SUBJECT: **DESIGN BUILD SERVICES FOR REPLACEMENT OF LOEST ROAD BRIDGE OVER LONG BRANCH CREEK**

BID # **CDB-0039-20** OPEN DATE: **2019-12-11**

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: 0

SUMMARY OF BIDS AND RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:

Subject bid was approved on 01/10/2020 to proceed with evaluation of two proposals received from J.B. Coxwell Contracting, Inc., and J.D. Hinson Company.

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

1. J.B. Coxwell Contracting, Inc.- 71.00
2. J.D. Hinson Company- 69.00

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

Attachments: Recommendation Memo, Scoring Matrix, Section 2.6, Attachment B- Evaluation Criteria, 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 Management Division**

(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

February 11, 2020

TO: Gregory W. Pease
Chief of Procurement

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

FROM: Robin G. Smith, P.E., Chief
Engineering and Construction Management

SUBJECT: CDB- 0039-20 – CSPEC-Presentation-
Design Build Services for Replacement of Loest Road Bridge over Long Branch Creek

---

Two submittals, received from the City's Request for Qualifications (RFQ.), with approval to proceed granted January 10, 2020, have been reviewed and ranked. Based on the averaged score, the following firms listed alphabetically were determined to be qualified. The ranking of first and second designates the order of qualification of these firms to perform the required services.

1. J.B. Coxwell Contracting, Inc.
2. J.D. Hinson Company

In accordance with the RFQ 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 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 for CDB-0039-20 for Design Build Services for Replacement of Loest Road Bridge over Long Branch Creek.

JPP/lw

cc: Gary Goldsberry, P.E., Project Manager, Engineering and Construction Management
Lori West, PW Contract Specialist, Engineering and Construction Management

Bid: CDB-0039-20 DESIGN BUILD SERVICES FOR REPLACEMENT OF LOEST ROAD BRIDGE OVER LONG BRANCH CREEK

Contractor Names		3.1 COMPLIANCE WITH DESIGN CRITERIA PACKAGE (INCLUDING EXPLANATION OR DEMOSTRATION OF APPROACH AND UNDERSTANDING OF THE PROJECT)	3.2 QUALIFICATIONS (INCLUDING EXPLANATION OR DEMOSTRATION OF AVAILABILITY, PAST WORK OF THE FIRMS, INCLUDING PARTNERS OR MEMBERS).	3.3 BONDING, INSURANCE AND FINANCIAL CAPACITY	3.4 PROJECT SCHEDULE AND ABILITY TO PROVIDE DESIGN-BUILD SERVICES	3.5 INTERVIEWS/PRESENTATIONS	TOTAL POINTS	Average
J.D. Hinson Company	Robin Smith	18	19	20	20		77	69.00
	Steve Long	15	14	15	17		61	
							0	
J.B. Coxwell Contracting, Inc	Robin Smith	19	18	20	20		77	71.00
	Steve Long	14	16	20	15		65	
							0	
								#DIV/0!

EVALUATION CRITERIA

TITLE:	DESIGN BUILD SERVICES FOR REPLACEMENT OF LOEST ROAD BRIDGE OVER LONG BRANCH CREEK		J.D. HINSON COMPANY	J.B. COXWELL CONTRACTING, INC.
BID NO.	CDB-0039-20 (PW)			
OPEN DATE:	DECEMBER 11, 2019 @ 2:00 PM			
ANALYST:	MARILYN LAIDLER, PURCHASING ANALYST			
SCORER NAME/SIGNATURE:				
ITEM	DESCRIPTION	POINTS		
3.1	COMPLIANCE WITH DESIGN CRITERIA PACKAGE (INCLUDING EXPLANATION OR DEMONSTRATION OF APPROACH AND UNDERSTANDING OF THE PROJECT).	20	15	14
3.2	QUALIFICATIONS (INCLUDING EXPLANATION OR DEMONSTRATION OF AVAILABILITY, PAST WORK OF THE FIRMS, INCLUDING PARTNERS OR MEMBERS).	20	14	16
3.3	BONDING, INSURANCE AND FINANCIAL CAPACITY	20	15	20
3.4	PROJECT SCHEDULE AND ABILITY TO PROVIDE DESIGN-BUILD SERVICES	20	17	15
3.5	INTERVIEWS/PRESENTATION	20		
	TOTAL POINTS	100	61	65

Laidler, Marilyn

From: Long, Steve
Sent: Monday, February 03, 2020 9:27 AM
To: Laidler, Marilyn
Subject: Loest Road Bridge Replacement CDB-0039-20
Attachments: grading Matrix - Loest Road (002).xlsx

Marilyn,

Attached, please find a copy of my grading for Loest Road Bridge Replacement (CDB-0039-20).

Thank you.

Steve

EVALUATION CRITERIA

			J. D. HINSON COMPANY	J.B. COXWELL CONTRACTING, INC.
TITLE:	DESIGN BUILD SERVICES FOR REPLACEMENT OF LOEST ROAD BRIDGE OVER LONG BRANCH CREEK			
BID NO.	CDB-0039-20 (PW)			
OPEN DATE:	DECEMBER 11 , 2019 @ 2:00 PM			
ANALYST:	MARILYN LAIDLER, PURCHASING ANALYST			
SCORER NAME/SIGNATURE:				
ITEM	DESCRIPTION	POINTS		
3.1	COMPLIANCE WITH DESIGN CRITERIA PACKAGE (INCLUDING EXPLANATION OR DEMOSTRATION OF APPROACH AND UNDERSTANDING OF THE PROJECT).	20	18	19
3.2	QUALIFICATIONS (INCLUDING EXPLANATION OR DEMOSTRATION OF AVAILABILITY, PAST WORK OF THE FIRMS, INCLUDING PARTNERS OR MEMBERS).	20	19	18
3.3	BONDING, INSURANCE AND FINANCIAL CAPACITY	20	20	20
3.4	PROJECT SCHEDULE AND ABILITY TO PROVIDE DESIGN-BUILD SERVICES	20	20	20
3.5	INTERVIEWS/PRESENTATION	20		
	TOTAL POINTS	100		

Laidler, Marilyn

From: Smith, Robin
Sent: Thursday, January 23, 2020 2:34 PM
To: Laidler, Marilyn
Subject: CDB-0039-20 Grading Matrix
Attachments: CDB-0039-20.pdf

For your review.

Robin G. Smith, P.E.
City Engineer / Chief of Engineering & Construction
City of Jacksonville I Department of Public Works
214 N. Hogan Street, Jacksonville, FL 32202
904.255.8710

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 Responses

A. City will rank the RFP responses based on the Evaluation Criteria contained in Attachment B according to F.S. 287.055 and City Ordinance Code Chapter 126.

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 the Project, use of new products, new uses for established products, etc.

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

2.6 Award of Design-Build Contract

A. Jacksonville Ordinance Code Chapter 126, Part 7. The City will evaluate, select, and rank based on the highest to lowest evaluation score, three Design-Build Firms determined based on the evaluation to be the most qualified and advantageous to the City. The relative importance (i.e., maximum scoring points) assigned to the evaluation Criteria is set forth in Attachment B.

B. Once the City has ranked the Firms, the City will open the sealed Pricing Proposal of the three top ranked DB Firms. Based upon the Pricing Proposal only, the City will again rank the Firms with the lowest priced Design-Build 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.

C. 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.]

D. 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.

E. 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 Bidder, City and Bidder 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.

If Design-Builder fails to perform the Services as agreed, City reserves the right to (i) issue a new solicitation for the Services; (ii) reopen the RFP for the purpose of awarding a second contract to another Bidder in accordance with the criteria and processes set forth herein; and/or (iii) take such other actions permitted by law.

2.8 Public Meetings and Special Accommodations. Any meetings of the RFP evaluation committee (i.e., the Competitive Sealed Proposal Evaluation Committee or Technical Review Committee) shall be noticed on City's website and shall comply with Florida's Open Meetings Laws. Please contact the Contact Person if you are uncertain of City's website address or if you experience problems accessing it. Persons requiring a special accommodation because of a disability should contact the Contact Person identified in Section 1 at least forty-eight (48) hours prior to the meeting.

2.9 Ex-Parte Communications. Communications regarding the RFP by a potential vendor, service provider, bidder, lobbyist or consultant to city employees, staff, or hired consultants are prohibited. This prohibition includes communications with the City's Office of General Counsel unless the Contact Person has authorized those communications in advance. Violations may result in the rejection/disqualification of a Response.

Attachment B– Evaluation Criteria

General:
Each Design-Build Firm being considered for this Project is required to submit a written SOQ Response and a Price Proposal each in separate sealed envelopes. The SOQ Response shall include sufficient information to enable the City to evaluate the qualifications and capability of the Design-Build Firm to provide the Services for the Project. Those firms meeting or exceeding the SOQ Response Evaluation Criteria regarding qualifications set forth below will be deemed the most qualified firms. Award of this contract shall be in accordance with Section 2.5 and 2.6 of this RFP

1. Submittal Requirements:
The SOQ Response shall be written and bound with tabs labeled for each Section and comply with the information, paper size and page limitation requirements as listed below:

A copy of the "**SOQ Response**" must also be submitted in electronic format on a CD. The format shall be in Microsoft Word and the file saved in .pdf format and must include Bookmarks for each Section. No macros will be allowed. Minimum font size of twelve (12) shall be used. Times New Roman shall be the required font type. Graphics, tables, charts and photographs not embedded as part of the text of the SOQ Response shall be held to a maximum of 5 pages and will be considered as part of the total page count of the SOQ Response.

The maximum number of pages for the SOQ Response shall be thirty (30) single-sided double-spaced 8½" by 11" pages, excluding appendices. Sheet tabs used to facilitate organization of the SOQ Response will not count toward the 30-page limit, however, no information on the tabs will be considered as part of the evaluation. A single-page cover letter will not be counted as part of the 30-page limit. A cover letter in excess of one page and any other information submitted beyond that noted in the RFP will be counted as part of the 30-page limit. Any Proposal exceeding these formal guidelines will be rejected without being considered by the City. Any Proposal that provides any proof of insurance, bonding capacity, and licensing may include copies of these documents in appendices, and they will not be counted against the 30-page limit.

Submit 1 Original, 2 CDs, and three (3) copies of the SOQ Response to:

City of Jacksonville
Procurement Division
Ed Ball Bldg, Rm 105
214 N. Hogan Street
Jacksonville, FL 32202

All submitted documents once received by the City shall become the property of the City.

2. Provide concise information pertaining to the following Evaluation Criteria in accordance with Section 287.055, F.S., and Part 7 of Chapter 126, Ordinance Code:; (i) compliance with the design Criteria Package; (ii) qualifications and past performance; (iii) financial capacity; and (iv) project schedule and ability to provide design-build services. The minimum information to be included in the SOQ Response is as follows:

Evaluation Criteria

- Demonstrated compliance with the design requirements or design criteria package
- Qualifications
- Financial Capacity
- Availability (project schedule)
- Interviews
- Price

3. **SOQ Response (Part 1):**

3.1 **Compliance with Design Criteria Package (including explanation or demonstration of approach and understanding of the Project)** – Maximum 10 Pages 20 Points

SOQ Response must comply with all aspects and requirements of the Design Criteria Package. Present a plan for completing the specified work. The plan should address all significant design and construction issues and constraints and should demonstrate efficient use of manpower, materials, equipment, construction schemes, and techniques for completing the Project. Coordination with the City on public involvement, railroad encroachments, and affected utilities shall also be discussed in this section.

3.2 **Qualifications (including explanation or demonstration of availability, past work of the firms, including partners or members)** – Maximum 10 Pages 20 Points

- Contractor Name & Applicable Prequalification Work Types:
  - Must show at least three previous similar roadway projects in excess of $1M in last five years – provide owner contact information.
  - Provide financial and schedule data for reference projects.
- Construction Project Manager:
  - Must show at least three previous similar roadway projects in excess of $1M in last ten years – provide owner contact information.
  - Provide financial and schedule data for reference projects.
  - Must be available for this Project – provide commitment.
- Construction Superintendent:
  - Must show at least one previous similar roadway projects in excess of $400K in last ten years – provide owner contact information.
  - Provide financial and schedule data for reference projects.
  - Must be available for this Project – provide commitment.
- Proposed Subcontractor Names(s):
  - Indicate previous experience of at least one similar project with Lead Firm in last five years.
  - Indicate previous experience with at least three similar roadway projects in the last ten years.
- Consulting Engineer Name and Applicable Prequalified Work Types:
  - Indicate previous experience of at least one similar project with Lead Firm in last five years.
  - Indicate previous experience with at least three similar roadway projects in last ten years.
- Design Project Manager:
  - Indicate previous experience of at least one similar project with Lead Firm in last five years.
  - Indicate previous experience with at least three similar roadway projects in last ten years.
- Design Engineer of Record:
  - Indicate previous experience of at least one similar project with Lead Firm in last five years.
  - Indicate previous experience with at least three similar roadway projects in last ten years.
  - Resumes of Key Personnel
  - Indicate availability.
  - Indicate previous experience with similar roadway projects.

3.3 **Bonding, Insurance and Financial Capacity** –Maximum 5 Pages 20 Points

Financial Capacity of the Firm to complete the Project:

- Must demonstrate financial capability to perform a $1M Project.
- Bonding Capacity must exceed $1M.
- Must demonstrate ability to meet insurance and indemnity requirements set forth in Attachments D and E of this RFP.

3.4 **Project Schedule and Ability to Provide Design-Build Services**–Maximum 5 Pages 20 Points

The Project Schedule must comply with the following construction completion requirement: The Contractor shall begin work within ten (10) calendar days, including Sundays and holidays, after the date of written notice from the owner to begin work, and shall complete the work within **245 calendar days**, including Sundays and holidays, after the expiration of such ten (10) day notice. If the Bidder determines that "off-hours" work is anticipated to complete the project within such

allotted times, a schedule therefore shall be attached to this proposal as required by section 20.3.4 of the General Conditions. Additionally, the Project Schedule shall:

- Demonstrate an effective approach in the form of a Project schedule.
- Identify if the Schedule is based on Calendar or Working Days.
- The minimum information to be included in the summary schedule of anticipated major milestones and their associated phasing is as follows:
- Anticipated Award Date
- Design
- 90% Plan Submittal
- 100% Plan Submittal
- 10-set Review
- Construction Mobilization
- Maintenance of Traffic (MOT)
- Erosion Control and Pollution Abatement
- Earthwork
- Roadway Items, including drainage and structures
- Lighting Conduit
- As-Builts / Closeout

3.5 Interviews/Presentations - 20 Points

Overall presentation regarding qualifications, approach to and schedule for the project, project organization development documents and ability to furnish the required design build services.

4.0 Price Proposal (Part 2)
Price – See the Bid Price proposal Form.

Must complete and submit the Bid Price Proposal Form contained on Form 1 of this RFP based on Section 1.10 Bid Price Proposal.

SUBJECT: DESIGN BUILD SERVICES FOR REPLACEMENT OF LOEST ROAD BRIDGE OVER LONG BRANCH CREEK

BID # CDB-0039-20 OPEN DATE: 2019-12-11

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: 0

SUMMARY OF BIDS AND RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
Recommend approval to proceed with evaluation of the two proposals received from J.D. Hinson Company, and J.B. Coxwell Contracting, Inc. No advantage would be gained by the re-solicitation of this bid.

Attachments: Recommendation Memo

ANALYST Marilyn Laidler
MARILYN LAIDLER

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED David Pease
for GREGORY PEASE, CHIEF
PROCUREMENT DIVISION

CONCURRENCE BY: Robin G. Smith, P.E., Chief, Engineering and Construction Management Division

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

MEMBERS APPROVING 5 MEMBERS DISAPPROVING 0 DATE: 1/9/2020

OTHER

ACTION OF AWARDING AUTHORITY DATE 1/10/2020

APPROVED ✓ BH DISAPPROVED:

OTHER:

SIGNATURE OF AUTHENTICATION

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