

10:	Netanya Hogu, Purchasing Agent Purchasing Division				
FROM:	Purchasing Division Richard Waskiewicz, Enterprise Director of Facilities Maintenance				
	Aviation Department				
SUBJECT:	Solicitation No.: Z2114075B1				
	FLL Pressure Washing Services				
Recommende	d Vendor: Evergreen Cleaning Ser d Group(s)/Line Item(s): All .mount: \$457,900	vice, Inc.  Potential Total Amount: \$1,373,700			
Initial Contract	Term: One Year	Contract Term, including Renewals: Three Years			
Mave review	has reviewed Vendor's response	(s) for specification compliance and Vendor responsibility. I endor Questionnaire and after careful evaluation, I concur with			
☐ I am satisfie	ACKGROUND/D & B REPORT: (ed with the Vendor's financial back ble Not needed for this solicitation	ground and/or rating and payment performance.			
I have revie	HISTORY: (check one) wed the Litigation History Form ar ditional information from the Office	nd there is no issue of concern. of the County Attorney to address an issue/concern.			
	RMANCE: (check all that apply) ed the Vendor's past Performance	Evaluations in Contracts Central and:			
No evaluati     Vendor rece     Vendor rece     Past evalua     No past Per	eived a rating ≤ 2.59 on an evaluateived a score of ≤ 2 on an individuntions are not relevant to the scope formance Evaluations exist in Cor	ntained any items rated a score of 2 or less. ion(s). Refer to additional information. al item(s). Refer to additional information. e of this contract.			
□ Reference \    \     \    \     \     \     \     \     \     \     \     \     \     \    \     \     \     \     \     \     \     \     \     \     \    \     \    \    \    \    \\     \     \     \     \     \     \     \     \     \     \	Verification Forms are attached.				
Reference \\ less than \$8	Verification Forms are not required 50,000 and the Vendor has a Perfo	OR I: Commodity only purchase (less than \$250,000); Service ormance Evaluation within the past three years.			
NON-CONCU					
	ncur. Detailed reason for non-conc				
	OF SIGNER: Lori Vassello ized to administer the contract.)	TITLE: Contract Grant Administrator Senior			
SIGNATURE:	Nassello	DATE: 07/31/2017			
C.C.W. (TOTAL)		DATE: 07/01/2017			



	e: FLL Pressure	Washing Service	ces	
Reference for: (Name of Firm) Z21140	075B1 - Evergree	en Cleaning Se	rvices, Inc.	
Organization/Firm Name providing refere	ence: Broward	County Facilitie	s Manageme	nt Division
Contact Name/Title: Ann Marie Rawling				
Contact E-mail: ARAWLINGS@broward	org / LFLEMING	@broward.org		
Contact Phone: 954 831 1410 and 954 8	31 6540			
	re/Chemical Clea	aning at Bus Te	rminals	
Contract No. P1176405B1				
Contract Amount: \$226,064.00				
Date Services Provided: From 02/10/14	4 to 05/09/16			
(list date ra	nge or date serv	ices began unti	"current")	
Vandar's rale in Project:   ✓ Prime Van	ndor 🗌 Sub-c	concultant/Cub	contractor	
Vendor's role in Project:  ☐ Prime Ven Would you use this vendor again? ☐ Ye				onal Comments (below).
		140, please spe	city in Addition	mai Comments (below).
Description of services provided by V		1 1 - 1 - 5	<b>.</b>	-+ 404 NIM 4-+ A
Weekly Pressure/Chemical Cleaning of and	of Downtown Ft	. Lauderdale E	us Terminai	at 101 NW 1st Ave.
Weekly Pressure/Chemical Cleaning of	of Northeast Tra	nsit Center Ru	s Terminal	at 304 Martin Luther
King Blvd.	or Northeast Tre	man center be	is reminiar	at 504 Martin Euther
Please rate your experience with the	Needs	Satisfactory	Excellent	Not Applicable
referenced Vendor:	Improvement	Satisfactory	Excellent	Not Applicable
<ol> <li>Vendor's Quality of Service</li> </ol>				
a. Responsive				
b. Accuracy				
c. Deliverables				
c. Deliverables 2. Vendor's Organization				
2. Vendor's Organization				
Vendor's Organization     a. Staff expertise				
Vendor's Organization     a. Staff expertise     b. Professionalism				
Vendor's Organization     a. Staff expertise     b. Professionalism     c. Turnover				
Vendor's Organization     a. Staff expertise     b. Professionalism     c. Turnover  3. Timeliness of:				
Vendor's Organization     a. Staff expertise     b. Professionalism     c. Turnover      Timeliness of:     a. Project     b. Deliverables				
Vendor's Organization     a. Staff expertise     b. Professionalism     c. Turnover      Timeliness of:     a. Project     b. Deliverables  Additional Comments: (provide on ad)	☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	needed)		
Vendor's Organization     a. Staff expertise     b. Professionalism     c. Turnover      Timeliness of:     a. Project     b. Deliverables	□ □ □ □ ditional sheet if	needed)		
Vendor's Organization     a. Staff expertise     b. Professionalism     c. Turnover      Timeliness of:     a. Project     b. Deliverables  Additional Comments: (provide on ad)	□ □ □ □ ditional sheet if	needed)		
Vendor's Organization     a. Staff expertise     b. Professionalism     c. Turnover      Timeliness of:     a. Project     b. Deliverables  Additional Comments: (provide on ad)	□ □ □ □ ditional sheet if	needed)		
Vendor's Organization     a. Staff expertise     b. Professionalism     c. Turnover      Timeliness of:     a. Project     b. Deliverables  Additional Comments: (provide on ad)	□ □ □ □ ditional sheet if	needed)		
2. Vendor's Organization  a. Staff expertise  b. Professionalism  c. Turnover  3. Timeliness of:  a. Project  b. Deliverables  Additional Comments: (provide on ad Please See Attached Sheet.	☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	needed)		
Vendor's Organization     a. Staff expertise     b. Professionalism     c. Turnover      Timeliness of:     a. Project     b. Deliverables  Additional Comments: (provide on ad)	☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐		ntract/Grant	Admionistrator Senior

#### **Vendor Reference Verification Form (Continuation Sheet)**

Broward County Solicitation No. and Title: FLL Pressure Washing Services
Reference for: (Name of Firm): Z2114075B1 - Evergreen Cleaning Services, Inc.
Organization/Firm Name providing reference: Broward County Facilities Management Division

This is a combined reference completed by Ann Marie Rawlings who is the Building Manager for the Northeast Transit Center Bus Terminal and Lucinda Fleming who was the Building Manger for the Downtown Ft. Lauderdale Bus Terminal.

<u>Ann states:</u> She had good service at the NE Transit Terminal when this vendor was under contract. Log books were always signed. Service was good and timely. Any discrepancies were quickly fixed. This vendor took over a new property and kept it in good condition. For questions 1 thru 3 Ann rates the Vendor as "Excellent". However as stated previously this was for a "New Facility"

<u>Lucinda states:</u> Because of the amount of traffic and public use of the facility. I felt this contractor was not equipped to meet the high demands of maintaining this facility. The appearance of bus lanes, pavers were deplorable, and instead of being proactive, this vendor was unproductive in keeping up with the quality/consistency of pressure washing surfaces. For questions 1 thru 3 Lucinda rates the Vendor as "Needs improvement", except for Professionalism which she gave them a "Satisfactory"



Broward County Solicitation No. and Title				
Reference for: (Name of Firm) Z21140	75B1 - Evergree	en Cleaning Se	rvices, Inc.	
Organization/Firm Name providing refere	nce: Broward	County Facilitie	s Manageme	ent Division
Contact Name/Title:				
Contact E-mail:				
Contact Phone:				
	e/Chemical Clea	aning at Bus Te	rminals	
Contract No. P1176405B1				
Contract Amount: Initial Term Amount:	\$31, 200 Tot	al Contract Ar	nount ( 3 Ye	ars): \$93,600
Date Services Provided: 2/10/14 - 5/9/16	6			
(list date ran	ge or date servi	ices began unti	l "current")	
Vendor's role in Project: ☐ Prime Vendor's		consultant/Sub-		
Would you use this vendor again? ⊠ Yes	s □ No If	No, please spe	cify in Addition	onal Comments (below).
Description of services provided by Ve				
Pressure washing of Northeast Transit	t Terminal 304	Hammondville	Roda Pomp	oano.
Places rate value as wallenes with the	Manda			
Please rate your experience with the referenced Vendor:	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Excellent	Not Applicable
tala alata, i amunit	improvement			
Vendor's Quality of Service			57	
a. Responsive			$\boxtimes$	
b. Accuracy			$\boxtimes$	
c. Deliverables			$\boxtimes$	
2. Vendor's Organization				
Staff expertise			$\bowtie$	
<ul> <li>b. Professionalism</li> </ul>			$\bowtie$	
c. Turnover				
3. Timeliness of:				
a. Project			$\boxtimes$	
b. Deliverables			$\bowtie$	
Additional Comments: (provide on add				
I had good service at the NE Transit Te	erminal when th	nis vendor was	s under cont	ract. Log books were
always signed. Service was good and timely. Any discrepancies were quickly fixed. I did not enter				
anything in Contract Central. This ven	dor took over	a new property	and kept it	in good condition.
References Checked By				
Name: Ann Marie Rawlings			ilding Manag	
Division/Department: Public Works/Facilit	ties Managemer	nt Date of \	/erification: N	May 16, 2017



Reference for: (Name of Firm) Z2114075B1 - Evergreen Cleaning Services, Inc.  Drganization/Firm Name providing reference: Broward County Facilities Management Division  Contact Name/Title:  Contact E-mail:  Contact Phone:  Name of Referenced Project: Pressure/Chemical Cleaning at Bus Terminals  Contract No. P1176405B1  Contract Amount: \$226,064.00 (2 year contract)  Date Services Provided: 2/2014 - 5/2016  (list date range or date services began until "current")  Vendor's role in Project: Prime Vendor Sub-consultant/Sub-contractor  Would you use this vendor again? Yes No If No, please specify in Additional Comments (below).  Description of services provided by Vendor:  Pressure washing of bus lanes, sidewalks, concrete pavement, brick paver's, concrete trash cans, benches, bridge over-pass, etc. at Downtown Mass Transit Terminal. Contract specifications included the removal of bird feces, gum, and any unsightly stain/mark from areas covered by the contract with pressure cleaning services.  Please rate your experience with the referenced Vendor:  1. Vendor's Quality of Service  2. Responsive Neces Provided Provi
Contact Name/Title: Contact E-mail: Contact Phone: Name of Referenced Project: Pressure/Chemical Cleaning at Bus Terminals Contract No. P1176405B1 Contract No. P1176405B1 Contract Amount: \$226,064.00 (2 year contract) Date Services Provided: 2/2014 - 5/2016  (list date range or date services began until "current")  Vendor's role in Project: Prime Vendor Sub-consultant/Sub-contractor Would you use this vendor again? Yes No If No, please specify in Additional Comments (below).  Description of services provided by Vendor: Pressure washing of bus lanes,sidewalks, concrete pavement, brick paver's, concrete trash cans, benches, bridge over-pass, etc. at Downtown Mass Transit Terminal. Contract specifications included the removal of bird feces, gum, and any unsightly stain/mark from areas covered by the contract with pressure cleaning services.  Please rate your experience with the referenced Vendor:  1. Vendor's Quality of Service  2. Responsive Meds  3. Responsive Meds  4. Responsive Meds  5. Accuracy  6. Deliverables  2. Vendor's Organization
Contact Name/Title: Contact E-mail: Contact Phone: Name of Referenced Project: Pressure/Chemical Cleaning at Bus Terminals Contract No. P1176405B1 Contract No. P1176405B1 Contract Amount: \$226,064.00 (2 year contract) Date Services Provided: 2/2014 - 5/2016  (list date range or date services began until "current")  Vendor's role in Project: Prime Vendor Sub-consultant/Sub-contractor Would you use this vendor again? Yes No If No, please specify in Additional Comments (below).  Description of services provided by Vendor: Pressure washing of bus lanes,sidewalks, concrete pavement, brick paver's, concrete trash cans, benches, bridge over-pass, etc. at Downtown Mass Transit Terminal. Contract specifications included the removal of bird feces, gum, and any unsightly stain/mark from areas covered by the contract with pressure cleaning services.  Please rate your experience with the referenced Vendor:  I. Vendor's Quality of Service  a. Responsive Meds b. Accuracy c. Deliverables  2. Vendor's Organization
Contact Phone: Name of Referenced Project: Pressure/Chemical Cleaning at Bus Terminals Contract No. P1176405B1 Contract Amount: \$226,064.00 (2 year contract) Date Services Provided: 2/2014 - 5/2016  (list date range or date services began until "current")  Vendor's role in Project: Prime Vendor Sub-consultant/Sub-contractor Would you use this vendor again? Yes No If No, please specify in Additional Comments (below).  Description of services provided by Vendor: Pressure washing of bus lanes,sidewalks, concrete pavement, brick paver's, concrete trash cans, benches, bridge over-pass, etc. at Downtown Mass Transit Terminal. Contract specifications included the removal of bird feces, gum, and any unsightly stain/mark from areas covered by the contract with pressure cleaning services.  Please rate your experience with the Needs Improvement  1. Vendor's Quality of Service  a. Responsive Medical Provided Improvement  b. Accuracy c. Deliverables  2. Vendor's Organization
Name of Referenced Project: Pressure/Chemical Cleaning at Bus Terminals  Contract No. P1176405B1  Contract Amount: \$226,064.00 (2 year contract)  Date Services Provided: 2/2014 - 5/2016  (list date range or date services began until "current")  Vendor's role in Project: Prime Vendor Sub-consultant/Sub-contractor  Would you use this vendor again? Yes No If No, please specify in Additional Comments (below).  Description of services provided by Vendor:  Pressure washing of bus lanes,sidewalks, concrete pavement, brick paver's, concrete trash cans, benches, bridge over-pass, etc. at Downtown Mass Transit Terminal. Contract specifications included the removal of bird feces, gum, and any unsightly stain/mark from areas covered by the contract with pressure cleaning services.  Please rate your experience with the referenced Vendor:  Needs Improvement  Needs Improvement  Needs Improvement  Accuracy  Batisfactory Excellent Not Applicable  Contract Specifications included the referenced Vendor:  Contract Specifications included the referenced Vendor and
Contract No. P1176405B1  Contract Amount: \$226,064.00 (2 year contract)  Date Services Provided: 2/2014 - 5/2016  (list date range or date services began until "current")  Vendor's role in Project: Prime Vendor Sub-consultant/Sub-contractor  Would you use this vendor again? Yes No If No, please specify in Additional Comments (below).  Description of services provided by Vendor:  Pressure washing of bus lanes, sidewalks, concrete pavement, brick paver's, concrete trash cans, benches, bridge over-pass, etc. at Downtown Mass Transit Terminal. Contract specifications included the removal of bird feces, gum, and any unsightly stain/mark from areas covered by the contract with pressure cleaning services.  Please rate your experience with the Needs Improvement  1. Vendor's Quality of Service  a. Responsive March Accuracy  b. Accuracy  c. Deliverables  2. Vendor's Organization
Contract Amount: \$226,064.00 (2 year contract)  Date Services Provided: 2/2014 - 5/2016  (list date range or date services began until "current")  Vendor's role in Project: Prime Vendor Sub-consultant/Sub-contractor  Would you use this vendor again? Yes No If No, please specify in Additional Comments (below).  Description of services provided by Vendor:  Pressure washing of bus lanes, sidewalks, concrete pavement, brick paver's, concrete trash cans, benches, bridge over-pass, etc. at Downtown Mass Transit Terminal. Contract specifications included the removal of bird feces, gum, and any unsightly stain/mark from areas covered by the contract with pressure cleaning services.  Please rate your experience with the referenced Vendor: Satisfactory Excellent Not Applicable in Not Applicable in Responsive Satisfactory Contract Section Service Service Section Section Section Section Sectio
Claim   Clai
(list date range or date services began until "current")  Vendor's role in Project:  Prime Vendor  Sub-consultant/Sub-contractor  Would you use this vendor again? Yes  No If No, please specify in Additional Comments (below).  Description of services provided by Vendor:  Pressure washing of bus lanes, sidewalks, concrete pavement, brick paver's, concrete trash cans, beenches, bridge over-pass, etc. at Downtown Mass Transit Terminal. Contract specifications included the removal of bird feces, gum, and any unsightly stain/mark from areas covered by the contract with pressure cleaning services.  Please rate your experience with the Needs Improvement  1. Vendor's Quality of Service  a. Responsive  Satisfactory Excellent Not Applicable  b. Accuracy  Service  Servi
Vendor's role in Project:  Prime Vendor  Sub-consultant/Sub-contractor Would you use this vendor again?  No If No, please specify in Additional Comments (below).  Description of services provided by Vendor: Pressure washing of bus lanes, sidewalks, concrete pavement, brick paver's, concrete trash cans, benches, bridge over-pass, etc. at Downtown Mass Transit Terminal. Contract specifications included the removal of bird feces, gum, and any unsightly stain/mark from areas covered by the contract with pressure cleaning services.  Please rate your experience with the referenced Vendor:  Satisfactory Excellent Not Applicable Improvement  1. Vendor's Quality of Service  a. Responsive  Satisfactory  Excellent Not Applicable  b. Accuracy  Service  Satisfactory  Satisfa
Would you use this vendor again? Yes No If No, please specify in Additional Comments (below).  Description of services provided by Vendor:  Pressure washing of bus lanes, sidewalks, concrete pavement, brick paver's, concrete trash cans, benches, bridge over-pass, etc. at Downtown Mass Transit Terminal. Contract specifications included the removal of bird feces, gum, and any unsightly stain/mark from areas covered by the contract with pressure cleaning services.  Please rate your experience with the referenced Vendor:  Needs Improvement  Satisfactory Excellent Not Applicable  a. Responsive Satisfactory Comment S
Would you use this vendor again? Yes No If No, please specify in Additional Comments (below).  Description of services provided by Vendor:  Pressure washing of bus lanes, sidewalks, concrete pavement, brick paver's, concrete trash cans, benches, bridge over-pass, etc. at Downtown Mass Transit Terminal. Contract specifications included the removal of bird feces, gum, and any unsightly stain/mark from areas covered by the contract with pressure cleaning services.  Please rate your experience with the referenced Vendor:  Needs Improvement  Satisfactory Excellent Not Applicable  a. Responsive Satisfactory Comment S
Pressure washing of bus lanes, sidewalks, concrete pavement, brick paver's, concrete trash cans, benches, bridge over-pass, etc. at Downtown Mass Transit Terminal. Contract specifications included the removal of bird feces, gum, and any unsightly stain/mark from areas covered by the contract with pressure cleaning services.  Please rate your experience with the referenced Vendor:  Needs Improvement  Satisfactory Excellent Not Applicable  1. Vendor's Quality of Service  a. Responsive                        b. Accuracy                    c. Deliverables                  2. Vendor's Organization
Pressure washing of bus lanes, sidewalks, concrete pavement, brick paver's, concrete trash cans, benches, bridge over-pass, etc. at Downtown Mass Transit Terminal. Contract specifications included the removal of bird feces, gum, and any unsightly stain/mark from areas covered by the contract with pressure cleaning services.  Please rate your experience with the referenced Vendor:  Needs Improvement  Satisfactory Excellent Not Applicable  1. Vendor's Quality of Service  a. Responsive                        b. Accuracy                    c. Deliverables                  2. Vendor's Organization
benches, bridge over-pass, etc. at Downtown Mass Transit Terminal. Contract specifications included the removal of bird feces, gum, and any unsightly stain/mark from areas covered by the contract with pressure cleaning services.  Please rate your experience with the referenced Vendor:  Needs Improvement  Satisfactory Excellent Not Applicable  a. Responsive  a. Responsive  b. Accuracy  c. Deliverables  2. Vendor's Organization
Please rate your experience with the referenced Vendor:  Needs Improvement  Needs Inprovement  Needs Inprovement  Needs Inprovement  Not Applicable  Learn of Service  a. Responsive b. Accuracy c. Deliverables  Needs Inprovement  Not Applicable  Learn of Service  a. Responsive b. Accuracy c. Deliverables  Not Applicable  Learn of Service  C. Vendor's Organization
Please rate your experience with the referenced Vendor:  Needs Improvement  Satisfactory Excellent Not Applicable  Excellent Not Applicable  Satisfactory Excellent Not Applicable  In Vendor's Quality of Service  a. Responsive
Teferenced Vendor: Improvement Satisfactory Excellent Not Applicable  1. Vendor's Quality of Service  a. Responsive
Teferenced Vendor: Improvement Satisfactory Excellent Not Applicable  1. Vendor's Quality of Service  a. Responsive
1. Vendor's Quality of Service  a. Responsive
a. Responsive  b. Accuracy  c. Deliverables  2. Vendor's Organization
b. Accuracy c. Deliverables  2. Vendor's Organization
c. Deliverables
2. Vendor's Organization
The state of the s
a. Staff expertise
b. Professionalism
c. Turnover
3. Timeliness of:
a. Project
b. Deliverables
Additional Comments: (provide on additional sheet if needed)
Because of the amount of traffic and public use of the facility. I felt this contractor was not equipped to
neet the high demands of maintaining this facility. The appearance of bus lanes, pavers were
deplorable, and instead of being proactive, this vendor was unproductive in keeping up with the
quality/consistency of pressure washing surfaces.
References Checked By
TOTAL
Name: Lucinda Fleming Title: Building Manager



Broward County Solicitation No. and Title: Z2114075B1 - FLL Pressure Washing Services					
Reference for: (Name of Firm) Evergreen Cleaning Service, Inc.					
Organization/Firm Name providing refere	ence: Das Assets	s, Inc.			
Contact Name/Title: Andrew Jackson					
Contact E-mail: dasassets@aol.com					
Contact Phone: 305-528-2273					
Name of Referenced Project: Pressure	Cleaning Service	es			
Contract No. N/A					
Contract Amount: \$50,000					
Date Services Provided: 01/2010-0	3/2017				
(list date ra	nge or date servi	ces began unti	"current")		
Vendor's role in Project: ☐ Prime Ver	ndor 🗆 Sub-o	onsultant/Sub-	contractor		
Would you use this vendor again? X Ye				onal Comments (below).	
•		ivo, picase spe		mai comments (below).	
Description of services provided by V					
The vendor provided pressure cleaning		ur commercia	l buildings (	exterior surfaces,	
parking lots, garage areas and sidewa	aiks).				
Please rate your experience with the	Needs	Satisfactory	Excellent	Not Applicable	
referenced Vendor:	Improvement	Satisfactory	Excellent	Not Applicable	
1. Vendor's Quality of Service					
a. Responsive			$\bowtie$		
b. Accuracy			$\boxtimes$		
c. Deliverables			$\boxtimes$		
2. Vendor's Organization					
a. Staff expertise			$\boxtimes$		
b. Professionalism			$\boxtimes$		
c. Turnover					
3. Timeliness of:					
a. Project			$\boxtimes$		
b. Deliverables			$\boxtimes$		
Additional Comments: (provide on ad		-			
It has been a pleasure working with the	•	•	•	_	
professional and accommodating to o	•	•		•	
volume traffic areas while ensuring al	I the necessary	safety measu	re were take	n.	
References Checked By		Т:41 В	: -l - ·- *		
Name: Andrew Jackson		Title: Pro		25/00/2017	
Division/Department: DAS Assets Inc.		Date of \	/erification: (	J5/U8/2UT/	



Broward County Solicitation No. and Title: Z2114075B1 - FLL Pressure Washing Services				
Reference for: (Name of Firm) Evergree	n Cleaning Serv	rice, Inc.	3	
Organization/Firm Name providing refere	ence: T&J Divers	sified Services		
Contact Name/Title: Torianto Thompson	า			
Contact E-mail: torianto@yahoo.com				
Contact Phone: 954-588-1539				
Name of Referenced Project: Press	ure Washing			
Contract No. N/A				
Contract Amount: Varies based on curre	ent accounts at t	he time. \$45,00	0 to 85,000.	
Date Services Provided: Jan/Feb	2011 to current			
(list date ra	nge or date servi	ices began unti	l "current")	
Vendor's role in Project: ☐ Prime Ver	odor 🕅 Sub e	consultant/Sub-	contractor	
Vendor's role in Project: ☐ Prime Ver Would you use this vendor again? ☐ Ye				anal Comments (holow)
		ino, piease spe	City in Addition	mai Comments (below).
Description of services provided by V				4 11
We do commercial cleaning work but				
clients require things beyond the bas sidewalks, entrance ways, and periph	_		in and pres	sure clean the
Sidewaiks, entrance ways, and periph	ery or the bush	103303.		
Please rate your experience with the	Needs	Satisfactory	Excellent	Not Applicable
referenced Vendor:	Improvement	,		
Vendor's Quality of Service		_		_
a. Responsive			$\boxtimes$	
b. Accuracy			$\boxtimes$	
c. Deliverables				
2. Vendor's Organization				
a. Staff expertise			$\boxtimes$	
b. Professionalism			$\boxtimes$	
c. Turnover			$\boxtimes$	
3. Timeliness of:				
a. Project			$\boxtimes$	
b. Deliverables				$\boxtimes$
	1141			
Additional Comments: (provide on ad	aitional sneet ii	r needed)		
References Checked By				
Name: Lori Vassello		Title: Co	ontract/Grant	Administrator Senior
Division/Department: Maintenance/Avia	tion			May 19, 2017

OPEN END CONTRACT - COMMODITY				
Agreement Nbr / Title				
P1176405B1 / Pressure/Chemical	Cleaning at Bus Termi	nals		
Not To Exceed Amount	Used Amou	unt		
\$226,064.00				
	EVALUAT	ION SUMMARY		
EVERGREEN CLEANING SERVICE INC Is RECOMMENDED For Future Contracts  Numerical Score				
Remarks:				5.00
Overall Rating	EXCELLENT			
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)				
	COUNTY CONT	ACT INFORMATION		
Overseeing Division				
FACILITIES MANAGEMENT				
Contract Administrator		Email: scampbell	Email: scampbell@broward.org	
Scott Campbell				
APPROVED EVALUATION				
Rated By		Reviewed By		
Ann Rawlings		Scott Campbell		
Date: 4/22/2016		Date: 6/23/2017		

A) Quality	Section Score: 5.00
Evaluation Question	Rating
How responsive was the vendor to notification of an unauthorized substitution?	N/A
2. How close did the delivered product(s) or software perform to expectations?	5 - Excellent
3. How accurate and timely were any necessary repairs or reconfigurations?	5 - Excellent
4. How timely were necessary parts or software made available?	N/A
5. How appropriate were any vendor recommended repairs or upgrades?	N/A
6. How efficient and timely were product/software installations and training completed?	5 - Excellent
7. How complete and timely did the vendor submit warranties, manuals, etc.?	N/A
8. How well did the vendor performance meet agreement expectations?	5 - Excellent
Commonts:	

Comments:

Evaluation Question	Rating
. How well did the amount of product shipped match the amount ordered?	N/A
2. How fast were partial deliveries or non-deliveries satisfied?	N/A
3. If there were backorders, how accurate where estimates of delivery times?	N/A
4. How accurate was the weight of the item received as compared to the weight listed on the invoice?	N/A
5. How accurate was the paperwork in the shipment?	N/A
6. How accurate were the licensing estimates for the software installation(s)?	N/A

C) Delivery	Section Score: 5.00
Evaluation Question	Rating
How timely was the complete order received, based on industry standards?	5 - Excellent
2. How well was the shipment protected against damage or loss?	N/A
3. How responsive was the vendor to notice of damaged goods?	N/A
4. How proactive was the vendor response to replacing damaged goods?	N/A
5. How cooperative was the vendor in making the delivery at a satisfactory time?	5 - Excellent
6. How accurate were the prices quoted to the invoiced price?	5 - Excellent
7. How accurate were the documents provided at closeout, e.g. packing slips, invoices, technica manuals, etc. regarding the correct material codes and pruchase order numbers?	I N/A
8. How accurate was the method of delivery?	N/A
9. How correct was the delivery location?	N/A
10. How visible were the required inspection stamps?	N/A
11. How well did the vendor manage delivery of the product and/or service?	5 - Excellent
12. How accurately were close-out procedures followed?	N/A

Comments:

D) Customer Service	Section Score: 5.00
Evaluation Question	Rating
1. How knowledgeable was the vendor regarding the requested product and/or service?	5 - Excellent
2. How timely were requests for information, proposals and quotes answered?	N/A
3. How prompt were County staff communications returned or responded to?	5 - Excellent
4. How proactive was the vendor in addressing County staff problems or concerns regarding the product or service?	ne 5 - Excellent
5. How courteous/professional was the vendor in dealing with the County, Sub-vendors, Count Tenants/Customers?	y 5 - Excellent
6. How sensitive/responsive was the vendor to working around County operationaal needs?	5 - Excellent
7. How consistent and clear were the vendor communications with County staff?	5 - Excellent

E) Support Section	on Score: 5.00
Evaluation Question	Rating
How close was the level of vendor technical expertise to what was needed to support the product or service?	5 - Excellent
2. How appropriate was the contact information provided by the vendor for questions?	5 - Excellent
3. How well did the vendor respond to additional questions regarding the product or service?	N/A
4. How timely was the vendor response compared to the contract requirements?	N/A
5. How clear was the vendor information regarding the warranty or replacement policy?	N/A
6. How well did the vendor respond to warranty service requests?	N/A
7. How timely were repairs completed?	5 - Excellent
8. How well did the vendor coordinate any sub vendors?	N/A
9. How responsive and competent were vendor representatives?	5 - Excellent

Comments:

	on Score: N/A	
F	Rating	
N/A		
nt N/A		
ed N/A		
N/A		
N/A		
in N/A		
nts		

OPEN END CONTRACT - COMMODITY					
Agreement Nbr / Title P1176405B1 / Pressure/Chemical	Cleaning at B	Bus Terminals			
Not To Exceed Amount		Jsed Amount			
\$226,064.00	\$2	5222,528.00			
	E	EVALUATION SUN	MARY		
EVERGREEN CLEANING SERVICE	EINC Is NOT	T RECOMMENDE	D For Future Cont	racts,	Numerical Score
due to the following. Remarks:					1.81
Overall Rating	POOR				
Unsatisfactory (1.0 - 1.8)   Poor (1.81 - 2.59)	Fair (2.60 - 3.19)	)   Good (3.20 - 4.49)   E	Excellent (4.50 - 5.00)		
	COUN	NTY CONTACT INF	FORMATION		
Overseeing Division					
FACILITIES MANAGEMENT					
Contract Administrator			Email: scampbell@	②broward.	org
Contract Administrator Scott Campbell			Email: scampbell@	Dbroward.	org
			Email: scampbell@	Dbroward.	org
			Email: scampbell@	®broward.	org
	A	APPROVED EVALU		Dbroward.	org
	A	APPROVED EVALU		Dbroward.	org
Scott Campbell	A	APPROVED EVALU	UATION	②broward.	org

A) Quality	Section Score: 1.00
Evaluation Question	Rating
How responsive was the vendor to notification of an unauthorized substitution?	N/A
2. How close did the delivered product(s) or software perform to expectations?	N/A
3. How accurate and timely were any necessary repairs or reconfigurations?	N/A
4. How timely were necessary parts or software made available?	N/A
5. How appropriate were any vendor recommended repairs or upgrades?	N/A
6. How efficient and timely were product/software installations and training completed?	N/A
7. How complete and timely did the vendor submit warranties, manuals, etc.?	N/A
8. How well did the vendor performance meet agreement expectations?	1 - Unsatisfactory

Comments: Vendor satisfied the minimum criteria/specifications in order to receive payment.

B) Quantity	Section Score: N/A
Evaluation Question	Rating
How well did the amount of product shipped match the amount ordered?	N/A
2. How fast were partial deliveries or non-deliveries satisfied?	N/A
3. If there were backorders, how accurate where estimates of delivery times?	N/A
4. How accurate was the weight of the item received as compared to the weight listed on the invo	ice? N/A
5. How accurate was the paperwork in the shipment?	N/A
6. How accurate were the licensing estimates for the software installation(s)?	N/A
Comments:	
Comments:	

C) Delivery	Section Score: 2.00
Evaluation Question	Rating
How timely was the complete order received, based on industry standards?	N/A
2. How well was the shipment protected against damage or loss?	N/A
3. How responsive was the vendor to notice of damaged goods?	N/A
4. How proactive was the vendor response to replacing damaged goods?	N/A
5. How cooperative was the vendor in making the delivery at a satisfactory time?	N/A
6. How accurate were the prices quoted to the invoiced price?	N/A
7. How accurate were the documents provided at closeout, e.g. packing slips, invoices, technica manuals, etc. regarding the correct material codes and pruchase order numbers?	l 3 - Fair
8. How accurate was the method of delivery?	N/A
9. How correct was the delivery location?	N/A
10. How visible were the required inspection stamps?	N/A
11. How well did the vendor manage delivery of the product and/or service?	1 - Unsatisfactory
12. How accurately were close-out procedures followed?	N/A

Comments: There was no improvement in the appearance of areas vendor documented was cleaned the previous night.

D) Customer Service	Section Score: 1.83
Evaluation Question	Rating
How knowledgeable was the vendor regarding the requested product and/or service?	1 - Unsatisfactory
2. How timely were requests for information, proposals and quotes answered?	N/A
3. How prompt were County staff communications returned or responded to?	3 - Fair
4. How proactive was the vendor in addressing County staff problems or concerns regarding the product or service?	1 - Unsatisfactory
5. How courteous/professional was the vendor in dealing with the County, Sub-vendors, County Tenants/Customers?	2 - Poor
6. How sensitive/responsive was the vendor to working around County operationaal needs?	1 - Unsatisfactory
7. How consistent and clear were the vendor communications with County staff?	3 - Fair

Comments: The vendor's performance was poor relating to job knowledge and the quality of cleaning in specified areas of cleaning. There was no improvement in the appearance of areas vendor documented was cleaned the previous night. Inspections were done immediately the following morning after areas were cleaned, and areas level of cleaning slightly improved. Vendor could have applied more chemical substance to remove stains and stayed on the job for longer periods of time to effectively clean lanes, sidewalks, trash cans, etc. Vendor's response was minimal at best, the vendor complained more than she would accommodate or effectively clean areas that needed additional cleaning. Vendor was for the most part defensive when it came to recommendations by the County and suggested that services will not be provided after the contract expires. As previously mentioned, Vendor was sensitive/defensive in their response to satisfy County's requests for improvements in cleaning.

E) Support Sect	ion Score: 2.00
Evaluation Question	Rating
How close was the level of vendor technical expertise to what was needed to support the product or service?	1 - Unsatisfactory
2. How appropriate was the contact information provided by the vendor for questions?	1 - Unsatisfactory
3. How well did the vendor respond to additional questions regarding the product or service?	1 - Unsatisfactory
4. How timely was the vendor response compared to the contract requirements?	3 - Fair
5. How clear was the vendor information regarding the warranty or replacement policy?	3 - Fair
6. How well did the vendor respond to warranty service requests?	N/A
7. How timely were repairs completed?	N/A
8. How well did the vendor coordinate any sub vendors?	N/A
9. How responsive and competent were vendor representatives?	3 - Fair
Comments: Vendor's technical expertise was not valid or did not meet the requirements that is needed facility. Contact information was through email, and the phone number providedVendor rarely answer only responded via email. Minimal response.	

F) Emergency Procurement Section	
Evaluation Question	Rating
How responsive was the vendor to providing after hours contact information?	1 - Unsatisfactory
2. How clear was the vendor regarding the local warehousing and availability of products in the eve of an emergency?	nt N/A
3. How proactive was the vendor in providing emergency support for repair or replacement of a faile or unusable commodity?	d N/A
4. How accessible was the vendor before, during and after the emergency?	N/A
5. How willing was the vendor to provide support services?	N/A
6. How cooperative was the vendor in demonstrating extra effort to meet County staff requirements the emergency?	in N/A