

STATE OF FLORIDA
DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

EXPERTECH NETWORK INSTALLATION,
INC.,

Petitioner,

vs.

CITY OF CAPE CORAL,

Respondent.

Case No. 07-4365BID

NOTICE OF FILING

Please take notice that the Respondent, City of Cape Coral has this date caused a copy of the Final Order of December 3, 2007 to be filed in this case.

Respectfully submitted this 12th day of December 2007.




Mark E. Lupe
Florida Bar No. 0948861
Assistant City Attorney
CITY OF CAPE CORAL
P.O. Box 150027
Cape Coral, FL 33915-0027
Telephone (239) 574-0408
Facsimile (239) 574-0404

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the forgoing has been furnished by regular U.S. Mail to the persons list below on this 12th day of December, 2007:

William S. Isenberg, Esq.
William S. Isenberg and Associates, P.A.
2005 South Federal Highway, Suite 100
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33316



Mark E. Lupe
Florida Bar No. 0948861
Assistant City Attorney
CITY OF CAPE CORAL
P.O. Box 150027
Cape Coral, FL 33915-0027
Telephone (239) 574-0408
Facsimile (239) 574-0404

**CITY OF CAPE CORAL
1015 Cultural Park Boulevard
Cape Coral, Florida**

**EXPERTECH NETWORK
INSTALLATION, INC.,**

Petitioner,

vs.

CITY OF CAPE CORAL,

Respondent.

DOAH Case No. 07-4365BID

FINAL ORDER

This proceeding was initiated by Petitioner, EXPERTECH NETWORK INSTALLATION, INC. (hereinafter EXPERTECH) filing a Notice of Intent to Protest on August 14, 2007, and a Protest of Intended Bid Award on August 24, 2007, in response to the Respondent, CITY OF CAPE CORAL (hereinafter CITY), posting of a notice of Intent to Award Bid No. ITB-PW060607-88 to Guymann Construction of Florida, Inc. The proceeding was referred to the Division of Administrative Hearings for a formal administrative hearing as provided in 2-150 of the City of Cape Coral Code of Ordinances.

A formal hearing was held on October 10, 2007 in Cape Coral, Florida before R. Bruce McKibben, a duly appointed Administrative Law Judge. On November 9, 2007, Judge McKibben submitted his Recommended Order. A copy of the Recommended Order is attached hereto as Exhibit A. The Recommended Order was served upon all parties. All parties were allowed ten (10) days in which to file exceptions to the Recommended Order. On November 19, 2007, the Petitioner filed exceptions to the

Recommended Order. A copy of the Petitioner's exceptions is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

RULING ON EXCEPTIONS

1. Petitioner timely filed Exceptions to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law. The exceptions point out that, in paragraph 16 of the Recommended Order, there is a finding of fact that states that the parties met on June 9, 2007, when in fact the meeting between the parties was on July 9, 2007. Based on this finding, the Judge concluded that at the time of the June 9, 2007 meeting, TetraTech was still attempting to get the required list of projects from the Petitioner. The exceptions assert that this is a "fact crucial to reaching a fair and accurate resolution of this matter."

2. The Council finds that the meeting did take place on July 9, 2007, not June 9, 2007, but that this error in the Recommended Order is not material to the conclusions of law reached by the Judge in his Recommended Order.

FINDINGS OF FACT

3. The Administrative Law Judge's Findings of Fact are approved, adopted and incorporated herein by reference, with the exception of paragraph 16. Paragraph 16 is hereby modified by deleting the second sentence in its entirety.

4. The Findings of Fact are supported by the record.


CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

5. The City Council has jurisdiction of the parties and subject matter of this case.

6. The Conclusions of Law of the Recommended Order are fully supported in law, and are hereby approved, adopted and incorporated herein by reference.

WHEREFORE, based upon the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, the City Council further ADOPTS the Recommendation contained in the Recommended Order, and hereby ORDERS that the Petitioner's Protest of Intended Bid Award be DISMISSED and that the bid be awarded to the second low bidder, Guymann Construction of Florida, Inc. Pursuant to Section 2-150(2) of the City of Cape Coral Code of Ordinances, the Petitioner, EXPERTECH is responsible for costs of the bid protest proceeding in the amount of \$6,689.64.

DONE AND ORDERED this 3rd day of December, 2007.



ERIC P. REICHTHALER
Mayor

STATE OF FLORIDA
DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

EXPERTECH NETWORK INSTALLATION,)
INC.,)
)
Petitioner,)
)
vs.)
)
CITY OF CAPE CORAL,)
)
Respondent.)
_____)

Case No. 07-4365BID

RECOMMENDED ORDER

Pursuant to notice, a final hearing was conducted in this case on October 10, 2007, in Cape Coral, Florida, before Administrative Law Judge R. Bruce McKibben of the Division of Administrative Hearings (DOAH).

APPEARANCES

For Petitioner: William S. Isenberg, Esquire
William S. Isenberg and Associates, P.A.
2005 South Federal Highway, Suite 100
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33316

For Respondent: Mark Edward Lupe, Esquire
Marilyn W. Miller, Esquire
City of Cape Coral
Post Office Box 150027
Cape Coral, Florida 33915

STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE

The issue in this case is whether Respondent's decision to reject the galvanized pipe replacement bid of Petitioner as non-

—
Exhibit "A"
—

responsive was erroneous, an abuse of discretion, arbitrary or capricious.

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

Respondent, the City of Cape Coral (the "City"), issued an Invitation to Bid concerning replacement of galvanized pipe. Petitioner was one of the companies responding to the Invitation to Bid. The City rejected Petitioner's bid as unresponsive and awarded the contract to Guymann Construction of Florida, Inc. (Guymann). Guymann did not file any pleadings or other materials in this case and did not make an appearance at final hearing. Upon entry of the Notice of Intent to Award by the City, Petitioner filed a Protest of Intended Bid Award. The matter was forwarded to the DOAH pursuant to the City's Administrative Law Judge Services Contract.

Pursuant to City Ordinance 68-07, a final hearing was scheduled by stipulation of the parties on October 10, 2007 (even though that date was more than 15 days after receipt of the protest at DOAH). At final hearing both parties were represented by counsel. Petitioner called four witnesses at the final hearing: John Wood, director of U.S. Operations for Petitioner; Michael Heitzler, senior project manager for Petitioner; David Marinelli, vice president of U.S. Operations for Petitioner; and Justin Fredericksen, project manager for TetraTech. Petitioner's Exhibits A through K were admitted into

evidence. Respondent called three witnesses: Justin Fredericksen; David Vallandingham, assistant superintendent for Public Works with the City; and George Reilly, utilities manager for the City. Respondent's Exhibits 1 through 13 were admitted into evidence by stipulation.

A Transcript of the final hearing was filed with DOAH on October 23, 2007. The parties were given until October 26, 2007, to file proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law, and written closing statements. Petitioner asked and was granted three additional days to submit its proposed recommended order. Each party timely filed a Proposed Recommended Order, and each was duly-considered in the preparation of this Recommended Order.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Petitioner, Ekpartech Network Installation, Inc., is a division of Bell Canada. Petitioner is a construction and engineering division of the parent company. It was set up to expand the parent's operations into the United States about nine years ago. Petitioner has steadily replaced its Canadian employees with U.S. employees over those years.

2. The City is a governmental entity established under the laws of the State of Florida. By contract with the DOAH, the City has agreed to utilize Administrative Law Judges to hear, inter alia, bid protests involving the City.

3. On May 7, 2007, the City issued Invitation to Bid No. ITB-PW060607-88. The Invitation to Bid sought bids for replacement of approximately 38,000 linear feet of two-inch galvanized pipe and associated appurtenances with 38,000 feet of four and six-inch DR18 PVC piping and associated appurtenances. The replacement would include approximately 385 service connections with Sch-80 PVC piping, all within the area known as Section 4 of the City. In addition, the scope of work included relocation of approximately 460 linear feet of eight-inch PVC water main pipe and associated appurtenances with 600 linear feet of eight-inch DR18 PVC piping and appurtenances along State Road 78.

4. A total specification package and complete set of drawings for the aforementioned work was prepared by the City's consulting engineer, TetraTech-HAI (hereinafter "Ttech"). The specifications and drawings by Ttech were made a part of the Invitation to Bid.

5. A pre-bid conference was held on May 16, 2007. At that conference, several issues were discussed, resulting in issuance of an Addendum to the Invitation to Bid. The Addendum was issued the same day as the conference and included the following paragraph:

Will the City allow directional drilling on the galvanized pipe replacement project?
No. All references to directional drilling on the galvanized pipe replacement project

are to be modified to jack & bore. All water main piping proposed to cross driveways shall be installed via jack & bore or open cut methods. Water main piping proposed to cross roadways, including long side services, shall be installed by jack & bore methods. Directional drilling is acceptable for the roadway crossings on the SR 78 Water Main Replacement portions only. Please see the enclosed revised Measurement and Payment section of the specifications (01025) and revised bid schedule. (Emphasis in original document.)

6. The Addendum also extended the due dates for bids by one week, to June 13, 2007. No protest was filed with the City with respect to the terms, conditions or specifications contained in the Invitation to Bid and the Addendum. On Wednesday, June 13, 2007, the City opened the bids.

7. Petitioner's bid was the low bid for the project. Its bid included a price of \$1,816,224, as compared to the second lowest bidder, Guymann (whose bid came in at \$1,987,561).¹ The bids were then reviewed by Ttech for conformity to the Invitation to Bid.

8. On July 31, 2007, Ttech notified the City that it was recommending approval of the Guymann bid despite Petitioner being the low bidder. The justification for that recommendation was as follows:

The lowest apparent bidder on the project was Expertech Network Installation, Inc. (Expertech) with a total bid of \$1,816,224.00. [Ttech] reviewed Expertech's bid package and found that the required list of at least five completed projects of the

type as the Galvanized Water Main Replacement project was not included in the package. [Ttech] contacted Expertech concerning the incomplete bid package and requested that Expertech provided the required list of at least five projects completed by Expertech of similar type as the Galvanized Water Main Replacement project. The list provided by Expertech did not include any completed projects of the type as the Galvanized Water Main Replacement.

9. On August 7, 2007, the City issued its Notice of Intent to Award, stating that the procurement division of the City would recommend award of the bid to Guymann as the most responsive, responsible bidder meeting the terms, conditions, and specifications set forth in the Invitation to Bid.

10. Petitioner timely filed a Notice of Intent to Protest; its Formal Written Protest was timely filed on August 24, 2007, along with the required bond.

11. There are three methods of drilling utilized for laying pipe in the ground: directional drilling, open cut drilling, and jack & bore drilling. A brief discussion of each is necessary in order to understand the dispute in this matter. Directional drilling is done utilizing a machine that is guided underground using steel rods. A person above ground with a sounding device directs the steel rods from one point to another. Directional boring is used when trenching or excavating is not practical. Directional boring minimizes environmental disruption. Jack & bore drilling (or auger

drilling) is similar to directional drilling in that it has an entrance pit, and then the pipe is manually jacked along the desired path while simultaneously excavating the soil. It is often used in projects that have to go under existing roads or driveways. Open cut drilling is the old, traditional method of digging a trench in the ground and laying the pipe in the open cut.

12. The Invitation to Bid, at page 10 of 53, included a request for each bidder to provide evidence of its experience with similar projects. Paragraph 5 asked for a list "of the last five projects of this type your organization has completed."² Paragraph 6 asked for a list "of projects of this type that your organization is currently engaged in." The lists of projects were to be completed as set forth in a table attached to the Invitation to Bid. The table is recreated below:

PROJECT TITLE & LOCATION	YOUR CONTRACT AMOUNT	CONTRACTOR OR SUB	REQUIRED COMPLETION DATE	ACTUAL COMPLETION DATE	NAME, ADDRESS & PHONE #

13. In its Bid, Petitioner provided a document entitled "Bidders Qualifications" in response to paragraph 5. The document was not on the table provided and was not entirely responsive to the information requested (i.e., it did not indicate whether Petitioner was contractor or subcontractor; there were no completion dates, and there were no contact persons). Nonetheless, the list contained eight completed projects. Those projects included two water main projects; the other six completed projects were telecommunication projects. While both types of projects would include drilling, there are distinct differences between the two. For example, water and wastewater projects require pressure testing, bacterial testing, and permitting that telecommunication projects do not. Petitioner's list also included projects that involved directional drilling. Since directional drilling was specifically prohibited in the galvanized pipe replacement project, those projects would not be deemed substantially similar in type.³

14. During the initial review of the bids, Ttech had specifically asked Petitioner to provide the required list of five completed projects of a similar type. In response, Petitioner submitted a list of four projects, which were listed as "Currently in Progress." Again, the projects were submitted on a form other than the table provided in the Invitation to

Bid. When Ttech followed up with the project contacts, it found that there had been no open cut drilling on two of them; the other two had not yet begun. However, by the date of final hearing the projects were substantially complete.

15. After Petitioner had submitted its list of projects, a meeting was called at the City. Petitioner was represented at the meeting along with City personnel and a representative from Ttech. Notes from that meeting, though inconclusive, seem to indicate that the requirement for five completed jobs of a similar nature was discussed. It is unclear whether Petitioner's representative was still at the meeting when this was discussed. However, it does not appear that anyone from the City or Ttech sent Petitioner a written request to provide evidence of additional work performed. Nor is there any evidence that the City or Ttech had an obligation to do so. At any rate, Petitioner did not submit any evidence of similar projects other than those discussed above.

16. There were notes made by attendees of the meeting. None of the notes submitted into evidence was conclusive as to all issues that were discussed at that time. However, in notes relating to a telephone conversation five days later, Ttech's representative noted discussing with Petitioner the need to provide evidence of five similar projects, which means that at

the time of the June 9, 2007, meeting, Tech was still attempting to get the required list of projects from Petitioner.

17. The projects submitted by Petitioner include directional drill excavation projects, which involved at least some open cuts (i.e., to make tie-ins at each end of the directional drill section). None of those projects was substantially similar in type to the proposed project, but did include some open cut work.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

18. DOAH has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to a contract with the City and in accordance with City Ordinance No. 68-07.

19. Cape Coral City Ordinance No. 68-07 sets forth the procedures for bidding on projects involving the City. Included in the rules for the bid selection process is a mandate that the City evaluate "[T]he professional qualifications, related experience and adequacy of the personnel assigned to the project" and also "[T]he prior experience and references of the proposer." § 2-144(1)(4)(b), Ordinance 68-07. The failure of Petitioner to submit a list of five completed projects related to galvanized pipe replacement made it impossible for the City to properly evaluate Petitioner's experience and professional qualifications.

20. The burden of proof in this case would be on Petitioner, as it attempts to prove that its bid satisfied all the requirements of the invitation to bid. Petitioner must establish by competent substantial evidence that it complied with the requirements in the Invitation to Bid, i.e., that Petitioner's bid included the required lists of pending and approved projects of the same kind. See, e.g., Asphalt Pavers, Inc. v State of Florida, Department of Transportation, 602 So. 2d 558 (Fla. 1st DCA 1992).

21. A bid challenge proceeding is de novo in nature, but de novo in the form of an intra-agency review to evaluate the action taken by the [municipality] at the time it took the action. State Contracting and Engineering Corporation v. Department of Transportation, 709 So. 2d 607 (Fla. 1st DCA 1998). The Administrative Law Judge in such cases does not sit as a substitute for the municipality in determining whether the right party prevailed in the proceeding. "Instead, the [ALJ] sits in a review capacity, and must determine whether the bid review criteria . . . have been satisfied." Intercontinental Properties, Inc. v. State Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services, 606 So. 2d 380, 386 (Fla. 3rd DCA 1992).

22. In order for Petitioner herein to prevail, it must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the City's

decision to reject Petitioner's bid was clearly erroneous, contrary to competition or arbitrary and capricious. See Miami-Dade County School Board v. Ruiz School Bus Service, Inc., 874 So. 2d 59 (Fla. 3rd DCA 2004), wherein the court discussed material deviations from bid specifications. An omission or deviation would be considered minor if it does not give the owner of the project "any reason to doubt the bidder's ability to fulfill their contracts." Id. at 60. Inasmuch as the City's rejection of Petitioner's bid was based on the fact that Petitioner failed to provide substantive information concerning its experience, the omission of five similar projects could not be deemed minor. Petitioner has not met its burden to prove that Respondent's actions were erroneous, contrary to competition, arbitrary or capricious.

23. The City's action concerning Petitioner's bid was based on logic and reason. If it could not ascertain Petitioner's experience, the City could not comfortably award a contract to that entity.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, it is

RECOMMENDED that a final order be entered by the City of Cape Coral upholding its rejection of Petitioner's bid for the galvanized pipe replacement project.

DONE AND ENTERED this 9th day of November, 2007, in
Tallahassee, Leon County, Florida.

S

R. BRUCE MCKIBBEN
Administrative Law Judge
Division of Administrative Hearings
The DeSoto Building
1230 Apalachee Parkway
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-3060
(850) 488-9675 SUNCOM 278-9675
Fax Filing (850) 921-6847
www.doah.state.fl.us

Filed with the Clerk of the
Division of Administrative Hearings
this 9th day of November, 2007.

ENDNOTES

- 1/ There were eight other bids submitted, but none of the other bidders protested the award; thus, their bids are not relevant to this discussion.
- 2/ "Type" is defined in The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language as "A group of persons or things sharing common traits or characteristics that distinguish them as an identifiable group or class; a kind of category." As no other definition of "type" was presented at final hearing, this definition will be used for purposes of this case. No substantive distinction exists between "same type" as opposed to "similar type" or any other type.
- 3/ The addendum to the Invitation to Bid did allow for some minor directional drilling, but the vast majority of the project involved the other methods of drilling.
- 4/ Unless specifically stated otherwise herein, all references to Florida Statutes shall be to the 2007 version.

COPIES FURNISHED:

William S. Isenberg, Esquire
William S. Isenberg and Associates, P.A.
2005 South Federal Highway, Suite 100
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33316

Mark Edward Lupe, Esquire
Marilyn W. Miller, Esquire
City of Cape Coral
Post Office Box 150027
Cape Coral, Florida 33915

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO SUBMIT EXCEPTIONS

All parties have the right to submit written exceptions within 10 days from the date of this Recommended Order. Any exceptions to this Recommended Order should be filed with the agency that will issue the Final Order in this case.

11/19/2007 13:59 95452351.52

ISFNERG

PAGE 02/07

Exhibit "B"

STATE OF FLORIDA
DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

CASE NO: 07- 4365BID

EXPERTECH NETWORK INSTALLATION, INC.,

Petitioner

vs.

CITY OF CAPE CORAL

Respondent.

PETITIONER'S EXCEPTIONS TO FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Petitioner, EXPERTECH NETWORK INSTALLATION, INC, by and through its undersigned attorneys, and pursuant to Rule 28-106.217 of the Division of Administrative Hearings, files its Exceptions to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law contained in the Recommended Order of the Honorable Bruce McKibben (the "Recommended Order"). The following are the disputed portions of the Recommended Order by page number and paragraph, the legal basis for the exception, and appropriate and specific citations to the record:

The Meeting at the City

On page 9, paragraphs 15 and 16 of the Recommended Order, the Administrative Law Judge states, as findings of fact, that:

- (i) The City called for a meeting that took place on June 9, 2007;
- (ii) Representatives of Petitioner, Respondent, and the Respondent's engineer, T-tech attended the meeting;
- (iii) At the time of the June 9, 2007 meeting, "Ttech was still attempting to get the required list of (5 completed projects of the type) from Petitioner."

11/19/2007 13:59 95452351.62

ISFNRENG

PAGE 83/87

(iv) This material fact was evidenced by the fact that "... in notes relating to a telephone conversation five days later (on June 14, 2007), Ttech's representative noted discussing with Petitioner the need to provide evidence of five similar projects." (emphasis added)

The Administrative Law Judge then states on page 10, paragraph 22, Conclusions of Law, that:

"Inasmuch as the City's rejection of Petitioner's bid was based on the fact that Petitioner failed to provide substantive information concerning its experience, the omission of five similar projects could not be deemed minor."

Thus, the Administrative Law Judge concluded that at the time of the meeting between the Petitioner, Respondent and T-tech, as well as during, and thereafter, Petitioner, while submitting a list of eight completed projects (paragraph 13 of the Recommend Order), failed to submit a list of five completed projects deemed by the City and T-tech to be similar to the project referenced in Bid No. ITB-FW060607-88.

**THE FINDINGS OF FACT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
IN PARAGRAPHS 13 AND 16 ARE COMPLETELY ERRONEOUS**

These findings of fact by the Administrative Law Judge, and, thus, the conclusions of law drawn from these facts are completely erroneous.

The meeting between the Petitioner, Respondent and T-Tech took place
On July 9, 2007, not June 9, 2007

The record is clear that the meeting between the Petitioner, Respondent Ttech's representative noted discussing with Petitioner the need to provide evidence of five similar projects t and T-Tech took place on July 9, 2007 and not June 9, 2007.

This is a fact crucial to reaching a fair and accurate resolution of this matter.

For the correct chronology is as follows:

(i) Petitioner's original bid contained eight completed projects.²

¹ Testimony of David Marinelli, Page 65 Final Hearing Transcript, lines 10-14, page 66, line 23 through page 67, line 2.
Testimony of Justin Frederickson, page 99, lines 8-11. The July 31, 2007 issue, Joint Exhibit 7, referenced by the
Administrative Law Judge in paragraph 8 of the Proposed Order

² Paragraph 13, Recommended Order

11/19/2007 13:59 95452351F2

ISFENBERG

PAGE 04/07

(ii) On June 14, 2007, 25 days before the July 9, 2007 meeting (not 5 days after), "...Ttech's representative noted discussing with Petitioner the need to provide evidence of five similar projects..."³

(iii) Expertech submitted a list of projects in response to this discussion.

(iv) The meeting took place after the list of projects was submitted.

(v) As of the start of the July 9, 2007 meeting, no decision had been made by the City or Tetra Tech that Expertech was non-responsive or non-responsible. Expertech was "in the running".⁴

(v) During the meeting, Expertech answered the questions of the City and Ttech to the satisfaction of the engineer from Ttech, Justin Fredericksen⁵

(vi) Following the end of the July 9, 2007 meeting, Expertech was "still in the running"⁶

(vii) While the Administrative Law Judge found, as a matter of fact that Ttech's representative (Justin Fredericksen) requested a list of five completed projects list five days after the meeting⁷, Mr. Fredericksen did not recall if he ever contacted Expertech after the July 9, 2007 meeting asking for any information whatsoever.⁸

(viii) Michael Heitzler, who began working at Expertech on July 23, 2007 as senior project manager for the water and sewer business, contacted Mr. Fredericksen to discuss the status of Expertech's bid on the subject Project. At that time, Mr. Fredericksen did not indicate that there was any missing data or information that he wanted from Expertech.⁹

Also, in paragraph 15 of the Recommended Order, the Administrative Law Judge states that the notes from the meeting "...though inconclusive seem to indicate that the requirement for five completed jobs of a similar nature was discussed. It is unclear whether Petitioner's representative was still at the meeting when this was discussed."

³ Paragraph 16, Recommended Order
⁴ Final Hearing Transcript, Page 100, lines 1-8
⁵ Final Hearing Transcript, Page 105, lines 16-23
⁶ Final Hearing Transcript, Page 103, line 24 through page 106, line 2
⁷ Paragraph 16, Recommended Order
⁸ Final Hearing Transcript, Page 106, lines 12-15
⁹ Final Hearing Transcript Page 42, line 13 through page 43, line 8

11/19/2007 13:59 9545235162

IBPNBERG

PAGE 05/07

IT IS CLEAR THAT THE REQUIREMENT FOR FIVE COMPLETED JOBS OF A SIMILAR NATURE WAS NOT DISCUSSED WHILE PETITIONER'S REPRESENTATIVE WAS PRESENT DURING THE JULY 9, 2007 MEETING

Justin Fredericksen kept notes during the meeting of July 9, 2007, which Notes were admitted as Exhibit I during the Final Hearing¹⁰ He did not recall any important issues that were discussed during the July 9, 2007 meeting that he did not put down into his notes, and, nowhere in his notes, which were made contemporaneously with the meeting of July 9, 2007, did he indicate that Expertech was requested to provide a written list of completed projects to the City or Tetra Tech.¹¹

Although Mr. Fredericksen testified that his notes appeared on pages 1, 3 and 4 (Mr. Danny Nelson from TTech, whose notes appear on page 2 did not testify at the final hearing), only page 1 of his notes reflected topics discussed while Petitioner's representative was present.¹² Nowhere in those notes was the topic of providing a written list discussed.

It is clear from these notes that Petitioner's representative was not present while the requirement for five completed jobs of a similar nature were discussed.

The Importance of the July 9, 2007 Meeting and the Communications between Petitioner, Respondent and Ttech thereafter cannot be overstated

Petitioner, Expertech, submitted its lists prior to the July 9, 2007 meeting. If the lists did not render Expertech non-responsive at the time of the July 9, 2007 meeting, and Expertech was still "in the running" subject to answering questions in a satisfactory manner during the meeting (to allay any of the City and Ttech's concerns regarding any incompleteness in the lists submitted), and Expertech answered those questions in a satisfactory manner, and no other lists or information was required of Expertech during or after the meeting, then by definition, Expertech should have been awarded the subject bid. For,

¹⁰ Final Hearing Transcript, Page 100, lines 9-11, Page 101, line 26 through page 102, line 7

¹¹ Final Hearing Transcript, Page 103, lines 2-9

¹² Final Hearing Transcript, Pages 104, 105

11/19/2007 13:59 9648235152

ISFNBORG

PAGE 05/07

although Expertech's projects involved directional drilling, as opposed to open cut trenching, John Wood of Expertech testified that the directional drilling projects engaged in by Expertech required expertise in open cut excavation.¹³ This testimony was echoed by that of David Vallandingham with the City of Cape Coral who testified that generally, in a directional drill job, there are so many open cuts that it is practical to do the entire job as an open cut excavations.¹⁴

In addition, while "water and wastewater projects require pressure testing, bacterial testing, and permitting that telecommunication projects do not"¹⁵, Expertech's lists demonstrated that Expertech had experience in "water projects" and, among the questions answered to Ttech's satisfaction during the July 9, 2007 meeting resulted in Ttech's notes from the July 9, 2007 stating that Expertech's representative had a "pretty good understanding of the process making the tie-ins and the city's specifications".¹⁶

On the other hand, if Expertech was still in the running as of the July 9, 2007 meeting subject not only to answering questions in a satisfactory fashion, but also subject to providing a list of similar projects as required of Expertech at the meeting and subsequent to the meeting, but Expertech failed to do so, then Expertech should not have been awarded the subject bid.

The Administrative Law Judge concluded that Expertech was required during the meeting to provide the list. While the Judge found the evidence of the notes to be "inconclusive" regarding this subject, the Judge concluded that since the meeting took place on June 9, 2007 and Ttech requested the list in a phone conversation five days later (on June 14, 2007), then answering questions in a satisfactory

¹³ Final Hearing Transcript, Pages 21-26.
¹⁴ Final Hearing Transcript, Page 142
¹⁵ Page 6, paragraph 13, Recommended Order

11/19/2007 13:59 9545236152

ISENBERG

PAGE 87/87

fashion was not the only prerequisite at and after the meeting for Expertech to be found "responsive".

In fact, there was no evidence during the final hearing that either the City or Tech requested any additional written information from Expertech at any time after receiving the second list from Expertech, or that the City or Tech made any comments whatsoever to Expertech, after receiving the second list, regarding any deficiencies in the information provided by Expertech.

This finding of fact was clearly erroneous, and led, in logical order, to the Judge's Conclusion of Law that the City's rejection of Petitioner's bid based on the fact that Petitioner failed to provide five similar projects even after being requested to do so after the meeting.

LEGAL BASIS FOR EXCEPTIONS.

The legal basis for the exceptions set forth above are that same constitute erroneous findings of fact which are not supported by the record. The conclusions of law set forth in the Recommended Order are dependent upon these erroneous findings of fact. Young v Department of Education, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, 943 So.2d 901, 902 (Fla. 1st DCA 2006)

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was delivered this 1st day of November, 2007, by U.S. Mail and e-mail to Mark E. Lupe, Esq., Assistant City Attorney, CITY OF CAPE CORAL, P.O. Box 150027, Cape Coral, FL 33915-0027, Telephone (239) 574-0408 Facsimile (239) 574-0404.

LAW OFFICES OF WILLIAM S. ISENBERG
& ASSOCIATES, P.A.

Attorneys for Petitioner
2005 S. Federal Highway
Suite 100
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33316
(954) 523-8899 phone
(954) 523-5162 fax

WILLIAM S. ISENBERG
PHN: 192762

⁴⁴ Exhibit I from Final Hearing, Justin Fredericksen's notes, page 1