

## SELECTION COMMITTEE MEETING

JULY 10, 2020

RFP #20-04-399

### DISASTER DEBRIS REMOVAL SERVICES

#### MINUTES

The Selection Committee for Disaster Debris Removal Services met July 10, 2020, for the purpose of evaluating responses received for RFP #20-04-399 Disaster Debris Removal Services. The meeting convened at 9:04 a.m. The meeting was held virtually utilizing Communications Media Technology (CMT) in accordance with Governor Ron DeSantis' Executive Order No. 20-69, dated March 20, 2020 and Executive Order No. 20-150 dated June 23, 2020 related to conducting local government public meetings while under the public health emergency related to the spread of Novel Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). The conducting of virtual meetings is subject to potential change or modification and reversion to non-virtual, in-person public meetings under Ch. 286, FS, dependent upon Executive Orders of the Governor. City Hall building is closed to the public.

#### **Selection Committee Members Present:**

Sam May, Chair, Public Works Director

Susan Nabors, Finance Director

Michael Sargis, Parks and Recreation Director, Assistant City Manager

#### **City of North Lauderdale Staff present:**

James Williams, Purchasing Manager

Patricia Vancheri, City Clerk

#### **Discussion:**

James Williams, Purchasing Manager, advised that this is the second meeting of the Selection Committee for RFP #20-04-399, Disaster Debris Removal Services. Roll call was done by self-introduction of Staff and the Selection Committee; no vendors were present. Mr. Williams acknowledged that the Committee Members received instructional guidelines with regard to understanding Policies and Procedures and Conflict of Interest prior to the evaluation of proposals. Further, all contact and communication is done through the purchasing division; the Committee shall maintain confidentiality throughout the evaluation process; and any communication between the Committee members shall be done in a publicly noticed meeting. Each member received copies of all proposals for evaluation independently and to be reviewed and ranked based upon established criteria. Evaluations are based solely on the content of the proposals. The purchasing division provided scoring cards to the Committee members to record their scores. Evaluations must be fair and equal, and supported by the content which will be deliberated at this meeting. Chair May asked for clarification regarding scores, and if the final scores would be given after vendor presentations, if any. Mr. Williams stated that the Committee member's evaluation scores at this time are for Sections A-D, with the pricing to come after. The Committee will do a ranking for a short list of 1-3 vendors or up to 3 vendors. If the Committee feels they have enough information to make a recommendation, they can do so at that point. If presentations are requested, the short list of vendors will be noticed, the presentations will be made [as Phase II] and the Committee members will rank up to 20 points which would be added to the scores from Phase I. If the Committee chooses not to have presentations, the top three ranked vendors will automatically receive a total of 20 points, concluding the final ranking. Ms. Nabors asked if this solicitation has the option to select a primary and a secondary vendor, since the City currently has a primary and secondary. Mr. Williams replied that there is an option to award multiple vendors, keeping in mind that each vendor's cost might be different. Discussion ensued with regard to the options.

Mr. Williams stated that all vendors were responsive and responsible and have met the general criteria as checked by purchasing.

The Committee presented scoring based on the following criteria:

- A** – Experience and ability (20 points); **B** – Operational Plan (15 points);
- C** - Previous Experience (15 points); and **D** – Financial Capability (5 points)

The Committee members deliberated individually on each of the proposals submitted by eight (8) vendors.

Mr. Williams asked for scores from each Committee member, to which the pricing would be added for a total score. The attached spreadsheets (Vendor Summary Scores and individual Evaluation Score Sheets) are a compilation of all total scores, including the pricing and Phase II scores given each vendor.

Ms. Nabors asked about the allocation of points for the pricing scores ranging from 5 to 25 points. Mr. Williams replied that the process was calculated in looking at the top three tiers as outlined in the RFP.

Based on the total Phase 1 scores the following vendors were ranked as the top three:

1. Grubbs Emergency Services – 232 points
2. DRC Emergency Services – 200 points
3. Custom Tree Care – 185.5 points

Mr. Williams asked Chair May if based on these proposals, was there enough information to recommend a final proposal, or would presentations be needed. A motion was made by Chair May; seconded by Committee Member Sargis. The motion passed unanimously on a roll call vote to accept these firms as the top three ranked vendors. Committee Member Nabors made a motion to forego the need for vendor presentations; seconded by Committee Member Sargis. The motion passed unanimously on a roll call vote.

Mr. Williams stated that a recommendation will go forward from the Selection Committee recommending these top ranked vendors. He stated that all these vendors are qualified and a motion would be in order to choose a primary and secondary. There was discussion regarding the experience of the third ranked vendor. Committee Member Nabors moved to recommend to the City Commission to enter into a contract with the top two firms, with the first ranked firm, Grubbs, as the primary vendor and the second ranked firm, DRC, as the secondary vendor. Committee Member Sargis seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously on a roll call vote.

Committee Member Nabors asked about the pricing. Mr. Williams replied that the pricing was reviewed by the purchasing division and the scores were allocated as follows for the top three ranked firms:

1. Grubbs Emergency Services - \$96.00 – 25 points
2. DRC Emergency Services - \$175.26 – 15 points
3. Custom Tree Care - \$103.71 – 20 points

Chair May asked if the pricing could be negotiated; Mr. Williams replied that based on the RFP there will be an opportunity to negotiate a contract, and the Committee has the ability to reconvene to discuss the process. The timeline was discussed for getting a contract in place as the current contract is about to expire on August 16, 2020. A ten minute recess was taken to provide the Purchasing Manager time to provide the pricing sheets from the three top ranked vendors to the Committee for their review. The Committee Members evaluated the pricing and discussed the line items. The Committee Members will provide the scoring sheets to the Purchasing Manager.

The Committee determined that they were comfortable with the overall pricing for individual categories.

A negotiation meeting was previously scheduled for July 22. It was decided that presentations were not needed. Committee Member Nabors moved to cancel the July 22 meeting and move forward with a recommendation to City Commission for award. Committee Member Sargis seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously on a roll call vote.

Mr. Williams stated that vendors will be contact through a Notice of Intent to Award that will be put up on the City's website and DemandStar. Committee Member Nabors commented that she will work on this item for presentation at the next Commission meeting, July 14<sup>th</sup>, or the last meeting on July 28<sup>th</sup>.

There was no further discussion, the meeting adjourned at 11:44 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Patricia Vancheri, City Clerk

### Vendors Summary Scores :

	COST	Points	Phase 1- Total Scores	Rankings	Phase 2- Total Scores
Ceres Environmental Services, Inc.	\$207.39	5	173	4	
CrowderGulf	\$235.49	5	170	5	
Custom Tree Care Inc.	\$103.71	20	185.5	3	245.5
DRC Emergency Services	\$175.26	15	200	2	260
Grubbs Emergency Services	\$96.00	25	232	1	292
KDF Enterprises, LLC	\$193.50	5	148	8	
Southern Disaster Recovery	\$202.90	5	159.5	7	
TFR Enterprises, Inc	\$190.61	5	162	6	

Evaluation Scoring: Grubbs Emergency Services					
Evaluator	Susan Nabors	Sam May	Michael Sargis		
Minimum Eligibility (Y/N)					
A – Experience and Ability ( 20 points)	19	20	17		
B – Operational Plan (15 points):	15	15	13		
C – Previous Experience (15 points):	15	15	13		
D - Financial Capability	5	5	5		
F – Pricing (25 points):	25	25	25		
TOTAL POINTS PHASE 1	79	80	73		
Phase 2: PRESENTATIONS	20	20	20		
TOTAL PHASE 1 & 2	99	100	93		
Total Point Award			292		

Evaluation Scoring: DRC Emergency Services					
Evaluator	Susan Nabors	Sam May	Michael Sargis		
Minimum Eligibility (Y/N)					
A – Experience and Ability ( 20 points)	19	20	16		
B – Operational Plan (15 points):	14	15	14		
C – Previous Experience (15 points):	14	15	13		
D - Financial Capability	5	5	5		
F – Pricing (25 points):	15	15	15		
TOTAL POINTS PHASE 1	67	70	63		
Phase 2: PRESENTATIONS	20	20	20		
TOTAL PHASE 1 & 2	87	90	83		
Total Point Award			260		

Evaluation Scoring: 3. Custom Tree Care Inc					
Evaluator	Susan Nabors	Sam May	Michael Sargis		
Minimum Eligibility (Y/N)					
A – Experience and Ability ( 20 points)	14	16	12		
B – Operational Plan (15 points):	12	13.5	13		
C – Previous Experience (15 points):	11	12	10		
D - Financial Capability	4	3	5		
F – Pricing (25 points):	20	20	20		
TOTAL POINTS PHASE 1	61	64.5	60		
Phase 2: PRESENTATIONS	20	20	20		
TOTAL PHASE 1 & 2	81	84.5	80		
Total Point Award			245.5		

Evaluation Scoring: 7. Southern Disaster Recovery					
Evaluator	Susan Nabors	Sam May	Michael Sargis		
Minimum Eligibility (Y/N)					
A – Experience and Ability ( 20 points)	18	18	14		
B – Operational Plan (15 points):	13	13.5	14		
C – Previous Experience (15 points):	14	12	13		
D - Financial Capability	5	5	5		
F – Pricing (25 points):	5	5	5		
TOTAL POINTS PHASE 1	55	53.5	51		
Phase 2: PRESENTATIONS					
TOTAL PHASE 1 & 2	55	53.5	51		
Total Point Award			159.5		

**Evaluation Scoring: Ceres Environmental Services, Inc**

Evaluator	Susan Nabors	Sam May	Michael Sargis		
Minimum Eligibility (Y/N)					
A – Experience and Ability ( 20 points)	20	20	16		
B – Operational Plan (15 points):	15	15	13		
C – Previous Experience (15 points):	15	15	14		
D - Financial Capability	5	5	5		
F – Pricing (25 points):	5	5	5		
TOTAL POINTS PHASE 1	60	60	53		
Phase 2: PRESENTATIONS					
TOTAL PHASE 1 & 2	60	60	53		
Total Point Award			173		

**Evaluation Scoring: CrowderGulf**

Evaluator	Susan Nabors	Sam May	Michael Sargis		
Minimum Eligibility (Y/N)					
A – Experience and Ability ( 20 points)	20	20	15		
B – Operational Plan (15 points):	14	15	13		
C – Previous Experience (15 points):	15	15	13		
D - Financial Capability	5	5	5		
F – Pricing (25 points):	5	5	5		
TOTAL POINTS PHASE 1	59	60	51		
Phase 2: PRESENTATIONS					
TOTAL PHASE 1 & 2	59	60	51		
Total Point Award			170		

**Evaluation Scoring: TFR Enterprises, Inc**

Evaluator	Susan Nabors	Sam May	Michael Sargis		
Minimum Eligibility (Y/N)					
A – Experience and Ability ( 20 points)	19	18	15		
B – Operational Plan (15 points):	14	15	12		
C – Previous Experience (15 points):	14	13.5	12		
D - Financial Capability	5	4.5	5		
F – Pricing (25 points):	5	5	5		
TOTAL POINTS PHASE 1	57	56	49		
Phase 2: PRESENTATIONS					
TOTAL PHASE 1 & 2	57	56	49		
Total Point Award			162		

**Evaluation Scoring: KDF Enterprises, LLC**

Evaluator	Susan Nabors	Sam May	Michael Sargis		
Minimum Eligibility (Y/N)					
A – Experience and Ability ( 20 points)	17	14	12		
B – Operational Plan (15 points):	13	13.5	12		
C – Previous Experience (15 points):	12	12	14		
D - Financial Capability	4.5	4	5		
F – Pricing (25 points):	5	5	5		
TOTAL POINTS PHASE 1	51.5	48.5	48		
Phase 2: PRESENTATIONS					
TOTAL PHASE 1 & 2	51.5	48.5	48		
Total Point Award			148		