City of Dillingham Action	Memorandum	Agenda of:	September 24, 2018
Action Memorandum No.	2018-09		
Subject:			
Authorize the City Manage Rehabilitation.	r to Award a Contr	act to PND fo	r D Street and Seward Street
City Manager: Recommend	Approval		
Fiscal Note: Yes	No Fund	ds Available:	Yes No
Other Attachments:			
-RFP 2018-05 D & Seward Statement of Qualificati -RFP Committee Recommend	ons	mation	
Summary Statement:			

This action memorandum authorizes administration to sign a contract with PND Engineers, Inc. for the geotechnical, survey, and design services required to complete the design phase of this project.

Proposals were due on August 30, 2018, at 4:00 PM and proposals were evaluated by committee comprised of three individuals. Notices were also posted in three public places: City Hall, N&N Market, AC Store, and the Post Office. Additionally, the RFPs were advertised on the City website and in the Bristol Bay Times on August 9 and 16.

(Such publication shall be made twice, with at least one week, but not more than two weeks, intervening between publications, and there shall be sufficient time between the late of last publication and the bid opening for preparation of bids, which time shall not be less than two weeks.)

Action Memorandum No.	2018-09
Summary Statement cont	inued:

PASSED and APPROVED by a duly constituted quorum of the Dillingham City Council on 924 2018

Mayor

ATTEST:

[SEAL]

City Clerk

Route to	Department Head	Date
X	Finance Director	
X	Public Works Director	
Х	Planning Director	
Х	City Clerk	

## City of Dillingham Fiscal Note

Agenda Date: August 2,	2018				
CIP Projects #1 Wastewater Syst	tem Upgrade - Lagoo	n Aeration	and #3 Landfil	II Ground Wa	ter projects engineering
portion.					
ORIGINATOR: Cynthia	Rogers				
FISCAL ACTION (TO BE COM	IPLETED BY FINA	NCE)	FISCAL IMI	PACT	✓ YES ☐ NO
AMOUNT REQUESTED:	\$107,689		FUNDING S		
	Budget Approved			City of Dilli	ngham
FROM ACCOUNT			Project		
3009 8520 30 62 4415 0		\$89,891	CIF	9 #1 & #3	
2200 8520 30 81 0000 0		\$17,798			
TO A CCOUNT	VERIFIED E	) V. A.	nita Fuller	Date:	7/27/2018
TO ACCOUNT:	VERIFIED	01, A	illa Fullei	Date.	112112010
EXPENDITURES OPERATING	EVIO	1			7
OPERATING	FY19				
Contract Services	\$ 107,689.00				
TOTAL OPERATING	\$ 107,689.00	s	- \$		\$ -
TOTAL OF ERATING	107,005.00	Ι Ψ			
CAPITAL	\$ -				
REVENUE	-				
FUNDING					
General & Special Rev. Funds					
State/Federal Funds					
Capital Project	107,689.00				
Other					
TOTAL FUNDING	\$ 107,689	\$	- \$		-
POSITIONS					
Full-Time					
Part-Time					
ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate pa	age if necessary)		See Res	olution 2018-	-12
PREPARED BY: Anita Fuller	AF			Aug	ust 2, 2018
DEPARTMENT: Finance					
APPROVED BY:					

Page 19 of 49

**Mayor** Alice Ruby

Manager Tod Larson



Dillingham City Council

Chris Napoli Chris Maines Aksel Buholm Curt Armstrong Andy Anderson Paul Liedberg

## **MEMORANDUM**

Date:

September 19, 2018

To:

Tod Larson, City Manager

From:

Cynthia Rogers, Planning Director

Subject:

RFP 2018-05,-06,-07: D and Seward Streets Rehabilitation

The scoring team met to evaluate the submittals in response to the Requests for Proposals for Statement of Qualifications (SOQ) and pricing for D and Seward Streets rehabilitation projects:

- RFP 2018-05 Geotechnical Services
- RFP 2018-06 Survey Services
- RFP 2018-07 Design Services

The recommendation of the scoring team is to select PND for all three RFPs. This is based on the following:

- 1. PND is the only submitter for survey services.
- 2. PND provided a competitive price point. The full price as submitted by PND was used for scoring. But in their submittal PND offered a 5% discount if they were awarded two contracts, and a 10% discount if they were awarded three contracts. This discount further underscored their competitive price point.
  - a. Without the added discount they were the least cost submitter for design services.
  - b. Without the discount they were the second least cost submitter for geotech services, but only missed being the least cost by a very small margin. With the discount, the difference in geotech services is very small. The higher Quality of Service scores resulted in PND having the highest overall point score for geotech.
- 3. PND identified an acceptable, alternative design methodology that provided for a cost effective, efficient design solution.
- 4. PND has demonstrated a history of past performance in prior Dillingham projects.
- 5. Using a single source for contracting will provide for efficient, streamlined oversight from the City of Dillingham, and prevent any issues that could arise when using multiple contractors for different parts of a project.

Two summaries of the scoring sheets are attached; one with prices to be kept internal and one with only the final scores to be released publicly. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Statement of Qualifications and Pricing for D and Seward Streets Rehabilitation Project  Sep-18	ingh	Dillingham SOQ Response: Team Summary					
60 pts max  PRICING POINTS   40 pts max  PRICING POINTS  41 #2 #3 300 max pts ed all 1nd max pts for all 3 tames pts for all 6 tames pts for a fo	ateme	ent of Qualifications and Pricing for D and Seward	Streets Rehabilitati	on Project			
60 pts max  PRICING POINTS <sup>2</sup> QUALITY OF SERVICE POINTS <sup>3</sup> #1 #2 #3  ALL TOTAL POINT  #1 #3 #3  ALL TOTAL POINT  #1 #4 #3  #1 #4 #4  #1	Sep-18						100 max pts each member,
thical chnical chnica			60 pts max	4	0 pts max		soo max pts for all 3 team members
chnical  chnical  31 30 23 25  chnical  60 31 30 25  27 30  80 25  80 27 30  80 25  80 27 30  80 25  80 25  80 25  80 25  80 25  80 25  80 25  80 25  80 25  80 25  80 25  80 25  80 25  80 25  80 25  80 25  80 25  80 25  80 26  80 26  80 26  80 26  80 27  80 26  80 26  80 27  80 26  80 26  80 27  80 26  80 26  80 27  80 26  80 26  80 27  80 40  80 26  80 27  80 40  80 28  80 40  80 28  80 40  80 28  80 20  80 28  80 20			PRICING POINTS <sup>2</sup>	QUALITY O	F SERVICE POIN	ITS³	ALL TOTAL POINTS4
31   30   23   25	018-0	5 GEOTECHNICAL		#1		œ	
1		Golder	31	30	23	25	171
660 31 30 25		Northern Geotechnical	42	28	27	30	212
ice - 5% (One Additional Contracts)		PDC	09	31	30	25	266
ice - 5% (One Additional Contracts)		PND <sup>5</sup>	49	33	37	40	258
ice - 10% (Two Additional Contracts)  55 33 37 40  60 35 40  70 40  71 28 35 34 40  72 40  73 36 40  74 40  75 36 35 34 40  76 35 34 40  77 36 36 36 36  78 36 40  79 36 36  70 40  70 4		PND: Price - 5% (One Additional Contract)	52	33	37	40	266
n RFP scope included the rehabilitation of D and Seward Streets. Addendum 1 added Main Street and Central Ave.  of Service Points = All categories except pricing Points = (Lowest Cost / Total Cost)*Max Points Possible.  of Service Points = All categories except pricing (Cover Letter-Relevant Project Experience+Project Team+Methods and Schedules).  ints = the sum of all individual scores (note the pricing points were included in the individual scores for each member of the scoring team).		PND: Price - 10% (Two Additional Contracts)	55	33	37	40	275
60 35 34 40  1 28 35 34 40  1 28 30 40  2 3 34 40  2 3 34 40  2 3 34 40  2 3 34 40  2 3 34 40  2 3 34 40  2 3 34 40  2 3 34 40  2 3 35 34 40  2 3 35 34 40  2 3 35 34 40  2 3 35 34 40  2 3 3 3 30  2 3 3 3 3 30  2 3 3 3 3 3 30  2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3  3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3  3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3  3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3  4 3 3 3 3	018-0	6 SURVEY					
128 35 34 40  129 35 34 40  120 35 34 40  21 28 30 40  22 35 35 40  32 35 32 40  Sobiets were calculated the rehabilitation of D and Seward Streets. Addendum 1 added Main Street and Central Ave.  of Service Points = All categories except pricing Points = (Lowest Cost / Total Cost)**Max Points Possible.  of Service Points = All categories except pricing (Cover Letter+Relevant Project Experience+Project Team+Methods and Schedules).		PND <sup>5</sup>	09	35	32	40	287
Main RFP scope included the rehabilitation of D and Seward Streets. Addendum 1 added Main Street and Central Ave.  Ity of Service Points = All categories except pricing (Cover Letter+Relevant Project Experience+Project Team+Methods and Schedules).	018-0	7 DESIGN					
60 35 34 40  21 28 30 40  32 35 40  Anin RFP scope included the rehabilitation of D and Seward Streets. Addendum 1 added Main Street and Central Ave.  By points were calculated the same by all reviewers: Pricing Points = (Lowest Cost / Total Cost)*Max Points Possible.  By of Service Points = All categories except pricing (Cover Letter-Relevant Project Experience+Project Team+Methods and Schedules).  Points = the sum of all individual scores (note the pricing points were included in the individual scores for each member of the scoring team).		CRW	28	35	34	40	193
Main RFP scope included the rehabilitation of D and Seward Streets. Addendum 1 added Main Street and Central Ave.  Ing points were calculated the same by all reviewers: Pricing Points = (Lowest Cost / Total Cost)*Max Points Posible.  Ity of Service Points = All categories except pricing (Cover Letter+Relevant Project Experience+Project Team+Methods and Schedules).		PND <sup>5</sup>	09	35	34	40	289
S:  E Main RFP scope included the rehabilitation of D and Seward Streets. Addendum 1 added Main Street and Central Ave.  Cing points were calculated the same by all reviewers: Pricing Points = (Lowest Cost / Total Cost)*Max Points Possible.  All categories except pricing (Cover Letter-Relevant Project Experience+Project Team+Methods and Schedules).  Tal Points = the sum of all individual scores (note the pricing points were included in the individual scores for each member of the scoring team).		Kuna	21	28	30	40	161
<ol> <li>1. The Main RFP scope included the rehabilitation of D and Seward Streets. Addendum 1 added Main Street and Central Ave.</li> <li>2. Pricing points were calculated the same by all reviewers: Pricing Points = (Lowest Cost / Total Cost)*Max Points Possible.</li> <li>3. Quality of Service Points = All categories except pricing (Cover Letter+Relevant Project Experience+Project Team+Methods and Schedules).</li> <li>4. Total Points = the sum of all individual scores (note the pricing points were included in the individual scores for each member of the scoring team).</li> </ol>		TBC	32	35	32	40	204
<ol> <li>The Main RFP scope included the rehabilitation of D and Seward Streets. Addendum 1 added Main Street and Central Ave.</li> <li>Pricing points were calculated the same by all reviewers: Pricing Points = (Lowest Cost / Total Cost)*Max Points Possible.</li> <li>Quality of Service Points = All categories except pricing (Cover Letter+Relevant Project Experience+Project Team+Methods and Schedules).</li> <li>Total Points = the sum of all individual scores (note the pricing points were included in the individual scores for each member of the scoring team).</li> </ol>		NOTES:					
<ol> <li>Pricing points were calculated the same by all reviewers: Pricing Points = (Lowest Cost / Total Cost)*Max Points Possible.</li> <li>Quality of Service Points = All categories except pricing (Cover Letter+Relevant Project Experience+Project Team+Methods and Schedules).</li> <li>Total Points = the sum of all individual scores (note the pricing points were included in the individual scores for each member of the scoring team).</li> </ol>		1. The Main RFP scope included the rehabilitation of D and Seward	Streets. Addendum 1 ad	ded Main Stree	t and Central Ave		
3. Quality of Service Points = All categories except pricing (Cover Letter-Relevant Project Experience-Project Team+Methods and Schedules).  4. Total Points = the sum of all individual scores (note the pricing points were included in the individual scores for each member of the scoring team).		2. Pricing points were calculated the same by all reviewers: Pricing	g Points = (Lowest Cost / T	otal Cost)*Max	Points Possible.		
4. Total Points = the sum of all individual scores (note the pricing points were included in the individual scores for each member of the scoring team).		3. Quality of Service Points = All categories except pricing (Cover Le	etter+Relevant Project Exp	erience+Projec	t Team+Methods	and Sch	edules).
		4. Total Points = the sum of all individual scores (note the pricing p	oints were included in the	individual scor	es for each meml	er of the	scoring team).