OFFICIAL FILE COPY
CLERK OF THE BOARD
OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA

Memorandum

MIAMI-DADE COUNTY

Date: July 3, 2012

Agenda Item No. 8(A)(5)

To: Honorable Chairman Joe A. Martinez
and Members, Board of County Commissioners

From: Carlos A. Gimenez
Mayor

Subject: Request to Reject Proposals for Concourse D Roof Rehabilitation, Project No. A10-MDAD-01, at Miami International Airport

Resolution No. R-536-12

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board of County Commissioenrs (Board) approve the attached resolution rejecting all proposals for Consultant Selection for the Concourse D Roof Rehabilitation, Project No. A10-MDAD-01, at Miami International Airport (MIA).

PROJECT NAME:	Concourse D Roof Rehabilitation
PROJECT NO.:	A10-MDAD-01
CONTRACT NO.:	A10-MDAD-01
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:	The Architect/Engineer (A/E) will be required to provide the following services which will enable the Miami-Dade Aviation Department to obtain a roof replacement for Concourse D (eastside/former A): preparation of roof plans, detailed drawings and specifications, construction documents, project-segment-specific contractor access and staging plans, Maintenance of Traffic (MOT) plans, as well as preparation of schedules, phasing and/or sequencing plans as may be applicable. The A/E shall prepare an estimate of probable construction costs and updates as required at various stages, and shall review the applicable codes and obtain documents confirming product approval for specified products and systems. The project involves the phased demolition of the existing roof to the roof deck from the former Concourse B Atrium to the eastern extremity of Concourse A (an estimated 18,861 square yards) and the replacement of a new built-up roof system in accordance with the MIA Terminal Design Guidelines Manual with all the necessary flashing, soffit, gutter, scupper, and drain replacement necessary to guarantee the roof for 15 years from project acceptance.
PROJECT LOCATION:	Miami International Airport
PRIMARY COMMISION DISTRICT:	Commissioner Rebeca Sosa's District 6
APPROVAL PATH:	Board of County Commissioners

OCI A&E PROJECT NUMBER:	A10-MDAD-01
USING AND MANAGING DEPARTMENT:	Miami-Dade Aviation Department

FISCAL IMPACT/FUNDING SOURCE

FUNDING SOURCE:	Federal Aviation Administration Airport Improvement Program (75%) only for new replacement roof, with Florida Department of Transportation funding 50% of the non-federal share. The balance will be funded from the Reserve Maintenance Fund.
PTP FUNDING:	No
GOB FUNDING:	No
ARRA FUNDING:	No
PROJECT TECHNICAL CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS:	Prime – 14.00 – Architecture Other - 9.05 – Soils, Foundations and Materials Testing - Roof Testing and Consulting, 10.01 - Environmental Engineering - Stormwater Drainage Design Engineering Services, 11.00 - General Structural Engineering, 12.00 - General Mechanical Engineering, 13.00 – General Electrical Engineering, 16.00 - General Civil Engineering, 18.00 – Architectural Construction Management.
ESTIMATED CONTRACT PERIOD:	1,825 days
ESTIMATED CONTINGENCY PERIOD:	None
IG FEE INCLUDED IN BASE CONTRACT:	Yes
ART IN PUBLIC PLACES:	No
BASE ESTIMATE:	$527,000.00
CONTINGENCY ALLOWANCE (SECTION 2-8.1 MIAMI-DADE COUNTY CODE):	PSA 10% $52,700.00
TOTAL DEDICATED ALLOWANCE:	$1,317.50
COST ESTIMATE:	$581,017.50
MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS EXCEED LEGAL REQUIREMENTS:	No

APPLICABLE WAGES (R-54-10): No

CONTRACT MEASURES: Disadvantaged Business Enterprise 28%

MANDATORY CLEARING HOUSE: No

BACKGROUND

On February 8, 2011, the Request to Advertise for this project was filed with the Clerk of the Board. On March 11, 2011, a notice to Professional Consultants was e-solicited by the Office of Capital Improvements (OCI).

Pursuant to Section 287-055, Florida Statutes, Sections 2-8-1 and Chapter 2-10-4 of the Code of Miami-Dade County, both of which govern certification, selection and negotiation procedures, the Competitive Selection Committee held a first-tier meeting June 1, 2011, to review 27 submittals, waived a second-tier meeting and ranked the top three firms that submitted as follows:

1. APEC Consultants, Inc. - 466 points
2. Allegues Architecture, Inc. - 435 points
3. Sixto Architect, Inc. - 428 points

The top-ranked firm, APEC Consultants, Inc., was found by the Selection Committee to have met the qualification requirements. Subsequently, the County Manager appointed a Negotiation Committee on June 23, 2011. Two negotiation meetings were held on July 8, 2011, and July 19, 2011, and a satisfactory agreement was negotiated on July 19, 2011, with APEC Consultants Inc.

Subsequent to negotiations, the Department reviewed funding for this project and has since determined that funding needed to be re-allocated to a higher priority project (the Central Chiller Plant Rehabilitation Project). An item reallocating a portion of the grant funds available for this Concourse D Roof Rehabilitation project to the Central Chiller Plant Rehabilitation Project is being presented to the Board under separate cover.

As a result, a request to reject all proposals is hereby submitted for approval by the Board. The Concourse D Roof Rehabilitation Project can be temporarily postponed because of interim roof repair work performed by the Aviation Department's Maintenance Division.

Jack Osterholt, Deputy Mayor

MEMORANDUM

(Revised)

TO: Honorable Chairman Joe A. Martinez and Members, Board of County Commissioners

DATE: July 3, 2012

FROM: R. A. Cuevas, Jr. County Attorney

SUBJECT: Agenda Item No. 8(A)(5)

Please note any items checked.

_____ **"3-Day Rule" for committees applicable if raised**

_____ **6 weeks required between first reading and public hearing**

_____ **4 weeks notification to municipal officials required prior to public hearing**

_____ **Decreases revenues or increases expenditures without balancing budget**

_____ **Budget required**

_____ **Statement of fiscal impact required**

_____ **Ordinance creating a new board requires detailed County Manager's report for public hearing**

_____ **No committee review**

_____ **Applicable legislation requires more than a majority vote (i.e., 2/3's ____, 3/5's ____, unanimous_____) to approve**

_____ **Current information regarding funding source, index code and available balance, and available capacity (if debt is contemplated) required**

Approved _____ Mayor
Veto _____
Override _____

Agenda Item No. 8(A)(5)
7-3-12

RESOLUTION NO. R-536-12

RESOLUTION REJECTING ALL PROPOSALS RECEIVED IN CONNECTION WITH CONCOURSE D ROOF REHABILITATION AT MIAMI INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PROJECT NO. A10-MDAD-01

WHEREAS, this Board desires to accomplish the purposes outlined in the accompanying memorandum, a copy of which is incorporated herein by reference,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA, that this Board hereby rejects all proposals received in connection with the Concourse D Roof Rehabilitation at Miami International Airport, Project No. A10-MDAD-01.

The foregoing resolution was offered by Commissioner **José "Pepe" Diaz**, who moved its adoption. The motion was seconded by Commissioner **Audrey Edmonson** and upon being put to a vote, the vote was as follows:

Joe A. Martinez, Chairman			**aye**
Audrey M. Edmonson, Vice Chairwoman			**aye**
Bruno A. Barreiro	**aye**	Lynda Bell	**aye**
Esteban L. Bovo, Jr.	**aye**	Jose "Pepe" Diaz	**aye**
Sally A. Heyman	**aye**	Barbara J. Jordan	**aye**
Jean Monestime	**aye**	Dennis C. Moss	**aye**
Rebeca Sosa	**aye**	Sen. Javier D. Souto	**absent**
Xavier L. Suarez	**aye**		

The Chairperson thereupon declared the resolution duly passed and adopted this 3rd day of July, 2012. This resolution shall become effective ten (10) days after the date of its adoption unless vetoed by the Mayor, and if vetoed, shall become effective only upon an override by this Board.

MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA
BY ITS BOARD OF
COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

HARVEY RUVIN, CLERK

By: Christopher Agrippa
Deputy Clerk

Approved by County Attorney as
to form and legal sufficiency.

David M. Murray

Memorandum

MIAMI-DADE COUNTY

Date: June 20, 2011

To: Alina T. Hudak
County Manager

Thru: George Navarrete
Director, OCI

From: Amelia M. Cordova-Jimenez, A&E Consultant Selection Coordinator
Chairperson, Competitive Selection Committee

Subject: NEGOTIATION AUTHORIZATION
Miami-Dade Aviation Department (MDAD)
Concourse "D" Roof Rehabilitation
OCI Project No. A10-MDAD-01

The Competitive Selection Committee (CSC) has completed the evaluation of the proposals submitted in response to the above referenced project, following the guidelines published in the Notice to Professional Consultants (NTPC).

OCI Project No.: A10-MDAD-01

Project Title: Concourse "D" Roof Rehabilitation

Scope of Services Summary: The selected proposer will be required to provide the following services which will enable MDAD to obtain a roof replacement for Concourse D (eastside/former A): Prepare roof plans, details, specifications, construction documents, project segment specific contractor access and staging plans; Maintenance of Traffic plans, preparation of schedules, phasing and/or sequencing plans as may apply. The selected proposer shall prepare an estimate of probable construction costs and update, as required at various stages and shall review the applicable codes and obtain documents confirming product approval for specified products and systems.

The project involves the phased tear-off (demolition) of the existing roof to the roof deck from the former Concourse B Atrium, to the eastern extremity of Concourse A (an estimated 18,861 square yards), and the replacement of a new built-up roof system in accordance with the Miami International Airport Terminal Design Guidelines Manual with all the necessary flashing, soffit, gutter, scupper, and drain replacement necessary to guarantee the roof for 15 years from project acceptance.

Term of Contract: One Professional Services Agreement (PSA) will be awarded under this solicitation for an estimated fee of $527,000 and an effective term of five years.

Review Committee: The Review Committee recommended, at their August 18, 2010 meeting, that a 28% Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) goal be applied to this solicitation.

Request to Advertise (RTA) Stamped by the Clerk of the Board (COB): February 8, 2011

Number of Proposals Received: 27

Name of Proposer(s): Please refer to the attached List of Respondents.

Compliance: All 27 respondents were deemed in compliance with the DBE goal established for this solicitation. Two of the 27 respondents, Laura M. Perez and Associates, Inc., and Harvey J. Ehrlich, Architect, P.A., have been eliminated from further consideration for this solicitation due to improper pre-qualification and technical certification status at the time of proposal submittal.

First Tier Results: See attached First Tier Tabulation Sheet.

Second Tier Results: Not applicable. Based on the CSC's professional expertise, and by majority vote, the information provided in the proposals was deemed sufficient to determine the qualifications of the teams. As a result of said determination and by a majority vote, the CSC decided to forego Second-Tier proceedings.

Request for Appointment of Negotiation Committee: Pursuant to Section 2-10.4 (6) of the Code of Miami-Dade County, OCI hereby requests the County Manager approve the following Negotiation Committee, for the purpose of negotiating a non-exclusive PSA for this project with the top ranked firm:

Tyrone Browne, MDAD
Enrique Perez, MDAD
Isaac Smith, WASD

Recommended Ranking Methodology: Miami-Dade County Code 2-10.4 (Code) and Implementing Order (I.O.) 3-34 have recently changed the manner in which the ranking order of A&E firms is calculated under the First Tier evaluation process. I.O. 3-34 requires the dropping of the highest and lowest scores per firm, while the Code requires that ranking order be based solely on an ordinal methodology, versus total qualitative points, in instances where Local Preference calculations are not applicable. Local Preference does not apply to this solicitation, given that all respondents are local firms. As a result, the CSC's recommended First Tier ordinal ranking denoted below is submitted for review and approval:

TOTAL ORDINAL SCORE
RANKING OF RESPONDENTS
SELECTION FOR PSA NEGOTIATION
ONE AGREEMENT WITH A
28% DBE GOAL

APEC Consultants, Inc.
Total Ordinal Score: 6
Ordinal Rank: 1st Place

The following teams will serve as the alternates:

Alleguez Architecture, Inc.
Total Ordinal Score: 9
Ordinal Rank: 2nd Place

Sixto Architect, Inc.
Total Ordinal Score: 20
Ordinal Rank: 3rd Place

Reporting to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC): Pursuant to the Cone of Silence Legislation included in the Conflict of Interest and Code of Ethics Ordinance, and Section 2-11.1 of the Miami-Dade County Code, the County Mayor or designee will report to the BCC any of the following instances:

- When negotiations do not commence, or other affirmative action is not taken, within 30 days of the Selection Committee's recommendation.
- When the County Mayor or designee's recommendation to award or reject is not made within 90 days from the date of the Selection Committee's recommendation.

If approved, the Negotiation Committee is to proceed with the contract negotiations pursuant to Section 6 of the above-mentioned Code, and submit the signed contract ready to be presented to the BCC for final approval no later than 60 days from the date of this memorandum.

If a satisfactory agreement cannot be reached within the 60 day period, a report is required to be prepared fully explaining all problems resulting from the negotiations. If negotiations are proceeding within a reasonable timeframe, then negotiations are to continue and the report is to be submitted upon completion. The final contract and report should be sent to this office.

Authorization to negotiate is approved utilizing the ordinal ranking denoted above.

6/21/11

Approved Date
Jennifer Glazer-Moon,
Assistant County Manager

Declined Date
Jennifer Glazer-Moon,
Assistant County Manager

Attachments:
1. List of Respondents
2. First Tier Tabulation Sheet

c: Ysela Llort, Assistant County Manager
Jose Abreu, Director, MDAD
George Navarrete, Director, OCI
Luisa Millan, Chief, Professional Services Division, OCI
Competitive Selection Committee
Clerk of the Board of County Commissioners

FIRST - TIER MEETING
JUNE 1, 2011
MIAMI DADE AVIATION DEPARTMENT
CONCOURSE D ROOF REHABILITATION
OCI PROJECT NO. A10-MDAD-01

TABULATION SHEET

COMPETITIVE SELECTION COMMITTEE

	NAME OF FIRM(S)	Tyrone Browne, MDAD	Enrique Perez, MDAD	Adolfo Martinez, PAUGS	Zafar Ahmed, PARKS	Isaac Smith, WASD	SUB-TOTAL	Average	Low Disparity	High Disparity	TOTAL QUALITATIVE POINTS	TOTAL ORDINAL SCORES	ORDINAL RANK	RANKING ORDER IMPACTED BY PQCTC STATUS	FINAL RANK, *pursuant to County Mayor or County Mayor's Designee determination
1	Allegato Architecture Inc. - LP														
	1A - Qualification of firms including team members associated to the project (Max. 50 points)	37	40	48	50	46	221	44	30	59					
	2A - Knowledge and Past Experience of similar type projects (Max. 20 points)	14	20	18	20	20	92	18	12	24					
	3A - Past Performance of the Firms (Max. 20 points)	14	15	18	20	18	85	17	11	23					
	4A - Amount of Work Awarded and Paid by the County (Max. 5 points)	3	4	2	4	3	16	3	2	4					
	5A - Ability of team members to interface with the County (Max 5 points)	4	2	5	5	5	21	4	3	6	435	9	2	2	2
		72	81	91	99	92									
	Ordinal Scores	8	3	3	2	2									
	Tie-Breaker No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 / Criteria 1A, 2A, 3A, 4A, 5A, Total Qual. Points for Criteria 1A	14	3	3	3	2									
2	Pedraza Architects Inc. - LP														
	1A - Qualification of firms including team members associated to the project (Max. 50 points)	35	30	45	50	28	188	38	25	50					
	2A - Knowledge and Past Experience of similar type projects (Max. 20 points)	14	15	15	20	10	74	15	10	20					
	3A - Past Performance of the Firms (Max. 20 points)	14	15	15	20	13	77	15	10	20					
	4A - Amount of Work Awarded and Paid by the County (Max. 5 points)	5	5	5	5	4	24	5	3	6			15		
	5A - Ability of team members to interface with the County (Max 5 points)	4	2	5	5	5	21	4	3	6	384	49	19	18	18
		72	67	85	100	60									
	Ordinal Scores	8	12	8	1	16									
	Tie-Breaker No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 / Criteria 1A, 2A, 3A, 4A, 5A, Total Qual. Points for Criteria 1A	17	19	13	2	24									
3	APEC Consultants Inc. - LP														
	1A - Qualification of firms including team members associated to the project (Max. 50 points)	50	40	48	49	45	232	46	31	62					
	2A - Knowledge and Past Experience of similar type projects (Max. 20 points)	20	25	18	19	20	102	20	14	27					
	3A - Past Performance of the Firms (Max. 20 points)	20	12	19	19	18	88	18	12	23					
	4A - Amount of Work Awarded and Paid by the County (Max. 5 points)	3	5	5	5	4	22	4	3	6					
	5A - Ability of team members to interface with the County (Max 5 points)	5	2	5	5	5	22	4	3	6	466	6	1	1	1
		98	84	95	97	92									
	Ordinal Scores	2	1	1	4	2									
	Tie-Breaker No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 / Criteria 1A, 2A, 3A, 4A, 5A, Total Qual. Points for Criteria 1A	2	1	1	12	3									
4	Infrico Service Corporation - LP														
	1A - Qualification of firms including team members associated to the project (Max. 50 points)	50	35	48	49	30	212	42	28	56					
	2A - Knowledge and Past Experience of similar type projects (Max. 20 points)	20	20	18	20	15	93	19	13	25					
	3A - Past Performance of the Firms (Max. 20 points)	20	10	19	20	17	86	17	12	23					
	4A - Amount of Work Awarded and Paid by the County (Max. 5 points)	4	3	3	3	3	16	3	2	4			5		
	5A - Ability of team members to interface with the County (Max 5 points)	5	2	5	5	5	22	4	3	6	429	25	5	5	5
		99	70	93	97	70									
	Ordinal Scores	1	9	2	4	12									
	Tie-Breaker No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 / Criteria 1A, 2A, 3A, 4A, 5A, Total Qual. Points for Criteria 1A	1	12	2	11	19									
5	Cocke Group, Inc. - JP														
	1A - Qualification of firms including team members associated to the project (Max. 50 points)	34	25	45	48	24	176	35	24	47					
	2A - Knowledge and Past Experience of similar type projects (Max. 20 points)	12	15	15	19	10	71	14	10	19					
	3A - Past Performance of the Firms (Max. 20 points)	16	10	19	19	14	78	16	10	21					
	4A - Amount of Work Awarded and Paid by the County (Max. 5 points)	4	5	3	5	3	20	4	3	5			19		
	5A - Ability of team members to interface with the County (Max 5 points)	4	2	5	5	5	21	4	3	6	366	68	25	23	23
		70	57	87	96	56									

	Ordinal Scores	10	18	6	5	18										
	Tie-Breaker No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 / Criteria 1A, 2A, 3A, 4A, 5A, Total Qual. Points for Criteria 1A	24	26	7	18	26										
6	MGE Architects, Inc. - LP															
	1A - Qualification of firms including team members associated to the project (Max. 50 points)	38	30	45	50	38	201	40	27	53						
	2A - Knowledge and Past Experience of similar type projects (Max. 20 points)	14	16	15	20	18	83	16	11	22						
	3A - Past Performance of the Firms (Max. 20 points)	16	20	19	20	16	91	18	12	24						
	4A - Amount of Work Awarded and Paid by the County (Max. 5 points)	2	1	1	1	1	6	2	1	2				9		
	5A - Ability of team members to interface with the County (Max 5 points)	4	4	5	5	5	23	5	3	6	405	38	11	10	10	
		74	70	86	96	78										
	Ordinal Scores	6	9	7	5	8										
	Tie-Breaker No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 / Criteria 1A, 2A, 3A, 4A, 5A, Total Qual. Points for Criteria 1A	8	14	10	15	14										
7	Stolo Architects Inc. - LP															
	1A - Qualification of firms including team members associated to the project (Max. 50 points)	35	35	48	47	48	213	43	25	57						
	2A - Knowledge and Past Experience of similar type projects (Max. 20 points)	16	18	15	19	19	84	17	11	22						
	3A - Past Performance of the Firms (Max. 20 points)	16	20	19	19	20	94	19	13	25						
	4A - Amount of Work Awarded and Paid by the County (Max. 5 points)	2	3	3	3	3	14	3	2	4						
	5A - Ability of team members to interface with the County (Max 5 points)	4	4	5	5	5	23	5	3	6	428	36	3	3	3	
		73	77	90	93	95										
	Ordinal Scores	7	5	4	6	1										
	Tie-Breaker No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 / Criteria 1A, 2A, 3A, 4A, 5A, Total Qual. Points for Criteria 1A	9	7	4	20	1										
8	Silva Architects LLC - LP															
	1A - Qualification of firms including team members associated to the project (Max. 50 points)	38	30	40	50	40	198	40	27	53						
	2A - Knowledge and Past Experience of similar type projects (Max. 20 points)	15	19	15	18	18	85	16	11	22						
	3A - Past Performance of the Firms (Max. 20 points)	15	10	16	18	15	74	15	10	20						
	4A - Amount of Work Awarded and Paid by the County (Max. 5 points)	4	5	3	5	3	20	4	3	5				14		
	5A - Ability of team members to interface with the County (Max 5 points)	3	3	5	5	4	19	4	3	5	392	47	18	17	17	
		75	62	79	96	80										
	Ordinal Scores	5	15	12	5	7										
	Tie-Breaker No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 / Criteria 1A, 2A, 3A, 4A, 5A, Total Qual. Points for Criteria 1A	6	22	20	16	11										
9	CSA Group, Inc. - LP															
	1A - Qualification of firms including team members associated to the project (Max. 50 points)	36	30	40	48	39	193	38	26	51						
	2A - Knowledge and Past Experience of similar type projects (Max. 20 points)	15	18	15	17	18	83	16	11	21						
	3A - Past Performance of the Firms (Max. 20 points)	16	10	16	17	14	73	15	10	19						
	4A - Amount of Work Awarded and Paid by the County (Max. 5 points)	3	4	4	4	4	19	4	3	5				16		
	5A - Ability of team members to interface with the County (Max 5 points)	4	1	5	5	5	20	4	3	5	384	52	21	20	20	
		73	60	80	91	80										
	Ordinal Scores	7	17	11	8	7										
	Tie-Breaker No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 / Criteria 1A, 2A, 3A, 4A, 5A, Total Qual. Points for Criteria 1A	11	25	17	23	12										
10	Ideal Architectural Design, P.A. - LP															
	1A - Qualification of firms including team members associated to the project (Max. 50 points)	42	35	40	50	30	201	41	27	54						
	2A - Knowledge and Past Experience of similar type projects (Max. 20 points)	20	15	15	20	15	85	17	11	23						
	3A - Past Performance of the Firms (Max. 20 points)	18	15	16	20	16	85	17	11	23						
	4A - Amount of Work Awarded and Paid by the County (Max. 5 points)	4	5	3	5	3	20	4	3	5				6		
	5A - Ability of team members to interface with the County (Max 5 points)	5	5	5	5	5	25	5	3	7	419	30	7	6	6	
		96	75	79	100	69										
	Ordinal Scores	3	6	12	1	13										
	Tie-Breaker No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 / Criteria 1A, 2A, 3A, 4A, 5A, Total Qual. Points for Criteria 1A	3	8	19	1	21										
11	Rodriguez Peterson & Porras Architects, Inc. - LP															
	1A - Qualification of firms including team members associated to the project (Max. 50 points)	38	25	40	48	30	181	36	24	48						
	2A - Knowledge and Past Experience of similar type projects (Max. 20 points)	14	15	13	19	18	79	16	11	21						
	3A - Past Performance of the Firms (Max. 20 points)	15	20	15	19	16	85	17	11	23						
	4A - Amount of Work Awarded and Paid by the County (Max. 5 points)	5	5	3	5	4	22	4	3	6				16		
	5A - Ability of team members to interface with the County (Max 5 points)	3	3	5	5	5	21	4	3	6	388	52	20	19	19	
		75	68	76	96	73										

	Ordinal Scores	5	11	14	5	10									
	Tie-Breaker No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 / Criteria 1A, 2A, 3A, 4A, 5A, Total Qual. Points for Criteria 1A	7	18	25	17	17									
12	Nine Caruso & Partners Inc., LP														
	1A - Qualification of firms including team members associated to the project (Max. 50 points)	37	30	45	50	29	191	38	26	51					
	2A - Knowledge and Past Experience of similar type projects (Max. 20 points)	15	15	20	20	16	86	17	12	23					
	3A - Past Performance of the Firms (Max. 20 points)	13	20	16	20	17	86	16	19	20					
	4A - Amount of Work Awarded and Paid by the County (Max. 5 points)	2	3	2	3	3	13	3	2	3			12		
	5A - Ability of team members to interface with the County (Max 5 points)	3	3	5	5	5	21	4	3	6	387	45	16	15	15
		70	61	88	98	70									
	Ordinal Scores	10	16	5	3	12									
	Tie-Breaker No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 / Criteria 1A, 2A, 3A, 4A, 5A, Total Qual. Points for Criteria 1A	19	24	5	6	20									
13	Architects International Inc., LP														
	1A - Qualification of firms including team members associated to the project (Max. 50 points)	49	40	42	50	28	209	42	25	56					
	2A - Knowledge and Past Experience of similar type projects (Max. 20 points)	20	20	15	20	14	89	18	12	24					
	3A - Past Performance of the Firms (Max. 20 points)	20	15	16	20	16	87	17	12	23					
	4A - Amount of Work Awarded and Paid by the County (Max. 5 points)	1	1	1	1	1	5	1	1	1			7		
	5A - Ability of team members to interface with the County (Max 5 points)	5	5	5	5	5	25	5	3	7	415	35	8	7	7
		95	81	79	96	64									
	Ordinal Scores	4	3	12	5	15									
	Tie-Breaker No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 / Criteria 1A, 2A, 3A, 4A, 5A, Total Qual. Points for Criteria 1A	4	4	18	13	23									
14	KVE Architecture + Design, Palo, LP														
	1A - Qualification of firms including team members associated to the project (Max. 50 points)	35	25	40	47	24	171	34	23	45					
	2A - Knowledge and Past Experience of similar type projects (Max. 20 points)	14	15	15	18	12	74	15	10	20					
	3A - Past Performance of the Firms (Max. 20 points)	14	10	16	18	14	72	14	10	19					
	4A - Amount of Work Awarded and Paid by the County (Max. 5 points)	3	4	3	4	4	18	4	2	5			21		
	5A - Ability of team members to interface with the County (Max 5 points)	3	3	5	5	5	21	4	3	6	356	72	27	25	25
		69	57	79	92	59									
	Ordinal Scores	11	18	12	7	17									
	Tie-Breaker No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 / Criteria 1A, 2A, 3A, 4A, 5A, Total Qual. Points for Criteria 1A	26	27	21	21	25									
15	Angel C. Sayol, FAIA, Architects, Planners, Interiors, LTD., LP														
	1A - Qualification of firms including team members associated to the project (Max. 50 points)	35	25	45	46	23	174	35	23	46					
	2A - Knowledge and Past Experience of similar type projects (Max. 20 points)	15	15	15	17	10	72	14	10	19					
	3A - Past Performance of the Firms (Max. 20 points)	14	15	17	17	12	75	15	10	20					
	4A - Amount of Work Awarded and Paid by the County (Max. 5 points)	3	5	5	5	4	22	4	3	6			15		
	5A - Ability of team members to interface with the County (Max 5 points)	5	5	5	5	5	25	5	3	7	368	61	24	22	23
		72	65	87	90	54									
	Ordinal Scores	8	13	6	9	19									
	Tie-Breaker No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 / Criteria 1A, 2A, 3A, 4A, 5A, Total Qual. Points for Criteria 1A	16	20	8	25	27									
16	Gueco Malone, P.A., LP														
	1A - Qualification of firms including team members associated to the project (Max. 50 points)	35	30	45	49	42	201	40	27	53					
	2A - Knowledge and Past Experience of similar type projects (Max. 20 points)	15	20	15	20	18	88	18	12	23					
	3A - Past Performance of the Firms (Max. 20 points)	14	20	18	20	17	89	18	12	24					
	4A - Amount of Work Awarded and Paid by the County (Max. 5 points)	3	4	2	4	2	15	3	2	3					
	5A - Ability of team members to interface with the County (Max 5 points)	3	5	5	5	5	23	5	3	6	416	24	4	4	4
		70	79	85	98	84									
	Ordinal Scores	10	4	8	3	4									
	Tie-Breaker No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 / Criteria 1A, 2A, 3A, 4A, 5A, Total Qual. Points for Criteria 1A	22	5	12	7	5									
17	KVE Architects, P.A., LP														
	1A - Qualification of firms including team members associated to the project (Max. 50 points)	35	35	45	50	40	205	41	27	55					
	2A - Knowledge and Past Experience of similar type projects (Max. 20 points)	15	20	15	20	18	88	18	12	23					
	3A - Past Performance of the Firms (Max. 20 points)	14	10	16	20	18	78	16	10	21					
	4A - Amount of Work Awarded and Paid by the County (Max. 5 points)	2	3	2	3	2	12	2	2	3			7		
	5A - Ability of team members to interface with the County (Max 5 points)	3	2	5	5	5	20	4	3	6	403	35	9	8	8
		69	70	83	98	88									

	Ordinal Scores	11	9	9	3	5									
	Tie-Breaker No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 / Criteria 1A, 2A, 3A, 4A, 5A, Total Qual. Points for Criteria 1A	25	13	14	4	8									
18	HADF Architecture, Inc. - LP														
	1A - Qualification of firms including team members associated to the project (Max. 50 points)	36	30	46	50	42	203	41	27	54					
	2A - Knowledge and Past Experience of similar type projects (Max. 20 points)	15	20	15	20	18	88	18	12	23					
	3A - Past Performance of the Firms (Max. 20 points)	14	15	16	20	19	84	17	11	22					
	4A - Amount of Work Awarded and Paid by the County (Max. 5 points)	1	2	1	1	2	6	1	1	2			11		
	5A - Ability of team members to interface with the County (Max 5 points)	4	5	5	5	5	24	5	3	6	405	41	14	13	13
		70	72	83	96	86									
	Ordinal Scores	10	8	10	5	3									
	Tie-Breaker No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 / Criteria 1A, 2A, 3A, 4A, 5A, Total Qual. Points for Criteria 1A	20	11	16	14	4									
19	Laura M. Perez and Associates, Inc. - LP - ELIMINATED DUE TO NON-CLOSURE														
	1A - Qualification of firms including team members associated to the project (Max. 50 points)	35	40	45	50	41	211	41	28	56					
	2A - Knowledge and Past Experience of similar type projects (Max. 20 points)	15	20	15	20	18	88	18	12	23					
	3A - Past Performance of the Firms (Max. 20 points)	16	15	19	20	17	87	17	12	23					
	4A - Amount of Work Awarded and Paid by the County (Max. 5 points)	2	2	2	2	2	10	2	1	3			6		
	5A - Ability of team members to interface with the County (Max 5 points)	5	5	5	5	5	25	5	3	7	421	25		N/A	N/A
		73	82	86	97	83									
	Ordinal Scores	7	2	7	4	5									
	Tie-Breaker No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 / Criteria 1A, 2A, 3A, 4A, 5A, Total Qual. Points for Criteria 1A	12	2	9	9	7									
20	Wolfberg, Alvarez and Partners, Inc. - LP														
	1A - Qualification of firms including team members associated to the project (Max. 50 points)	35	30	45	46	42	198	40	27	53					
	2A - Knowledge and Past Experience of similar type projects (Max. 20 points)	15	20	15	17	17	84	17	11	22					
	3A - Past Performance of the Firms (Max. 20 points)	15	15	19	17	18	84	17	11	22					
	4A - Amount of Work Awarded and Paid by the County (Max. 5 points)	2	3	1	3	1	10	2	1	3			9		
	5A - Ability of team members to interface with the County (Max 5 points)	4	5	5	6	6	24	5	3	6	400	38	12	11	11
		71	73	85	88	83									
	Ordinal Scores	9	7	8	11	5									
	Tie-Breaker No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 / Criteria 1A, 2A, 3A, 4A, 5A, Total Qual. Points for Criteria 1A	18	9	11	27	6									
21	Lee A. Daly Company - LP														
	1A - Qualification of firms including team members associated to the project (Max. 50 points)	35	35	45	50	38	203	41	27	54					
	2A - Knowledge and Past Experience of similar type projects (Max. 20 points)	14	20	15	20	17	86	17	12	23					
	3A - Past Performance of the Firms (Max. 20 points)	14	15	16	20	17	82	16	11	22					
	4A - Amount of Work Awarded and Paid by the County (Max. 5 points)	2	2	2	2	2	10	2	1	5			10		
	5A - Ability of team members to interface with the County (Max 5 points)	4	5	5	5	5	24	5	3	6	405	40	13	12	12
		69	77	83	97	79									
	Ordinal Scores	11	5	9	4	8									
	Tie-Breaker No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 / Criteria 1A, 2A, 3A, 4A, 5A, Total Qual. Points for Criteria 1A	27	6	15	10	15									
22	Heery International Inc. - LP														
	1A - Qualification of firms including team members associated to the project (Max. 50 points)	35	35	45	50	38	203	41	27	54					
	2A - Knowledge and Past Experience of similar type projects (Max. 20 points)	15	15	18	20	18	86	17	12	23					
	3A - Past Performance of the Firms (Max. 20 points)	15	10	16	20	16	77	15	10	20					
	4A - Amount of Work Awarded and Paid by the County (Max. 5 points)	2	3	2	3	2	12	2	2	3			8		
	5A - Ability of team members to interface with the County (Max 5 points)	3	5	5	6	5	23	5	3	6	402	36	10	9	9
		70	68	87	98	79									
	Ordinal Scores	10	11	6	3	8									
	Tie-Breaker No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 / Criteria 1A, 2A, 3A, 4A, 5A, Total Qual. Points for Criteria 1A	21	17	6	5	13									
23	YZA Architects P.A. - LP														
	1A - Qualification of firms including team members associated to the project (Max. 50 points)	35	35	40	46	38	194	39	25	52					
	2A - Knowledge and Past Experience of similar type projects (Max. 20 points)	15	15	12	18	17	77	15	10	20					
	3A - Past Performance of the Firms (Max. 20 points)	12	10	17	18	17	74	15	10	20					
	4A - Amount of Work Awarded and Paid by the County (Max. 5 points)	4	5	5	5	5	24	5	3	6			13		
	5A - Ability of team members to interface with the County (Max 5 points)	4	3	5	5	4	21	4	3	6	390	61	23	21	21
		70	68	79	92	81									

	Ordinal Scores	10	11	12	7	6									
	Tie-Breaker No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 / Criteria 1A, 2A, 3A, 4A, 5A, Total Qual. Points for Criteria 1A	23	16	23	22	9									
24	Harvey J. Ehrlich, Architect, P.A. - EP - ELIMINATED DUE TO PQC/TC ISSUES														
	1A - Qualification of firms including team members associated to the project (Max. 50 points)	35	30	40	45	30	180	36	24	48					
	2A - Knowledge and Past Experience of similar type projects (Max. 20 points)	15	15	12	18	18	78	16	10	21					
	3A - Past Performance of the Firms (Max. 20 points)	14	15	18	18	16	81	16	11	22					
	4A - Amount of Work Awarded and Paid by the County (Max. 5 points)	5	5	4	5	4	23	5	3	6			17		
	5A - Ability of team members to interface with the County (Max 5 points)	4	4	5	5	4	22	4	3	6	384	55	22	N/A	N/A
		73	69	79	91	72									
	Ordinal Scores	7	10	12	8	11									
	Tie-Breaker No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 / Criteria 1A, 2A, 3A, 4A, 5A, Total Qual. Points for Criteria 1A	13	15	22	24	18									
25	Perez & Perez Architects Planners, Inc. - EP														
	1A - Qualification of firms including team members associated to the project (Max. 50 points)	40	35	40	39	40	204	41	27	54					
	2A - Knowledge and Past Experience of similar type projects (Max. 20 points)	15	15	12	19	16	77	15	10	20					
	3A - Past Performance of the Firms (Max. 20 points)	15	15	15	19	15	79	16	11	21					
	4A - Amount of Work Awarded and Paid by the County (Max. 5 points)	1	1	1	1	2	6	1	1	2			12		
	5A - Ability of team members to interface with the County (Max 5 points)	4	5	5	5	5	24	5	3	6	390	45	15	14	14
		75	71	73	93	78									
	Ordinal Scores	5	8	15	6	9									
	Tie-Breaker No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 / Criteria 1A, 2A, 3A, 4A, 5A, Total Qual. Points for Criteria 1A	5	10	27	19	16									
26	Southeast Design Associates, Inc. - EP														
	1A - Qualification of firms including team members associated to the project (Max. 50 points)	35	30	40	49	34	188	40	27	53					
	2A - Knowledge and Past Experience of similar type projects (Max. 20 points)	15	15	12	19	16	77	15	10	20					
	3A - Past Performance of the Firms (Max. 20 points)	15	10	15	20	10	70	14	9	19					
	4A - Amount of Work Awarded and Paid by the County (Max. 5 points)	3	5	5	5	5	23	5	3	6			13		
	5A - Ability of team members to interface with the County (Max 5 points)	4	3	5	6	5	22	4	3	6	390	46	17	16	16
		72	63	77	98	80									
	Ordinal Scores	8	14	13	3	7									
	Tie-Breaker No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 / Criteria 1A, 2A, 3A, 4A, 5A, Total Qual. Points for Criteria 1A	15	21	24	8	10									
27	VEE Architecture Corp. - EP														
	1A - Qualification of firms including team members associated to the project (Max. 50 points)	35	30	40	45	35	185	37	25	49					
	2A - Knowledge and Past Experience of similar type projects (Max. 20 points)	16	15	12	17	13	73	15	10	19					
	3A - Past Performance of the Firms (Max. 20 points)	14	10	14	17	10	65	13	9	17					
	4A - Amount of Work Awarded and Paid by the County (Max. 5 points)	3	5	5	5	5	23	5	3	6			20		
	5A - Ability of team members to interface with the County (Max 5 points)	5	2	5	5	5	22	4	3	6	368	71	26	24	24
		73	62	76	89	68									
	Ordinal Scores	7	15	14	10	14									
	Tie-Breaker No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 / Criteria 1A, 2A, 3A, 4A, 5A, Total Qual. Points for Criteria 1A	10	23	26	26	22									

YELLOW SHADING DENOTES HIGH AND LOW ORDINAL SCORES DROPPED
GREEN SHADING DENOTES ELIMINATED FIRMS
OCI CHAIRPERSON: AMELIA M. CORDOVA-JIMENEZ