

ITEM # 32

**ADDITIONAL MATERIAL
10:00 REGULAR MEETING
APRIL 22, 2014**

**SUBMITTED AT THE REQUEST OF
FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATIVE
SERVICES DEPARTMENT**



**FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DEPARTMENT
PURCHASING DIVISION**

115 S. Andrews Avenue, Room 212 • Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301 • 954-357-6065 • FAX 954-357-8535

MEMORANDUM

April 21, 2014

TO: Board of County Commissioners

THRU: Scott G. Miller, Ph.D., Director /CFO
Finance and Administrative Services Department

Digitally signed by BOB MIRACLE
DN: dc=cty, dc=broward, dc=bc,
ou=Organization, ou=BCC, ou=FA,
ou=Users, cn=BOB MIRACLE
Date: 2014.04.21 18:27:58 -04'00'

FROM: Brenda J. Billingsley, Director
Purchasing Division

**Brenda J.
Billingsley**

Digitally signed by Brenda J. Billingsley
DN: cn=Brenda J. Billingsley, o=Broward
County, ou=Purchasing Division,
email=bbillingsley@broward.org, c=US
Date: 2014.04.21 18:01:28 -04'00'

SUBJECT: April 22, 2014 Board Meeting – Agenda Item # 32
Waterproofing Maintenance and Repair (CBE Reserve), Bid No. P1161106B1

During the March 18, 2014 (Item #12) Board meeting, the above mentioned agenda item was pulled by the County Auditor for further analysis. Both the County Auditor and Commissioner Wexler submitted a Pre-Board Meeting Inquiry (PBMI). The County Auditor's PBMI was in reference to unit prices (hourly rates). Commissioner Wexler's PBMI focused on the difference in bid prices between the recommended bidder and next bidder, references, and performance evaluations. Staff responded to the PBMI (see attached). In addition, staff (Purchasing and Facility Maintenance Division) met with the County Auditor to discuss his concerns in detail. Additionally, staff met with the vendor to discuss the requirements of the bid and to seek confirmation of their intent to perform the services based on the price submitted in their bid. The vendor did confirm.

The County Auditor concluded that he would prefer that in the future a different procurement method be used to bid hourly rates. However, this would not impact this agenda item's Recommendation for Bid Award.

Attachment

BJB/gm

c: Bertha Henry, County Administrator
Rob Hernandez, Deputy County Administrator
Monica Cepero, Assistant County Administrator
Tom Hutka, Director, Public Works
Bob Miracle, Deputy CFO, Finance and Administrative Services
Evan Lukic, County Auditor, County Auditor's Office
Glenn Marcos, Assistant Director, Purchasing Division

Broward County Board of County Commissioners

Sue Gunzburger • Dale V.C. Holness • Kristin Jacobs • Martin David Kiar • Chip LaMarca • Stacy Ritter • Tim Ryan • Barbara Sharief • Lois Wexler
www.broward.org



PRE-BOARD MEETING INQUIRY REPORT

For 03/18/2014

Regular Meeting

Agenda Item: 3

Office: District#6 - Commissioner Suzanne Gunzburger

Question: The agenda report states: ... "The CVB requires larger office space due to an increase in staffing which cannot be efficiently accommodated at its current location." However, despite additional staffing the new agreement appears to arrange for 37 parking spaces instead of the current 38. Is this due to car pooling and/or mass transit use? Or? Also, in Exhibit 3, why is the term "(Annex)" in the header for 101 NE 3rd Avenue.

Answer: CVB has indicated that the 37 parking spaces would be sufficient for its needs due to travel schedules which result in not all staff being at the office at the same time and the fact that some staff live within walking distance. The 101 NE 3 Avenue office complex consists of two buildings, a 21-story tower and a 6-story annex building. The proposed lease is for space in the annex building.

Department/Office Public Works Department

Agenda Item: 12

Office: County Auditor

Question: 1. Pages 4, 6 and 7 of Exhibit 1 list hourly rates. How can one vendor reasonably provide labor at a unit price of \$1.00?

Answer: Question: Pages 4, 6 and 7 of Exhibit 1 list hourly rates. How can one vendor reasonably provide labor at a unit price of \$1.00? Response: Upon conducting a bid analysis, the Purchasing Division made an inquiry to Shiff Construction & Development, Inc. about their line items bid at \$1.00 each. They responded that these line items were bid in the same manner, as in their previous contract with the County, and based upon their waterproofing experience there is little to no need for electric, plumbing or mechanical work on these types of projects. If such ancillary work is required, it will be performed at no additional costs to the County.

Department/Office Finance & Administrative Services Department

Office: District#5 - Commissioner Lois Wexler

Question: 1. An approximate \$2 million difference between the recommended awardee and the next bidder is concerning. Please explain. 2. The references are for relatively small jobs (\$63K, \$44K, and \$300K) and yet this job is for \$2.4 million. Please explain. 3. There are three situations where the awardee scored less than 2 and the project manager summary always ended with an identical statement of support. Please explain.

Answer: QUESTION 1. An approximate \$2 million difference between the recommended awardee and the next bidder is concerning. Please explain. ANSWER: This project was competitively bid to the CBE Reserve Market and the County received two bidders in response. Upon conducting a bid analysis, the Purchasing Division made an inquiry to Shiff Construction & Development, Inc. about their line items bid at \$1.00 each. They responded that these line items were bid in the same manner as in their previous contract with the County and based upon their waterproofing experience there is little to no need for electric, plumbing or mechanical work on these types of work. If such ancillary work is required, it will be performed at no additional costs to the County. QUESTION 2: The references are for relatively small jobs (\$63K, \$44K, and \$300K) and yet this job is for \$2.4 million. Please explain. ANSWER: In 2009, Shiff was awarded a previous County contract (Master Agreement No. Q0745201B1-Waterproofing Maintenance and Repair) which contained a similar scope of work in the amount of \$4,009,775. The firm received an overall score of 4.06 out of 5 possible points. The references provided by the vendor are for their most recent projects with the City of Pompano Beach, City of Hallandale Beach, and Broward County. QUESTION 3. There are three situations where the awardee scored less than 2 and the project manager summary always ended with an identical statement of support. Please explain. ANSWER: The Project Manager followed-up with the Contractor, Shiff, on individual items on past evaluations with a score of "2" or less received on two separate contracts at the same time. The forms have been updated and attached herein to reflect a summarization of the Project Manager's experience and contractor's commitment to prevent similar issues from arising in future contract performance. **An Attachment accompanied this response**

Department/Office Public Works Department

Agenda Item: 18

Office: District#5 - Commissioner Lois Wexler

Question: Has the County started negotiating ILA's with the municipalities for their share of the costs?