



16-04-HFP-04Z - Bay Acres Design Concept Report

Project Overview

Project Details	
Reference ID	16-04-HFP-04Z
Project Name	Bay Acres Design Concept Report
Project Owner	Brandon Morrison
Project Type	RFP
Department	Procurement
Budget	\$0.00 - \$0.00
Project Description	<p>This solicitation is only open to those vendors which have been considered as qualified for on-call work within 16-04-HFP-04. Cochise County ("County") issues this Request for Proposal ("RFP") to obtain competitive vendor pricing in the open market for the completion of Bay Acres design concept report (Phase I) services, in compliance with A.R.S. §41-2534 concerning competitive sealed proposals (bidding). This solicitation may result in an award to a single vendor, however, the County reserves the right to award to multiple vendors, if determined to be in the best interest of the County. This solicitation is only open to those vendors who have been previously determined as pre-qualified in accordance with Cochise County on-call listing 16-04-HFP-04, and, therefore, will be only open for competition, with exclusions. The County hereby invites competent vendors to submit proposals. Submissions received before the closing deadline will be evaluated in accordance with Section 8.0 – Evaluation Criteria (below). Submissions should include only pricing and relevant information pertaining to Section 8.0 – Evaluation Criteria. All documentation and data submitted by any vendor shall be in accordance with section 5.0 – Preparation of Response/Required Content and will be handled in accordance with the Arizona State Statutes applying to Library, Archives and Public Records. This solicitation includes additional documentation specific to this</p>



	requirement. See any attached documents for examples of the additional requirements and specifications. The County expects any potential contractors to adhere to the outlined requirements and specifications throughout the life cycle of this requirement and shall enforce standards, terms and conditions contained within any documentation within this solicitation and any supporting documents. Any deviations from these requirements must be specifically outlined within the submission and an alternate must be proposed.
Open Date	Jul 16, 2019 8:00 AM MST
Close Date	Jul 31, 2019 4:00 PM MST

Highest Scoring Supplier	Score
JE FULLER/HYDROLOGY & GEOMORPHOLOGY, INC.	95.67 pts

Seal status

Requested Information	Unsealed on	Unsealed by
Appendix A to Solicitation 16-04-HFP-04Z	Jul 31, 2019 4:04 PM MST	Brandon Morrison
Technical Proposal for Solicitation 16-04-HFP-04Z	Jul 31, 2019 4:04 PM MST	Brandon Morrison

Conflict of Interest

Declaration of Conflict of Interest You have been chosen as a Committee member for this Evaluation. Please read the following information on conflict of interest to see if you have any problem or potential problem in serving on this committee. ## Code of Conduct All information related to submissions received from Suppliers or Service Providers must be kept confidential by Committee members. ## Conflict of Interest No member of a Committee shall participate in the evaluation if that Committee member or any member of his or her immediate family: * has direct or indirect financial interest in the award of the contract to any proponent; * is currently employed by, or is a consultant to or under contract to a proponent; * is negotiating or has an arrangement



concerning future employment or contracting with any proponent; or, * has an ownership interest in, or is an officer or director of, any proponent. Please sign below acknowledging that you have received and read this information. If you have a conflict or potential conflict, please indicate your conflict on this acknowledgment form with information regarding the conflict. I have read and understood the provisions related to the conflict of interest when serving on the Evaluation Committee. If any such conflict of interest arises during the Committee's review of this project, I will immediately report it to the Purchasing Director.

Name	Date Signed	Has a Conflict of Interest?
Brandon Morrison	Aug 05, 2019 8:13 AM MST	No
Karen Riggs	Jul 31, 2019 4:34 PM MST	No
Joaquin Solis	Aug 05, 2019 12:23 PM MST	No



Signatures

Name	Signatures
Brandon Morrison (Project Owner)	
Brandon Morrison (Evaluator)	
Karen Riggs (Evaluator)	
Joaquin Solis (Evaluator)	



Questions and Answers

No messages



Public Notices

No messages



Internal Discussions

Bay Acres

Karen Riggs, Aug 07, 2019 3:58 PM MST

Did you get my scores? I cannot tell if they have been submitted. I can see them but don't know if you can. Thanks, K



Submissions

Supplier	Date Submitted	Name	Email	Confirmation Code
JE FULLER/HYDROLOGY & GEOMORPHOLOGY, INC.	Jul 31, 2019 11:11 AM MST	CYRUS MILLER	cyrus@jefuller.com	NTQ3NDc=
WEST Consultants	Jul 31, 2019 3:07 PM MST	Brian Wahlin	bwahlin@westconsultants.com	NTQ3ODQ=



Project Criteria

Criteria	Points	Description
Pricing	50 pts	o Vendor must submit the project proposed amount included on Appendix A – Vendor Submission Cover Letter o Vendor must submit a cost breakdown structure of all required materials/labor rates required on a unit level basis
A - Technical Proposal	50 pts	
A-1 - Technical Ability	20 pts	Rate the vendors technical ability to perform the services, as required throughout the solicitation documentation, to the best interest of the County
A-2 - Past Performance	20 pts	Rate the vendors past performance in relation to the services, as required throughout the solicitation documentation, to the best interest of the County
A-3 - Design Concept Approach	10 pts	Rate the vendors design concept approach to perform the services, as required throughout the solicitation documentation, to the best interest of the County
Total	100 pts	



Scoring Summary

Active Submissions

	Total	Pricing	A - Technical Proposal	A-1 - Technical Ability	A-2 - Past Performance
Supplier	/ 100 pts	/ 50 pts	/ 50 pts	/ 20 pts	/ 20 pts
JE FULLER/HYDROLOGY & GEOMORPHOLOGY, INC.	95.67 pts	50 pts (\$78,020.00)	45.67 pts	18.67 pts	18.33 pts
WEST Consultants	78.68 pts	41.35 pts (\$94,350.00)	37.33 pts	17 pts	13.33 pts

	A-3 - Design Concept Approach
Supplier	/ 10 pts



	A-3 - Design Concept Approach
Supplier	/ 10 pts
JE FULLER/HYDROLOGY & GEOMORPHOLOGY, INC.	8.667 pts
WEST Consultants	7 pts



Proposal Scores

JE FULLER/HYDROLOGY & GEOMORPHOLOGY, INC. - Scoring Summary

Evaluation Group 1 - Main Evaluation

	Total	Pricing	A - Technical Proposal	A-1 - Technical Ability	A-2 - Past Performance
Reviewer	/ 100 pts	/ 50 pts	/ 50 pts	/ 20 pts	/ 20 pts
Brandon Morrison	96 pts	\$78,020.00	46 pts	18 pts	18 pts
Karen Riggs	97 pts	\$78,020.00	47 pts	20 pts	19 pts
Joaquin Solis	94 pts	\$78,020.00	44 pts	18 pts	18 pts
	Average:	\$78,020.00	Average:	18.67 pts	18.33 pts
	Consensus:	-	Consensus:	-	-



		↓		↓	↓
Calculated:	95.67 pts	50 pts (\$78,020.00)	45.67 pts	18.67 pts	18.33 pts

	A-3 - Design Concept Approach
Reviewer	/ 10 pts
Brandon Morrison	10 pts
Karen Riggs	8 pts
Joaquin Solis	8 pts
	8.667 pts
	-
	↓
Calculated:	8.667 pts



WEST Consultants - Scoring Summary

Evaluation Group 1 - Main Evaluation

	Total	Pricing	A - Technical Proposal	A-1 - Technical Ability	A-2 - Past Performance
Reviewer	/ 100 pts	/ 50 pts	/ 50 pts	/ 20 pts	/ 20 pts
Brandon Morrison	84.35 pts	\$94,350.00	43 pts	18 pts	15 pts
Karen Riggs	79.35 pts	\$94,350.00	38 pts	20 pts	12 pts
Joaquin Solis	72.35 pts	\$94,350.00	31 pts	13 pts	13 pts
	Average:	\$94,350.00	Average:	17 pts	13.33 pts
	Consensus:	-	Consensus:	-	-
		↓		↓	↓
Calculated:	78.68 pts	41.35 pts (\$94,350.00)	37.33 pts	17 pts	13.33 pts



	A-3 - Design Concept Approach
Reviewer	/ 10 pts
Brandon Morrison	10 pts
Karen Riggs	6 pts
Joaquin Solis	5 pts
	7 pts
	-
	↓
Calculated:	7 pts



Proposal Score Comments

JE FULLER/HYDROLOGY & GEOMORPHOLOGY, INC. - Scoring Comments

Pricing - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Brandon Morrison	50 pts (\$78,020.00)	-	Pricing as proposed by JE Fuller.
Karen Riggs	50 pts (\$78,020.00)	-	Lowest cost proposal. Estimated costs per task are reasonable.
Joaquin Solis	50 pts (\$78,020.00)	-	The Bay Acres Cost proposal listed specific hourly amounts that was consistent with the JE Fuller scope of work (SOW). The SOW proposed breakdown of work proposed.

A-1 - Technical Ability - Reviewer Scores



Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Brandon Morrison	18 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	<p>Vendor outlines competency, both relative and recent to the nature of the work to be performed, in the format that is required by Cochise County, as they have performed similar projects of this nature for several local government entities. The vendor outlines specific information regarding projects of this nature within 5 project outlines. Vendor outlines a quality control process that is completed with the review of the customer in mind, providing a unique aspect toward quality control. Vendor also asserts their internal measures for timely completion through hands-on project management, timely reporting and direct contact increasing access for data required for the reports. Vendor does state internal measures for cost control, but they do not outline ways in which this can be achieved, only that their company is practiced</p>



Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
			through employee ownership. Vendor does have equipment in place which will ensure a timely report can be generated and that up-to-date information can be provided.
Karen Riggs	20 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	Long history of relevant projects in southeast Arizona and Cochise County. They are familiar with our survey projection, have shown to come up with creative, cost-saving while technically feasible solutions.
Joaquin Solis	18 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	Submitter included a list of the professional/technical staff proposed for the Bay Acres proposed SOW project. The proposed professional/technical staff was included to demonstrate that the work would be performed by staff with experience to perform the work proposed for Cochise County, Other specific professional/technical staffing was included as being qualified to



Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
			perform work under this Request for Proposal if needed.

A-2 - Past Performance - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Brandon Morrison	18 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	Vendor provides response for similar projects with similar organizations within similar locations, geographical requirements. They outline projects for Pima County, past work completed with Cochise County, as well as larger projects of this very nature, making them capable and reliable for the type of work to be performed.
Karen Riggs	19 pts	Meets or exceeds my expectations	They have current relevant experience in the watersheds of this project. They have already modeled City of Douglas



Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
			improvements that will be necessary for this project. In their previous work for Cochise County, their work has been timely, accurate, and the quality and finished products have been what we were looking for.
Joaquin Solis	18 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	<p>The past performance list includes projects similar to that requested by the RFP performed by the consultant to the satisfaction of Cochise County.</p> <p>The list also includes previous analysis work performed by the submitter in the specific area. One includes analysis for a large entity as well as a single parcel owner.</p>

A-3 - Design Concept Approach - Reviewer Scores



Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Brandon Morrison	10 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	Vendor outlines tasks which fit the County's needs. Additionally, prior to performing data analysis, they propose reviewing already existing data in order to compare new data. This, I believe, will ensure a high-level of detail and relevancy to the project.
Karen Riggs	8 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	Their understanding of the issues, complexities and desired project approach were superior.
Joaquin Solis	8 pts	High level of detail in response	<p>The responses to the design concept approach for the scope of work were explained in a detailed manner. The proposed location by the submitter is consistent with the location proposed by Cochise County.</p> <p>The concept approach submitted explains work performed by neighboring entities (City of Douglas). It also explains models</p>



Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
			<p>that can be used as well as hydrologic and hydraulic models that are recommended.</p> <p>The RFP gives detailed locations of where detailed hydraulic modeling will occur consistent with the scope. It also includes areas upstream of the proposed diversion channel beyond the scope of work.</p>



WEST Consultants - Scoring Comments

Pricing - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Brandon Morrison	41.35 pts (\$94,350.00)	-	Pricing as proposed by West Consultants.
Karen Riggs	41.35 pts (\$94,350.00)	-	Highest cost estimate. Categories were not comparable with other proposal. Substantially higher.
Joaquin Solis	41.35 pts (\$94,350.00)	-	The Bay Acres Cost proposal listed specific hourly amounts that was not consistent with the scope of work (SOW). The SOW did not give much breakdown of work proposed.

A-1 - Technical Ability - Reviewer Scores



Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Brandon Morrison	18 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	Vendor outlines great ability to complete the scope of work, however, they do not offer, save for 1, any types of projects which are similar to this project which have been completed. The project stated is currently on-going. The vendor has worked with departments of transportation for bridge design and similar designs. The vendor does, however, outline their ability to remain innovative by completing a first EAP for a major levee in AZ. This was developed with experts both nationally and internationally, showing a high-level capability with collaboration efforts. The vendor shows a very diverse capability.
Karen Riggs	20 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	They have the relevant experience and talent to accomplish this type of project.
Joaquin Solis	13 pts	Medium level of detail in response	Submitter did not include a list of the professional/technical staff proposed for the Bay Acres



Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
			<p>proposed SOW project. Only a general information statement of the general offices proposed to do the work was submitted.</p> <p>Although work has been performed by the submitter for Cochise County, Cochise County was not included on the list of satisfied customers for other projects submitted for this Request for Proposal. This information should have been included in the past performance portion of the RFP.</p>

A-2 - Past Performance - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Brandon Morrison	15 pts	Meets or exceeds my expectations	Vendor supplies a detailed response with many projects, some completed and some on-going. However, the work performed is in-



Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
			<p>line with the work to be completed. Also, the vendor details a quality control plan in-line with Federal requirements through CPARS, ensuring a high-level of quality. Most of the work completed is for Federal agencies and therefore, a strong Federal background is present within the vendors response. The vendor has only performed one major project with the County and therefore would have to ensure that sensors are used by another in-place agency, or provide their own data gathering equipment.</p>
Karen Riggs	12 pts	Partially meets my expectations	<p>While they have the technical ability to accomplish the goals and objectives of the project, their past performance in projects for Cochise County have not been exceptional. We have had some issues with timeliness and proactive completion of projects.</p>



Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Joaquin Solis	13 pts	Partially supported claim(s)	<p>Although work has been performed for Cochise County, Cochise County was not included on the list of satisfied customers (page 2) of this RFP for other projects.</p> <p>However, the past performance list does include a project currently being performed by the consultant for Cochise County. The list does include work performed to the satisfaction of other entities.</p>

A-3 - Design Concept Approach - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Brandon Morrison	10 pts	High level of detail in response	The vendor outlines a high-level of response with each task and creates an understanding of the entire scope of work. The vendor outlines the objective of the County



Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
			well in order perform the required services.
Karen Riggs	6 pts	Partially fits desired attributes	Their lesser level of knowledge of the area and its drainage history showed itself in their approach which did not meet our expectations for clarity and direct approach.
Joaquin Solis	5 pts	Partially supported claim(s)	<p>The responses to the design concept approach was brief and very generalized. There was no indication, by the submitter, of previous studies performed in this area. It was just noted that existing hydrologic and hydraulic models will be identified and reviewed.</p> <p>The assumed location of a pre-existing channel described on the east side of Washington avenue is shown in a figure to be located on the west side of Washington</p>



Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
			avenue.

