

Walters, Vivian (RER)

From: Walters, Vivian (RER)
Sent: Friday, July 12, 2013 12:43 PM
To: Marrero, Asael (ISD)
Cc: Johnson, Laurie (RER)
Subject: Recommendation For Mesaures
Attachments: Responses - Prime & Subs.pdf

SBD has completed the review of the subject project. Responses were sufficient to establish a Tier 1 Set-Aside for CBEs, (even with the consideration of the requirements listed as “**Preferred**”; additionally, in the areas that had no requirements, namely: **11.00** and **16.00**, responses were still sufficient; and in **20.00**, which had no responses, the stated (**preferred**) requirements would not be applicable, as these scopes of services are external to the structure.

However, a recommendation of a **28% CBE sub-consultant** goal is being made, distributed as follows:

- **12.00 General Mechanical Engineering @ 13%;**
- **13.00 General Electrical Engineering @ 12%;**
- **20.00 Landscape Architecture @ 1%**
- **22.00 ADA Title II Consultant @ 2%.**

Please respond with your “**concurrence**” or **dissent** as to this recommendation.

Advise as to any “*errors, omissions, and/or misunderstanding*”.

Regards,

Vivian O. Walters, Jr.

Contract Development Specialist II
Regulatory and Economic Resources Department
Small Business Development Division
111 NW 1st Street #19 Floor
Miami, FL 33128
walterv@miamidade.gov

☎ Office (305) 375-3138 | 📠 Fax (305) 375-3160

“Delivering Excellence Every Day”

"For the New Project Review & Analysis Process"

 *click on our new website*

<http://www.miamidade.gov/sba/about-project-review-and-analysis.asp>

Miami-Dade County is a public entity subject to Chapter 119 of the Florida Statutes concerning public records. E-mail messages are covered under such laws and thus subject to disclosure.



A13-ISD-01 GOB

Professional Services Agreement for Preparation of Design Criteria Package for the Mental Health Facility Renovation

*Listed below are the firms that have responded to the availability study for the aforementioned project, along with projects performed of a similar scope and meeting the requirements, as stipulated by **ISD** (which were listed as **"Preferred"**).*

✓ Prime – 14.00 & 18.00 (48%)

1. LIVS Associates, Inc.
2. CIMA Engineering Corp. (Meets requirements, but doesn't have the one **"Preferred"** project)
3. Silva Architects, LLC
4. Rizo Carreno & Partners, Inc.
5. Rodriguez Peterson & Porras Architects, Inc.
6. Chalgub, Inc. (Meets requirements, but doesn't have the one **"Preferred"** project)
7. Southeast Design Associates, Inc.
8. Luis E Naya D/B/A Naya Architects
9. Laura M. Perez & Associates, Inc.

✓ Sub-consultants (52%)

11.00 – General Structural Engineering

1. Youssef Hachem Consulting Engineering, Inc.
2. Eastern Engineering Group Company
3. Protek Electrical Engineering, Inc.
4. UCI Engineering

12.00 – General Mechanical Engineering

1. Protek Electrical Engineering, Inc.
2. Louis J. Aguirre & Associates, P.A.
3. Gartek Engineering Corp
4. UCI Engineering (Did not list any of the **"Preferred"** experience)

13.00 – General Electrical Engineering

1. Gartek Engineering Corp
2. Louis J. Aguirre & Associates, P.A.

3. Protek Electrical Engineering, Inc.
4. Youssef Hachem Consulting Engineering, Inc
5. UCI Engineering (Did not list any of the "**Preferred**" experience)

16.00 – General Civil Engineering

1. Develotec, Inc.
2. Milian, Swain & Associates, Inc.
3. Ford Engineers, Inc.

17.00 – Engineering Construction Management

1. Develotec, Inc. (Doesn't have all the "**Preferred**" experience).
2. Louis J. Aguirre & Associates, P.A.
3. Protek Electrical Engineering, Inc.
4. Youssef Hachem Consulting Engineering, Inc

20.00 – Landscape Architecture

22.00 – ADA Title II Consultant

1. Borges & Associates, Inc.
2. Ideal Architecture Design
3. J. Bonfill & Associates, Inc.
4. Luis E Naya D/B/A Naya Architects

*Responses were sufficient to establish a Tier 1 Set-Aside for CBEs, (with the consideration of the requirements listed as "**Preferred**"; additionally, in the areas that had no requirements, namely: **11.00** and **16.00**, responses were still sufficient; and in **20.00**, which had no responses, the stated (**preferred**) requirements would not be applicable, as these scopes of services are external to the structure.*

*However, a recommendation of a **28% CBE sub-consultant** goal is being made, distributed as follows: **12.00** @ 13%; **13.00** @ 12%; **20.00** @ 1% and **22.00** @ 2%.*