



Public Works Department • Water and Wastewater Services

WATER AND WASTEWATER ENGINEERING DIVISION

2555 West Copans Road • Pompano Beach, Florida 33069-1233 • 954-831-0745 • FAX 954-831-0798/0925

DATE: October 21, 2009
TO: Lindell Y. Simon, Purchasing Agent III, Purchasing Division
FROM: Gregory M. Balicki, P.E. Director, Contract Administrator
RE: Bid No. Y0763509C1, North County Neighborhood Improvement Project
Bid Package 12, Project No. 1152/8629 Water and Wastewater Services

CONCURRENCE:

Water and Wastewater Services has reviewed the bid submitted by Ric-Man Construction, Inc., for specification compliance and vendor responsibility. I have reviewed all documents including the Supplement to Bid/Tender Form (Bidder's Questionnaire) and after careful evaluation, I concur with award to: Ric-Man Construction, Inc., in the amount of \$9,454,637.41.

Please provide D&B Report (Yes/ No)

I have reviewed the D&B Report and am satisfied with the Vendor's rating and payment performance. This was reviewed as part of the RLI Short Listing process.

Not applicable

I have reviewed the response to the Vendor/Bidder's Questionnaire in regards to litigation history and there is no issue of concern. The litigation history was reviewed as part of the RLI Short Listing process.

A particular issue of concern was identified justifying additional information from the County Attorney's Office as attached.

Not applicable – Give Reason _____

I have reviewed the Vendor's Past Performance Evaluations and the Vendor received an overall rating above 2.59 on all evaluations. One Evaluation with a rating of 3.22.

No Past Performance Evaluations found in PMIS; verification and comments pertaining to Vendor's prior work history, as indicated in the Vendor/Bidder's Questionnaire, is attached.

NON-CONCURRENCE:

I do not concur. Reason for rejection/non-concurrence: _____

TYPED NAME OF SIGNER: Gregory M. Balicki, P.E.

TITLE: Director, Contract Administrator

SIGNATURE:

DATE: 10/22/09

TYPED NAME OF SIGNER: Alan W. Garcia, P.E.

TITLE: WWS Director

SIGNATURE:

DATE: 10/22/09

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM
Final Construction Evaluation

CONTRACT INFORMATION			
Contract/ RLI/ Agreement No. N606244CF	Project Title HIGHLANDS SCRUB NATURAL AREA SITE IMPROV	Commission Districts 2	
Contractor / Consultant Name RIC-MAN INTERNATIONAL INC <i>Construction</i>			Phone
Award Amount \$978,710.55	Change Order + Ammendments \$30,883.59	No of : 2	Total Cost \$1,009,594.14
Substantial Completion Date 1/1/1900	Final Completion Date 1/1/1900		
Goal Type MWBE	County Established 29.00	Vendor Committed 40.00	Attained 27.48

RECOMMENDED FOR FUTURE		
Recommended for future Contracts. If other than Yes, provide details explanation as attachment.	Yes	Numerical Score 3.22
Overall Rating	Good	Goal Evaluation Score
Unsatisfactory (1.0 - 1.8) Poor (1.81 - 2.59) Fair (2.60 - 3.19) Good (3.20 - 4.49) Excellent (4.50 - 5.00)		Weighted Score

COUNTY CONTACT INFORMATION	
Contract Administrator Name Robert HARBIN	Email rharbin@broward.org
APPROVED EVALUATION	Date :
Project Manager Name William Kristen	Email wkristen@broward.org
APPROVED EVALUATION	Date :

EVALUATION CRITERIA
<p>This evaluation provides an indication of the vendors's ability to implement a practical, accurate, complete and cost conscious project. For each item, please provide a numerical score from 1 to 5, in accordance to the performance rating scale. Select N/A if the criteria does not apply to this evaluation. Reviewer comments must be entered for a rating of 1, 2 or 5. Minimum passing score is 2.60. The following scale is used to rank the level of contributions made by the contractor to the project.</p> <p>1 - Unsatisfactory Performance: Project had multiple, significant issues which the consultant provided no assistance to resolve and that resulted in substantial time and cost impacts;</p> <p>2 - Poor Performance: Project had several issues which the consultant provided limited assistance to resolve and that resulted in significant time and cost impacts;</p> <p>3 - Fair Performance: Project had some issues which the contractor pursued to resolve and that resulted in acceptable time and/or cost impacts;</p> <p>4- Good Performance: Project had some minor issues which the contractor aggressively pursued to resolve and there were minor time or cost impacts related to the contractor's performance;</p> <p>5 - Excellent Performance: Project had no time or cost impacts related to contractor's performance.</p>

A) Evaluation Of Construction Contracting Firm		Section Score: 3.25
Evaluation Question	Rating	
1. Cooperation with Contract Administrator and other County personnel as well as with Consultant(s)	4	
2. Conformance with schedule of work progress and timeliness of completion: A) Substantial completion	3	
3. Conformance with schedule of work progress and timeliness of completion: B) Final completion	3	
4. Conformance with specification/drawings and other requirements	3	
5. Quality of finished work and cleanup	4	
6. Competency of superintendent, supervisors and workers	4	
7. Accessibility of work to inspections and timeliness of notices for inspections	4	
8. Validity of claims for extra costs	3	
9. Contractors project safety program	3	
10. Damage/accident/liability documentation	3	
11. Quality/accuracy/timeliness of work schedules; shop drawings; material/fixture/equipments lists; progress reports; records of location/manholes, etc.	3	
12. Control/coordination of construction	3	
13. Did the Contractor actively pursue/take aggressive action in obtaining building permits, Certificates of Occupancy, and other required documents for the project in a timely manner?	3	
14. Did the Contractor actively participate in overcoming problems with the Consultant, Building Officials and/or Regulatory Agencies?	4	
15. Change Order processing (accuracy, timeliness, documentation, etc.)	3	
16. Did the Contract exercise adequate/effective coordination, and control of subcontractor(s) work and paperwork?	3	
17. Compliance with prevailing wage rate policies	3	
18. Prompt payment to subcontractor(s)	3	
19. Proactive participation in resolution of disputes	3	
20. Project closeout documentation provided (Punch list, warranties, Operation and Maintenance Manuals, etc)	3	
Comments:		

B) Contract Goals Evaluation		Section Score: 3.00
Evaluation Question	Rating	
1. Compliance with contract goals	3	
2. Compliance with the submission of Quarterly Performance Reports	3	
3. Subcontractors were fully and promptly paid	3	
4. Compliance with submission of EEO Plan and Affirmative Action Plan	N/A	
Comments:		

Rating Official Information

Name : Bill Kristen, Project Manager II

Signature : APPROVED EVALUATION

10/20/2009

Form 103-27 (Rev. 08/01/08)