
**SEMINOLE COUNTY GOVERNMENT
AGENDA MEMORANDUM**

SUBJECT: Professional Services: PS-2404-07/BHJ - Final Design Services for CR 426 Safety Improvements - Division Street to SR 46.

DEPARTMENT: Administrative Services

DIVISION: Purchasing and Contracts

AUTHORIZED BY: Frank Raymond

CONTACT: Bill Johnson

EXT: 7128

MOTION/RECOMMENDATION:

Approve ranking list and authorize staff to negotiate rates for PS-2404-07/BHJ - Final Design Services for SR 426 Safety Improvements - Division Street to SR 46 with Earth Tech Consulting, Inc. of Orlando, Florida (\$700,000.00 estimated usage amount over the term of the Agreement).

County-wide

Ray Hooper

BACKGROUND:

PS-2404-07/BHJ will provide professional services for final & post design services for the construction of an 8 foot shoulder (5 foot paved) along both sides of CR 426 (Division Street to SR 46) as needed and 1 foot pavement widening on both sides as necessary within project limits. These improvements may include but are not limited to drainage, safety, utilities, driveway connections, unsignalized pedestrian crossings of intersecting roadways, and ADA access along the proposed corridor under a LAP Agreement with FDOT. The project was publicly advertised and the County received eighteen (18) submittals (listed alphabetically):

Bentley Architects + Engineers, Inc.
Bermello Ajamil & Partners, Inc.
Calvin, Giordano & Associates, Inc.
Carnahan, Proctor, & Cross, Inc.
Consul-tech Transportation, Inc.
CPH Engineers, Inc
EAC Consulting, Inc.
Earth Tech Consulting, Inc.
Eisman & Russo, Inc.
GAI Consultants, Inc.
HDR Engineering, Inc.
Horizon Engineering Group
Infrastructure Engineers, Inc.
Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson
Lochrane Engineering, Inc.
Moffatt & Nichol
Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.
WBQ Design & Engineering, Inc.

The Evaluation Committee, which consisted of Brett Blackadar, Principal Engineer, Public Works; Gary Johnson, Director, Public Works; Jerry McCollum, County Engineer, Public Works; and Shad Smith, Principal Engineer, Public Works, evaluated the submittals and agreed to shortlist three (3) firms. The Evaluation Committee interviewed these firms giving consideration to the following criteria:

- Project Approach
- Qualifications of the Proposed Team/Similar Work Experience
- Innovation/Cost Saving Ideas

The attached backup documentation includes the Bid Tabulation, the Presentation Summary & Scoring Sheets, the Evaluation Summary Sheet and the Project Scope. The Evaluation Committee recommends that the Board approve the ranking below and authorize staff to negotiate rates with the top ranked firm in accordance with F.S. 287.055, the Consultants Competitive Negotiation Act (CCNA):

1. Earth Tech Consulting, Inc.
2. Horizon Engineering Group
3. Moffatt & Nichol

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Board approve ranking list and authorize staff to negotiate rates for PS-2404-07/BHJ - Final Design Services for SR 426 Safety Improvements - Division Street to SR 46 with Earth Tech Consulting, Inc. of Orlando, Florida (\$700,000.00 estimated usage amount over the term of the Agreement).

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Professional Services - PS-2404-07/BHJ - Backup

Additionally Reviewed By:

County Attorney Review (Ann Colby)

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

PS NUMBER: PS-2404-07/BHJ

PS TITLE : Final Design Services for CR 426 Safety Improvements
- Shoulder Construction (Division Street to SR 46)

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.

DATE: September 12, 2007 TIME: 2:00 P.M.

RESPONSE -1-	RESPONSE -2-	RESPONSE -3-	RESPONSE -4-	RESPONSE -5-
Bentley Architects + Engineers, Inc. 665 West Warren Ave. Longwood, FL 32750	Bermello Ajamil & Partners, Inc. 315 E Robinson St. STE 570 Orlando, FL 32801	Calvin, Giordano & Associates, Inc. 390 N. Orange Ave. STE 2600 Orlando, FL 32801	Carnahan, Proctor, & Cross, Inc. 1035 S. Semoran Blvd. STE 1027 Winter Park, FL 32792	Consul-tech Transportation, Inc. 2828 Edgewater Dr. Orlando, FL 32804
Molly A. DeVivero, P.E. (407) 331-1616 – Phone (407) 331-4566 – Fax	Michael Heron, P.E. (407) 210-6620 – Phone (407) 650-0455 – Fax	Mindy Carlisle, P.E. (407) 423-0523 – Phone (407) 926-7761 – Fax	Greg Procter, Pres. (407) 478-3620 – Phone (407) 673-6600 – Fax	Phillip Hursh, P.E. (407) 649-8334 – Phone (407) 649-8190 – Fax
RESPONSE -6-	RESPONSE -7-	RESPONSE -8-	RESPONSE -9-	RESPONSE -10-
CPH Engineers, Inc 500 W Fulton St Sanford, FL 32771	EAC Consulting, Inc. 315 E. Robinson St., #580 Orlando, FL 32801	Earth Tech Consulting, Inc. 30 S. Keller Rd. STE 500 Orlando, FL 32810	Eisman & Russo, Inc. 3361 Rouse Road STE 125 Orlando, FL 32817	GAI Consultants, Inc. 618 East South St. Orlando, FL 32801
David A. Gierach, P.E., Pres. (407) 322-6841 – Phone (407) 330-0639 – Fax	Enrique A. Crooks, P.E. (407) 420-4756 – Phone (407) 420-4756 – Fax	David W. Gordon, P.E. (407) 660-1719 – Phone (407) 660-0250 – Fax	Antonio J. Mahfoud, P.E. (407) 382-7774 – Phone (407) 382-7723 – Fax	Richard A. Cima, P.E. (407) 423-8398 – Phone (407) 843-1070 – Fax

RESPONSE -11-	RESPONSE -12-	RESPONSE -13-	RESPONSE -14-	RESPONSE -15-
HDR Engineering, Inc. 315 E. Robinson St. STE 400 Orlando, FL 32801 Steven A. Keyes, P.E. (407) 420-4200 – Phone (407) 420-4242 – Fax	Horizon Engineering Group 2500 Maitland Center Parkway STE 300 Maitland, FL 32751 Scott P. Seck (407) 644-7755 – Phone (407) 644-7855 – Fax	Infrastructure Engineers, Inc. 2121 Old Hickory Tree Rd. St. Cloud, FL 34772 Greg Peschong, P.E. (407) 957-1660 – Phone (407) 957-8744 – Fax	Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson 615 Crescent Executive Court STE 106 Lake Mary, FL 32746 Jon Miller (407) 833-9898 – Phone (407) 833-9899 – Fax	Lochrane Engineering, Inc. 201 South Bumby Ave. Orlando, FL 32803 Donald P. Graham, P.E. (407) 896-3317 – Phone (407) 896-9167 – Fax
RESPONSE -16-	RESPONSE -17-	RESPONSE -18-		
Moffatt & Nichol 1025 Greenwood Blvd, STE 371 Lake Mary, FL 32746 Jeffrey A. Messenger, P.E. (407) 562-2030 – Phone (407) 562-2031 – Fax	Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc. 225 E. Robinson St. STE 300 Orlando, FL 32801 Mark Bertoncini, P.E. (407) 839-4006 – Phone (407) 839-4008 – Fax	WBQ Design & Engineering, Inc. 201 N. Magnolia Ave. Orlando, FL 32801 Jennifer R. Quigley (407) 839-4300 – Phone (407) 839-1621 – Fax		

Tabulated by B. Johnson - Posted September 17, 2007 (2:00 PM EST)

Short-listing Evaluation Committee Meeting: **Revised** Thursday, October 18, 2007 at 3:00 PM EST – Reflections Plaza, Lake Jessup Conference Room, 520 W. Lake Mary Blvd, Sanford, FL 32773

Short-listed Firms: *(Updated by B. Johnson October 19, 2007 at 9:15 AM EST)*

Earth Tech Consulting, Inc.
Horizon Engineering Group
& Nichol

Presentations: Wednesday, November 14, 2007 at 1:30 PM EST – Reflections Plaza, Lake Jessup Conference Room, 520 W. Lake Mary Blvd, Sanford, FL 32773.

Earth Tech Consulting, Inc.	1:30 – 2:10 PM
Horizon Engineering Group	2:15 – 2:55 PM
Moffatt & Nichol	3:00 – 3:40 PM

Ranking and Authorization for Negotiation: *(Board Date: Tuesday, December 11, 2007)*
(Updated by B. Johnson 11/16/2007 8:30 AM EST)

1. Earth Tech Consulting, Inc.
2. Horizon Engineering Group
3. Moffatt & Nichol

Recommendation: TBD

PRESENTATION RANKINGS

11/14/2007

1:30 PM EST

PS-2404-07/BHJ - Final Design Services for CR 426 Safety Improvements - Shoulder Construction (Division Street to SR 46)

	B. Blackadar	G. Johnson	J. McCollum	S. Smith	TOTAL POINTS	RANKING
Earth Tech Consulting, Inc.	1	1	1	2	5	1
Horizon Engineering Group	2	2	2	1	7	2
Moffatt & Nichol	3	3	3	3	12	3

The Evaluation Committee agrees to the following ranking:

- 1 Earth Tech Consulting, Inc.
- 2 Horizon Engineering Group
- 3 Moffatt & Nichol



Brett Blackadar



Jerry McCollum



Gary Johnson



Shad Smith

PS-2404-07/BHJ – Final Design Services for CR 426 Safety Improvements - Shoulder Construction (Division Street to SR 46)

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Earth Tech Consulting, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Jerry McCollum

EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion up to the number of points allotted for each. The total number of points for all criterion will equal 100 points based on the following general guidelines:

- Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Please describe any strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment for each of the above stated evaluation criteria.

Project Approach: (60) 16 mos. schedule QAVAC program

Safety issues - No passing zone study.
 Bike riders use - Have several parks along roadway
 School bus stop issues - Why need 29' when you have 22'. Can use 6' shoulders and black base.
 Reduce earthwork - 2 Row areas of access. Audible edge lines. Intersect. design - Drainage - w. 10' l.f.
 Right of way details. Endments at 4' f. Use maintenance maps. Est 4.1 M. Ut. l.f. Use
 ET estimate 2.7M Very detailed Very good (+) Score 49.2
 (0-60)

Cost Savings

82

Qualifications of Proposed Team/Similar Work Experience: (20)

Good experience staff and experience, HAP experience and right of way (FOWT former staff)

Good (++) Score 15.6
 (0-20)

78

Innovation/Cost Savings Ideas: (20)

Typical Section 11' lanes / black base / audible edge. Innov. intersection, Fencing / mulch
 Row savings
 Very good / detailed
 Score 16.0
 (0-20)

80

Ranking 1 Total Score (0-100) 80.80

Row
 Q 42/43 - w/out claim Row prescription

PS-2404-07/BHJ - Final Design Services for CR 426 Safety Improvements - Shoulder Construction (Division Street to SR 46)

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Horizon Consulting Group

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Jerry McCollum

EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion up to the number of points allotted for each. The total number of points for all criterion will equal 100 points based on the following general guidelines:

- Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Please describe any strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment for each of the above stated evaluation criteria.

Project Approach: (60)

QA/QC program
 Reduce plan format (S) - Good on history of projects
 Design criteria (Use PPM) Speed study (57 mph)
 All lanes - 5' shoulder use 4' shoulder use 6' shld. most areas - maybe not mill. Harv. curve issues, 4 areas of ROW acco. Shift rdwy in some areas to save ROW - side slope issues. Missing soil SW to Shore Kelly. No Pestling Study. MAT
 Rumble strip (b. Ker). Drainage/Wetland issue. 80
 utilities / Public Involvement - 12 mos. schedule Score 48.0
 Horizon est. 5.0 M Very good (0-60)

Qualifications of Proposed Team/Similar Work Experience: (20)

Very experienced staff and similar work especially in mill/resurfacing Also LAP experience Barfield for ROW
 Good (++) Score 15.6 (0-20)

Innovation/Cost Savings Ideas: (20)

Minimize mill/resurfacing. Use black base. Shift ROW in order to save money. Guard rail (Min. wetland)
 Detailed Good (++) Score 15.6 (0-20)

Ranking 2

Total Score (0-100) 79.2

Q Row - maint. map will consider as option

PS-2404-07/BHJ – Final Design Services for CR 426 Safety Improvements - Shoulder Construction (Division Street to SR 46)

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Moffatt & Nichol

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Jerry McCollum

EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion up to the number of points allotted for each. The total number of points for all criterion will equal 100 points based on the following general guidelines:

- Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Please describe any strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment for each of the above stated evaluation criteria.

Project Approach: (60)

QA/QC program

LAP criteria - Use PPM-3R criteria.
 No R, L, or W. Postpone after FDOT work done. 12 hrs. design. Widen to one side only to get 12' pavement. Maybe minimal milling. Drainage Util. L. Several intersections dismissed. Mail box issue. Did discuss wild-life issue. No b. Kog discussion. Est. 4,25M. Do Passing Zone study. Available markings. Good(++)

78

Score 46.8
(0-60)

Qualifications of Proposed Team/Similar Work Experience: (20)

Several LAP projects. Did original study for project. Done similar projects. CR 448 project (L. K. E.). Good exp. staff and experience.

78

Good(++)

Score 15.6
(0-20)

Innovation/Cost Savings Ideas: (20)

Lane widening (Must 12') - widen 1 side only. Safety improvement. Survey. No ROW? Q How do this (Ans. exceptions)

78

Good(++)

Score 15.6
(0-20)

Ranking 3

Total Score (0-100) 78.0

PS-2404-07/BHJ – Final Design Services for CR 426 Safety Improvements - Shoulder Construction (Division Street to SR 46)

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Earth Tech Consulting, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Brett Blackadar

EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion up to the number of points allotted for each. The total number of points for all criterion will equal 100 points based on the following general guidelines:

- Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Please describe any strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment for each of the above stated evaluation criteria.

Project Approach: (60)

Very good discussion. Very good school bus discussion. Excellent typical section analysis. Good intersection turn lane analysis. Very good utility analysis. Good drainage overview. Ed has already met with the agency where we need ROW. Very good ROW discussion. Very good mail delivery discussion. Very good cost analysis. Had very good pavement discussions. Excellent project schedule. Excellent answers to questions.

Score 55
(0-60)

Qualifications of Proposed Team/Similar Work Experience: (20)

Proposed team is experienced & qualified. They have both County & DOT experience. Ed Bokhold is former DOT ROW agent. LAP experience.

Score 19
(0-20)

Innovation/Cost Savings Ideas: (20)

Propose a re-passing zone analysis. Propose maintaining 11' lanes, 6' shoulders & black base, but earthwork in half. Install available striping. Do maintenance work to expand ROW. Excavate out areas from survey. Several other items. OK start do constructability review.

Score 18
(0-20)

Ranking _____

Total Score (0-100) 92

PS-2404-07/BHJ – Final Design Services for CR 426 Safety Improvements - Shoulder Construction (Division Street to SR 46)

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Horizon Consulting Group

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Brett Blackadar

EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion up to the number of points allotted for each. The total number of points for all criterion will equal 100 points based on the following general guidelines:

- Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Please describe any strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment for each of the above stated evaluation criteria.

Project Approach: _____ (60)

Very good overview of history of projects in corridor. Did a special study to justify 55 mph design speed. Very good design technical analysis. Very good intersection analysis. Good horizontal clearance analysis. Proper subgrade connection to Stone Lake park. Return road to passing state & special study. Very detailed drainage discussion. Very thorough culvert discussion. Very good environmental permitting discussion. Did not propose detailed typical sections. Score 50
(0-60)

Qualifications of Proposed Team/Similar Work Experience: _____ (20)

Experienced + qualified team. They have County + FDOT experience. Ed Bartfield is on the team - but he did not present. Score 18
(0-20)

Innovation/Cost Savings Ideas: _____ (20)

Propose reduced set of plans. Proper 8' shoulders + steeper slopes using Ch. 25 P.M. Propose to maintain 11' ft laneway for new pavement, mill 0.5" or not at all. No cross slope connection by making it equal at rebuild. Acquire R/W on only one side. Proper rumble strips in pavement markings. Proper BSA per review. Multiple pavement design options for contractor. Proper 2' paved in tight area. Score 19
(0-20)

Ranking _____

Total Score (0-100) 88

PS-2404-07/BHJ – Final Design Services for CR 426 Safety Improvements - Shoulder Construction (Division Street to SR 46)

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Moffatt & Nichol

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Brett Blackadar

EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion up to the number of points allotted for each. The total number of points for all criterion will equal 100 points based on the following general guidelines:

- Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Please describe any strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment for each of the above stated evaluation criteria.

Project Approach: (60)

Some most regular street, has 12' lanes. Very good pavement analysis. Very good analysis of typical section near Reed Ave. Very good road utility discussion. Very good utility analysis. Propose passing zone study. Very good flooding discussion. Very good permit plan analysis. Very good environmental discussion. Very good historical structure research. Propose 12 month design schedule.

Score 50
(0-60)

Qualifications of Proposed Team/Similar Work Experience: (20)

Team is not as experienced or diversified as other proposed teams. Team does have a lot of similar experience. They are doing a similar project for Lake County.

Score 17
(0-20)

Innovation/Cost Savings Ideas: (20)

No improvements needed for cost. Propose no PWS acquisition. Widen to 12 lanes but within on only one side of road. Don't do minimum pavement design. Propose available pavement marking. 45th savings for Survey. Propose clear zone variations so we can build the project sooner.

Score 18
(0-20)

Ranking _____

Total Score (0-100) 87

PS-2404-07/BHJ – Final Design Services for CR 426 Safety Improvements - Shoulder Construction (Division Street to SR 46)

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Earth Tech Consulting, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Gary Johnson

EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion up to the number of points allotted for each. The total number of points for all criterion will equal 100 points based on the following general guidelines:

- Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Please describe any strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment for each of the above stated evaluation criteria.

Project Approach: _____ (60)

Excellent funding analysis - Fed req's
Traffic study good - no pass zones featured, multiple school bus stops
Innovative approach - 11' lanes, 6' shldr on black base
Intersections - Geneva & Snow Hill Rd
Drainage analysis good - permitting included, recognized pre-existing cond.
"Expand R/W envelope" - use maintenance maps, easements for harmonizing
LAP experience 16 month schedule

Score 55
(0-60)

Qualifications of Proposed Team/Similar Work Experience: _____ (20)

HNTB background
LAP experience

Score 20
(0-20)

Innovation/Cost Savings Ideas: _____ (20)

Typical section - design issues
Right-of-way - earthwork
QA/QC

Score 18
(0-20)

Ranking 1

Total Score (0-100) 93

PS-2404-07/BHJ – Final Design Services for CR 426 Safety Improvements - Shoulder Construction (Division Street to SR 46)

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Horizon Consulting Group

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Gary Johnson

EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion up to the number of points allotted for each. The total number of points for all criterion will equal 100 points based on the following general guidelines:

- Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Please describe any strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment for each of the above stated evaluation criteria.

Project Approach: _____ (60)

Extensive Mill & resurface experience - LAP projects, \$3R
Good general mgmt. approach - Use DOT PPM c'tels
Keep 11' lanes & shoulder, 2' paved, mill & resurface black base
Good horiz & vertical alignment analysis, widen west @ N. end
Good clear zone analysis, drainage basin issues, multiple options, avoid mitigation
Utility coordination standard procedure
12 month schedule - No exemption due to wetlands

Score 50
(0-60)

Qualifications of Proposed Team/Similar Work Experience: _____ (20)

Extensive FDOT mill & resurface (\$3R)
Scott S - extensive SC experience

Score 20
(0-20)

Innovation/Cost Savings Ideas: _____ (20)

Multiple options - black base determined by contractor
- reduce reviews

Score 15
(0-20)

Ranking 2

Total Score (0-100) 85

PS-2404-07/BHJ – Final Design Services for CR 426 Safety Improvements - Shoulder Construction (Division Street to SR 46)

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Moffatt & Nichol

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Gary Johnson

EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion up to the number of points allotted for each. The total number of points for all criterion will equal 100 points based on the following general guidelines:

- Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Please describe any strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment for each of the above stated evaluation criteria.

Project Approach: _____ (60)

"1 yr early, \$2M savings" → Design, no R/W, limits, survey
LAP Manual: Green Book or PPM (FDOT)
Textbook 3R project - no R/W req'd postpone
<15% needs to be widened - good details at each intersection (west end)
mailbox turnoffs, utility pole adjustments
Passing zone study, use guardrail instead of extending culverts
Noticed General Permit - saves R/W + mitigation

Score 45
(0-60)

Qualifications of Proposed Team/Similar Work Experience: _____ (20)

3 current LAP projects
SC exp g/TET, CR 448 (Lake County)

Score 15
(0-20)

Innovation/Cost Savings Ideas: _____ (20)

Reuse exist. materials
2D aerial survey saves 2 months, \$45K
12 mos. vs. 24 mos.

Score 15
(0-20)

Ranking 3

Total Score (0-100) 75

PS-2404-07/BHJ – Final Design Services for CR 426 Safety Improvements - Shoulder Construction (Division Street to SR 46)

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Earth Tech Consulting, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Shad Smith

EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion up to the number of points allotted for each. The total number of points for all criterion will equal 100 points based on the following general guidelines:

- Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Please describe any strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment for each of the above stated evaluation criteria.

Project Approach: (60)

Excellent approach. Very Good presentation.
16 Month schedule - very realistic
covered safety very well. Excellent cost coverage.
Drainage exemption - Disagree due to wetland
covered. Benefit cost very well
A couple of areas not covered well and not detailed.
Do not recommend milling - actually said can't
do it with safety money.

Score 55
(0-60)

Qualifications of Proposed Team/Similar Work Experience: (20)

Outstanding experienced team.
LAPE experience
Excellent Subs.

Score 19
(0-20)

Innovation/Cost Savings Ideas: (20)

Reduce Design Cost. ROW reduction Excellent
Typical section breakdown. Intersection improvements
Add wildlife fencing.
Maintenance Maps.

Score 20
(0-20)

Ranking _____

Total Score (0-100) 94

PS-2404-07/BHJ – Final Design Services for CR 426 Safety Improvements - Shoulder Construction (Division Street to SR 46)

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Horizon Consulting Group

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Shad Smith

EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion up to the number of points allotted for each. The total number of points for all criterion will equal 100 points based on the following general guidelines:

- Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Please describe any strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment for each of the above stated evaluation criteria.

Project Approach: _____ (60)

*Excellent coverage of typicals.
Outside slopes varied
Good schedule, Modify limits.
Realized 20' Dedication at North end.
Excellent answer to Questions, Maint Maps
Covered ADA Sidewalks well
mentioned Historic Building
Did not cover RW in detail.*

Score 57
(0-60)

Qualifications of Proposed Team/Similar Work Experience: _____ (20)

*Excellent team w/ exp experience.
Listed similar projects.*

Score 18
(0-20)

Innovation/Cost Savings Ideas: _____ (20)

*11' x 4' shoulder. Multiple Port Designs, 2' urban sidewalks.
Reduce wetland impacts < .5.
Estimate is high.*

Score 20
(0-20)

Ranking _____

Total Score (0-100) 95

PS-2404-07/BHJ – Final Design Services for CR 426 Safety Improvements - Shoulder Construction (Division Street to SR 46)

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Moffatt & Nichol

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Shad Smith

EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion up to the number of points allotted for each. The total number of points for all criterion will equal 100 points based on the following general guidelines:

- Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Please describe any strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment for each of the above stated evaluation criteria.

Project Approach: (60)

Mentioned follow FHWA criteria for ROW.
Explained only small area has 12' lane
*State No ROW Required. Cover control zones well.
found some drainage structures that were missing.
Covered environmental very well. Covered Geotech
PZ Study is needed.
12 Mo schedule. Good presentation NOT excellent
Disagree that D. Mott needs involved.

Score 53
(0-60)

Qualifications of Proposed Team/Similar Work Experience: (20)

GOOD team. No county experience.
Did similar project CR 448 in lake Co.
LAP experience.

Score 17
(0-20)

Innovation/Cost Savings Ideas: (20)

Removing 6' Rail at 6th St. Relocate handrail
Did show COST and how much saved.
Reed Ave + Oklahoma St improvements. No ROW required
No ROW

Score 17
(0-20)

Ranking _____

Total Score (0-100) 87

EVALUATION RANKINGS

October 18, 2007 at 3:00 PM EST

PS-2404-07/BHJ - Final Design Services for CR 426 Safety Improvements - Shoulder Construction (Division Street to SR 46)

	B. Blackadar	G. Johnson	J. McCollum	S. Smith	TOTAL POINTS	RANKING
Bentley Architects + Engineers, Inc.	15	13	13	15	56	14
Bermello Ajamil & Partners, Inc.	12	9	12	10	43	10
Calvin, Giordano & Associates, Inc.	17	12	15	17	61	16
Carnahan, Proctor, & Cross, Inc.	18	14	18	18	68	18
Consul-tech Transportation	13	6	8	11	38	9
CPH Engineers, Inc.	16	8	17	16	57	15
EAC Consulting, Inc.	8	4	11	12	35	8
Earth Tech Consulting, Inc.	2	1	3	1	7	1
Eisman & Russo, Inc.	5	3	9	6	23	7
GAI Consultants, Inc.	6	2	5	8	21	4
HDR Engineering, Inc.	7	7	6	2	22	6
Horizon Engineering Group	4	5	4	5	18	2
Infrastructure Engineers, Inc.	11	11	14	7	43	10
Johnson Mirmiran & Thompson	9	16	7	14	46	12
Lochrane Engineering, Inc.	10	17	10	9	46	12
Moffatt & Nichol	3	10	1	4	18	2
Vanasse Hangen & Brustlin, Inc.	1	15	2	3	21	4
WBQ Design & Engineering, Inc.	14	18	16	13	61	16

The Evaluation Committee agrees to short-list the following firms:

**Earth Tech Consulting, Inc.
Horizon Engineering Group
Moffatt & Nichol**


Brett Blackadar


Jerry McCollum


Gary Johnson


Shad Smith

Exhibit A
C.R. 426 Shoulder Improvements
Division Street to SR 46
CIP # 1916-52
FP ID: 419679-1

<p>Scope of Services</p> <p>Preliminary Engineering, Design & Permitting</p>

A. PURPOSE AND INTENT

Seminole County (**COUNTY**) wishes to select a FDOT Prequalified Professional Engineering Firm (**CONSULTANT**) to provide professional engineering design services for this FDOT LAP Project (FPN No. 419679-1-38-01). The design services are in connection with constructing shoulders along both sides of approximately 2.0 miles of County Road 426 from Division Street to SR 46.

The purpose of this document is to inform prospective **CONSULTANTS** that the **COUNTY** intends to design and construct shoulder including 5' paved along both sides of County Road 426 as needed. This document defines the scope of work and the responsibilities of the **CONSULTANT** and it provides a non-exclusive summary of technical requirements and necessary professional services. Our purpose is to achieve a quality design in a timely manner from competent professionals providing construction documents.

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project is located in Seminole County with a small segment in the city limits of Oviedo. This project consists of addition of 5' paved shoulder and the widening 8-foot shoulders as needed. Additionally, the mainline roadway will be widened to 12' as deemed necessary for increased safety. Lastly, this project includes the mainline milling and resurfacing of the existing pavement. These improvements may include but are not limited to shoulder construction, drainage, pavement striping, utility relocations, driveway connections, right-of-way acquisition, milling and resurfacing, and ADA access along the proposed corridor in areas of existing sidewalk. It is anticipated that some additional right-of-way will be required, as justified.

C. GENERAL PROJECT REQUIREMENTS

1.0 Project Invoicing

When invoicing, the **CONSULTANT** is to submit an invoicing distribution consistent with the primary categories of the Scope of Services. Direct expenses shall be separately listed. Each month's invoice is to indicate the following minimum data:

- Invoice Number
- Contract amount
- Percent (%) complete for each category (to date)
- Previous percent (%) complete for each category
- An overall project percent (%) complete (to date)
- An overall earned amount (to date)
- Total retainage to date
- The previous invoice amount (incl. retainage)
- Amount earned this invoice
- Less retainage (current invoice)
- Amount due this invoice

- County Contract Number & FDOT Contract Number
- Project Identification & Limits.

2.0 Consultant Personnel

The **CONSULTANT**'s work is to be performed by the key personnel at the office location identified in the technical/fee proposal submitted by the **CONSULTANT**. Prior to any changes in the indicated personnel or the **CONSULTANT**'s office-in-charge of the work, as identified in the **CONSULTANT**'s Proposal, these changes will be reviewed and approved by the **COUNTY**.

3.0 Project Related Correspondence

The **CONSULTANT** will furnish copies of all correspondence, telephone memorandums, fax's, maps, exhibits, etc. between the **CONSULTANT** and any party regarding this project. This information is to be forwarded to the **COUNTY**'s Project Manager within one (1) week of the contact with these parties.

The **CONSULTANT** is responsible for recording and distributing the minutes of all meetings, presentations, etc. pertaining to this project. Upon completion of the study, the **CONSULTANT** shall deliver to the **COUNTY**, in an organized manner, all project files, maps, sketches, worksheets, and other materials used or generated during the study process.

4.0 Professional Endorsement

The **CONSULTANT** will provide the **COUNTY** with a final copy of all design documents with his/her professional endorsement (seal/signature as appropriate) on every sheet of the record print sets, computations, maps, exhibits and any other professional work shown on the endorsed sheets produced by the **CONSULTANT**. The original set of plans shall have the title block placed on each sheet, and the raised seal and original signature shall be placed on the Key Map.

5.0 Supplemental Services

Fees and associated time for completion of additional work that is determined by the **COUNTY** to be extraordinary to the accomplishment or requirements of the original work contemplated in the scope of services may be negotiated as an extension of the man-hour and fee proposal within the approved design services Agreement utilizing man-hour unit price basis from the current fee proposal for similar work. Supplemental work for tasks not contemplated in the Scope of Services can be negotiated as a formal amendment to the original design services Agreement. The executed work order will authorize the additional work to begin.

6.0 Legal Proceedings

The **CONSULTANT** will serve as an expert witness in legal proceedings, if requested by the **COUNTY**. The fee for these services will be established if and when these services are requested.

7.0 County Responsibility

The **COUNTY** shall provide the following:

- Project Manager who will provide administrative and technical coordination for the **COUNTY**
- Relevant design correspondence on file
- Assistance with the application process for environmental permits.

8.0 Subcontractor Services

The variety of the professional services required to successfully design the project makes it desirable, if not necessary, for the **CONSULTANT** to subcontract portions of the work (e.g., aerial photography). The **CONSULTANT** is authorized to subcontract these services to a FDOT Prequalified Subconsultant under the provisions of this document. However, a minimum of 50% of the total contract man-hours specified for work described in the Scope of Services must be performed by the prime **CONSULTANT**. The subcontracting firms must be approved by the **COUNTY** prior to initiation of their work on this project.

Coordination of SUBCONSULTANT services is the responsibility of the CONSULTANT. The CONSULTANT shall be fully responsible for the satisfactory performance of all subcontracted work. All work shall be reviewed by the CONSULTANT prior to delivery to the COUNTY.

D. SCOPE OF WORK REQUIREMENTS

The CONSULTANT will provide all necessary professional services for the preparation of construction plans, technical specifications, special provisions, agency permits, bid documents, and related professional services to design C.R. 426 Shoulder improvements from Division Street to SR 46.

Final design plans will be prepared consistent with COUNTY and the FDOT requirements. The CONSULTANT will prepare all documents necessary to successfully permit the project through regulatory agencies and to publicly bid and construct the project according to the design and permits. The final construction design developed by the CONSULTANT shall be the best solution to a given problem and not merely an adherence to the minimum FDOT, AASHTO, or County standards.

The CONSULTANT will submit a **man-hour and fee proposal** for the required services, including SUBCONSULTANT services and direct expenses. With this proposal, the CONSULTANT will provide a Project Schedule, as described in Section 1.2 of Appendix A.

The professional services for the design services included within this Scope of Services can be generally grouped into the following eight (8) primary categories:

1. **Administration**
2. **Surveys**
3. **Final Design & Specifications**
4. **Environmental & Regulatory Permitting**
5. **Utility Coordination and Relocation**
6. **Local Government, FDOT, & Other Agency Coordination**
7. **Deliverables / Phase Submission Documents**

Please refer to the **Appendix A** for a description of each task within these eight (8) elements. These descriptions provide a non-exclusive summary of the specific tasks within this Scope of Services and are the minimum criteria for project performance and execution.

APPENDIX A

Expanded Scope of Services

1.0 Administration

2.1 Project Initiation/Notice to Proceed

The CONSULTANT will prepare for and attend a Kick-off Meeting with the COUNTY's Project Manager, staff and others as determined by the COUNTY. At this meeting, the COUNTY and key members of the CONSULTANT's team will set the final parameters for the project. The executed work order will serve as the Notice to Proceed.

2.1 Project Schedule

As part of the man-hour and lump-sum fee proposal, the CONSULTANT will provide a Project Schedule, identifying the timetable for execution and completion of all elements of the Scope of Work. The schedule will identify major tasks, duration and task relationships. An electronic submittal, compatible with *MS Project* is required. This schedule will indicate both projected and actual completion dates. The CONSULTANT will send the COUNTY's Project Manager an e-mail update of the *MS Project* compatible schedule monthly.

2.1 Project Status Meetings

The appropriate members of the CONSULTANT's team will attend periodic meetings [up to three (3)] with the COUNTY's Project Manager and staff to discuss the project's progress, status and other activities. The purpose of these meetings is to maintain clear communication between the COUNTY and the CONSULTANT's team. The CONSULTANT will prepare minutes from these meetings, and distribute these minutes within ten (10) days following each meeting.

The CONSULTANT will communicate with the COUNTY bi-weekly, via email, the project's progress and issues.

2.1 Coordination Meetings

The CONSULTANT will be required to meet with various project stakeholders to discuss the project and receive input. The CONSULTANT should plan to attend at least four (4) such meetings. The CONSULTANT may be called upon to provide maps, plans sheets, audio-visual displays and similar material for these meetings.

2.1 Public Involvement

The purpose of a public involvement element is to ensure that the community is involved in the project development and decision making process so that the COUNTY can develop a project that not only meets the pedestrian needs of the area, but is also supported by the community it serves. Therefore, the CONSULTANT will conduct the following public involvement activities:

1.1 Community Awareness Program:

The CONSULTANT will provide newsletters to update the general public on the project's progress at the 60% Phase submittals.

1.2 Public Involvement Meeting:

The CONSULTANT will prepare for one (1) public involvement meeting as described below. The CONSULTANT will conduct the meeting for the COUNTY, with assistance from the COUNTY, to ensure an adequate number of personnel are present. The CONSULTANT will be responsible for presentation and handout materials, and will provide minutes / summary the meeting. The CONSULTANT shall prepare written responses to questions not adequately

addressed at the meeting and will provide follow-up information necessary to respond to the public's questions and comments.

The **CONSULTANT** shall coordinate and conduct, with the **COUNTY**'s assistance, a public involvement meeting at the approximate 60% Construction Plan Stage. The purpose of this meeting is to inform the community of the project and proposed sidewalk improvements along the CR 426 corridor. The **CONSULTANT** shall present the design to the public and respond to their questions and comments. The meeting shall include a 20-minute presentation followed by a question and answer period. The **CONSULTANT** will have staff available to respond to questions from the public. The **CONSULTANT** will prepare and provide mounted color aerial based boards depicting the 60% Construction Plans. The **CONSULTANT** will prepare and provide up to two-hundred (200) copies of a comment and information form for use by the public.

2.0 SURVEYS/RIGH-OF-WAY DOCUMENTS

2.1 Specific Purpose Surveys for Right-of-Way Acquisition and Sketches of Description

The **CONSULTANT** is to provide the **COUNTY** with the necessary Specific Purpose Surveys for right-of-way acquisition and Sketches of Description for the project. These documents shall meet or exceed the following requirements:

- 2.1.1 Comply with the Technical Standards for Land Surveyors and Mappers in accordance with Chapter 61G17-6, Florida Administrative Code, pursuant to Chapter 472, Florida Statutes.
- 2.1.2 The man-hour and fee proposal should reflect an estimated twenty (15) right-of-way acquisition parcels. If additional parcels are necessary, the **CONSULTANT** will be reimbursed on a unit price basis derived from the fee proposal. Parcel sketches, descriptions and Specific Purpose Survey maps will be submitted.
- 2.1.3 Title searches will be to the earliest public record. Two (2) sets are required and will be submitted in the manner as described within these specifications. The **COUNTY** will acquire and provide the Title Searches to the **CONSULTANT**.
- 2.1.4 Final approved Specific Purpose Survey maps and sketches of description will, in addition to blueline and mylars, be submitted in the following formats:
 - a. Specific Purpose Survey for Right-of-Way Acquisition will be in Microsoft format.
 - b. Legal descriptions on disk in Microsoft Word format.
 - c. A numbered Point-Plot drawing of all parcels and control points will be prepared and submitted on disk in MicroStation.
 - d. Sketch of descriptions in a MicroStation file.

2.2 CONTROL SURVEYS

- 2.2.1 The Control Survey will be contained within the Specific Purpose Survey map in place of the key map. The title block will note Specific Purpose Survey for Right-of-Way Acquisition. The map will be drawn at a scale of not greater than 1 inch = 200 feet, and will be legible. The Specific Purpose Survey will meet the Minimum Technical Standards as required in Chapter 61G17-6.005 (4)(A) and contain the following certification on the first sheet of the Specific Purpose Survey.

"I hereby certify that to the best of my knowledge and belief this drawing, consisting of sheets _____ thru _____ is a true, accurate and complete depiction of a field survey performed under my direction and completed on _____. I further certify that said drawing is in compliance with the Florida Minimum Technical Standards for Control Surveys as set forth in Chapter 61G17-6 by the Florida Board of Professional Surveyors and Mappers, pursuant to section 472.027, Florida Statutes."

- 2.2.2 The Specific Purpose Survey, where possible, will be required to be tied to the COUNTY'S Horizontal Control and GPS Control Networks. All P.C.P.'s and fractional corners will have State Plane Coordinate Values calculated for them and shown on the Specific Purpose Survey Point Reference sheet in a tabular form. Vertical control will be based on, tied into the COUNTY'S Vertical Control Points, where possible, and noted on the map.
- 2.2.3 The baseline of survey, as shown on the Specific Purpose Survey, shall physically exist in the field and have referenced P.C.P.'s at all P.I.s, P.C.s, P.T.s, the beginning and end of the project, and at all side street centerline intersections.
- 2.2.4 The control survey will show all control references both horizontal and vertical.
- 2.2.5 The following surveyor's note shall be contained on the Specific Purpose Survey:

"This survey was performed for the purpose of establishing a baseline, locating existing monumentation and placing additional monuments where required. Said data to be used in the preparation of Boundary Surveys for Right-of-Way Acquisition."
- 2.2.6 Field notes and computer printouts will be submitted at the 60% submittal. All field traverse, bench loop runs and sketches depicting stations with point block numbers for data collected information will be kept in bound field book provided by the **CONSULTANT**. These books become the property of Seminole County. Computer printouts of raw and processed electronically collected field data will be bound and have an index that correlates the material to the field book sketch by field book and page. All field books will be certified by the surveyor of record. Additional field notes and computer printout information will be submitted as completed or in the next submittal.
- 2.2.7 All sections through which the corridor or proposed corridor passes will be surveyed in their entirety. All section and 1/4 section corners will be recovered or set and referenced in accordance with the latest addition of the B.L.M. *Manual of Instructions for the Survey of the Public Lands of the United States*. All certified corner records used or new records to be submitted to D.N.R. will be submitted at 60% for review by the **COUNTY**. All references to be placed outside the limits of construction.
- 2.2.8 All underground storage tanks, septic tanks, drainfields and wells must be field located if inside the proposed right-of-way limits or within the limits of construction, and shown in detail with station/offset location on the right-of-way map as well as the construction plans. All above ground improvements must be located within 25' of the proposed right-of-way or limits of construction by station/offset.

2.3 RIGH-OF-WAY SURVEYS

- 2.3.1 "I hereby certify this Specific Purpose Survey, consists of sheets ____ through ____ for the specific purpose of surveying, referencing, describing and mapping the right-of-way corridor and adjoining properties for the transportation facility shown and depicted hereon, that said survey was done under my responsible charge and meets the Minimum Technical Standards for Land Surveyors and Mappers as set forth within Chapter 61G17-6, Florida Administrative Code, Florida Statutes."
- 2.3.2 Boundary Surveys for Right-of-Way Acquisition will be submitted at the preliminary and final phases. Detailed Maps are to be drawn at 1" = 40' scale. Variations of this scale may be acceptable provided all required information is shown in a "legible" format; however, approvals from the COUNTY'S Project Manager and Quality Assurance Surveyor are required prior to preparation of any non-standard scale map.
- 2.3.3 Field notes and computer printouts will be provided. All field traverse, bench loop runs and sketches depicting stations with point block numbers for data collected information will be kept in

bound field book provided by the ENGINEER. These books become the property of the COUNTY. Computer printouts of raw and processed electronically collected field data will be bound and have an index that correlates the material to the field book sketch by field book and page. All field books will be certified by the surveyor of record. Additional field notes and computer printout information will be submitted as completed or in the next submittal.

- 2.3.4 All section and ¼ section corners used in fractional calculations will be recovered or set and referenced in accordance with the latest addition of the B.L.M. *Manual of Instructions for the Survey of the Public Lands of the United States*. All certified corner records used or new records to be submitted to D.N.R. will be submitted for review by the COUNTY. All references are to be placed outside the limits of construction.
- 2.3.5 Subdivision Blocks, affected by the right-of-way takings, adjoining the right-of-way corridor, will be mathematically closed and supported by field measurements; found corners to be noted on the Map. All Block corners will be recovered or set in the field and noted on the Map. A Surveyor's Report will be prepared for areas where it is not readily apparent by reviewing the Map as to what corners were held to construct a particular block or tier of blocks.
- 2.3.6 A Surveyor's Report will be required on parcels that present unusual problems (conflicting corners, deed overlays, hiatus, etc.). This report should include, but not limited to, sketches, detailed title chronology, plats, tax maps and the surveyor's opinion detailing how the problem was resolved.
- 2.3.7 All underground storage tanks, septic tanks, drain fields and wells must be field located if inside the proposed right-of-way limits or within the limits of construction, and shown in detail with station/offset location on the right-of-way map as well as the construction plans. All above ground improvements must be located within 25' of the proposed right-of-way or limits of construction by station/offset.
- 2.3.8 Upon completion of acquisition, the ENGINEER shall complete the table of ownership with the appropriate book and page where the description for the fee take and/or temporary construction easement and/or permanent easement is recorded.

2.4 SKETCH OF DESCRIPTION AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION

- 2.4.1 An individual sketch of description will be prepared for each right-of-way parcel, temporary construction easement, permanent easement, rights-of-entry, and T.I.I.F. reservations.
- 2.4.2 All sketches, legal descriptions, control survey data and right-of-way survey data must match verbatim.
- 2.4.3 All sketches will include a computational sheet showing the lines traversed, closure and area.
- 2.2.9 Each owner set of descriptions will be placed in a file marked with the right-of-way parcel number. This file will also contain title work, surveyor's reports, calculation sheets, and any other pertinent data concerning the subject parcel.
- 2.4.5 The following represents the minimum criteria for sketches of description and legal descriptions:

Sketch of Description (Sheet #1):

Show complete parent tract

Show all calls utilized in the legal description

- 3. Note all deed references to the R/W, easement, etc.

4. Prepare each Sketch on an 8½" x 11" or 8½" x 14" format, including company name of certifying Surveyor, title block, border, scale, date, etc.
5. Sign, seal, and date by Surveyor-of-Record
6. Surveyor's Notes:
 "This is not a Survey"
 "Sketch based upon the right-of-way survey prepared for the roadway design, see sheet ____ of ____."
7. Photocopies of Right-of-Way Maps are not acceptable

Legal Descriptions (Sheet #2):

1. Strip descriptions are not acceptable
2. Aliquot-part descriptions, when they can be utilized, are preferred
3. Metes and bounds descriptions will contain the following:

Preamble to contain the parent tract recording data and any recording data that is used to create the parent tract geometry as it is shown on the map. Also section, township, range, plat data, county and state.

Points of commencement will be from the closest identifiable corner (section corner, subdivision corner, block corner, lot corner, etc.), if needed.

Superior calls to and along fractional lines, plat lies, right-of-way lines and deed lines.

4. All descriptions will contain the following:
 At the top of the page, list the RW project name, RW parcel #, title search #, Tax I.D. #(s), owner(s) name(s), designation for fee simple, temporary construction easement or permanent easement. Include area of parcel: if less than ½ acre →square footage, if more than ½ acre →acres A "subject to" listing of all easements that affect the description along with the type and recording information.

2.5 Design Surveys

The **CONSULTANT** shall furnish complete field verified design surveys. The surveys shall include aerial targeting as necessary, wetlands vegetation lines, topography, right-of-way, 100' interval cross sections for plotting purposes, cross sections at driveways with anticipated connection slopes approaching maximum design criteria, physical location of utilities, drainage and base line control, along with surveys necessary for side road connections or upgrading. Should additional field surveys be required to successfully design, permit and construct this project, the **CONSULTANT** is to obtain this information as a fundamental requirement of this scope of services.

The work shall be performed in accordance with the latest edition of the FDOT Location Manual, Policy No. 760.001-760.012 and the Minimum Technical Standards for Land Surveying in the State of Florida set forth by the Board of Land Surveyors, Chapter 61G17-6, F.A.C., pursuant to Chapter 472, Florida Statutes. Variations in survey methodologies, etc., as required by FDOT, will be permitted if approved by the **COUNTY** Surveyor prior to submittal of man-hour and lump-sum fee proposals. Coordination with the **COUNTY** Surveyor is required prior to beginning this work effort.

3 Final Design & Specifications

3.4 Assembly and Evaluation of Data

The **CONSULTANT** is to collect and evaluate all available and appropriate data for the successful final design of this project. Specifically, and non-inclusively, the **CONSULTANT** will address the following:

3.2.6 Assembly of Data:

The **CONSULTANT** is to collect and review all available information such as records, maps, surveys, plans, soil investigation reports, utility service system availability data, zoning classifications, building codes and standards, requirements of all agencies having jurisdiction over the project, and any other information which may have a bearing or impact to the planning, design, approval, permitting, construction and/or operation of this project. The **CONSULTANT** is to review all appropriate **COUNTY** information on this project.

3.2.7 Regulatory Agencies:

The **CONSULTANT** is to coordinate all necessary and required activities with regulatory agencies throughout the entire design and permitting phases of the project.

3.2.8 Field Reviews and Surveys:

The **CONSULTANT** is to field review data, including surveys, for consistency with actual field conditions.

The **CONSULTANT** is to evaluate right-of-way and topographic surveys for consistency with design and construction requirements of the project, as well as adherence to appropriate standards of professional practice.

3.2.9 Soils Survey / Geotechnical Investigations:

The **CONSULTANT** is to provide the necessary soil survey and analysis for the project design. The results of the soils survey will be analyzed, posted and summarized appropriately on the cross-sections and applicable plan sheets consistent with FDOT requirements. This analysis will include design recommendations for roadway fill alternate culvert materials and other design and construction elements. Further, the soils investigations will include all required soil parameters necessary to design and construct the shoulder, widening, drainage systems, including surface water management systems, utility installations, etc.

3.2.10 Preliminary Drainage:

The **CONSULTANT** is to evaluate the project's overall drainage situation. The concern is to identify at the earliest possible stage the need to address large-scale drainage issues and/or issues of significance to the project. The **CONSULTANT** is to review these matters with the **COUNTY** early in the progress of the final design.

3.2.11 Environmental Issues:

The **CONSULTANT** is to evaluate the project's overall impact to the environment, specifically addressing elements requiring agency permitting. The purpose is to identify at the earliest possible stage the need to address the critical path(s) of design elements related to these issues. The **CONSULTANT** is to review these matters with the **COUNTY** early in the progress of the final design.

3.5 Drainage Design

The **CONSULTANT** is to provide for the drainage basin/sub-basin mapping and design sufficient to meet **COUNTY** and Federal standards, as well as State and Federal regulatory agency permit requirements.

3.2.6 The project must meet the following minimum requirements:

- a. Seminole **COUNTY**'s Land Development Code, including Appendix B;
- b. St. Johns River Water Management District rules and regulations;
- c. Other State and Federal rules and regulations.

- 3.2.7 Before or at the 60% submission, the **CONSULTANT** is to obtain **COUNTY** approval for the conceptual layout and design for all stormwater management facilities (SWMF). The **CONSULTANT** is to submit the following minimum information at this time:
- a. Large-scale mapping of all drainage elements affecting the design of the project, including basin and sub-basin delineations on a scaleable, readable, contoured map;
 - a. Definable locations of the SWMF on a scaleable graphic including parcel identification information;
 - b. Brief narrative on availability of land, zoning, current use, future use (Comp. Plan), environmental issues, if any, estimated construction costs, and other relevant data to adequately review and evaluate the proposed SWMF location.

3.6 Construction Plan Preparation

The shoulder and widening design will be based on the best interest of the public and benefits to the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of Seminole County.

The **CONSULTANT** is to provide all necessary and required construction plans for the successful design and construction of the project. Each contract plans package and its component parts will be prepared in accordance with **COUNTY** and/or FDOT standards, policies, procedures, memorandums and directives. Design work will comply with the *Manual of Uniform Minimum Standards for Design, Construction and Maintenance for Streets and Highways*, latest non-metric edition, *Seminole County Consultants Informational Guidelines for Projects*, and FDOT standards with deference to **COUNTY** policy, procedures and specifications. Exceptions to these standards may be permitted, but must be pre-approved by the **COUNTY** prior to submittal of man-hour and technical proposals.

Each contract plans package shall be accurate, legible, complete in design, suitable for public bidding purposes and drawn to scales acceptable to the **COUNTY** and in a format acceptable to the **COUNTY**. For recommendations concerning the plans preparation the **CONSULTANT** should refer to the latest non-metric editions of the *FDOT Roadway Plans Preparation Manual, Volumes I & II, Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction, Design Standards*, and other applicable manuals as determined by the **COUNTY**'s Project Manager. Usage of CADD or FDOT CADD criteria in general is mandatory. It is the **CONSULTANT**'s responsibility to acquire and utilize the necessary FDOT manuals that are required to complete the project design. The project must meet the following minimum plans and documentation requirements:

- a. Plan sets:
 1. Cover / Key Sheet
 2. Summary of Pay Items
 3. Drainage Maps (1"=200' maximum scale, with contours)
 4. Typical Sections
 5. Summary of Quantities
 6. Summary of Drainage Structures (Includes invert elevations)
 7. Plan Sheets (1"=40' maximum scale)
 8. Special Profiles (if necessary)
 9. Miscellaneous details (1"=10' maximum scale)
 10. Drainage Detail Sheets
 11. Drainage Structure Cross Sections
 12. Erosion Control Sheets (NPDES Sheet)
 13. Soils Survey Data Sheets
 14. Signing and Pavement Marking Plans and details
 15. Cross Sections Sheets (scale 1"=2' or 5' by 1"=10', 20' 40', 50')
 16. Traffic Control Data Sheet
 17. Utility Adjustment Sheets (as necessary)

b. Design Documentation Report:

Technical criteria, strategic decisions, project influences and processes employed in the execution of project design and plans preparation are to be memorialized in a bound document submitted to the COUNTY. The purpose is to provide a chronicle of the strategies, decision and events that lead to the preparation of the final construction documents. At a minimum, the CONSULTANT is to provide the following documentation:

1. Design criteria (non-standard or special exceptions)
2. Design Calculations
3. Drainage computations
4. Quantity computations with graphical backup.
5. Computerized information (provide in a format compatible with COUNTY)
6. Review comments and responses
7. Agency coordination
8. Utility coordination
9. Meetings, telephone conversations, correspondence

3.7 Intersections, Project Termini Design & Driveways

The CONSULTANT is to provide all necessary design and special detailing required to adequately detail improvements to intersections, terminus points and driveways within the project area.

3.8 Signing and Pavement Marking Plans

The CONSULTANT is responsible for the preparation and design of a complete set of signing and pavement marking plans in compliance with the latest (non metric) FDOT Standards, the *M.U.T.C.D.*, and the "*Sign/Marking Standards for Older Road Users Program Compliance*" for the project. These plans will be included as a component part of the contract plans set and shall include all necessary side street signing and striping necessary for the safe and effective operation of vehicles and pedestrians on or crossing the roadway.

Phase submittals for engineering review will be in accordance with the requirements for construction plans and submitted at 60%, 90% and 100% completion stages.

3.9 Standard Specifications and Special Provisions

The COUNTY uses the current edition of the FDOT "*Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction*", and Supplements thereto, and all technical memorandum and addenda henceforth for the standard specification on roadway and bridge construction.

The CONSULTANT is responsible to provide all Special Provisions necessary for the successful construction of the project. These Special Provisions are to be prepared in the same and complimentary format as the referenced standard specifications.

The COUNTY reserves the right to reject any special provision specification deemed inadequate for the project.

3.10 Engineer's Estimate of Probable Construction Costs and Quantity Computation

The CONSULTANT will prepare preliminary estimates of probable construction costs with unit prices based on current FDOT estimates and pay items.

These estimates will be provided at project start, and the 60% and 90% phase submittals of the final construction plans. A "final" estimate will be provided when professionally endorsed plans are delivered to the COUNTY.

The **CONSULTANT** will prepare a Summary of Pay Items plan sheet to be incorporated as part of the final construction plans.

The **CONSULTANT** will prepare and submit a complete Quantity Computation Book, listing all quantities and their related calculations for the project. Computer and/or written computations must conform to the **FDOT** general format as outlined in the current *Basis of Estimate Manual and Computation Manual*. The final Quantity Computation Book will be included in the design documentation report.

The **CONSULTANT** will submit to the **COUNTY** any necessary copies of quantity computations requested for review.

3.11 Maintenance of Traffic

The **CONSULTANT** is responsible for providing a construction design conducive to safe maintenance of traffic for vehicles and pedestrians.

3.2.6 The **CONSULTANT** will prepare a Traffic Control Data Sheet (T.C.D.S.) for inclusion as part of the roadway plans. The intent of the T.C.D.S., as prepared by the **CONSULTANT**, is to provide adequate minimum requirements and direction to the construction contractor regarding specific project and construction plan conditions, and to enable the contractor to prepare a detailed maintenance of traffic plan for approval by the **COUNTY** prior to construction beginning.

3.2.7 The T.C.D.S. will explain the following:

- a. Recommended construction phasing intent
- b. Special construction techniques, methodologies, materials or sequencing of events
- c. Unusual or extraordinary typical section applications
- d. Unique traffic conditions or access requirements
- e. And other conditions known to the **CONSULTANT** that would positively or negatively affect the preparation of the detailed maintenance of traffic plan by the roadway contractor.

3.2.8 The T.C.D.S. will include, as a minimum, the following:

- a. General notes
- b. Graphical and written phasing typical sections
- c. Graphical and written description of requirements at intersections and major driveways within the project
- d. An erosion sediment control plan approved by SJRWMD for use throughout the different construction phases of this project. This document is also to be used in conjunction with the MOT plans.

4 Environmental & Regulatory Permitting

The **CONSULTANT** is required to submit complete permit applications, respond to Requests for Additional Information and provide all necessary follow up information for all permits necessary to successfully design and construct the project.

4.4 St. Johns River Water Management District (District)

Environmental permitting through the District is a requirement of the District and a significant element of this project. The **CONSULTANT** is to actively involve the **COUNTY**'s Project Manager in all permitting activities involving the District including pre-application conferences, RAI meetings, field meetings, Board of Governor meetings, etc.

4.2.6 The **CONSULTANT** is responsible for early identification of all potential permitting issues.

4.2.7 The **CONSULTANT** is to coordinate with the District and any other regulatory agencies having jurisdiction to assure that design efforts are properly directed toward permit requirements.

4.2.8 The **CONSULTANT** will prepare a complete permit package necessary to construct the project, including site and system design information required by and acceptable to the District and all other regulatory agencies.

4.2.9 The **CONSULTANT** will professionally endorse the permit package(s) for District permitting and any regulatory agency exercising jurisdiction with the **COUNTY** as applicant. The **CONSULTANT** is responsible for permit package submittal, agency coordination and for all the information necessary to secure permits from these regulatory agencies. The **COUNTY** will provide the permitting fees.

4.5 Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP)

At this juncture, we do not anticipate any site condition on this project that would initiate jurisdictional authority by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP). However, if FDEP jurisdiction is exercised, the **CONSULTANT** is responsible to address their issues and pursue appropriate resolutions. Compensation for professional fees for this work will be negotiated as supplemental services to the existing design services Agreement using man-hour unit prices from the current Agreement.

4.6 NPDES

The **CONSULTANT** is responsible to obtain appropriate permits, notices, clearances, etc. from the Environmental Protection Agency (or State of Florida if delegated) regarding the construction of this project.

5 Utility Coordination and Relocation

Coordination of existing and proposed utilities is of critical importance to the cost and overall success of the project. The **CONSULTANT** is to contact all utility companies and local governments having facilities within the project area and obtain necessary information on their existing and proposed facilities. The **CONSULTANT** is to coordinate design activities with the respective utility companies/local governments and **COUNTY** Project Manager.

The **CONSULTANT** is responsible to accurately reflect the information provided by these utilities. When necessary for the accuracy of the design, the **CONSULTANT** will obtain actual field horizontal and vertical locations, coordinating this effort through respective utility companies/local governments. The **CONSULTANT** will field verify vertical and horizontal location data on existing utilities prior to the final design of project to avoid unnecessary conflicts. The field verification of vertical and horizontal positions will be at intervals not to exceed 200', including all valves, changes in direction and structures. Accuracy shall be within 0.2 of a foot horizontally and vertically. The mapping work described in this section does not include normal design survey utility work specified in the Design Survey and the Utilities sections. The **CONSULTANT** will evaluate relocations, abandonments, adjustments, or facilities to remain in place for impact to design elements of the project.

5.4 Early Coordination

The **CONSULTANT** will submit two (2) sets of plans to each entity for verification of respective utility locations after the initial field survey is plotted and field reviewed. One set should be marked up and returned to the **CONSULTANT**.

5.5 Coordination at 60% Plans

The **CONSULTANT** will prepare 60% plans showing existing utilities. Following **COUNTY** review and plan adjustment, the **CONSULTANT** will submit two (2) sets of plans to these groups for review and markup. One set should be marked up and returned to the **CONSULTANT**.

Upon return of these markups, the **CONSULTANT** is responsible to prepare a complete **Utilities Adjustment Plan** for the project as part of the roadway design process. This work includes coordination with public and private utility companies for the location and design of their pre-construction (existing) and post-construction (relocated) utilities.

5.6 Coordination at 90% Plans

At the time of the 90% submittal, the **CONSULTANT** will contact these groups again and send two (2) sets of the 90% plans for review and markup. One set should be marked up and returned to the **CONSULTANT**.

Additional submissions and coordination are at the discretion of the **CONSULTANT**. The **CONSULTANT** may request that the utility companies provide an electronic copy of any corrections.

6 Local Government, FDOT, Other Agencies Coordination

Coordination with local governments, public agencies and others is of critical importance to the overall success of the project. Accordingly, the **CONSULTANT** is responsible to coordinate all design activities with these groups to ensure adequate opportunity on their behalf to address design and construction issues.

The **CONSULTANT** is responsible to contact each local government, FDOT, and other known agencies having an interest in this project. The **CONSULTANT** is to coordinate their interest with the design of the project, as necessary, to work towards solutions acceptable to the **COUNTY** and these groups.

Contact with these groups is to occur at regular intervals as needed, and with a set of "final" plans delivered to these groups after the **CONSULTANT** has professionally endorsed the final plans. One (1) plan set is to be delivered to each group for review and comment at each submission stage.

7 Deliverables / Phase Submission Documents

The **CONSULTANT** will submit Design Plans and support documents to the **COUNTY** and FDOT for review and approval at specific junctures. Each plan set submitted will have the percentage complete for that submittal clearly indicated on the first sheet of each set of plans.

7.4 30% Design Documents Submission (2 week COUNTY review)

- Five (5) sets of prints: horizontal and vertical geometry, typical sections, and cross sections at 500 feet (or as needed- critical sections). Meeting to discuss initial design concepts for approval by **COUNTY**.

7.5 60% Design Documents Submission (2 week COUNTY review / 4 week FDOT review)

- Five (8) sets of prints (Construction Plans) for **COUNTY** and three (3) for FDOT
- Preliminary estimate of probable construction cost
- Preliminary Drainage Computations (SWMF layout / big picture information)
- 60% signed checklist
- One (1) CD containing PDF files of plan set
- A detailed utility conflict letter based upon the preliminary drainage design

7.6 90% Design Documents Submission (2 week COUNTY review / 3 to 4 week FDOT review)

- Five (8) sets of prints (Construction Plans) for **COUNTY** and three (3) for FDOT
- Preliminary estimate of probable construction cost (Engineer's Estimate)
- Final Right-of-Way maps
- Final Drainage Design and documentation (with maps, comps, etc.)
- 90% signed checklist
- One (1) CD containing PDF files for plan set
- One (1) CD containing CADD files for plans set.

7.7 100% Design Documents Submission (2 week COUNTY review / 3 to 4 week FDOT review)

- Five (8) sets of prints (Construction Plans) for COUNTY and three (3) for FDOT
- One (1) CD containing PDF files for entire 100% plan set for bidding purposes
- One (1) CD containing CADD files for entire plans set.
- One (1) engineer's cost estimate
- One (1) set of bid forms (Provide forms electronically as well)
- One (1) Design Documentation Reports
- Contract Documents and Specifications
- 100% signed checklist

7.8 Final Deliverables (after COUNTY and FDOT have approved 100% plans)

- Two (2) sets of bound signed and sealed Construction Plans for COUNTY and one copy for FDOT
- One (1) set of un-bound signed and sealed Construction Plans
- One (1) CD containing PDF files for entire Final plan set

7.9 General Phase Submission Comments

7.2.6 All plan submittals will be half size prints (11x17).

7.2.7 When aerial photography is used as a base, the half-size prints will be halftone, clear, Photo-Mechanical Transfers (PMT's) or equivalent quality.

7.2.8 As a minimum, phase submittals to the COUNTY should be in accordance with the current FDOT Plans Preparation Manual (non-metric) information content requirements including a written response to previous COUNTY review comments.

7.2.9 Phase submittals of construction plans shall not be considered complete if applicable individual component parts, such as signals, signing and pavement markings, utility adjustments, etc., are not included with the submittal.

7.2.10 If the COUNTY determines that the phase submittal is incomplete, the CONSULTANT is to pick-up the submittal, make it complete and resubmit. The COUNTY may require additional data if determined by individual project requirements.

7.2.11 Phase submittals of Construction Plans or Drainage Computations will not be considered representative of the percent complete indicated until they have been reviewed and accepted by the COUNTY.

—— End of Appendix A – Expanded Scope of Services ——