SUBJECT: **DESIGN BUILD SERVICES MONCRIEF COMMUNITY CENTER**

BID # **CDB-0638-19** OPEN DATE: **2019-09-25**

COMPETITIVE SEALED PROPOSAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE

KIND AND BASIS OF CONTRACT:
CONSTRUCTION – DESIGN/BUILD- PRE-QUALIFICATIONS

AGENCY: **DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS**

BASIS OF AWARD: **EVALUATION CRITERIA**

NUMBER OF BIDS INVITED: 4 NUMBER RECEIVED: 2 OTHER: 1

SUMMARY OF BIDS AND RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:

Subject bid was approved on 10/10/19 to proceed with evaluation of two proposals received from Acon Construction Co., Inc, and Core Construction Company.

The two proposals received were found to be responsive, interested and qualified and available to provide the services required by the RFP, below are the scores and ranking:

1) Acon Construction Co., Inc- 46.50
2) Core Construction Company- 27.00

Pursuant to Section 2.6- Award of Contract of RFP, recommend approval to move forward with presentation/interviews before CSPEC at next meeting.

Attachments: Recommendation Memo, Scoring Matrix, Section 2.6, Previous Award

ANALYST Marilyn Laidler
MARILYN LAIDLER

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED
GREGORY PEASE, CHIEF
PROCUREMENT DIVISION

CONCURRENCE BY: **Robin G. Smith, P.E., Chief, Engineering and Construction Mgmt./ Tom Daly, Chief, Housing & Community Development**

(ALL AWARD ACTIONS SUBJECT TO LAWFULLY APPROPRIATED FUNDS)
ACTION OF CSPEC COMMITTEE ON RECOMMENDATIONS ABOVE

MEMBERS APPROVING_____ MEMBERS DISAPPROVING_____ DATE:_____

_____ _____ OTHER_____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

ACTION OF AWARDING AUTHORITY DATE _____

APPROVED_____ DISAPPROVED: _____

OTHER: _____

SIGNATURE OF AUTHENTICATION _____

City of Jacksonville, Florida

Lenny Curry, Mayor

Department of Public Works
Engineering & Construction Management Division
214 N. Hogan Street, 10th Floor
Jacksonville, FL 32202
(904) 255-8762
www.coj.net

ONE CITY. ONE JACKSONVILLE

November 04, 2019

TO: Gregory W. Pease
Chief of Procurement

FROM: John P. Pappas, P.E.
Director

SUBJECT: RFP CDB-0638-19 D/B Moncrief Community Center – CSPEC-Presentation

The two submittals received from the City's request for Proposals (RFP) have been reviewed and ranked. In accordance with the RFP requirements, oral interviews are to take place in front of the Evaluation Committee and under the observation of CSPEC. We anticipate needing twenty minutes for each Design Build Firm (Acon Construction and Core Construction) presentation.

The evaluation committee for this proposal is as follows:

William J. Joyce, P.E., Director of Operations, Department of Public Works
Robin G. Smith, P.E., Chief, Engineering and Construction management.

Accordingly, we request your approval to schedule the oral interviews Moncrief Community center

Please contact me for any questions.

JPP/mcw

ab

Bid: CDB-0638-19 DESIGN BUILD SERVICES FOR MONCRIEF COMMUNITY CENTER

Contractor Names		COMPLIANCE WITH DESIGN CRITERIA PACKAGE (INCLUDING EXPLANATION OR DEMOSTRATION OF APPROACH AND UNDERSTANDING OF THE PROJECT)	QUALIFICATIONS (INCULDING EXPLANATION OR DEMOSTRATION OF AVAILABILITY, PAST WORK OF THE FIRMS, INCLUDING PARTNERS OR MEMBERS)	BONDING, INSURANCE AND FINANCIAL CAPCITY	PROJECT SCHEDULE AND ABILITY TO PROVIDE DESIGN-BUILD SERVICES	TOTAL POINTS	Average
Acon Construction Co. Inc	Bill Joyce	4	18	5	20	47	46.50
	Robin G. Smith	3	18	5	20	46	
						0	
Core Construction Company	Bill Joyce	3	17	4	3	27	27.00
	Robin G. Smith	2	18	4	3	27	
						0	
							#DIV/0!

Reviewer #1

EVALUATION CRITERIA

TITLE:	DESIGN BUILD SERVICES FOR MONCRIEF COMMUNITY CENTER	ACON CONSTRUCTOIN	
BID NO.	CDB-0638-19 (PW)		
OPEN DATE:	SEPTEMBER 25, 2019 @ 2:00 PM		
BUYER:	MARILYN LAIDLER, PURCHASING ANALYST		
GRADER:	BILL JOYCE Bill Joyce		
ITEM	DESCRIPTION	QUANTITY	POINTS
	FIRST PHASE- QUALIFICATIONS (PART 1)		EARNED
3.1	COMPLIANCE WITH DESIGN CRITERIA PACKAGE (INCLUDING EXPLANATION OR DEMOSTRATION OF APPROACH AND UNDERSTANDING OF THE PROJECT).	5	4
3.2	QUALIFICATIONS (INCLUDING EXPLANATION OR DEMOSTRATION OF AVAILABILITY, PAST WORK OF THE FIRMS, INCLUDING PARTNERS OR MEMBERS).	20	18
3.3	BONDING, INSURANCE AND FINANCIAL CAPACITY	5	5
3.4	PROJECT SCHEDULE AND ABILITY TO PROVIDE DESIGN-BUILD SERVICES	20	20
3.5	INTERVIEWS/PRESENTATION	10	
	SECTION 3		
1	SECTION 3 ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES PLAN	5	
2	TABLE A- PREFERENCE OF SECTION 3 BUSINESS CONCERNS - CAT 1,2 & 3	17	
3	TABLE B- PREFERENCE FOR TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT- CAT 1, 2 & 3	16	
	JSEB PROGRAM	2	
	TOTAL POINTS		

Reviewer #1

EVALUATION CRITERIA

TITLE:	DESIGN BUILD SERVICES FOR MONCRIEF COMMUNITY CENTER	Core Construction Company	
BID NO.	CDB-0638-19 (PW)		
OPEN DATE:	SEPTEMBER 25, 2019 @ 2:00 PM		
BUYER:	MARILYN LAIDLER, PURCHASING ANALYST		
GRADER:	BILL JOYCE Bill Joyce		
ITEM	DESCRIPTION	QUANTITY	POINTS
	FIRST PHASE- QUALIFICATIONS (PART 1)		EARNED
3.1	COMPLIANCE WITH DESIGN CRITERIA PACKAGE (INCLUDING EXPLANATION OR DEMOSTRATION OF APPROACH AND UNDERSTANDING OF THE PROJECT).	5	3
3.2	QUALIFICATIONS (INCLUDING EXPLANATION OR DEMOSTRATION OF AVAILABILITY, PAST WORK OF THE FIRMS, INCLUDING PARTNERS OR MEMBERS).	20	17
3.3	BONDING, INSURANCE AND FINANCIAL CAPACITY	5	4
3.4	PROJECT SCHEDULE AND ABILITY TO PROVIDE DESIGN-BUILD SERVICES	20	3
3.5	INTERVIEWS/PRESENTATION	10	
	SECTION 3		
1	SECTION 3 ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES PLAN	5	
2	TABLE A- PREFERENCE OF SECTION 3 BUSINESS CONCERNS - CAT 1,2 & 3	17	
3	TABLE B- PREFERENCE FOR TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT- CAT 1, 2 & 3	16	
	JSEB PROGRAM	2	
	TOTAL POINTS		

EVALUATION CRITERIA

TITLE:	DESIGN BUILD SERVICES FOR MONCRIEF COMMUNITY CENTER		Acon Construction Co. Inc.	CORE Construction Company
BID NO.	CDB-0638-19 (PW)			
OPEN DATE:	SEPTEMBER 25, 2019 @ 2:00 PM			
BUYER:	MARILYN LAIDLER, PURCHASING ANALYST			
ITEM	DESCRIPTION	POINTS		
	FIRST PHASE- QUALIFICATIONS (PART 1)			
3.1	COMPLIANCE WITH DESIGN CRITERIA PACKAGE (INCLUDING EXPLANATION OR DEMOSTRATION OF APPROACH AND UNDERSTANDING OF THE PROJECT).	5	3	2
3.2	QUALIFICATIONS (INCLUDING EXPLANATION OR DEMOSTRATION OF AVAILABILITY, PAST WORK OF THE FIRMS, INCLUDING PARTNERS OR MEMBERS).	20	18	18
3.3	BONDING, INSURANCE AND FINANCIAL CAPACITY	5	5	4
3.4	PROJECT SCHEDULE AND ABILITY TO PROVIDE DESIGN-BUILD SERVICES	20	20	3
3.5	INTERVIEWS/PRESENTATION	10		
	SECTION 3			
1	SECTION 3 ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES PLAN	5		
2	TABLE A- PREFERENCE OF SECTION 3 BUSINESS CONCERNS - CAT 1,2 & 3	17		
3	TABLE B- PREFERENCE FOR TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT- CAT 1, 2 & 3	16		
	JSEB PROGRAM	2		
	TOTAL POINTS	100	46	27

Reviewer #2

6) The Proposer shall obtain any necessary permits or permit modifications not already provided.

2.6 Award of Design-Build Contract.

A. The process for contract award is set forth in Section 287.055, Florida Statutes, and Jacksonville Ordinance Code Chapter 126, Part 7. Generally, City will evaluate, select and rank, based on the highest to lowest evaluation score, Design-Build Firms determined based on the evaluation to the most qualified and advantageous to the City. Interviews will be conducted as part of the evaluation process as set forth in the evaluation criteria. The relative importance (i.e., maximum scoring points) assigned to the Evaluation Criteria is set forth on Attachment B.

B. Section 3 submittal forms including, Tables A and Table B, Section 3 Business Application Certification Form (To be completed by both the Contractor and Sub-contractors), Letters of Intent, Section 3 Economic Opportunities Plan, Appendix "A", List of Subcontractors and Shop Fabricators, Training and Apprenticeship Program Memo in accordance with 24 CFR, Part 135 will be used for Section 3 Evaluation Criteria.

C. Once the City has ranked the Firms, the City will open the sealed Pricing Proposal of the three top ranked DB Firms meeting the minimum qualifications and the Section 3 Criteria. Based upon the Pricing Proposal only, the City will again rank the Firms with the lowest priced DB Firm ranked first, second lowest ranked second and so on. The price shall be established based upon the Bid Price Proposal as described on FORM 1 "Bid Price Proposal Form". Once the price rankings are completed, the CSPEC will forward their recommendation of rankings (first, second, and third ranked DB Firms) to the Mayor's Office for approval.

D. The City may make an award within sixty (60) days after the date of the Responses are due, during which period the Responses shall remain firm and shall not be withdrawn. Any Response that expresses a shorter duration may, in City's sole discretion, be accepted or rejected. If award is not made within sixty (60) days, the Response shall remain firm until either the Contract is awarded or City receives from Contractor written notice that the Response is withdrawn. [Note: Withdrawal of a Response may be requested within 72 hours (excluding State holidays, Saturdays and Sundays) after the date and time Responses are due. City will not accept an amended Response after the date and time Responses are due.]

E. Except as may otherwise be expressly set forth in the RFP, City intends to award one contract, but reserves the right to enter into a contract with multiple Contractors or to reject all Responses.

F. Based on the evaluation results, City shall electronically post a notice of intended award at City's website. Please contact the Contact Person if you are uncertain of City's website address or if you experience problems accessing it. Any person who is adversely affected by the decision shall file with City a notice of protest in accordance with the Protest provisions of the RFP. City does not intend to provide tabulations or notices of award by telephone.

2.7 **Terms of Agreement.** After award to the successful Contractor, City and Contractor will promptly enter into a written agreement (the "Contract") incorporating the terms of the RFP, the successful Response, and other terms and conditions as may be agreed to between the parties. To the extent the Response contains exceptions to or modifications of the RFP, such exceptions or modifications are stricken unless City affirmatively accepts the exceptions or modifications in the Contract. The Contract will be substantially in the form set forth in Form 5 to the RFP, subject to additional modifications required by the City's Office of General Counsel to further the City's purpose of this RFP. City will not be obligated to pay Contractor for the RFP services until the Contract is signed by both parties. City retains the right to reject all bids and/or amend its notice of award at any time prior to the full execution of the Contract.

PROCUREMENT DIVISION

ONE CITY. ONE JACKSONVILLE

ADDENDUM NO.	**ONE (1)**
BID NUMBER	**CDB-0638-19**
TITLE OF BID	**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) – DESIGN-BUILD SERVICES - MONCRIEF COMMUNITY CENTER**
OPENING TIME AND DATE	**2:00 P.M.; September 25th, 2019**

THIS ADDENDUM IS ISSUED FOR THE INFORMATION OF BIDDERS ON THE ABOVE TITLED PROJECT AND WILL BE PART OF THE CONTRACT.

THE PURPOSE OF THIS ADDENDUM IS TO CORRECT THE RFP:

1. Replace the Table of Contents of Appendix "A" (Section 3 and other Federal Requirements) with the enclosed Table of Contents.
2. **CLARIFICATION:** The SOQ grading for the Shortlisted Respondents must have 45 points minimum (75% of the SOQ 60 points max.).
3. **CORRECTIONS:**
   - The Evaluation Criteria summary is included at the "beginning" of Attachment B instead of at the "end" of Attachment "B" indicated in Section 2.5.A (Page 9).
   - Delete "1st Permit Submittal" requirement for 60% Plans (Page 39). Also, only 11"x17" sets of plans are needed for the 60% plan submittal.
   - Five (5) 24"x 36" sets of plans shall be submitted with the construction plan submittal (in addition to the two (2) 11" x 17" sets indicated on Page 40). Also, 7 specification books are required.
   - The DB Firm is responsible for all the copies of the plans and specification needed for any required permits.
4. Replace Exhibit 11 GMP format, with the attached revised Exhibit 11. PDF and Excel formats of Exhibit 11 are provided in this addendum.

DATE: September 12, 2019 BUYER: MARILYN LAIDLER (ML)

RECEIPT ACKNOWLEDGED BY RETURN OF SIGNED COPY WITH BID.

Bidder's Signature

Title

Company

Date

3) Two (2) digital scanned copies (in pdf format) of entire Response, on a separate CD- ROM or flash drive. Large files may be scanned as several separate PDF files.

4) One (1) REDACTED scanned copy of the Response (if necessary pursuant to Section 2.12). This copy should be marked "Confidential – Trade Secret" or something comparable to alert the reader of Bidder's claim of a public records exemption.

All copies are to be placed in a sealed package. The outside must be marked with (i) the RFP title and number, and (ii) Bidder's name, address, contact person, and telephone number.

It is the sole responsibility of each Bidder to ensure all copies are EXACT duplicates of the original Response. Photocopies or CD copies will be used for the purpose of evaluating the Responses. Any information contained in the original Response which has not been transferred to the CDs or photocopies will NOT be considered. The original document will be used solely for official record keeping and auditing purposes.

2.5 Evaluation of Statement of Qualifications.

A. The RFP responses will be ranked by the City based on:

- The Evaluation Criteria contained in Attachment B according to F.S. 287.055 and City Ordinance Code Chapter 126 (60%). A summary of the Evaluation Criteria (including Section 3) is included at the end of Attachment B.
- Section 3 Compliance contained in Appendix "A" (40%)

B. Before making an award, City reserves the right to seek clarifications, revisions, and information it deems necessary for the proper evaluation of Responses. Failure to provide any requested clarifications, revisions or information may result in rejection of the Response.

C. City reserves the right to accept or reject any and all Responses, or separable portions thereof, and to waive any minor irregularity, technicality, or omission if City determines that doing so will serve City's best interests. City may reject any Response not submitted in the manner specified by the RFP.

D. The City may waive minor informalities or irregularities in Proposals received where such is merely a matter of form and not substance, and the correction or waiver of which is not prejudicial to other Proposers. Minor irregularities are defined as those that will not have an adverse effect on the City's interest and will not affect the Price of the Proposals by giving a Proposer an advantage or benefit not enjoyed by other Proposers.

1) Any design submittals that are part of a Proposal shall be deemed preliminary only.

2) Preliminary design submittals may vary from the requirements of the Design and Construction Criteria.

3) In no event will any such elections by the City be deemed to be a waiving of the Design and Construction Criteria.

4) The Proposer who is selected for the Project will be required to fully comply with the Design and Construction Criteria for the Price Bid, regardless that the Proposal may have been based on a variation from the Design and Construction Criteria.

5) Proposers shall identify separately all innovative aspects as such in the SOQ Response. An innovative aspect does not include revisions to specifications or established City policies. Innovation should be limited to Design-Build Firm's means and methods, roadway alignments, approach to Project, use of new products, new uses for established products, etc.

Attachment B- Evaluation Criteria

A. SUMMARY:

This is a two-phase design-build selection process (TPSP) with CDBG funding. The following is a Summary for each phase:

1. FIRST PHASE – QUALIFICATIONS

SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

- **ATTACHMENT A- RESPONSE FORMAT:**
  1. Cover Letter
  2. Required Forms
  3. Proof of Minimum Requirements
  4. Statement of Qualification (SOQ) - Attachments A & B

- **SECTION 3**
  1. Section 3 IFB Submittal Form
  2. Section 3 Resident Preference Claim
  3. Table A and Table B
  4. Section 3 Business Application Certification Form
  5. Letters of Intent
  6. Conflict of Interest
  7. Section 3 Economic Opportunities Plan
  8. List of Subcontractors and Shop Fabricators
  9. Business Employees List
  10. Training and Apprenticeship Program Memo

GRADING CRITERIA:

- **SOQ - Max 60 Points and 30 Pages (See SOQ Response)**
  1. Compliance with DCP – **5 Points, 10 Pages**
  2. Qualifications – **20 Points, 10 Pages**
  3. Bonding, Insurance and Financial Capacity – **5 Points, 5 Pages**
  4. Project Schedule and Ability to Provide Design-Build Services: **20 Points, 5 Pages**
  5. Oral Interviews: **10 Points**

- **SECTION 3 – Max 40 Points**
  1. Section 3 Economic Opportunities Plan (EOP) - **5 Points**
  2. Table A - Preference for Section 3 Business Concerns – Cat 1, 2, &3 **17 Points**
  3. Table B - Preference for Training and Employment - Cat 1, 2, & 3 : **16 Points**

JSEB Program: **2 Points**

FIRST PHASE TOTAL POSIIBLE POINTS: 100

2. SECOND PHASE - PRICE:

Once the City has ranked the Firms, the City will open the sealed Pricing Proposal of the three top ranked DB Firms meeting the minimum qualifications and the Section 3 Criteria. Based upon the Pricing Proposal only, the City will again rank the Firms with the lowest priced DB Firm ranked first, second lowest ranked second and so on. The price shall be established based upon the Bid Price Proposal as described on FORM 1 "Bid Price Proposal Form". Once the price rankings are completed, the CSPEC will forward their recommendation of rankings (first, second, and third ranked DB Firms) to the Mayor's Office for approval.

SUBJECT: **DESIGN BUILD SERVICES MONCRIEF COMMUNITY CENTER**

BID # **CDB-0638-19** OPEN DATE: **2019-09-25**

COMPETITIVE SEALED PROPOSAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE

KIND AND BASIS OF CONTRACT:
CONSTRUCTION – DESIGN/BUILD- PRE-QUALIFICATIONS

AGENCY: **DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS**

BASIS OF AWARD: **EVALUATION CRITERIA**

NUMBER OF BIDS INVITED: 4 NUMBER RECEIVED: 2 OTHER: 1

SUMMARY OF BIDS AND RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
Recommend approval to proceed with evaluation of the two proposals received from ACON Construction Co., Inc, and Core Construction Company. No advantage would be gained by the re-solicitation of this bid.

Attachments: Recommendation Memo(s)

ANALYST Marilyn Laidler
MARILYN LAIDLER

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED Greg Pease
GREGORY PEASE, CHIEF
PROCUREMENT DIVISION

CONCURRENCE BY: **Robin G. Smith, P.E., Chief, Engineering and Construction Mgmt./ Tom Daly, Chief, Housing & Community Development**

(ALL AWARD ACTIONS SUBJECT TO LAWFULLY APPROPRIATED FUNDS)
ACTION OF CSPEC COMMITTEE ON RECOMMENDATIONS ABOVE

MEMBERS APPROVING MEMBERS DISAPPROVING DATE: 10/10/19

OTHER

ACTION OF AWARDING AUTHORITY DATE 10/10/19

APPROVED ✓ DISAPPROVED:

OTHER:

SIGNATURE OF AUTHENTICATION

Brian Hughes
Chief Administrative Officer
For: Mayor Lenny Curry
Under Authority of:
Executive Order No: 2019-02