



Audit of Distribution of Task Orders-Multiple Award Contracts

Division of Inspector General **Neil Kelly, Clerk of the Circuit and County Courts** **Audit Report**

Bob Melton, CPA, CIA, CFE, CIG
Inspector General

Audit Conducted by:
Alice Garner, CPA, CIGA
Senior Inspector General Auditor

Report No. BCC-123
September 10, 2014

FOR INFORMATION CONTACT:
Bob Melton, Inspector General
Telephone: (352) 253-1644

Division of Inspector General
Phone (352) 253-1644
Fax (352) 253-1645



Clerk of the Circuit Court

Post Office Box 7800
Tavares, Florida 32778-7800

September 10, 2014

Board of County Commissioners

We have conducted an audit of the task orders and multiple award contracts managed by the Procurement Services Division of the Board of County Commissioners' Fiscal and Administrative Services Department, as scheduled per the Clerk's Annual Inspector General Audit Plan.

We appreciate the cooperation and assistance provided by the Fiscal and Administrative Services Department and also other local county and governmental entities contacted during the course of our audit.

Respectfully Submitted,

Bob Melton

Bob Melton, CPA, CIA, CFE, CIG
Inspector General

CC: Honorable Neil Kelly, Clerk of Circuit & County Court
David Heath, County Manager
Steve Koontz, Fiscal and Administrative Services Department Director
Barnett Schwartzman, Procurement Services Division Manager

Know of Fraud, Waste, or Abuse?
Contact our hotline at (352)253-1643 or
email fwa@lakecountyclerk.org

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | 1 |
| INTRODUCTION..... | 3 |
| Scope and Methodology | 3 |
| Overall Conclusion | 3 |
| Background | 4 |
| OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT..... | 6 |
| 1. The Mission Statement of Lake County Procurement Should Be Re-Examined..... | 6 |
| 2. The Current Roles of Contract Administration Need Improvement..... | 7 |
| 3. The Use of Change Orders Should Be Reviewed..... | 10 |
| 4. Committee Composition and Contractor Selection Processes Need Improvement. | 12 |
| 5. The Language and Content of Solicitations and Contracts Need Improvement. | 15 |
| 6. Current Practices Using Multiple Award Contracts Should Be Improved..... | 18 |
| 7. Management Should Implement a System to Document Contractor Performance. | 20 |
| 8. Management of Contract Files Needs Improvement. | 21 |
| 9. Contract Term Dates Should Be Established and Followed. | 24 |
| 10. Supporting Documentation in Munis Should Be Improved. | 25 |
| GLOSSARY..... | 26 |
| APPENDIX A – Task Orders Issued by Public Works Division..... | 26 |
| APPENDIX B – Example of Selection Committee Notes | 26 |
| APPENDIX C – Addendum to Management Response | 26 |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

We conducted an audit of task orders and multiple award contracts managed by the Procurement Services Division. Multiple award contracts are those which are awarded to multiple vendors who have met the basic overall qualifying requirements established within the solicitation, but may not establish firm pricing for a specific product or specific service to be provided. Various County departments may choose a contractor from the list under certain conditions without further competitive procurement for their specific project.

The mission statement of Lake County Procurement should be re-examined. The mission statement does not recognize that fair and open competition is a basic tenet of public procurement. Establishing fair and open competition as a basic tenet of the county's procurement will help to ensure the best goods and services are acquired at the best prices.

The current roles of contract administration need improvement. The current practice of requesting a proposal from contractors for continuing contracts does not maximize competition. Interviews with division staff revealed that the majority of them simply rotate the contractors of continuing contracts, obtaining a proposal from only the contractor next in line. However, when we selected a sample of contracts and reviewed the task order activity, we found that this is not always the case.

Change orders have been used to alter the scope of a project and circumvent competition. In two instances, the proposals for the task orders were for pre-construction costs only in the amounts of \$2,718.05 and \$1,063.70. One change order increased the original amount by \$253,907.48 and the other by \$83,929.29. In these two examples, not only was the funding significantly increased, the scope of the project was completely changed.

The method of assigning selection committee members does not reasonably ensure independence in selection of contractors. In the current process, the user Department Director recommends the selection committee members and is also a voting member of the committee. No requirement exists that requires a majority of the committee members be from departments other than the department procuring the services.

The method of evaluating professional solicitations received is inadequate. The current process and resulting decision are not fully documented. A formal system should be put in place to establish explicit criteria to be measured. A weight and value should be assigned to each category of criteria. We also found that the solicitations do not explicitly include evaluation criteria and how the criteria will be weighted.

No formal written criteria exist for determining whether a project should be solicited separately. We noted two projects costing \$256,596.04 for construction on the County Fleet Building and \$88,946.28

for roof repair/replacement of the Public Defender’s Office Building which were not solicited separately; the nature and amount of the task of both projects are such that individual solicitations may have resulted in more competition.

We also noted other opportunities for improvement related to contract administration and the procurement processes. In total, our report contains 25 recommendations for improvement.

INTRODUCTION

Scope and Methodology

We conducted an audit of task orders and multiple award contracts managed by the Procurement Services Division. Our audit objectives were:

1. To determine whether the contract vendor selection process is objective and results in fair and open competition.
2. To determine whether task orders are in compliance with laws, ordinances, policies and procedures.
3. To determine whether the current roles of contract administration are sufficient to ensure adequate control.

To determine whether the contract vendor selection process is objective and results in fair and open competition, we conducted interviews, examined contract files, reviewed committee meeting notes, examined applicable standards and reviewed practices of other local governments.

To determine whether task orders are in compliance with laws, ordinances, policies and procedures we interviewed department and procurement staff, reviewed task orders and supporting documentation and tested a sample of purchase orders and related contract and documents.

To determine whether the current roles of contract administration are sufficient to ensure adequate control we conducted interviews, documented the processes and researched procurement best practices.

Our audit included such tests of records and other auditing procedures, as we considered necessary in the circumstances. The audit period was October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013. However, transactions, processes and situations reviewed were not limited by the audit period.

Overall Conclusion

We conclude that except for needed improvements as noted in the report, the contract vendor selection process is objective and results in fair and open competition, task orders are in compliance with laws, ordinances, policies and procedures and the current roles of contract administration are sufficient to ensure adequate control.

Background

The primary mission of the Procurement Services Division is, “To facilitate the County departments and agencies in obtaining the appropriate quality commodities and services they require to successfully accomplish their respective missions, goals and objectives in the most timely manner at the lowest total cost of ownership within legal and ethical parameters.” The division is aligned within the County’s Fiscal and Administrative Services Department and has seven employees handling the functions of procurement services, fixed asset management and document services. The Procurement Services staff includes the Procurement Division Manager, three Contracting Officers and an Office Associate. Together they are responsible for the development of policy and procedures related to procurement, award of new contracts and execution of general purchasing activity.

Services provided to award new contracts with departments is a significant process. With a multiple award contract, more than one vendor is contracted with for the same purpose, and in a continuing contract, more than one vendor may be contracted with to provide on-call services. Depending on the task, whether for professional services, construction and/or commodities, the process is different to help ensure not only that management’s needs are met, but also to help ensure that equal opportunities are provided to the prospective vendors.

The Procurement Services Division has written a Purchasing Procedure Manual (LC-7) that is available to the public and employees on its website. These procedures provide, “a detailed description of the procurement policies of the County, a guide to the related implementing procedures applicable to County departments in general and most specifically to the County’s Procurement Services entity.” The division has also many internal operating procedures including No. 103, Task Orders for Professional Services under Continuing Contracts.

The County may formally solicit goods and services through a variety of contractual methods depending on the commodity to be procured or the complexity of terms and conditions. In these situations, the use of an Invitation to Bid (ITB), Request for Proposal (RFP) or Request for Statement of Qualifications (RSQ) is appropriate. Other procurement methods include use of a County purchasing card and use of an existing agreements or contracts.

According to the Purchasing Procurement Manual, “the ITB procedure involves full and open competition based on clear and complete specifications contained within the ITB, with award to be made to the lowest priced responsive responsible bidder. This process requires full compliance of vendors to the requirements of the solicitation, with no exception to, or deviation from, the technical or contractual requirements set forth in the ITB. Determination of ‘responsibility’ (the overall capability of the vendor to perform the effort) shall be performed with full due diligence by all County personnel impacted by the award recommendation. This evaluation shall include, but not be limited to, consideration of all evidence of adequate technical resources, performance history, and financial stability demonstrated by the vendor. The Manual further includes that the, “RFP procedure is used when specifications are not sufficiently detailed to support the Invitation to Bid process, or when an

additional level of flexibility in the award process is considered necessary to ensure completion of a 'best value' award. This process generally involves descriptive technical proposals being provided by vendors in response to a general work description included in the RFP. Award under an RFP is generally based on qualifications, experience, or quality of the required goods or services in addition to relative price. In some cases, price will be a determining award factor... In other cases, price will be one of several award factors..." Finally, the Manual provides that the, "RSQ procedure is used for the purchase of specialized technical or professional services. The RSQ process involves descriptive technical proposals being provided by vendors in response to a general work description included in the RSQ. Award is to be based on qualifications, experience, or perceived quality of the services associated with responding vendors. Price is not considered in the initial award evaluation. For that reason, formal Selection Committees... are used to evaluate vendor responses to RSQs. Selection Committee comments and recommendations for award will generally be rendered in the form of qualitative statements recorded within a written summary generally prepared by the assigned OPS [Procurement Services Division] contracting officer. This process is used primarily for actions falling within the governance of the Consultants Competitive Negotiations Act (CCNA). The RFP procedure format with evaluation by formal Selection Committees may also be used for CCNA actions with price excluded from the initial award consideration."

The division also manages the online vendor registration database. Local vendors are encouraged to register their business with the County online. When they do this, they will automatically receive an e-mail notice anytime the County issues a formal solicitation for a good and/or service that match the commodity codes that they selected during the registration process. This practice is designed to continually increase the competitive base of vendors willing and able to provide the wide range of goods and services purchased by the County.

The Procurement Services Division is fully funded through the County's General Fund. According to the Adopted Budget Book FY 2013-14, the fund balance carried forward for the General Fund for fiscal year (FY) 2014 is \$19.3 million, of which 0.7 million is on reserve specifically for purchase orders. The budgeted expenditures for the division are \$732,596, of which \$279,036 is for operating and the remainder is for personal services. The division further anticipates issuing approximately 140 formal solicitations and managing 375 contracts.

A glossary of some terms used in this report is included at the end of the report.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

Our report disclosed certain policies, procedures and practices that could be improved. Our audit was neither designed nor intended to be a detailed study of every relevant system, procedure or transaction. Accordingly, the Opportunities for Improvement presented in this report may not be all-inclusive of areas where improvement may be needed.

1. The Mission Statement of Lake County Procurement Should Be Re-Examined.

The mission statement of the Procurement Services Division does not recognize that fair and open competition is a basic tenet of public procurement. It states, “The primary mission of the Procurement Services Division is to facilitate the County departments and agencies in obtaining the appropriate quality commodities and services they require to successfully accomplish their respective missions, goals and objectives in the most timely manner at the lowest total cost of ownership within legal and ethical parameters.”

Florida Statute Chapter 287 prescribes the statutes for procurement of personal property and services for state agencies; it includes commodities, insurance and contractual services. The Legislative intent of the chapter states:

“287.001 Legislative intent.—The Legislature recognizes that fair and open competition is a basic tenet of public procurement; that such competition reduces the appearance and opportunity for favoritism and inspires public confidence that contracts are awarded equitably and economically; and that documentation of the acts taken and effective monitoring mechanisms are important means of curbing any improprieties and establishing public confidence in the process by which commodities and contractual services are procured. It is essential to the effective and ethical procurement of commodities and contractual services that there be a system of uniform procedures to be utilized by state agencies in managing and procuring commodities and contractual services; that detailed justification of agency decisions in the procurement of commodities and contractual services be maintained; and that adherence by the agency and the vendor to specific ethical considerations be required.”

Although this section is directed to state agencies, the principles contained therein also apply to local governments. Establishing fair and open competition as a basic tenet of the county’s procurement will help to ensure the best goods and services are acquired at the best prices. We recognize that the County’s Purchasing Policy (LCC-18) includes, “All purchasing actions are to be conducted on the basis of full and open competition to the greatest degree possible...”

however, had this tenet been a part of its mission, the situations noted in Opportunity for Improvement Nos. 3 and 6 may not have occurred.

We Recommend management re-examine its mission statement and emphasize fair and open competition as a basic tenet of the County's procurement.

Management Response: Concur and completed.

2. The Current Roles of Contract Administration Need Improvement.

The roles of contract administration are decentralized. During our audit work, we noted that most contract administration and all contract monitoring are done by the user department.

The County's Contract Administration Policy (LCC-39) specifically states:

“The user department is responsible for the operational management and administration of any contract awarded within the scope of this Policy on behalf of the department, and shall perform that function in accordance with all applicable Lake County Policies, Procedures, Ordinances and Board Action. It is the responsibility of the user department to initiate proper and timely execution of all Amendments and Change Orders to a contract.”

However, we found several instances where centralized management is needed. For example, there is no inventory of task orders; the members of selection committees are recommended by the Department Director; and receipt of proposals and selection of vendors is done by the user department. Our specific concerns are discussed below.

- A. An inventory of task orders issued on continuing contracts is not maintained in a central location. The only physical task orders retained by the Procurement Services Division are for the current and previous fiscal year. Also, the division does not maintain a list of task orders issued; therefore, the creation of a list had to be done manually.

Currently, the user departments are expected to retain an inventory of their own task orders and are to include a copy in Munis, the County's financial system, as an attachment to the requisition they create; however, we found that in some instances the task order is not attached in Munis and one of the divisions interviewed does not maintain any physical files. Also, Procurement Services staff does not perform a review to ensure that the records are complete. See also Opportunity for Improvement No. 10.

It is important for management to ensure that an inventory of all task orders is maintained in a central location. Task orders are not separately identifiable or entered into Munis as a transaction; they are simply an attachment; no one has access to a complete inventory of task

orders; and Procurement Services is responsible for ensuring that all approvals are obtained for each task but cannot provide evidence that they were received. Without a centralized system of maintaining task orders, accountability and analyses are hampered or precluded.

- B. The method of assigning selection committee members does not reasonably ensure independence in selection of contractors. In the current process, the user Department Director recommends the selection committee members and is also a voting member of the committee. No requirement exists that requires a majority of the committee members be from departments other than the department procuring the services. This can create a conflict of interest situation; a voting member should not be directly involved in selecting the other voting members. This practice does not reasonably ensure an unbiased formation of the committee. For example, we found that a committee was comprised of three voting members, two of which were from the user department, including the Department Director. See also Opportunity for Improvement No. 4.

It is important for the creation and the composition of the selection committee to be independent and objective in appearance and fact; the Procurement Services Division Manager should recommend the selection committee members since he is independent from the entire process. Every effort should be made to obtain members outside of the operating department procuring the services.

- C. The current practice of requesting a proposal from contractors of continuing contracts does not maximize competition. Interviews with division staff revealed that the majority of them simply rotate the contractors of continuing contracts, obtaining a proposal from only the contractor next in line. However, when we selected a sample of contracts and reviewed the task order activity we found that this is not always the case.

The following table depicts the task order activity, sorted in date order, through September 30, 2013 for Continuing On-Call Stormwater Engineering Services RSQ # 10-0037:

| Vendor Name | Contract Number | Purchase Order Date | Amount |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-------------|
| Booth, Ern, Straughan & Hiott, Inc. | 10-0037B | 04/13/11 | \$1,305.00 |
| Booth, Ern, Straughan & Hiott, Inc. | 10-0037B | 11/22/11 | \$6,615.00 |
| AMEC / BCI Engineers & Scientists | 10-0037A | 02/02/12 | \$65,501.46 |
| AMEC / BCI Engineers & Scientists | 10-0037A | 02/22/12 | \$20,165.00 |
| Booth, Ern, Straughan & Hiott, Inc. | 10-0037B | 04/26/12 | \$19,122.83 |
| AMEC / BCI Engineers & Scientists | 10-0037A | 06/12/12 | \$63,323.45 |
| AMEC / BCI Engineers & Scientists | 10-0037A | 07/12/12 | \$10,940.00 |
| AMEC / BCI Engineers & Scientists | 10-0037A | 02/25/12 | \$1,194.40 |
| AMEC / BCI Engineers & Scientists | 10-0037A | 08/21/12 | \$2,203.00 |

Clearly, the contractors were not rotated; the distribution in the quantity of task orders was uneven; and the distribution in dollars was also uneven (\$27,042.83 compared to \$163,327.31).

The following table shows the task order activity, sorted in date order, through September 30, 2013 for Landscape Architectural Services RFP #11-0030:

| Vendor Name | Contract Number | Purchase Order Date | Amount |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Cribb Philbeck Weaver Group, Inc. | 11-0030A | 04/16/12 | \$30,210.00 |
| Cribb Philbeck Weaver Group, Inc. | 11-0030A | 05/04/12 | \$104,780.00 |
| Green Consulting Group, Inc. | 11-0030D | 07/12/12 | \$8,930.00 |
| Cribb Philbeck Weaver Group, Inc. | 11-0030A | 08/31/12 | \$59,090.00 |
| Cribb Philbeck Weaver Group, Inc. | 11-0030A | 08/19/13 | \$4,734.50 |
| NFC Landscape Architects | 11-0030B | 00/00/00 | \$0.00 |
| HHI Design | 11-0030C | 00/00/00 | \$0.00 |

Under this contract, all but one task order went to a single contractor and two of the contractors have received nothing since the contract's inception.

We have included, in Appendix A – Task Orders Issued by the Public Works Division, another example to further illustrate that the contractors are not rotated, the dollars are disbursed unevenly, some contractors are not used, and the quantity of task orders are not distributed evenly.

This practice does not maximize fair and open competition; for significant projects, a proposal should be obtained from several of the contractors who have continuing contracts. Also, to further ensure that the vendor selection is fair and objective, we suggest that the proposals be solicited by the Procurement Services Division. For further discussion, see Opportunity for Improvement No. 6. Although continuing contracts go through a general competitive process initially to get on the list, these are not project-specific. Once they are on the list, they are sometimes used for many different, unrelated projects. By obtaining proposals from three or more firms on significant projects, competition would be increased, thereby helping to ensure the best services are obtained at the lowest reasonable price.

We Recommend management:

- A. Maintain a comprehensive file of task orders in one location. The task orders should remain on file in the Procurement Services Division for a minimum of five years.
- B. Establish Procurement Services as the agency to appoint selection committee members.

- C. Solicit significant proposals from vendors on behalf of user departments to three or more contractors having continuing contracts with the County. Procurement Services should establish a selection committee to select the individual contractor based on the proposals received.

Management Response:

- A. Concur and completed.
- B. Concur and completed.
- C. Concur to the extent permitted by Florida Statutes, with evaluation to be completed in manner appropriate for the purchase.

3. The Use of Change Orders Should Be Reviewed.

Change orders have been used to alter the scope of a project and circumvent competition. During our audit work, we selected a sample of 30 task orders; two of the task orders in the sample have change orders that increase the original purchase order amount by over 80 times the original amount. The proposals for the task orders were for pre-construction costs only in the amounts of \$2,718.05 and \$1,063.70. One change order increased the original amount by \$253,907.48 and the other by \$83,929.29.

The following details further describe the task orders and related change orders:

| Task Order A | Cumulative Total | Task Order B | Cumulative Total |
|---|------------------|--|------------------|
| Pre-Construction Scope of Work for the Public Defender's Office Roof Repair / Replacement | \$1,063.70 | Pre-Construction Scope of Work for the County Fleet Building | \$2,718.05 |
| Change Order 1 | | Change Order 1 | |
| GMP award for project known as Public Defenders Office Re-Roof (\$83,929.29) | \$84,992.99 | GMP award for project known as Lake County Fleet Maintenance Facility (\$253,907.48) | \$256,625.53 |
| Change Order 2 | | Change Order 2 | |
| Add waterproof caps to existing roof (\$810); add walkway pads (\$3,218.40) | \$89,021.39 | Adjust funding sources to match approved budgets (\$0.00) | \$256,625.53 |
| Change Order 3 | | Change Order 3 | |
| Adjust Purchase Order for Change Order #2 (\$75.11) | \$88,946.28 | Adjust Purchase Order for Change Order #1 (\$29.49) | \$256,596.04 |
| | | | |
| Amount of Change | \$87,882.58 | | \$253,877.99 |
| Percent Change | 8,262% | | 9,340% |

According to the County’s Purchasing Procedure Manual, the term “change order” is used specifically within Procurement Services, “to signify a monetary change to the purchase order in support of a specific contract. One example in this regard is the process and form used to raise the funding allocated to a given term and supply contract.” However, in these two examples, not only was the funding significantly raised by over 80 times the original amount, the scope of the project was completely changed. Instead of processing a change order, management should have either issued another task order or re-solicited the work. This practice is not within the intent of change orders and reduces competition.

We Recommend management ensure that change orders do not change the scope of the project, do not materially change the amount of funding, and are not used to circumvent competition.

Management Response: Concur but note that the specific examples stated by the IG reflect incremental funding activity rather than true change order activity.

Inspector General’s Comment: We agree that the change orders used were not for true change order activity. The point of our Opportunity For Improvement is that change orders should not be used in these situations.

4. Committee Composition and Contractor Selection Processes Need Improvement.

We reviewed the contractor selection process used to select the contract to be awarded. We noted the following concerns:

- A. The composition of selection committees does not reasonably ensure independence in the contractor selection process. For two out of three contracts where a selection committee was utilized, we found that the composition of the selection committee was either not consistent with the intent of the Purchasing Procedure Manual or included a potential conflict of interest, at least in appearance.

The Purchasing Procedure Manual states, “Selection Committees shall be comprised of technically expert personnel from multiple departments and/or external entities with an emphasis on assignment of senior level personnel knowledgeable of all, or specific aspects of, the work to be performed.” It further states that “Selection Committees shall generally consist of three or five voting members... On an exceptional basis, multiple personnel from a single department may be included on a Selection Committee when necessary to ensure the completion of an accurate and comprehensive evaluation.” The majority of the voting members should not be from the user department.

1. The composition of the selection committee for solicitation 11-0023 appears to be adequate and meets the stated attributes. However, the contract folder contains emails from the Department Director stating that he has a conflict of interest with one of the firms that responded to the solicitation; he asked one of his staff (his technical advisor) to be the voting member on behalf of the department. The director was kept on the committee as a non-voting member; however, the file does not indicate what the conflict was nor does it identify the firm that the conflict existed with; also, none of the solicitations submitted disclosed any conflict. The lack of documentation suggests that a conflict of interest existed and may not have been handled in the best possible manner.
2. The composition of the selection committee for solicitation 12-0004 was comprised of three voting members, two of which were from the user department; therefore, the majority vote rested with the user department. It could be perceived that the user department members could have influenced the decision of the committee as a whole. If two additional participants had been assigned to the selection committee, changing the composition from three to five voting members, an independent committee could have been achieved.

- B. The method of evaluating professional solicitations received is inadequate. Selection committee members are not provided specific guidance on how to qualify and evaluate a contractor; the Contracting Officer simply sends a memo to the committee members stating, “Read all proposals thoroughly and check for references as appropriate.” It further states that the firm or individual must be qualified per Florida Statute 287.055 and lists some general factors to consider such as capabilities and past record; however, it does not define them or state how to consider them; nor does it require anyone to document that anything was considered and to what extent. The instructions further state that, “After discussions, the committee shall vote on the firms to be ‘short listed’ for the committee to hold discussions.” During our review of the Procurement Division’s contract files, we also found that the solicitations do not explicitly include evaluation criteria and how the criteria will be weighted. Additionally, the current process and resulting decision are not fully documented.

One of the guiding standards of the National Institute of Governmental Purchasing (NIGP) states, “Before issuing the solicitation, procurement professionals and applicable stakeholders must establish the criteria by which the resulting bids or proposals will be evaluated. Once the appropriate procurement method is selected, criteria should be established to evaluate bids or proposals for the most economically advantageous offer for the contracting authority, or for the lowest price.” The NIGP further provides that, “When a multi-step procurement method is selected, bidders/offerors may be ‘qualified’ according to the selection criteria. The selection criteria may include questions to determine whether or not the bidder/offeror is responsible and has the capability and capacity to perform/deliver... Each criterion should be weighted to reflect its relative importance to the contracting authority... To accomplish this task, weightings may be assigned a range that specifies a minimum and maximum weighting.”

It is a common procurement industry practice to implement a system of evaluation criteria and weighting for ranking respondents and include it in the solicitations. A formal system should be put in place to establish explicit criteria to be measured. A weight and value should be assigned to each category of criteria.

The following is a brief example of high level criteria for professional services:

| Written Evaluation 600 Points | | |
|---|--------------|------|
| Ability of firm and its professional personnel | 150 points | 15% |
| Firm experience with projects of similar size | 100 points | 10% |
| Firm willingness/ability to meet schedule and budget | 50 points | 5% |
| Volume of work previously awarded by County | 100 points | 10% |
| Effect of the firms current and projected workload | 50 points | 5% |
| Minority business status | 75 points | 7.5% |
| Location | 75 points | 7.5% |
| Oral Evaluation 400 Points | | |
| Understanding of the project | 150 points | 15% |
| Ability to provide services | 50 points | 5% |
| Approach to project and methods | 100 points | 10% |
| Qualifications | 100 points | 10% |
| Total Points | 1,000 points | 100% |

Without specific guidance, and no requirement to document anything, there is no way to determine whether any committee member actually verified what was submitted by the contractor; the members simply come to the meeting with their preferences. The current process is informal and subjective, and does not ensure consistency.

We Recommend management:

- A.1. Require committee members and the assigned Contracting Officer prepare a conflict of interest statement prior to any meetings. All statements should be included in the contract file for reference.
- A.2. Ensure that the number of participants from the user department in a selection committee do not constitute a majority of the voting members.
- B.1. Develop and implement a formal process that includes criteria, weights and point values for the qualification of professional solicitations.
- B.2. Provide guidance and training to committee members at the time the solicitations are

provided, including detailed instruction on how to qualify a contractor to be short listed, as well as a checklist of tasks assigned to each. The members should document the results and use that information to justify their short list recommendation.

Management Response:

A.1. Staff will comply with any applicable Florida Statutes.

A.2. Concur at any time such delineation provides for an adequately qualified committee.

B.1. Concur with the exception of establishing a point-based evaluation to the extent permitted by Florida law.

B.2. Concur with note that procurement contracting officers do provide guidance in this regard and prepare a unified record of committee deliberations.

5. The Language and Content of Solicitations and Contracts Need Improvement.

We reviewed solicitations and contracts for appropriate elements including the scope of work, qualifications standards, evaluation criteria and scoring, reporting requirements and completion requirements. We noted the following concerns:

A. Several contracts have a vague scope of work. For 8 out of 30 tasks orders reviewed (26.7%), the scope of the associated contract is vague and does not define the types of projects or tasks that could be done under the contract. For example, the scope of one contract simply states that it is for construction or repair services.

The following table shows the contracts in the sample found having an inadequate scope:

| Contract Number | Scope of Work Contract language |
|------------------------|---|
| 11-0023B | “Generally, the Consultant shall be required to perform on call electrical and mechanical services as directed by task orders of various County departments.” |
| 13-0210A | “The Contractor shall provide construction and repair services, on an as needed basis, to the County on projects not exceeding \$50,000.00.” |
| 10-0016C | “On the terms and conditions set forth in this Agreement, County hereby engages Consultant to provide on call architectural services for County.” |
| 12-0207C | “The purpose of the solicitation is to provide for an on-call job order contract for County road, drainage and sidewalk construction projects having an individual value of \$100,000 or less. The work under those projects may fall within new construction, renovation, or repair work scope and may involve site work and landscaping work elements.” |
| 12-0207A | “The purpose of the solicitation is to provide for an on-call job order contract for County road, drainage and sidewalk construction projects having an individual value of \$100,000 or less. The work under those projects may fall within new construction, renovation, or repair work scope and may involve site work and landscaping work elements.” |
| 12-0207B | “The purpose of the solicitation is to provide for an on-call job order contract for County road, drainage and sidewalk construction projects having an individual value of \$100,000 or less. The work under those projects may fall within new construction, renovation, or repair work scope and may involve site work and landscaping work elements.” |
| 08-0020A | “On the terms and conditions set forth in this Agreement, County hereby engages Consultant to provide professional services for geotechnical engineering services and geotechnical engineering for specific projects listed in the County’s 2008-2012 Transportation Construction Program...” |

A clear scope of work to be done should be a critical component of all contracts. One of the County’s Purchasing Policy Statements states that, “... That all specifications or statements of work included in County procurement actions accurately describe the essential needs of the County, and contain no artificial or arbitrary requirements that limit competition or increase cost.” Without a clear scope of work, management could include projects that should be solicited separately to achieve the tenant of fair and open competition. The scope of these contracts appears to be open-ended and allow management to complete numerous separate projects without soliciting proposals specific to those projects. This practice does not provide reasonable assurance that the most qualified firms are selected for the projects.

- B. Evaluation criteria and scoring methodology is not included in solicitations. We reviewed the solicitations in selected contract files and found that none of the Request for Statement of Qualifications included a description of the evaluation criteria, weights, or scoring methodology. Additionally, as previously mentioned in Opportunity for Improvement No. 4, there is no formal process that includes criteria, weights and point values for the qualification of professional solicitations; therefore, once the process is formalized, it is important that management include a high level of the evaluation criteria, range of weights and scoring methodology directly in the solicitations that will utilize the selection committee process. This disclosure helps to assure the proposers that the County has established a fair and open evaluation process and helps them to know the aspects of the proposal that the County considers important.
- C. The stated scope and qualifications statement in some solicitations could be improved. In two of six solicitations reviewed, the appropriate elements were not contained in the documents. Both solicitations were documented using a Request for Statement of Qualifications. In one of them, the stated scope was vague. In both of them, the Qualifications Statement does not identify the minimum qualifications; instead it defers to the minimum education and experience requirements stated in various listed Florida Statutes "as applicable." The Qualifications Statement should list the minimum qualifying requirements that the County is seeking for the particular solicitation; otherwise, potential contractors may waste their time responding at an unnecessary expense.
- D. Responsiveness of solicitations is not documented by the Procurement Division. Responsiveness is a determination as to whether or not the proposal meets submission requirements, including time of submission and whether responses are provided for all required components. Although, responsiveness is reviewed by the Procurement Division Manager, it is not a formal process; a checklist is not referenced; and the process is not documented.

We Recommend management:

- A. Ensure that all continuing contracts have a clear scope of work that, at a minimum, lists projects or tasks that could be done.
- B. Include a high level of the evaluation criteria, range of weights and scoring methodology directly in solicitations that utilize a selection committee.
- C. Ensure that the details of qualifications requirements are listed directly in solicitations. Contracts should not defer to statutes that may or may not apply.
- D. Put a formal process in place to document the responsiveness of solicitations received, including a completed checklist for each contractor to be added to the contract file.

Management Response:

- A. Concur but note that scopes under on-call contracts need to allow for a range of activity.
- B. See response B.1 to Opportunity 4.
- C. Concur but note that the County relies on the evaluation factors stated in the CCNA statute.
- D. Concur and note such action is currently completed.

6. Current Practices Using Multiple Award Contracts Should Be Improved.

We reviewed the processes used when accessing vendors of multiple award (continuing) contracts. We selected a sample of 30 purchase orders, interviewed department staff and reviewed supporting documentation. We noted the following concerns:

- A. User departments do not document the vendor selection criteria under multiple award contracts. We reviewed their project files and found that documentation does not exist to support why the user department selected the particular vendor for 28 out of 30, or 93.4%, of the purchases. In fact, one of the department directors stated that he did not maintain any physical files for contracts or projects. For the other two tasks, the evidence was implied in the form of an additional proposal and the lower priced proposal happened to be selected. Contractor selection criteria should be documented to demonstrate that the contractor was chosen in a fair and objective manner; without documentation, it could be perceived that preferences are made. We also noted no system was in place that would provide for a systematic rotation.
- B. Current practices under multiple award on-call contracts do not provide fair and open competition on significant projects. Proposals were not obtained from multiple contractors on the same original contract award for 28 out of 30 of the projects sampled with the majority of division staff interviewed stating that they simply rotate the contractors of continuing contracts. For further discussion, see Opportunity for Improvement Number 2. However, there was no system that would ensure the contractors were actually rotated. On those contracts that are governed by the Consultants Competitive Negotiation Act, limitations are placed on price competition. However, even though rates are established on continuing contracts, competition can still be achieved on factors other than rates. For example, RSQ 12-0004, On Call Continuing Transportation and Traffic Engineering Services, was awarded to four contractors; however, prior to executing the resulting four contracts, the same rates were negotiated with all of the contractors. If the rates are already the same for each contractor, the County should seek proposals from each contractor for each project to determine whether one might be more efficient and effective in work to be performed.

The County’s Purchasing Policy Manual provides several Basic Policy Statements including, “...that each procurement action is conducted in accordance with the best interests of the County, and with the highest level of integrity and fairness to all involved parties throughout the acquisition cycle.” The manual further states that the primary Procurement Services goal is, “to ensure the County receives the goods and services it requires in a timely and cost-effective manner while maintaining compliance with established procurement policy.” Obtaining proposals from several contractors on significant individual projects is in the best interest of the county to help ensure that the best contractor is chosen for each individual project.

- C. No formal written criteria exist for determining whether a project should be solicited separately. In our sample of purchase orders, we noted 3 out of 30, or 10%, of the projects are distinct or large enough to have been solicited separately. One of the projects was separately identified and priced in the contract; the contract includes another project that was not a part of the sample, but was also separately identified and priced; more competition may have been obtained if the projects had been solicited separately. The other two projects cost \$256,596.04 for construction on the County Fleet Building and \$88,946.28 for roof repair/replacement of the Public Defender’s Office Building; the nature and amount of the task of both projects are such that individual solicitations may have resulted in more competition. Currently, there are no formal written criteria for determining whether a project should be solicited separately or as to why a project is not. Projects that are large enough or distinct should be solicited separately to facilitate fair and open competition. However, management does not reference a formal list of criteria when determining whether a project should be solicited separately or added to an existing contract.

We Recommend management:

- A. Instruct user departments to document the reason they selected a specific vendor for multiple award contracts and include it in their project or contract file.
- B. Require that user departments cease offering significant projects to on-call contractors on a non-competitive basis; instead, they should solicit technical proposals from several on-call contractors.
- C.1. Establish formal and consistent criteria for determining whether a project should be initiated using an existing contract or solicited under a new contract.
- C.2. Document justification for each significant project that is not solicited separately.

Management Response:

- A. Concur and completed (revised task order review form attached). [See Appendix C – Addendum to Management Response.]
- B. See response C to Opportunity 2.
- C.1. Concur but note the CCNA Statute itself includes such criteria.
- C.2. Concur for projects approaching CCNA continuing contract thresholds.

7. Management Should Implement a System to Document Contractor Performance.

During our review of processes used to evaluate vendor performance, we noted the following concerns:

- A. A process is not in place to formally document contractor deficiencies. The Purchasing Procurement Manual requires that the user department telephone and have meetings with the vendor to resolve any issue; if the issue cannot be resolved it should then be turned over to Procurement Services. However, when we spoke with the user departments they informed us that they only email the Procurement Division Manager as needed.

Additionally, the County’s Contract Administration Procedure specifically requires:

“A written record of any discrepancies in contract compliance and related corrective actions should be maintained in the departmental contract file with further distribution within the department as dictated by the department director. A copy of any such document under a private sector-sourced contract is to be provided to OPS [Office of Procurement Services] to support development of a full record of specific vendor performance by the County. Early and prompt coordination with OPS on any such issue is hereby confirmed as standard County procedure.”

However, this does not appear to be the standard practice. At the conclusion of our audit work, the division put a process in place where the Division Manager can input and/or attach performance reports in an internally used online application. The lack of formal documentation can eventually result in the County’s inability to enforce contractual deficiencies. A formal evaluation system should be put in place including the involvement of Procurement Services at the start of the process. Such a process could begin with preparing a form that is sent to the Contracting Officer to be included in the contract file.

- B. Management does not require contractors to update their qualifications and experience upon renewal. Contractors are not required to update their qualifications, experience or

performance data when contract renewals are exercised. This should be done to ensure that the contractor is still qualified to perform the contract prior to renewing an option. Without updating qualifications and experience, changes in staffing or experience could occur without detection.

We Recommend management:

- A. Develop and implement a formal evaluation system to report vendor deficiencies, including the involvement of Procurement Services at the start of the process. Such a process could begin with preparing a form that is sent to the Contracting Officer to be included in the contract file.
- B. Require the contractor to submit updated statements of qualifications and experience at the end of each contract term.

Management Response:

- A. Concur and note that such action was initiated prior to start of this audit.
- B. Concur.

8. Management of Contract Files Needs Improvement.

We reviewed the contract files maintained by the Procurement Services Division including file organization, documentation and approvals. The following are our concerns:

- A. Contract files do not document the use of objective criteria in vendor ranking. We reviewed evidence to support the selection committee, interview committee and negotiation processes and found that three out of six of the contract files did not demonstrate that objective criteria was used and documented; all of them were RSQ solicitations. The selection committee notes for all three files were prepared by the Contracting Officer.

The following is an excerpt from the notes of one of the selection committee meetings we reviewed (the full notes are attached as Appendix B – Example of Selection Committee Notes):

“Prior to the meeting, the committee individually reviewed the eight (8) responses. It was noted that the Consultant’s Competitive Negotiation Act ‘CCNA’ criteria and the ‘business friendly’ initiatives approved by the Board were utilized to review the responses.

The committee members considered such factors as the ability of professional personnel; whether a firm is certified minority business enterprise; past

performance; willingness to meet time and budget requirements, location (none of the eight (8) listed and office in Lake County), recent, current, projected workloads of the firms; and the volume of work previously awarded to each firm by the agency, with the object of effecting an equitable distribution of contracts among qualified firms, provided such distribution does not violate the principle of selection of the most highly qualified firms.

Each committee member announced a list of three (3) firms they individually deemed to be the most highly qualified to perform the required services.”

Although the notes state that responses were reviewed using the criteria of the "CCNA" and "business friendly" initiatives, the notes do not indicate anywhere what specific criteria was met by the short-listed firms, nor do they state what criteria was not met by those that were not selected. The notes further only list the top firms that were ranked by the committee members. There are no notes in any of the files documenting the justification of the ranking made by each committee member.

Likewise, the interview committee notes were prepared by the Contracting Officer; they include information about the various firms, but do not state what the deciding criteria were. Finally, the only indication of a negotiation process in one file is the inclusion of rate sheets from various firms and in another file are emails requesting rate sheets; notes were not included in any of the files to document the actual negotiation process. A detailed recording of selection and interview committee meetings is critical to ensure the appearance of an objective and fair vendor selection process.

The Purchasing Procurement Manual includes the following:

“Formal Selection Committees are subject to all applicable provisions of the ‘Sunshine Act’. All formal Selection Committee meetings shall be advertised and conducted in strict compliance with the then current provisions of the ‘Sunshine Act’ (Section 286.011 of the Florida Statutes).”

Section 286.011, Florida Statutes, states:

“(1) All meetings of any board or commission of any state agency or authority or of any agency or authority of any county... at which official acts are to be taken are declared to be public meetings... (2) The minutes of a meeting of any such board or commission of any such state agency or authority shall be promptly recorded, and such records shall be open to public inspection.”

Because the Contracting Officers are not preparing minutes of the selection and interview committee meeting, management is not complying with the County Purchasing Procurement

Manual or the Sunshine Act as it relates to recording the minutes of public meetings. Also, meeting minutes are not available for public inspection.

- B. The Procurement Division Manager does not ensure the completeness of contract files. During discussions with the manager, he stated that he does not review the completeness of the contract files created by his staff; he said that he only ensures that his own are complete. A periodic review of contract files can ensure that procurement policies and procedures are followed and supported.
- C. A comprehensive record of task orders issued is not maintained. During our audit work, we requested a list of task order contracts; the Procurement Division Manager replied, “I can’t get that.” Instead, he suggested that we go to the procurement website and search a few key phrases to get all of the CCNA contracts; he said this would be about 80% of the associated contracts; the remaining contracts (non-CCNA) could be identified by his memory. An additional 24 contracts came to our attention. The original list signed by the Division Manager had 51 contracts; the final list has 75.

Task orders represent the individual projects that are performed off of the continuing contract. Without a comprehensive list of task orders, it is not readily determinable which projects were performed under each of the various continuing contracts on file. Because continuing contracts are at high risk for potential abuse, it is essential that projects performed under the contracts are closely monitored on an individual and an overall basis. The Procurement Services Division is responsible for the issuance of all County contracts and should have a listing readily available.

We Recommend management:

- A. Require Contracting Officers document the meeting minutes in more detail for all selection and interview committee meetings, as well as, the process taken for any negotiations. Minutes for selection and interview committee meetings should be made available for public inspection.
- B. Put a process in place for the review of the completeness and adequacy of contract files by the Procurement Division Manager.
- C. Maintain an inventory listing of task order contracts.

Management Response:

- A. Concur and note such action is currently completed.
- B. Concur and note such action is currently completed.

- C. Concur for contracts that require task order review by the County Attorney office.

9. Contract Term Dates Should Be Established and Followed.

We reviewed the term dates for several contracts and noted the following:

- A. Some County contracts do not have an end date. During our audit work, we found three contracts associated with purchase orders do not have a stated end date for 6 out of 30 (20 percent) of the purchases sampled. All of the contracts were modified after four months to include term provisions, were open for 18 months and are now closed; the following table identifies the amounts spent under the contracts:

| Contract Number | Amount Expended |
|-----------------|---------------------|
| 12-0207A | \$634,235.98 |
| 12-0207B | \$37,855.92 |
| 12-0207C | \$59,768.94 |
| | |
| Total | \$731,860.61 |

Procurement best practices require that contracts have an end date. An end date allows both parties to know when the contract terminates and enforces a new procurement.

- B. Management is not following the terms of all contracts; modifications are used to extend contracts past their intended expiration dates. We reviewed the term clauses for several contracts and found that six were continued past the terms stated in the contract. For example, contract 10-0003A, for civil engineering, states that the term is for 12 months including two optional one-year renewals; however, the contract was renewed for a total of three years and is currently open. During the time of the renewals in the third year, new projects were awarded in the amount of \$65,100. Under the same original award, another contract 10-0003B had the same terms and was also renewed a third year; in that third year, new projects were awarded in the amount of \$115,633. As of August 8, 2014, the County website lists both contractors as having been awarded the new contract for civil engineering, number 13-0030. The terms of contracts should be followed to ensure that fair and adequate competition is achieved. Management appears to be using modifications to extend contracts instead of soliciting new contracts.

We Recommend management:

- A. Ensure that all contracts have a stated end date.

B. Follow the agreed to terms of contracts.

Management Response:

A. Concur but note the one example cited reflects an oversight corrected prior to audit.

B. Concur.

10.Supporting Documentation in Munis Should Be Improved.

Supporting documentation in Munis for task orders is inconsistent. During our review of task orders, we examined the documentation attached to the related purchase orders within the Munis financial system and noted differences between identification, support, and consistency. Currently, the user department of the related task order is responsible for creating the requisition and uploading the supporting documentation; the Procurement Services Division reviews the requisition and creates the purchase order. However, we noted that the associated contract is not always referenced in the purchase order; a data entry field is available but is not used; instead, a person has to look in the notes field or view attachments and still may not find a reference. Additionally, we found that many of the records in Munis do not have any supporting documentation attached; others have some, but not all relevant documents are attached, and there is no consistency as to the naming of the attachments. Internal Operating Procedures do not provide guidance to user departments on how to ensure that supporting documentation in Munis is consistent and complete for task orders. As a result, contracts associated with specific purchase orders are not easily identifiable in many cases.

We Recommend management establish a process to ensure that supporting documentation and data in Munis is adequate and consistent. This should include a review of each purchase order by the Contracting Officer.

Management Response: Concur.

GLOSSARY

Consultant’s Competitive Negotiation Act (CCNA) –Section 287.055, Florida Statutes, is the statute that must be followed in selecting and negotiating contracts with firms to provide professional design and construction related services. These services include architectural, engineering, land surveying and mapping, materials testing laboratories, construction management, and design-build services either for single specific projects or for continuing contracts.

Continuing Contract – Also referred to as an on-call contract. A type of multiple award contract whereas the vendors are on-call and selected to perform services on a project or task order basis.

Modification – A general term that applies to any change made to an existing contract. One example of a modification is the process and form used to exercise a currently existing option period under a term and supply contract. (LC-7 Purchasing Procedure Manual)

Multiple Award Contract – A contract that is a binding agreement awarded to multiple vendors who have met the basic qualifying requirements established within the solicitation, but may not establish firm pricing for a specific product or specific service to be provided. Such contracts should provide for the inclusion of additional qualifying vendors, and the release of vendors no longer meeting the qualifying conditions, over the full life of the contract. (LC-7 Purchasing Procedure Manual)

Purchase Order – An electronic document created in the County financial system by the Contracting Officer upon the approval of a requisition that serves to formalize and fund a specific purchase. All information and supporting documentation that was included in the requisition is converted to the purchase order.

Requisition – An electronic document entered into the County financial system by the user department when there is a need for goods or department services to be procured. The user provides sufficient detail and includes supporting documentation as an attachment including any task order, proposal(s), estimates, and project schedules. It is submitted to and reviewed by Procurement Services.

Task Order – One of many projects under an on-call contract. All RSQs, some RFPs and few ITBs result in the use of task orders.

User Department – Refers to the division or department that initiated the transaction, project or task and that will be receiving the services.

APPENDIX A – Task Orders Issued by Public Works Division

| PO Date | Order Amount | Contract Number | Vendor Name | User Department |
|----------|--------------|-----------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------|
| 10/27/08 | \$8,732.00 | 08-0020D | Professional Service Industries, Inc. | Road Operations |
| 11/05/08 | \$22,050.00 | 08-0020E | Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 11/24/08 | \$760.00 | 08-0020B | Central Testing Laboratory, Inc. | Road Operations |
| 12/11/08 | \$1,445.00 | 08-0020E | Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 02/19/09 | \$2,580.00 | 08-0020E | Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 03/12/09 | \$3,613.50 | 08-0020D | Professional Service Industries, Inc. | Road Operations |
| 03/16/09 | \$32,213.50 | 08-0020D | Professional Service Industries, Inc. | Environmental Services |
| 04/20/09 | \$6,675.00 | 08-0020B | Central Testing Laboratory, Inc. | Environmental Services |
| 04/27/09 | \$455.00 | 08-0020E | Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 05/11/09 | \$15,655.00 | 08-0020D | Professional Service Industries, Inc. | Road Operations |
| 05/11/09 | \$7,114.00 | 08-0020E | Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc. | Environmental Services |
| 06/15/09 | \$3,355.50 | 08-0020A | Ardamann & Associates, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 08/03/09 | \$11,853.00 | 08-0020A | Ardamann & Associates, Inc. | Environmental Services |
| 10/23/09 | \$8,730.00 | 08-0020B | Central Testing Laboratory, Inc. | Environmental Services |
| 10/23/09 | \$15,655.00 | 08-0020D | Professional Service Industries, Inc. | Road Operations |
| 10/23/09 | \$1,460.60 | 08-0020D | Professional Service Industries, Inc. | Stormwater Management |
| 10/26/09 | \$24,668.60 | 08-0020D | Professional Service Industries, Inc. | Environmental Services |
| 10/29/09 | \$12,100.00 | 08-0020A | Ardamann & Associates, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 11/24/09 | \$13,234.00 | 08-0020E | Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc. | Environmental Services |
| 12/09/09 | \$7,600.00 | 08-0020D | Professional Service Industries, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 12/10/09 | \$70,071.30 | 08-0020D | Professional Service Industries, Inc. | Road Operations |
| 12/22/09 | \$15,104.00 | 08-0020D | Professional Service Industries, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 02/04/10 | \$3,964.00 | 08-0020D | Professional Service Industries, Inc. | Environmental Services |
| 03/31/10 | \$10,678.00 | 08-0020A | Ardamann & Associates, Inc. | Road Operations |
| 04/15/10 | \$24,681.70 | 08-0020D | Professional Service Industries, Inc. | Road Operations |
| 05/14/10 | \$21,337.00 | 08-0020D | Professional Service Industries, Inc. | Road Operations |
| 05/18/10 | \$23,982.00 | 08-0020C | Devo Seereeram Phd Pe LLC | Stormwater Management |
| 06/15/10 | \$8,338.00 | 08-0020D | Professional Service Industries, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 08/26/10 | \$4,031.00 | 08-0020E | Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc. | Environmental Services |
| 08/27/10 | \$1,111.00 | 08-0020C | Devo Seereeram Phd Pe LLC | Engineering Operations |
| 08/27/10 | \$23,939.00 | 08-0020D | Professional Service Industries, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 10/11/10 | \$4,950.00 | 08-0020B | Central Testing Laboratory, Inc. | Environmental Services |

Distribution of Task Orders – Multiple Award Contracts

| PO Date | Order Amount | Contract Number | Vendor Name | User Department |
|----------|--------------|-----------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 10/11/10 | \$3,395.00 | 08-0020D | Professional Service Industries, Inc. | Stormwater Management |
| 01/24/11 | \$11,853.00 | 08-0020A | Ardamann & Associates, Inc. | Environmental Services |
| 02/03/11 | \$4,222.40 | 08-0020D | Professional Service Industries, Inc. | Stormwater Management |
| 03/09/11 | \$1,755.00 | 08-0020E | Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 03/14/11 | \$5,046.00 | 08-0020B | Central Testing Laboratory, Inc. | Road Operations |
| 05/01/11 | \$7,373.00 | 08-0020A | Ardamann & Associates, Inc. | Environmental Services |
| 05/10/11 | \$22,340.00 | 08-0020B | Central Testing Laboratory, Inc. | Environmental Services |
| 05/10/11 | \$14,490.00 | 08-0020D | Professional Service Industries, Inc. | Stormwater Management |
| 06/01/11 | \$7,735.00 | 08-0020B | Central Testing Laboratory, Inc. | Environmental Services |
| 07/14/11 | \$4,941.00 | 08-0020D | Professional Service Industries, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 07/18/11 | \$24,815.50 | 08-0020D | Professional Service Industries, Inc. | Environmental Services |
| 09/02/11 | \$45,766.00 | 08-0020C | Devo Seereeram Phd Pe LLC | Engineering Operations |
| 09/20/11 | \$3,701.00 | 08-0020B | Central Testing Laboratory, Inc. | Road Operations |
| 10/11/11 | \$11,788.00 | 08-0020A | Ardamann & Associates, Inc. | Road Operations |
| 12/15/11 | \$820.00 | 08-0020D | Professional Service Industries, Inc. | Road Operations |
| 12/16/11 | \$17,155.80 | 08-0020D | Professional Service Industries, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 12/20/11 | \$5,401.00 | 08-0020B | Central Testing Laboratory, Inc. | Road Operations |
| 02/08/12 | \$4,691.50 | 08-0020B | Central Testing Laboratory, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 02/28/12 | \$11,317.00 | 08-0020B | Central Testing Laboratory, Inc. | Road Operations |
| 03/22/12 | \$14,048.00 | 08-0020A | Ardamann & Associates, Inc. | Road Operations |
| 03/22/12 | \$21,116.00 | 08-0020A | Ardamann & Associates, Inc. | Road Operations |
| 05/04/12 | \$4,831.00 | 08-0020B | Central Testing Laboratory, Inc. | Road Operations |
| 06/12/12 | \$21,734.00 | 08-0020A | Ardamann & Associates, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 06/25/12 | \$16,592.00 | 08-0020D | Professional Service Industries, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 08/08/12 | \$5,875.00 | 08-0020B | Central Testing Laboratory, Inc. | Road Operations |
| 08/08/12 | \$24,627.00 | 08-0020D | Professional Service Industries, Inc. | Road Operations |
| 12/03/12 | \$17,355.00 | 08-0020B | Central Testing Laboratory, Inc. | Road Operations |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 08/22/12 | \$3,348.00 | 08-0021 | Nordarse | Ctrl Lndfl Ph I Post Closure |
| 12/23/08 | \$15,664.50 | 08-0021 | Nordarse | Ctrl Lndfl Ph I Post Closure |
| 12/11/09 | \$25,897.00 | 08-0021 | Nordarse | Lady lake Post Closure |
| 03/08/12 | \$3,830.00 | 08-0021 | Nordarse | Landfill Operations |
| 02/23/12 | \$3,830.00 | 08-0021 | Nordarse | Landfill Operations |
| 02/08/11 | \$48,690.00 | 08-0021 | Nordarse | Landfill Operations |
| 09/14/10 | \$2,950.00 | 08-0021 | Nordarse | Landfill Operations |
| 01/27/09 | \$92,715.00 | 08-0021 | Nordarse | Phase III Landfill |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

Distribution of Task Orders – Multiple Award Contracts

| PO Date | Order Amount | Contract Number | Vendor Name | User Department |
|----------|--------------|-----------------|--|--------------------------|
| 05/13/13 | \$1,300.00 | 08-0251 | Habitat Restoration & Wildlife Protection Services | Laboratory |
| 04/24/13 | \$116,000.00 | 08-0251 | Habitat Restoration & Wildlife Protection Services | Road Operations Transfer |
| 04/24/13 | \$85,000.00 | 08-0251 | Habitat Restoration & Wildlife Protection Services | Road Operations Transfer |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 10/24/12 | \$70,000.00 | 09-0034 | Malcolm Pirnie | Covanta Contract Mgmt |
| 10/09/11 | \$70,000.00 | 09-0034 | Malcolm Pirnie | Covanta Contract Mgmt |
| 10/06/10 | \$67,594.00 | 09-0034 | Malcolm Pirnie | Covanta Contract Mgmt |
| 02/26/10 | \$67,594.00 | 09-0034 | Malcolm Pirnie | Covanta Contract Mgmt |
| 10/09/08 | \$78,610.00 | 09-0034 | Malcolm Pirnie | Covanta Contract Mgmt |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 04/23/10 | \$220,371.50 | 10-0003B | Griffey Engineering, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 05/20/10 | \$4,720.00 | 10-0003A | Booth, Ern, Straughn and Hiott, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 07/29/10 | \$420.00 | 10-0003A | Booth, Ern, Straughn and Hiott, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 10/20/10 | \$11,850.00 | 10-0003B | Griffey Engineering, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 10/22/10 | \$7,833.50 | 10-0003C | Springstead Engineering, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 11/30/10 | \$2,600.00 | 10-0003A | Booth, Ern, Straughn and Hiott, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 04/07/11 | \$52,724.18 | 10-0003A | Booth, Ern, Straughn and Hiott, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 06/30/11 | \$9,395.00 | 10-0003B | Griffey Engineering, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 10/20/11 | \$2,527.50 | 10-0003B | Griffey Engineering, Inc. | Stormwater Management |
| 10/20/11 | \$2,527.50 | 10-0003B | Griffey Engineering, Inc. | Stormwater Management |
| 01/10/12 | \$2,440.00 | 10-0003A | Booth, Ern, Straughn and Hiott, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 05/04/12 | \$3,225.00 | 10-0003B | Griffey Engineering, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 06/12/12 | \$181,945.00 | 10-0003B | Griffey Engineering, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 12/19/12 | \$3,390.00 | 10-0003B | Griffey Engineering, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 03/04/13 | \$6,900.00 | 10-0003A | Booth, Ern, Straughn and Hiott, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 09/09/13 | \$96,428.00 | 10-0003B | Griffey Engineering, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 08/21/13 | \$1,690.00 | 10-0016C | Heery International Inc | Hazardous Waste |
| 02/14/13 | \$762.00 | 10-0016C | Heery International Inc | Hazardous Waste |
| 08/21/13 | \$525.00 | 10-0016C | Heery International Inc | Recycling |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 12/15/10 | \$4,855.00 | 10-0017C | NFC Landscape Architects | Engineering Operations |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 01/24/11 | \$2,102.00 | 10-0018B | HDR Engineering, Inc. | Covanta Contract Mgmt |
| 02/07/11 | \$49,650.00 | 10-0018B | HDR Engineering, Inc. | Landfill Operations |

Distribution of Task Orders – Multiple Award Contracts

| PO Date | Order Amount | Contract Number | Vendor Name | User Department |
|----------|--------------|-----------------|--|-------------------------------|
| 05/10/11 | \$33,620.00 | 10-0018A | CDM Smith, Inc. | Expansion of Co Recycling Prg |
| 10/07/11 | \$329,031.00 | 10-0018B | HDR Engineering, Inc. | Ctrl Lndfl Ph II Closure |
| 12/02/11 | \$23,120.00 | 10-0018B | HDR Engineering, Inc. | Landfill Operations |
| 02/03/12 | \$8,502.00 | 10-0018B | HDR Engineering, Inc. | Landfill Operations |
| 03/08/12 | \$10,905.00 | 10-0018B | HDR Engineering, Inc. | Landfill Operations |
| 09/14/12 | \$37,829.94 | 10-0018B | HDR Engineering, Inc. | Ctrl Lndfl Ph II Closure |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 02/15/11 | \$1,553.75 | 10-0029A | Kleinfelder Southeast, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 04/07/11 | \$1,480.00 | 10-0029B | Precision Enviro Assessments LLC | Engineering Operations |
| 06/06/11 | \$20,180.00 | 10-0029A | Kleinfelder Southeast, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 07/25/11 | \$1,480.00 | 10-0029B | Precision Enviro Assessments LLC | Engineering Operations |
| 08/01/11 | \$17,500.00 | 10-0029C | Shaw Environmental, Inc. | Landfill Operations |
| 08/29/11 | \$1,365.00 | 10-0029A | Kleinfelder Southeast, Inc. | Yard Waste Operations |
| 01/18/12 | \$2,330.00 | 10-0029A | Kleinfelder Southeast, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 01/23/12 | \$1,580.00 | 10-0029B | Precision Enviro Assessments LLC | Engineering Operations |
| 02/21/12 | \$2,855.00 | 10-0029A | Kleinfelder Southeast, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 02/21/12 | \$2,300.00 | 10-0029A | Kleinfelder Southeast, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 02/21/12 | \$9,167.50 | 10-0029A | Kleinfelder Southeast, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 02/28/12 | \$1,275.00 | 10-0029A | Kleinfelder Southeast, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 02/28/12 | \$7,450.00 | 10-0029C | Shaw Environmental, Inc. | Ctrl Lndfl Ph I Post Closure |
| 04/05/12 | \$6,939.50 | 10-0029A | Kleinfelder Southeast, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 04/09/12 | \$1,580.00 | 10-0029B | Precision Enviro Assessments LLC | Engineering Operations |
| 04/18/12 | \$3,134.50 | 10-0029A | Kleinfelder Southeast, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 04/18/12 | \$2,592.00 | 10-0029A | Kleinfelder Southeast, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 04/24/12 | \$12,049.00 | 10-0029A | Kleinfelder Southeast, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 04/26/12 | \$1,580.00 | 10-0029B | Precision Enviro Assessments LLC | Engineering Operations |
| 06/05/12 | \$4,552.50 | 10-0029A | Kleinfelder Southeast, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 06/05/12 | \$9,402.50 | 10-0029A | Kleinfelder Southeast, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 07/02/12 | \$1,480.00 | 10-0029B | Precision Enviro Assessments LLC | Engineering Operations |
| 09/04/12 | \$2,125.00 | 10-0029A | Kleinfelder Southeast, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 09/17/12 | \$2,230.00 | 10-0029A | Kleinfelder Southeast, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 10/24/12 | \$1,385.75 | 10-0029A | Kleinfelder Southeast, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 10/24/12 | \$1,855.00 | 10-0029A | Kleinfelder Southeast, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 10/29/12 | \$9,641.50 | 10-0029A | Kleinfelder Southeast, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 10/29/12 | \$2,300.00 | 10-0029A | Kleinfelder Southeast, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 11/13/12 | \$2,300.00 | 10-0029A | Kleinfelder Southeast, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 12/06/12 | \$2,409.50 | 10-0029A | Kleinfelder Southeast, Inc. | Stormwater Management |
| 01/07/13 | \$2,240.00 | 10-0029A | Kleinfelder Southeast, Inc. | Engineering Operations |

Distribution of Task Orders – Multiple Award Contracts

| PO Date | Order Amount | Contract Number | Vendor Name | User Department |
|----------|--------------|-----------------|---|------------------------|
| 01/07/13 | \$2,290.00 | 10-0029A | Kleinfelder Southeast, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 01/13/13 | \$2,171.50 | 10-0029A | Kleinfelder Southeast, Inc. | Road Impact District 6 |
| 02/05/13 | \$874.00 | 10-0029A | Kleinfelder Southeast, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 02/05/13 | \$2,166.00 | 10-0029A | Kleinfelder Southeast, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 03/04/13 | \$6,298.75 | 10-0029A | Kleinfelder Southeast, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 04/07/13 | \$9,752.50 | 10-0029A | Kleinfelder Southeast, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 05/01/13 | \$4,200.00 | 10-0029A | Kleinfelder Southeast, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 06/05/13 | \$9,226.25 | 10-0029A | Kleinfelder Southeast, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 07/01/13 | \$4,846.50 | 10-0029A | Kleinfelder Southeast, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 07/23/13 | \$4,229.00 | 10-0029A | Kleinfelder Southeast, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 08/01/13 | \$7,986.10 | 10-0029C | Shaw Environmental, Inc. | Road Operations |
| 09/09/13 | \$3,903.75 | 10-0029A | Kleinfelder Southeast, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 07/02/13 | \$4,391.60 | 10-0034A | AMEC Envir & Infrastructure / BCI Engineers & Sci | Road Operations |
| 06/03/13 | \$1,990.80 | 10-0034A | AMEC Envir & Infrastructure / BCI Engineers & Sci | Road Operations |
| 06/03/13 | \$1,096.20 | 10-0034A | AMEC Envir & Infrastructure / BCI Engineers & Sci | Road Operations |
| 02/25/13 | \$2,453.80 | 10-0034A | AMEC Envir & Infrastructure / BCI Engineers & Sci | Road Operations |
| 06/09/11 | \$1,536.00 | 10-0034B | Professional Service Industries, Inc. | Environmental Services |
| 09/08/11 | \$10,103.92 | 10-0036B | Professional Service Industries, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 04/13/11 | \$1,305.00 | 10-0037B | Booth, Ern, Straughan & Hiott, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 11/22/11 | \$6,615.00 | 10-0037B | Booth, Ern, Straughan & Hiott, Inc. | Stormwater Management |
| 02/02/12 | \$65,501.46 | 10-0037A | AMEC Envir & Infrastructure / BCI Engineers & Sci | Stormwater Management |
| 02/22/12 | \$20,165.00 | 10-0037A | AMEC Envir & Infrastructure / BCI Engineers & Sci | Stormwater Management |
| 06/12/12 | \$63,323.45 | 10-0037A | AMEC Envir & Infrastructure / BCI Engineers & Sci | Stormwater Management |
| 07/12/12 | \$10,940.00 | 10-0037A | AMEC Envir & Infrastructure / BCI Engineers & Sci | Stormwater Management |
| 02/25/13 | \$1,194.40 | 10-0037A | AMEC Envir & Infrastructure / BCI Engineers & Sci | Stormwater Management |
| 08/21/13 | \$2,203.00 | 10-0037A | AMEC Envir & Infrastructure / BCI Engineers & Sci | Stormwater Management |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 04/20/11 | \$32,518.93 | 10-0038A | B&H Consultants, Inc. | Road Operations |
| 01/31/11 | \$21,260.00 | 10-0038A | B&H Consultants, Inc. | Road Operations |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 06/15/11 | \$16,334.30 | 10-0217 | Ardamann & Associates, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

Distribution of Task Orders – Multiple Award Contracts

| PO Date | Order Amount | Contract Number | Vendor Name | User Department |
|----------|--------------|-----------------|--|------------------------------|
| 10/05/11 | \$732.50 | 11-0007C | Southeastern Surveying & Mapping Corporation | Engineering Operations |
| 03/24/13 | \$26,260.20 | 11-0007C | Southeastern Surveying & Mapping Corporation | Stormwater Management |
| | | | | |
| 10/25/12 | \$3,032.00 | 12-0004D | Traffic Engineering Data Solutions, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 12/19/12 | \$2,972.00 | 12-0004D | Traffic Engineering Data Solutions, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 02/05/13 | \$3,920.00 | 12-0004C | Tindale-Oliver & Associates, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 03/19/13 | \$9,208.00 | 12-0004D | Traffic Engineering Data Solutions, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 05/01/13 | \$3,851.89 | 12-0004A | GMB Engineers & Planners, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 05/01/13 | \$9,481.89 | 12-0004A | GMB Engineers & Planners, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 05/13/13 | \$975.00 | 12-0004D | Traffic Engineering Data Solutions, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 05/22/13 | \$4,957.50 | 12-0004B | METRO Consulting Group, LLC | Engineering Operations |
| 06/24/13 | \$2,900.00 | 12-0004C | Tindale-Oliver & Associates, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 06/24/13 | \$3,615.00 | 12-0004D | Traffic Engineering Data Solutions, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 01/07/13 | \$2,034.50 | 12-0005B | Professional Service Industries, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 02/14/13 | \$7,304.00 | 12-0005B | Professional Service Industries, Inc. | Road Operations |
| 04/01/13 | \$15,913.00 | 12-0005A | Central Testing Laboratory, Inc. | Road Operations Transfer |
| 06/10/13 | \$1,732.00 | 12-0005C | Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc. | Road Operations |
| 07/29/13 | \$9,770.00 | 12-0005A | Central Testing Laboratory, Inc. | Road Operations |
| 08/09/13 | \$14,418.40 | 12-0005B | Professional Service Industries, Inc. | Road Operations |
| 08/28/13 | \$18,210.00 | 12-0005A | Central Testing Laboratory, Inc. | Road Operations |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 04/01/13 | \$3,995.00 | 12-0022 | Andreyev Engineering, Inc. | Ctrl Lndfl Ph I Post Closure |
| 11/13/12 | \$11,300.00 | 12-0022 | Andreyev Engineering, Inc. | Landfill Operations |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 08/22/12 | \$53,600.10 | 12-0207A | Estep Construction, Inc. | Stormwater Management |
| 10/04/12 | \$86,441.70 | 12-0207A | Estep Construction, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 10/04/12 | \$19,348.00 | 12-0207A | Estep Construction, Inc. | Road Operations |
| 10/05/12 | \$15,828.88 | 12-0207B | Ovation Construction Company, Inc. | Road Operations |
| 10/25/12 | \$22,192.94 | 12-0207C | Wagner 3 Ventures, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 10/29/12 | \$22,657.00 | 12-0207A | Estep Construction, Inc. | Road Operations |
| 11/29/12 | \$12,824.00 | 12-0207A | Estep Construction, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 12/03/12 | \$14,194.75 | 12-0207C | Wagner 3 Ventures, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 12/19/12 | \$16,235.00 | 12-0207A | Estep Construction, Inc. | Road Operations |
| 01/07/13 | \$75,075.00 | 12-0207A | Estep Construction, Inc. | Stormwater Management |
| 01/29/13 | \$13,056.75 | 12-0207C | Wagner 3 Ventures, Inc. | Engineering Operations |

Distribution of Task Orders – Multiple Award Contracts

| PO Date | Order Amount | Contract Number | Vendor Name | User Department |
|----------|--------------|-----------------|--|------------------------------|
| 02/25/13 | \$10,324.50 | 12-0207C | Wagner 3 Ventures, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 03/04/13 | \$8,280.00 | 12-0207A | Estep Construction, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 04/19/13 | \$3,550.00 | 12-0207A | Estep Construction, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 04/19/13 | \$62,510.00 | 12-0207A | Estep Construction, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 05/01/13 | \$6,950.00 | 12-0207A | Estep Construction, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 05/13/13 | \$54,274.00 | 12-0207A | Estep Construction, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 05/22/13 | \$16,740.00 | 12-0207A | Estep Construction, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 06/20/13 | \$32,387.44 | 12-0207A | Estep Construction, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 06/20/13 | \$12,520.00 | 12-0207A | Estep Construction, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 06/30/13 | \$5,496.00 | 12-0207A | Estep Construction, Inc. | Stormwater Management |
| 07/01/13 | \$22,027.04 | 12-0207B | Ovation Construction Company, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 07/23/13 | \$98,907.07 | 12-0207A | Estep Construction, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 07/29/13 | \$19,036.96 | 12-0207A | Estep Construction, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 08/01/13 | \$79,191.46 | 12-0207A | Estep Construction, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 08/01/13 | \$39,833.32 | 12-0207A | Estep Construction, Inc. | Engineering Operations |
| 08/21/13 | \$7,286.00 | 12-0207A | Estep Construction, Inc. | Road Operations |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 03/04/13 | \$23,160.00 | 13-0002B | S2L, Inc. | Ctrl Lndfl Ph I Post Closure |
| 04/01/13 | \$25,290.00 | 13-0002B | S2L, Inc. | Landfill Operations |
| 04/01/13 | \$30,430.00 | 13-0002B | S2L, Inc. | Solid Waste Administration |
| 05/13/13 | \$31,470.00 | 13-0002A | SAIC Energy, Environment & Infrastructure, LLC | Solid Waste Administration |
| 08/01/13 | \$23,285.00 | 13-0002B | S2L, Inc. | Loghouse Post Closure |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 06/25/13 | \$48,130.13 | 13-0210A | Ryan Fitzgerald Construction, Inc. | Road Operations |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 06/26/13 | \$149,500.00 | 13-0434A | Habitat Restoration & Wildlife Protection Services | Road Operations Transfer |

APPENDIX B – Example of Selection Committee Notes



LAKE COUNTY FLORIDA

**Selection Committee Notes
August 8, 2011, 9:00 a.m.
11-0023, Mechanical & Electrical Engineering**

Attendees

Susan Dugan, Procurement Services, Facilitator
 Jay Dagner, Building Services
 Doug Woodyard, Information Technology
 Richard LeBlanc, Architect
 Kristian Swenson, Facilities Management & Development Director (non -voting)

Prior to the meeting, the committee individually reviewed the eight (8) responses. It was noted that the Consultant’s Competitive Negotiation Act “CCNA” criteria and the “business friendly” initiatives approved by the Board were utilized to review the responses.

The committee members considered such factors as the ability of professional personnel; whether a firm is a certified minority business enterprise; past performance; willingness to meet time and budget requirements, location (none of the eight (8) listed an office in Lake County), recent, current and projected workloads of the firms; and the volume of work previously awarded to each firm by the agency, with the object of effecting an equitable distribution of contracts among qualified firms, provided such distribution does not violate the principle of selection of the most highly qualified firms.

Each committee member announced a list of three (3) firms they individually deemed to be the most highly qualified to perform the required services.

| Richard LeBlanc | Jay Dagner | Doug Woodyard |
|------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------|
| TLC Engineering | TLC Engineering | TLC Engineering |
| Hanson Professional Services, Inc. | OCI Associates | Hanson Professional Services |
| OCI Associates, Inc. | Bobes Associates | Bobes Associates |

All of the firms mentioned on the list above are recommended for discussion. In summary, the Selection Committee’s consensus is to invite the following firms for discussion and interview for the on-call mechanical and electrical engineering services, RSQ 11-0023:

Bobes Associates
 Hanson Professional Services, Inc.
 OCI Associates, Inc.
 TLC Engineering

Susan Dugan will schedule interviews with the shortlisted firms.

Susan Dugan,
 Senior Contracting Officer

APPENDIX C – Addendum to Management Response

M E M O R A N D U M



LAKE COUNTY
FLORIDA

To: Office of Procurement Services (OPS)
From: (department submitting request)
Date: (date transmitted)
Subject: Task Order Recommendation

General Information

Contract Number: _____ Vendor: _____
Multiple award: yes no *If yes is noted, provide reason for selection of vendor:*
 Balancing work assignments Start date compliance Price (non-CCNA)
 Specialized expertise (describe): _____
 Other (describe): _____

Specific Order Information

Dollar value: \$ _____ General scope: _____
Scope includes CCNA services: yes no. *If yes is noted, this task order is for:*
 general study services that do not exceed \$200,000 for full term of the task order, **or**
 services in direct support of a project that itself has a value of \$2 million or less.
If this a change to an existing task order, insert current PO number: _____

Departmental Recommendation:

This department recommends approval of the subject task order for the services described in the attached proposal. The scope and pricing of the task order comply with the terms and conditions of the stated contract, and the total price is considered fair and reasonable.

Departmental point of contact/signature: _____
Department Director approval/signature: _____

Review by Procurement Services

Procurement Services concurs in the user department recommendation as follows:

- Task order deliverables and respective due dates are clearly defined
- Contractual compliance of the task order scope and pricing has been confirmed
- The task order as reviewed complies with all applicable statutory limitations

Contracting Officer signature: _____ Date: _____
Procurement Manager signature: _____ Date: _____

Review by the County Attorney Office:

Review of the task order recommendation has been completed and approval or comment has been provided to the user department and the procurement office.

Task Order Approval Form / June 2014