and testing of component materials and completed work items to the extent that will determine that the materials and workmanship incorporated into the project are in reasonable conformity with the plans, specifications and contract provisions.

Sampling, testing and laboratory methods shall be accomplished by the CONSULTANT as required by the Florida Department of Transportation Standard Specification or as modified by the contract provisions.

#### **CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING SERVICES**

The CONSULTANT shall perform management engineering services necessary:

(1) to assure that proper coordination of the activities of all parties involved will accomplish a complete project; (2) to maintain organized, complete, accurate records of all activities and events relating to the project; (3) to provide interpretations of the plans, specifications and contract provisions of a minor nature (Any other major interpretations that affect the integrity of the construction plans, specifications, and contract revisions, shall first be directed to the Design Consultant for their interpretations and recommendations); (4) to make recommendations to the COUNTY to resolve disputes which arise in relation to the construction contract; and

(5) to maintain an adequate level of surveillance of the Contractor's activities. The CONSULTANT shall also perform any other construction engineering services normally or customarily assigned to a Resident Engineer that are required to fulfill its responsibilities under this Agreement. Construction engineering services for this project shall include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following:

The CONSULTANT shall provide a resident project engineer and the requisite inspection staff to observe the Contractor's on-site construction operations as required or necessary to determine that quality of workmanship and materials is such that the project will be completed in reasonable conformity with the plans, specifications, and other contract provisions. The project site staff to be under the direction of a registered professional engineer (Resident Engineer).

Prior to the start of construction, the CONSULTANT shall assist the COUNTY in review of the bids received for construction of the project. The review shall consist of an overview of the bid prices received and the qualifications of the apparent, qualified low bidder.

The CONSULTANT shall maintain records of all significant activities and events relating to the project and estimates of all work completed by the Contractor. The CONSULTANT shall immediately report to the COUNTY apparent significant changes in quantity, time or cost as they are noted.

The CONSULTANT shall maintain a Project Control Schedule for the work. The CONSULTANT shall, on a regular basis, report the status to the COUNTY on all major items of work requested of the Construction Contractor reflected on the Project Control Schedule.

The CONSULTANT shall review the Construction Contractor's schedule in detail and submit a report to the COUNTY as well as meet with and discuss with the Construction Contractor during the schedule review and approval process, and any updates thereto. Any subsequent Construction Contractor requests for major activity or construction contract time extensions shall be reviewed by and commented on by the CONSULTANT. Project Control Schedule runs to review the results of Contractor requests and/or CONSULTANT recommended alternatives shall be performed by the CONSULTANT, as required.

The CONSULTANT shall maintain a log of materials entering into the work and utilized in the work with proper indication of the basis of acceptance of each shipment of material.

The CONSULTANT shall maintain records of all sampling and testing accomplished under this Agreement and analyze such records required to ascertain acceptability of material and completed work items.

The CONSULTANT shall meet with the Construction Contractor on no less than a weekly basis (depending upon actual level of activity and/or progress) for project coordination and problem resolution.

The CONSULTANT shall record minutes of each meeting and forward a copy to the Contractor and to the COUNTY with the engineer's summary weekly report. Included in the report shall be noted activities accomplished, production achieved and shall list and describe those scheduled activities which were not accomplished, and what activities/events were planned for the next week. The CONSULTANT shall list separately any quality control problems or impediments to the work that would normally be noted in the engineer's weekly summary report.

Once each month, the CONSULTANT shall prepare a tabulation of the quantity of each pay item satisfactorily completed to date. Quantities shall be based on daily records or calculations. Calculations shall be retained. The tabulation will be used for preparation of the monthly progress Estimate. The CONSULTANT shall submit the completed tabulation to the COUNTY.

Shop drawings and other submittals will be reviewed and approved by the CONSULTANT for conformance to the intent of the design concept of the project plans and specifications. Shop drawings/sample submittals and approvals shall be tracked by the CONSULTANT. Tracking shall include, but not be limited to, maintaining cognizance of the status of each submittal as it progresses through the review and approval process and procedures. The CONSULTANT shall actively encourage all reviewers to accomplish reviews promptly.



The CONSULTANT shall provide to the Contractor, interpretations of the plans, specifications and contract provisions. The CONSULTANT shall consult with the COUNTY when interpretation involves complex or otherwise significant issues or may have an impact on the cost of performing the Work. When warranted by the COUNTY, the COUNTY shall request an interpretation from the Design Consultant prior to any major changes of the plans specifications and contract revisions being clarified to the Contractor by the CEI Consultant. The COUNTY shall coordinate all requests for involvement of the Design Consultant.

The CONSULTANT shall analyze any and all problems that arise on the project and proposals submitted by the Contractor and shall prepare and submit a recommendation to the COUNTY.

The CONSULTANT shall analyze changes to the plans, specifications or contract provisions and extra work which appear to be necessary to carry out the intent of the contract when it is determined that a change or extra work is necessary and such work is clearly within the scope of the original contract. The CONSULTANT shall recommend such changes to the COUNTY for approval/disapproval.

When it is determined that a modification to the original contract for the project is required due to necessary change in the character of the Work, the CONSULTANT shall negotiate prices with the Contractor and prepare and submit for approval/disapproval by the COUNTY a Supplemental Agreement or change order.

In the event that the Contractor for a project submits a claim for additional compensation, the CONSULTANT shall analyze the submittal and prepare a recommendation to the COUNTY covering and analyzing the validity and reasonableness of the charges and shall conduct negotiations leading to a recommendation for settlement of the claim.

In the event that the Contractor submits a request for extension of the allowable contract time, the CONSULTANT shall analyze the request and prepare a recommendation to the COUNTY covering the accuracy of statement and the actual effect of the delay on the completion of the controlling work items and the costs to the COUNTY.

The CONSULTANT shall prepare and submit to the COUNTY for further processing a final estimate and two (2) sets of record plans for the construction contract.

The CONSULTANT shall monitor the construction contract to the extent necessary to observe construction activities in order to verify general compliance with the requirements of permits. The COUNTY will provide the CONSULTANT with a copy of each permit within the project limits.

Upon identification of a prospective changed condition or construction contract change, the extent of change shall be analyzed by the CONSULTANT and in order of magnitude estimate of cost and time of change, if any, will be prepared by the CONSULTANT.

The CONSULTANT shall negotiate all changes with the Contractor using the CONSULTANT - prepared estimate as a basis. The CONSULTANT shall submit the results to the COUNTY within two (2) weeks of start of negotiations or report the major differences to the COUNTY, if agreement is not reached. The CONSULTANT shall prepare supplement and change order documents and track the status of each one until executed.

#### **PERSONNEL**

The CONSULTANT shall provide an agreed upon number of qualified personnel to effectively carry out its responsibilities under this Agreement. The CONSULTANT shall utilize only competent personnel who are qualified by experience and education.

### **STAFFING**

The CONSULTANT shall maintain an appropriate staff after completion of construction to complete the final Estimate and Record Plans. No personnel other than those designated herewith, shall be assigned to the project by the CONSULTANT unless authorized by the COUNTY.

Construction engineering and inspection forces shall be required to be retained by or under contract to the CONSULTANT at all times while the Contractor is working on the construction contract. If the construction contract is suspended, the CONSULTANTS forces shall be adjusted, to correspond with the type of suspension; provided, however, that no member of the CONSULTANT'S forces shall be deemed to be a COUNTY employee.

### **PHOTOGRAPHS**

The CONSULTANT shall take and submit two (2) prints of each progress photograph taken each month. Views and timing of photographs shall be to show maximum progress. Photographs shall be clean, sharp and clearly show details. Photographs shall be submitted in sets with each photograph numbered in sequence beginning with the numeral one (1). Photographs shall be enclosed in a clear plastic protector punched to fit a standard 8 1/2-inch by 11-inch three-ring binder. The CONSULTANT shall provide monthly aerial photos of the project.

### **OTHER SERVICES**

The CONSULTANT shall upon written authorization by the COUNTY, perform any additional services not otherwise identified in this Agreement as may be required by the COUNTY in connection with the project. The following items are not included as part of this Agreement, but may be required of the CONSULTANT by the COUNTY to supplement the CONSULTANT'S services under this Agreement:

- (1) The CONSULTANT shall, upon review, approval and written authorization by the COUNTY, make such changes and revisions to the plans and specifications as may be required in order to complete the construction activities.
- (2) The CONSULTANT shall, upon written request by the COUNTY, assist the COUNTY in preparing for arbitration hearings, or litigation that occurs during the

CONSULTANT'S contract time in connection with the project covered by the Agreement.

- (3) The CONSULTANT shall, upon written request by the COUNTY, provide qualified engineers and/or engineering witnesses, provide exhibits and otherwise assist the COUNTY in any litigation or hearings in connection with the construction contract(s).
- (4) The CONSULTANT shall, upon written request by the COUNTY, provide overall program project control schedules for the purposes of assisting the COUNTY in overall planning and scheduling of construction projects.
- (5) The CONSULTANT shall, upon written request by the COUNTY, provide project cost and cash flow analysis services to assist the COUNTY with overall program financial management of the COUNTY'S proposed road construction/improvement program.
- (6) The COUNTY agrees to compensate the CONSULTANT for authorized additional services not included in this Agreement as a supplement to the basic fee for CE&I services. The amount of such fee and the specific scope of services will be negotiated prior to the CONSULTANT providing such additional services.

**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: \_\_\_\_\_

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

\_\_\_\_\_, President

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

**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.

EXHIBIT C

RATE SCHEDULE

## Truth in Negotiations Certificate

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

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

Firm \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Title \_\_\_\_\_

Date of execution\*\*\* \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

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

(End of certificate)