

# B.C.C. - SEMINOLE COUNTY, FL RFP TABULATION SHEET

ALL SUBMITTALS ACCEPTED BY SEMINOLE COUNTY ARE SUBJECT TO THE COUNTY'S TERMS AND CONDITIONS AND ANY AND ALL ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS SUBMITTED BY THE PROPOSERS ARE REJECTED AND SHALL HAVE NO FORCE AND EFFECT. RFP DOCUMENTS FROM THE PROPOSERS LISTED HEREIN ARE THE ONLY SUBMITTALS RECEIVED TIMELY AS OF THE ABOVE OPENING DATE AND TIME. ALL OTHER RFP DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO THIS SOLICITATION, IF ANY, ARE HEREBY REJECTED AS LATE.

RFP NUMBER: **RFP-5815-24/RTB**

RFP TITLE: Master Services Agreement for Seminole County Sports Lighting

DATE: May 22, 2024 TIME: 2:00 P.M.

Page 1 of 2

RESPONSE -1-	RESPONSE -2-	RESPONSE -3-
<p><b>Musco Lighting</b> 100 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue West Oskaloosa, IA 52577</p> <p><b>Bob DeCouto</b> Ph: 407-421-5660 Email: <a href="mailto:bob.decouto@musco.com">bob.decouto@musco.com</a></p>	<p><b>Orion Energy Systems, Inc.</b> 2210 Woodland Dr Manitowoc, WI 54220</p> <p><b>Brendan Hartt</b> PH: N/A Email: <a href="mailto:bhartt@oesx.com">bhartt@oesx.com</a></p>	<p><b>Qualite Sports Lighting, LLC</b> 215 West Mechanic St Hillsdale, MI 49242</p> <p><b>Patrick Kinney</b> PH: 502-791-7371 Email: <a href="mailto:pkinney@qualite.com">pkinney@qualite.com</a></p>

**Tabulated and posted by:** Robert Bradley, Procurement Administrator, Tuesday, June 11, 2024

**Evaluation Committee Meeting:** Monday, July 15, 2024 at 11:00AM EST (updated and posted Tuesday, June 18, 2024 at 11:00AM by Robert T. Bradley, Procurement Administrator)

Shortlist Meeting: Tuesday August 21, 2024

1. Musco Lighting
2. Orion Energy Systems

**Presentations with the 2 top ranked firms:** Tuesday, September 17, 2024 at 9:00AM EST at 1101 E. First Street, Sanford, FL – County Manager’s Conference Room 3024 (listed alphabetically)

- Musco Lighting
- Orion Energy Systems

**BCC Date:** January 28, 2025 – Approve recommendation to award to top ranked firm – Musco Lighting (Updated and posted, Tuesday, January 14, 2025 at 9:00AM EST by Robert Bradley, Procurement Administrator) –

**\*\*Protest:** On October 31, 2024, the County received a timely protest of the award recommendation from Orion Energy Systems. No further action will commence on this project until it is resolved by Purchasing and Contracts Division Manager. – Updated and posted, Friday, November 1, 2024 at 11:00AM EST by Robert Bradley, Procurement Administrator



Seminole County  
**Resource Management - Purchasing & Contracts**  
 Stephen Koontz, Purchasing and Contracts Manager  
 1301 East Second St., Sanford, FL 32771

**EVALUATION TABULATION**

RFP No. RFP-5815-24/RTB

Master Services Agreement for Seminole County Sports Lighting

RESPONSE DEADLINE: May 22, 2024 at 2:00 pm

Report Generated: Thursday, August 22, 2024

**AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY**

Vendor	Lorie Bailey-Brown	Rick Durr	William Pandos	Amanda Salazar	Chad Wilsky	Michael Wirsing	Total Score (Max Score 100)
Musco Lighting	80	100	92	85	95	95	<b>91.17</b>
Orion Energy Systems, Inc.	60	83	76	79	90	80	<b>78</b>
Qualite Sports Lighting, LLC	52	65	77	76	90	75	<b>72.5</b>

The Evaluation Committee approves the above stated ranking and agrees to conduct presentations and interview with the two (2) top-ranked firms Musco Lighting and Orion Energy Systems, Inc.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Rick Durr

\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael Wirsing

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chad Wilsky

\_\_\_\_\_  
Lorie Bailey-Brown

\_\_\_\_\_  
Amanda Salazar

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bill Pandos



Seminole County  
**Resource Management - Purchasing & Contracts**  
 Stephen Koontz, Purchasing and Contracts Manager  
 1301 East Second St., Sanford, FL 32771

**PRESENTATION RANKING**

RFP No. RFP-5815-24/RTB

Master Services Agreement for Seminole County Sports Lighting

RESPONSE DEADLINE: May 22, 2024 at 2:00 pm

Report Generated: Tuesday, January 14, 2025

**AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY**

Vendor	Lorie Bailey-Brown	Rick Durr	William Pandos	Amanda Salazar	Chad Wilsky	Michael Wirsing	Total Score (Max Score 100)	Total Average Rank
Musco Lighting	76 (2)	93 (1)	94 (1)	92 (1)	97 (1)	97 (1)	91.5	1.17
Orion Energy Systems, Inc.	90 (1)	63 (2)	64 (2)	79 (2)	78 (2)	67 (2)	73.5	1.83

We approve the above stated ranking and recommend award to the top ranked firm Musco Lighting.

Lorie Bailey-Brown *Lorie Bailey Brown*

Rick Durr *RD*

William Pandos *william Pandos*

Amanda Salazar maternity leave

Chad Wilsky *Chad Wilsky*

Michael Wirsing *Michael Wirsing*



Seminole County  
Resource Management - Purchasing & Contracts  
Stephen Koontz, Purchasing and Contracts Manager  
1301 East Second St., Sanford, FL 32771

**PRESENTATION SCORING**

RFP No. RFP-5815-24/RTB

Master Services Agreement for Seminole County Sports Lighting

RESPONSE DEADLINE: May 22, 2024 at 2:00 pm

Report Generated: Tuesday, October 29, 2024

**PHASE 2**

**EVALUATORS**

Name	Title	Agreement Accepted On
Lorie Bailey-Brown	Director	Jul 30, 2024 3:00 PM
Rick Durr	Director	Aug 5, 2024 10:36 AM
William Pandos	Greenways & Natural Lands Division Manager	Jul 31, 2024 10:05 AM
Amanda Salazar	Parks and Recreation Division Manager	Aug 6, 2024 9:42 AM
Chad Wilsky	Fleet and Facilities Director	Aug 20, 2024 3:52 PM
Michael Wirsing	Park and Recreation Division Manager	Jul 30, 2024 9:37 AM

**EVALUATION CRITERIA**

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Qualifications and Experience	Points Based	25 (25% of Total)

Description:

EVALUATION TABULATION  
RFP No. RFP-5815-24/RTB  
Master Services Agreement for Seminole County Sports Lighting

---

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Project Understanding and Approach	Points Based	30 (30% of Total)

Description:

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Proposed Implementation Plan	Points Based	30 (30% of Total)

Description:

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Cost	Points Based	15 (15% of Total)

Description:

### AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY

Vendor	Lorie Bailey-Brown	Rick Durr	William Pandos	Amanda Salazar	Chad Wilsky	Michael Wirsing	Total Score (Max Score 100)	Total Average Rank
Musco Lighting	76 (2)	93 (1)	94 (1)	92 (1)	97 (1)	97 (1)	<b>91.5</b>	<b>1.17</b>
Orion Energy Systems, Inc.	90 (1)	63 (2)	64 (2)	79 (2)	78 (2)	67 (2)	<b>73.5</b>	<b>1.83</b>
Qualite Sports Lighting, LLC Excluded	0 (3)	0 (3)	0 (3)	0 (3)	0 (3)	0 (3)	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>

### VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP-5815-24/RTB

Master Services Agreement for Seminole County Sports Lighting

Vendor	Qualifications and Experience Points Based 25 Points (25%)	Project Understanding and Approach Points Based 30 Points (30%)	Proposed Implementation Plan Points Based 30 Points (30%)	Cost Points Based 15 Points (15%)	Total Score (Max Score 100)
Musco Lighting	24.8	29.3	27	10.3	<b>91.5</b>
Orion Energy Systems, Inc.	16.5	20.5	23.3	13.2	<b>73.5</b>
Qualite Sports Lighting, LLC	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<b>Excluded</b>					

**INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES**

**Musco Lighting**

**Qualifications and Experience | Points Based | 25 Points (25%)**

Lorie Bailey-Brown: 25

Proven record of qualification and experience.

Rick Durr: 25

Arguably the standard in sports lighting even at the local, municipal level. Been in business for 50 years. Has always been easy to work with and responsive to our needs at both our newer Musco projects (Boombah and Soldiers Cree) as well as their older systems in place at our other sports facilities.

William Pandos: 24

Musco's presentation was very informative and explained their years in business. All the past work they have done. A vast majority of sports fields. all sorts of other amazing projects they did for businesses and our national monuments. How globally they are. They seem to be a cornerstone of this industry.

Amanda Salazar: 25

Musco has tons of experience working with municipalities and parks and recreation departments.

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP-5815-24/RTB

Master Services Agreement for Seminole County Sports Lighting

---

Chad Wilsky: 25

Very Experienced with sports lighting and parks & recreation projects throughout the country, Florida and in the County. NFL, MLB and collegiate

Michael Wirsing: 25

The vendor has been in business for 50 years and is exclusively a sports lighting company. The vendor has done everything from stadiums at all levels to small park and recreation settings. They have done since 2016 770 projects in Florida including several in Seminole County and even have done ones with Seminole County. Liked that they do all facets from designing, building, installing, and warranty work for their projects.

**Project Understanding and Approach | Points Based | 30 Points (30%)**

Lorie Bailey-Brown: 30

Presented a clear understanding of the project and their approach.

Rick Durr: 28

Provided everything as requested for each of the county's park sites. Thorough and complete. Did a great job at also educating the committee on various factors to look for regarding each facility.

William Pandos: 28

They provided a very detailed explanation of their values and warranties. They explained how the lighting levels will be at the property lines and the nonglare from their fixtures. They even provided data from neighborhoods regarding the surrounding limits of the park. They also explained how they will make the improvements to current systems and what new advantages we will have from their equipment. It will meet the County's needs.

Amanda Salazar: 30

They know exactly what we are looking for and our intended use.

Chad Wilsky: 30

Detailed approach and understanding. Provided experiences from past projects

Michael Wirsing: 30

Musco was very familiar with the project. During their presentation, they showed that they had been out to our facilities and did some light readings and were able to share what our current light readings are currently and what we can expect. Liked that they talked

about partnering with the County to help with community questions. Also liked that they have been through the permitting process in Seminole County.

**Proposed Implementation Plan | Points Based | 30 Points (30%)**

Lorie Bailey-Brown: 20

Presented flexibility of implementation

Rick Durr: 28

Easy to understand. Versatile and responsive plan. Matches our past experience with the company with old and new solutions.

William Pandos: 29

They are very willing to work with the county on which properties we want done first the provide a feasible time lin.

Amanda Salazar: 25

Their timeline is a little bit longer than the competitor because it requires more machinery, but still a well-organized plan.

Chad Wilsky: 30

Had familiarity with locations. Detailed implementation plan and articulated the plan well. Also provided experiences from past projects

Michael Wirsing: 30

Their proposed plan was straightforward and made it clear that they would work around our programs and offerings. They also were well aware of our biggest needs and offered great advice about what facilities they would recommend starting with first.

**Cost | Points Based | 15 Points (15%)**

Lorie Bailey-Brown: 1

Price is significantly higher than competitor

Rick Durr: 12

Cost is logical for the service and warranty provided. Is consistent with past projects in Seminole County as well.

William Pandos: 13

I believe the products we are receiving is worth the value they have proposed to the County and will be a great company partnership.

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP-5815-24/RTB

Master Services Agreement for Seminole County Sports Lighting

---

Amanda Salazar: 12

Price is a little higher than competitor, however the warranty coverage is much better.

Chad Wilsky: 12

Costs appears to be inclusive and comprehensive of the County's requirements. No adds on needed

Michael Wirsing: 12

While Musco was not the cheapest it appears that they provide a high-quality product and have the financial resources to back up their warranties.

### Orion Energy Systems, Inc.

Qualifications and Experience | Points Based | 25 Points (25%)

Lorie Bailey-Brown: 20

Qualifications and experience were presented

Rick Durr: 14

Concerns regarding longevity in the sports lighting world. First install of municipal sports lighting was in 2022. Some concerns regarding the business model being subdivided among different corporate partnerships from design, install and maintenance.

William Pandos: 17

Orion provided a nice presentation. They have a new partnership to work with. They all have years of experience but their company is young for their product. They sold their previous version and started this company. They show they do a lot of business not parks and sporting venues.

Amanda Salazar: 18

Vendor has little experience with municipalities; their product has only been out a few years and is still in the first generation of fixtures.

Chad Wilsky: 15

Very innovative. Provided experience with high school stadiums but was not able to provide project experience with other parks & recreation departments, professional sports and collegiate stadiums/ ballparks. Products not proven

Michael Wirsing: 15

The vendor is new to the marketplace with their first installation being in 2021. They had started another lighting company but it was sold so the owners did have experience but the company seems new and the lighting solution has not been used a lot in park and recreation settings. With this big of a project, the product being untested compared to others in the market gives me pause. Only installation in Florida is used by high schools which are not always used every day like our parks.

**Project Understanding and Approach | Points Based | 30 Points (30%)**

Lorie Bailey-Brown: 30

Clearly presented understanding of project and approach

Rick Durr: 15

Team provided the required information - except for addressing glare calculations as requested. Presentation ran long and skipped the portion of the presentation applicable to Seminole County.

William Pandos: 15

They provided a good explanation of the product. We were able to put our hands on some of the products. They showed how it would attach to our existing poles. They did not provide any information on the glare or spillover into neighboring properties. They explained about their surge protection redundancy and that if a light strike happens they won't warranty it.

Amanda Salazar: 23

Vendor knows what we are looking for, but did not provide some data/analytics we were hoping to see for light pollution and usage.

Chad Wilsky: 25

Articulated understanding and the approach but still as a team/ organization very limited experience in providing this type of service

Michael Wirsing: 15

Was a bit confused with the connection to Orion and Mako lights. Seems like there a several different companies partnering together rather than just one company that does it all. Was disappointed that they did not provide glare readings in their presentations as they didn't provide it in their proposals either which we had requested. This component is a huge factor in playability and impact on the neighbors. The vendor spent time talking about other services like security cameras and charging stations rather than focusing on the sports lighting component.

**Proposed Implementation Plan | Points Based | 30 Points (30%)**

Lorie Bailey-Brown: 25

Presented a flexible implementation plan.

Rick Durr: 20

Plan seems versatile and responsive.

William Pandos: 20

They provided a schedule on how long it will take to install.

Amanda Salazar: 25

Had a quick plan in place because the equipment did not require a lot of heavy machinery for long periods of time.

Chad Wilsky: 25

Detailed plan, but limited past project experience with the specific services the County is seeking

Michael Wirsing: 25

The product seems to be able to be installed quickly and the vendor stated they will work with us to work around our schedule. An implementation plan from a time standpoint was shorter than other vendors.

**Cost | Points Based | 15 Points (15%)**

Lorie Bailey-Brown: 15

significantly lower cost was presented and addressed during the presentation

Rick Durr: 14

Was the low price, however it was made clear that glare analysis was not included in the project, so no idea if this would add cost. With this relatively new product, it was made clear that while they are on the first generation of lighting technology design, implementation of next generation designs during the warranty period would come at an additional cost.

William Pandos: 12

Their cost is within the level I would imagine to be in for their product

Amanda Salazar: 13

Price was lower than competitor, but any change in their products (such as new generations of fixtures coming out) would cost us out of pocket.

Chad Wilsky: 13

Not sure if price is all inclusive of the services the County is seeking

Michael Wirsing: 12

Liked that the vendor showed cost recovery for the LED lights over the current metal lights and ROI. The product is less expensive but without the time in the market, it's hard to know whether or not these lights will last as long as others who have been doing it for much longer.

**Qualite Sports Lighting, LLC**  
(Excluded)

**Qualifications and Experience | Points Based | 25 Points (25%)**

Lorie Bailey-Brown: 0

Rick Durr: 0

William Pandos: 0

Amanda Salazar: 0

Chad Wilsky: 0

Michael Wirsing: 0

**Project Understanding and Approach | Points Based | 30 Points (30%)**

Lorie Bailey-Brown: 0

Rick Durr: 0

William Pandos: 0

Amanda Salazar: 0
Chad Wilsky: 0
Michael Wirsing: 0

**Proposed Implementation Plan | Points Based | 30 Points (30%)**

Lorie Bailey-Brown: 0
Rick Durr: 0
William Pandos: 0
Amanda Salazar: 0
Chad Wilsky: 0
Michael Wirsing: 0

**Cost | Points Based | 15 Points (15%)**

Lorie Bailey-Brown: 0
Rick Durr: 0
William Pandos: 0
Amanda Salazar: 0
Chad Wilsky: 0
Michael Wirsing: 0

**PHASE 1**

**EVALUATORS**

EVALUATION TABULATION  
RFP No. RFP-5815-24/RTB  
Master Services Agreement for Seminole County Sports Lighting

---

Name	Title	Agreement Accepted On
Lorie Bailey-Brown	Director	Jul 30, 2024 3:00 PM
Rick Durr	Director	Aug 5, 2024 10:36 AM
William Pandos	Greenways & Natural Lands Division Manager	Jul 31, 2024 10:05 AM
Amanda Salazar	Parks and Recreation Division Manager	Aug 6, 2024 9:42 AM
Chad Wilsky	Fleet and Facilities Director	Aug 20, 2024 3:52 PM
Michael Wirsing	Park and Recreation Division Manager	Jul 30, 2024 9:37 AM

**EVALUATION CRITERIA**

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Qualifications and Past Experience	Points Based	25 (25% of Total)

Description:

Each proposal shall include a statement of the contractor’s qualifications that includes:

A description of the contractor’s experience with similar work, including references for at least three (3) existing or past clientele. Use Attachment I “Similar Project Experience” form. The County intends to conduct reference checks of those clients. These checks will be designed to validate the company’s performance, ascertain the difference (if any) between expectations and delivery, and determine overall satisfaction with the company’s services.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Project Understanding	Points Based	25 (25% of Total)

Description:

EVALUATION TABULATION  
RFP No. RFP-5815-24/RTB  
Master Services Agreement for Seminole County Sports Lighting

---

Each proposal shall include a statement detailing the contractor’s understanding of, and planned approach to, the services contemplated in the Scope of Services section of this document. This statement shall include the following:

A. A description of contractor’s understanding of the Scope of Services and how contractor will approach work.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Proposed Implementation Plan	Points Based	25 (25% of Total)

Description:

Each proposal shall include a detailed implementation plan for the execution of the scope of services.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Price Proposal	Points Based	25 (25% of Total)

Description:

Proposer must submit costs inclusive of all direct and indirect components, services, insurance, coordination and incidentals necessary for the performance of the services.

When the Price Proposal Form(s) is included as part of the solicitation documents, Proposals must be submitted only upon the forms provided, with all items properly filled out in non-erasable permanent ink and must be properly signed and dated. The Proposal Form(s) will be rejected if it shows any omissions, alterations of form of any kind.

**AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY**

Vendor	Lorie Bailey-Brown	Rick Durr	William Pandos	Amanda Salazar	Chad Wilsky	Michael Wirsing	Total Score (Max Score 100)	Total Average Rank
Musco Lighting	80 (1)	100 (1)	92 (1)	85 (1)	95 (1)	95 (1)	<b>91.17</b>	<b>1</b>

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP-5815-24/RTB

Master Services Agreement for Seminole County Sports Lighting

Vendor	Lorie Bailey-Brown	Rick Durr	William Pandos	Amanda Salazar	Chad Wilsky	Michael Wirsing	Total Score (Max Score 100)	Total Average Rank
Orion Energy Systems, Inc.	60 (2)	83 (2)	76 (3)	79 (2)	90 (2.5)	80 (2)	<b>78</b>	<b>2.25</b>
Qualite Sports Lighting, LLC	52 (3)	65 (3)	77 (2)	76 (3)	90 (2.5)	75 (3)	<b>72.5</b>	<b>2.75</b>

**VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA**

Vendor	Qualifications and Past Experience Points Based 25 Points (25%)	Project Understanding Points Based 25 Points (25%)	Proposed Implementation Plan Points Based 25 Points (25%)	Price Proposal Points Based 25 Points (25%)	Total Score (Max Score 100)
Musco Lighting	23.7	23.5	23.3	20.7	<b>91.17</b>
Orion Energy Systems, Inc.	18.5	18.7	18.7	22.2	<b>78</b>
Qualite Sports Lighting, LLC	21	14.3	15.5	21.7	<b>72.5</b>

**INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES**

<b>Musco Lighting</b>	
<b>Qualifications and Past Experience   Points Based   25 Points (25%)</b>	
Lorie Bailey-Brown: 20	acceptable
Rick Durr: 25	Provided multiple references with similar clients and projects.
William Pandos: 24	

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP-5815-24/RTB

Master Services Agreement for Seminole County Sports Lighting

---

Musco provided required states license, contractor license, multiple years of experience, many similar projects. Very knowledgeable they have been industry for many years. Leading MFC for sport lighting

Amanda Salazar: 23

Almost all of references and experience listed is relevant to types of work and scale.

Chad Wilsky: 25

Similar project experience with large counties and cities

Michael Wirsing: 25

Musco provided a number of near by park and recreation agencies as references including showing locations that were retrofit and all locations are similar to our project with softball fields, rectangular fields, tennis courts, etc. Musco has been in the industry for decades and the County currently uses their proposed lights as well as the lights that are being replaced were Musco lights that have been in use for more than 30 years.

**Project Understanding | Points Based | 25 Points (25%)**

Lorie Bailey-Brown: 20

Acceptable

Rick Durr: 25

Highly detailed approach to each park project, specifically designed for each location

William Pandos: 24

Musco provided a very detail on all the equipment to be used number a fixtures to be used, the wattage. how to be installed and connected to the existing lighting structures within all the County facilities identified. Lighting photometrics-both infield and the boundary were provided. described all the switch gear, breaker replacement and operators controls with a power surge protection system. They noted the warranty and met the required years requested. Cost savings and usage data reported

Amanda Salazar: 22

Very detailed understanding and planned approach to the scope provided. Vendor uses control system all parks currently have and utilize on a daily basis. Warranty is longer for products.

Chad Wilsky: 25

Detailed project understanding and approach provided

Michael Wirsing: 25

Musco provided a very detailed plan for each park with a full photometric scan. They provided a spill report for each field at every location as well as equipment layout and light aiming angles for each and every facility. Musco provided a very detailed plan for what they are responsible for and what the County is responsible. Musco provided an EPA reduction chart for each of the fields which shows the future reduction counts. Musco even provided instruction and assembly/disassembly instructions for all fixtures. Their presentation was the most in-depth and provided the most data driven information.

**Proposed Implementation Plan | Points Based | 25 Points (25%)**

Lorie Bailey-Brown: 20

Acceptable

Rick Durr: 25

Answered every question I have regarding how this will be implemented on a site by site basis.

William Pandos: 23

A scheduled time line of the expected delivery and installation for each park

Amanda Salazar: 22

Very detailed plan-broken up by individual parks. Each park has photometrics by area and by fixture.

Chad Wilsky: 25

Detailed project implementation provided

Michael Wirsing: 25

Each park site was given a realistic timeline for each park site. The details provided about all installation components was a welcomed site and was good to see all the specifics of the products they are proposing.

**Price Proposal | Points Based | 25 Points (25%)**

Lorie Bailey-Brown: 20

Acceptable

Rick Durr: 25

Highly detailed list of costs with exceptions based on site-by-site locations. Very thorough.

William Pandos: 21

Musco did provide both purchasing and leasing cost. they we can partner with Duke Energy. They were very detailed on all the cost associated with this project.

Amanda Salazar: 18

Vendor provided many options for financing. Initial price is high compared to other bids.

Chad Wilsky: 20

\$3,605,400

Michael Wirsing: 20

Musco provided upfront pricing and options for leasing as part of their proposal. Musco is offering a 15 year warranty and provided all the specific details regarding warranty.

### Orion Energy Systems, Inc.

#### Qualifications and Past Experience | Points Based | 25 Points (25%)

Lorie Bailey-Brown: 15

Acceptable

Rick Durr: 18

Not all similar types of installations provided with client types (Home Depot parking lot, etc.)

William Pandos: 18

Orion has provided their experience at 3 large business lighting project. isn't sport field related. They look to have done a few schools lights. They provided their sales lisc. But I didn't see their contractor . They are a young company.

Amanda Salazar: 20

Vendor has lots of experience in public service for large-scale projects.

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP-5815-24/RTB

Master Services Agreement for Seminole County Sports Lighting

---

Chad Wilsky: 25

Similar project experience with large private corporations and school systems

Michael Wirsing: 15

It seems that the company is new to the industry. They stated in their references that the first MAKO installation was in October 2021 and the company was founded in 2019. Other vendors have been around longer and have been able to develop technology, identify possible issues with products, and have had time to refine products based on data. With MAKO being so new I have concerns that there has not been enough time to collect enough data to know if the equipment will last or what possible issues could arise after a few years of service. Out of the three projects, only one was a recreation facility the other two were school systems that may not use lights as often as our parks do. Would have liked to know that they have done jobs similar to our operations.

**Project Understanding | Points Based | 25 Points (25%)**

Lorie Bailey-Brown: 15

Acceptable

Rick Durr: 20

Covered most of what was required. Missing information on lighting aiming plan (provided general specs, but not site specific), no discussion of if additional wiring or conduit was required, or surge protection.

William Pandos: 17

A photometric plan was submitted but with out the 150 ft boundary line. They provided details of the lamps and equipment to be used. A electrical surge protection and controller information. Warranty info their energy usage was just watts not amperage or cost savings

Amanda Salazar: 20

Vendor has very detailed photometrics for each location.

Chad Wilsky: 20

Project understanding and approach provided

Michael Wirsing: 20

MAKO provided a good understanding of the scope of service and provided photometric for each facility showing footcandles. They did not show a 150 scan for potential glare or footcandles as requested. This is important as many of our facilities either backup to

neighborhoods and this could be an issue or to a busy street like Red Bug Lake Park. Was confused about the relationship between MAKO and Orion.

**Proposed Implementation Plan | Points Based | 25 Points (25%)**

Lorie Bailey-Brown: 15

Acceptable

Rick Durr: 20

Made some generalizations in the timelines, but enough information was provided for a review and possible future comment/questions.

William Pandos: 18

they provide a schedule of time to perform the amount the work per project. The submittal was all combine and made it difficult to review.

Amanda Salazar: 19

Plan/installation schedule was very organized and detailed. Explanation of materials was very thorough. Vendor also has local warehousing for material storage and staging. Warranty is not very long for certain parts.

Chad Wilsky: 20

Project implementation provided

Michael Wirsing: 20

Orion proved a plan for project management and MAKO provided a very generic project timeline assuming we went straight through. Would have liked to see the plan by site instead as it appears that they just broke it down over 12 weeks...rather than every four to five lines being a week. I have to assume that the timeline is for once items are on-site and crews are there...could not find a timeline showing how long items would take to be shipped or other considerations.

**Price Proposal | Points Based | 25 Points (25%)**

Lorie Bailey-Brown: 15

Acceptable

Rick Durr: 25

Met requirements.

William Pandos: 23

they provide cost for both purchase and leasing.

Amanda Salazar: 20

Did not see an alternative price for financing, but financing is available. Pricing is competitive.

Chad Wilsky: 25

\$2,734,735.56

Michael Wirsing: 25

Pricing was competitive. Liked that they showed a cost savings chart with a direct comparison to current fixtures.

### Qualite Sports Lighting, LLC

#### Qualifications and Past Experience | Points Based | 25 Points (25%)

Lorie Bailey-Brown: 13

Acceptable

Rick Durr: 25

Met requirements.

William Pandos: 20

identified a team to with years of experience in lighting. They have given many similar projects as examples. warranty Alot of references

Amanda Salazar: 18

Vendor had experience but not a lot of it was to the large scale we are looking for. Vendor does have option for mobile on and off but would require us to change current systems.

Chad Wilsky: 25

Similar project experience with private corporations and cities

Michael Wirsing: 25

The vendor provided 3 recent projects as well as several other projects they had completed in Florida. Projects included large facilities similar to our facilities. Projects also included different types of facilities including tennis courts, athletic fields, and basketball courts. The vendor stated that they have been in business for 35 years.

**Project Understanding | Points Based | 25 Points (25%)**

Lorie Bailey-Brown: 13

Acceptable

Rick Durr: 5

Incomplete at best. Provided cut sheets for products but lacked all project detail specific to what had been requested in the proposal documents.

William Pandos: 18

They provide the details of equipment to be used. No photometric plans were provided. They explain their tech for operating the system did not see surge protection price for operating / savings did not see . 25 year warranty . Light cloud security for controls

Amanda Salazar: 20

Contractor has understanding of the project with options.

Chad Wilsky: 20

Project understanding and approach provided

Michael Wirsing: 10

The vendor did provide Energy Usage for each area but did not specify the wattage or any type of breakdown of what lights are being used on what field/court. The vendor did not provide any photometric reports per the bid requirements. The vendor did not provide any foot candle reports to show light levels on the fields/courts. The vendor did not provide 150 scans as requested in the bid. The vendor did not provide any plans to show how the lights will be angled.

**Proposed Implementation Plan | Points Based | 25 Points (25%)**

Lorie Bailey-Brown: 13

Acceptable

Rick Durr: 10

Major deficiencies in providing detail requested in the scope of services. Lacking specific site plans, photometrics, specific mounting heights, installation plans.

William Pandos: 17

they will use their own installer they explain what their schedule would be for the replacement

Amanda Salazar: 18

Vendor did not have photometrics/detail sheet on how lighting would look in park and affect residents. It was nice to see their factory/materials would be stored at their warehouse and not stationed on-site.

Chad Wilsky: 20

Implementation plan provided

Michael Wirsing: 15

The vendor stated they can be onsite within 3-6 weeks after notice to proceed. The vendor stated that they would be on-site for a 10-20 day period for every 10-18 poles. This was the level of detail; others provided a more detailed timeline that would have shown how long each park would take rather than leave it vague and for the County to guess each site. Very little details about the actual plan were provided.

**Price Proposal | Points Based | 25 Points (25%)**

Lorie Bailey-Brown: 13

Acceptable4

Rick Durr: 25

Met requirements.

William Pandos: 22

they have given both purchase and 72 month lease cost

Amanda Salazar: 20

Did not see a change in pricing for financing, but option to finance was available.

Chad Wilsky: 25

\$2,796,630

Michael Wirsing: 25

The vendor price was provided. One-time purchase was \$2,796,630. The leasing option was \$47,990 for 72 months which comes out to \$3,455,280. The vendor provides 25-year warranty.