



DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

ENGINEERING ♦ FACILITIES ♦ REAL PROPERTY ♦ ROADS/BRIDGES ♦ STORMWATER ♦ TRAFFIC

1525 EAST JEFFERSON STREET ♦ BROOKSVILLE, FLORIDA 34601
P 352.754.4060 ♦ F 352.754.4423 ♦ W www.HernandoCounty.us

DATE: December 19, 2023
TO: Alisa Pike, Procurement Coordinator
FROM: Laura A. Borgesi, PE, PSM, MPA, Traffic Engineer
SUBJECT: Recommendation for Award Bid No. 23-RFQ00422/AP
Project Name: Continuing Engineering Services

The attached bid received from HDR Engineering, Inc for the above referenced project/solicitation is submitted for your review, evaluation, and award recommendation. In accordance with the Hernando County Ordinance No. 93.16, Section 2-105 (6) and Purchasing and Contracts Department Policies and Procedures Manual, Procedure No. 130F, Paragraph 3. (D), Policy140I, Paragraph 2(H), please complete items 2 through 6 and return this award recommendation form with your technical evaluation attached, approved by your department director/manager.

- 1. Total Contract Bid Price is: \$Task Order Based
2. Reference checks are satisfactory: [X] YES [] NO
If no, provide an explanation using the space provided below and/or attached to this form.
3. Recommend award as responsive and responsible bidder [X] YES [] NO
If no, provide a detailed explanation using the space provided below and/or attached to this form.
4. Request Next Bidder? [X] YES [] NO (Using five additional vendors)
5. Provide a statement that addresses the reason(s) for your recommendation or rejection. Include your basis for determining that pricing is fair and reasonable and that the Bidder has the ability and resources to perform in accordance with the bid terms, conditions and scope.

HDR Engineering, Inc. provides all the design engineering services that will be utilized on projects within the Department of Public Works. The references received for HDR Engineering, Inc. were all excellent and indicate that the company is reliable and responsive.

6. Provide the funding information: Fund 1015 Dept 03221 Account 5303103

Recommendation Approved By: [Signature] Date: 12/19/2023
Department Director/Manager

Enclosure

REFERENCE CHECK

BID #: 23-RFQ00422/AP

BID TITLE: Continuing Professional Engineering Services

RESPONDENT: HDR Engineering

REFERENCE (Company or Person): Hernando County DPW/Engineering

PHONE #: 352-540-6570 PERSON YOU SPOKE TO: Scott Nelson

1. Describe the work contracted by your firm/company.

Continuing Professional Engineering Services (18R00045) – multiple contracts, tasks included transportation, solid waste, environmental, architecture, and water/wastewater projects for several County Departments. Contract Cost: \$1.2M to date

2. Was the work completed on time?

Work is always on time.

3. Were you satisfied with the final results?

I am very satisfied with HDR's Designs.

4. Did you implement their recommendations?

Yes, After discussions with items in question / in need.

5. Did you encounter any problems?

No.

6. How would you rate the company on a scale of 1 to 5 (low to high) on the following:

Professionalism 5

Qualifications 5

Final Product 5

Cooperation 5

Reliability 5

7. Would you contract with this company again?

Yes Y No Maybe

Reference checked by: Scott E. Nelson

Date: 11-16-2023

REFERENCE CHECK

BID #: 23-RFQ00422/AP

BID TITLE: Continuing Professional Engineering Services

RESPONDENT: HDR Engineering

REFERENCE (Company or Person): Pasco County Government

PHONE #: 727-834-3604 PERSON YOU SPOKE TO: Kevin Sumner

1. Describe the work contracted by your firm/company.

Miscellaneous Professional Engineering Services (15-009) – Tasks included roadway design, drainage systems, traffic design, structures design, traffic control, environmental, utility coordination, etc.

Contract Cost: \$1.1M

2. Was the work completed on time? Yes.

3. Were you satisfied with the final results? Yes.

4. Did you implement their recommendations? Yes.

5. Did you encounter any problems? A few, but they were all resolved satisfactorily.

6. How would you rate the company on a scale of 1 to 5 (low to high) on the following:

Professionalism 5

Qualifications 5

Final Product 5

Cooperation 4.5

Reliability 5

7. Would you contract with this company again?

Yes X No Maybe

Reference checked by: Tina R. Duenninger

Date: 11/20/2023

REFERENCE CHECK

BID #: 23-RFQ00422/AP

BID TITLE: Continuing Professional Engineering Services

RESPONDENT: HDR Engineering

REFERENCE (Company or Person): Polk County Government

PHONE #: 863-535-2285 PERSON YOU SPOKE TO: Doug Gable, P.E.

1. Describe the work contracted by your firm/company.

Professional Engineering Services for Roads & Drainage (17-52) – development of design and construction documents for roadway, drainage, structures, signing and pavement marking, signalization, lighting, utility design, and environmental permitting; reports, design, analysis, inspection, and post design services for bridge project.

Contract Cost: \$1.3M

2. Was the work completed on time?

yes

3. Were you satisfied with the final results?

yes

4. Did you implement their recommendations?

yes

5. Did you encounter any problems?

no

6. How would you rate the company on a scale of 1 to 5 (low to high) on the following:

Professionalism 5

Qualifications 5

Final Product 5

Cooperation 5

Reliability 5

7. Would you contract with this company again?

Yes No Maybe

Reference checked by: Tina R. Duenninger

Date: 11/21/2023

TECHNICAL EVALUATION FOR BID AWARD

RFQ# 23-RFQ00422/AP
Continuing Professional Engineering Services

VENDOR: HDR ENGINEERING, INC

This document has been developed to facilitate your evaluation. Your evaluation should be limited to the attached. **Procurement will ensure that all documents required by the solicitation are contained for evaluation. This documentation will be included with the bid submitted for evaluation. Bids that are determined non-responsive by the Procurement Department will not be submitted to you for evaluation.** Please note that you should focus your attention on the areas contained within this document. Your evaluation will be a major consideration as to the responsiveness and/or responsibility of a bidder.

- A. Is the amount of the bid reasonable and realistic for the services to be performed or the item or equipment to be purchased?

NO BID REQUIRED, BASED ON SKILL AND REFERENCES

If the bid is considered reasonable/realistic, provide justification for your conclusion.

If you consider the bid to be unreasonable and/or unrealistic, please explain in detail.

- B. Was an independent County estimate developed prior to soliciting for the procurement?

NO

If affirmative, submit this estimate with your evaluation in the same format as the bid schedule and describe the extent the estimate was used in the analysis of the bid.

- C. Do the resources (manpower, equipment, supplies, etc.) proposed by the bidder meet the minimum requirements, if any, established by the solicitation?

YES

If minimums were not identified in the solicitation, you may request information on proposed resources from the bidder **through Procurement.**