

1 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10					
TO:	Mark Roberts, Purchasing Agent				
	Purchasing Division				
FROM:	Gregory M. Balicki, P.E.				
	Water and Wastewater Services Engineering Division				
SUBJECT:	Solicitation No.: PNC2115060C1				
	New Booster Pumping Station for District 3A				
Recommende	ed Vendor: Cardinal Contractors, Inc. ed Group(s)/Line Item(s): Lines 01-01 through 01-04 Amount: \$2,517,250.00 Potential Total Amount: \$2,517,250.00				
Initial Contrac	ct Term: Fixed Purchase Contract Term, including Renewals: Fixed Purchase				
Mave review	NCE: y has reviewed Vendor's response(s) for specification compliance and Vendor responsibility. I wed all documents including the Vendor Questionnaire and after careful evaluation, I concur with dation for award to the Vendor.				
⊠ I am satisfi	BACKGROUND/D & B REPORT: (check one) ied with the Vendor's financial background and/or rating and payment performance. able Provide explanation if choosing this option				
I have reviewed to the property of th	HISTORY: (check one) ewed the Litigation History Form and there is no issue of concern. Iditional information from the Office of the County Attorney to address an issue/concern.				
	DRMANCE: (check all that apply) ed the Vendor's past Performance Evaluations in Contracts Central and:				
☐ No evaluat ☐ Vendor red ☑ Vendor red ☐ Past evaluat	ceived an overall rating ≥ 2.59 on all evaluations. cions within the past three years contained any items rated a score of 2 or less. ceived a rating ≤ 2.59 on an evaluation(s). Refer to additional information. ceived a score of ≤ 2 on an individual item(s). Refer to additional information. ations are not relevant to the scope of this contract. cerformance Evaluations exist in Contracts Central. AND				
□ Reference	Verification Forms are attached.				
D. (OR				
	Verification Forms are not required: Commodity only purchase (less than \$250,000); Service \$50,000 and the Vendor has a Performance Evaluation within the past three years.				
NON-CONCL	JRRENCE:				
☐ I do not co	ncur. Detailed reason for non-concurrence is attached.				
	Director of Water and Wastewater				

SIGNATURE:

DATE:

1 4

TITLE: Services Engineering Division

TYPED NAME OF SIGNER: Gregory M. Balciki, P. E. (Individual authorized to administer the contract.)



Vendor Reference Verification Form

Broward County Solicitation No. and Titl	e: PNC2115060	C1 New Booste		tation for District 3A
Reference for: (Name of Firm) Cardina	al Contractors, Ir	ic.		
Organization/Firm Name providing reference: Manatee County				
Contact Name/Title: Anthony Benitez, F	Project Manager			
Contact E-mail: Anthony.Benitez@mym	anatee.org			
Contact Phone: 941.737.4767 x 7333	200 OA V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V			
Name of Referenced Project: SWWRF	Lake Filtration S	system and Pon	d Improveme	nts
Contract No.		•	•	
Contract Amount: \$13M				
Date Services Provided: 8/12-1/15				
(list date ra	nge or date serv	rices began unti	l "current")	
Vendor's role in Project: ☐ Prime Ver	ndor 🗌 Sub-	consultant/Sub-	contractor	
Would you use this vendor again? ⊠ Ye				onal Comments (below).
		No, please spe	City in Addition	mai Comments (below).
Description of services provided by V	endor:			
Please rate your experience with the	Needs	0-41-6-4	Carallant	Not Applicable
referenced Vendor:	Improvement	Satisfactory	Excellent	Not Applicable
1. Vendor's Quality of Service				
a. Responsive			\boxtimes	П
b. Accuracy	F		\boxtimes	П
c. Deliverables	H	H	\boxtimes	Ħ
2. Vendor's Organization	ш			_
a. Staff expertise	П	П	\boxtimes	П
b. Professionalism	H	H		H
c. Turnover	H			H
3. Timeliness of:				ш
a. Project			\boxtimes	П
b. Deliverables	H		\boxtimes	H
b. Bolivolabloo			K	
Additional Comments: (provide on ad	ditional sheet i	f needed)		
· ·				
References Checked By				
Name: William Mitchell		Title: Ex	pansion Proje	ect Administrator
Division/Department: \MMS/MMFD				January 03 2018



Vendor Reference Verification Form

Broward County Solicitation No. and Title	e: PNC2115060	C1 New Booste	r Pumping St	ation for District 3A	
Reference for: (Name of Firm) Cardinal Contractors, Inc.					
Organization/Firm Name providing reference: Broward County Water and Wastewater Services					
Contact Name/Title: John Morra, P.E.					
Contact E-mail: jmorra@broward.org					
Contact Phone: 954-831-0902					
Name of Referenced Project: Water Tre	atment Plant 2A	4Log Virus Ina	ctivation		
Contract No. 9127					
Contract Amount: \$2,021,801.63					
Date Services Provided: 9/2012-1/2013	3				
(list date ra	nge or date serv	ices began unti	l "current")		
Vendor's role in Project: ☐ Prime Ven	dor 🗆 Sub-	consultant/Sub-	contractor		
Would you use this vendor again? ⊠ Ye				onal Comments (below).	
505		140, picase spe	ony in Additio	mai comments (below).	
Description of services provided by V				1 - f = 00 in - h - t-ti-	
Contractor furnished and installed a 4 mixer and several hundred feet of 60 i					
with sodium hypochlorite and ammon			snea emuen	t transfer water pipe	
with Social hypochiorite and animor	na Chemicai inj	ection vauits.			
Please rate your experience with the referenced Vendor:	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Excellent	Not Applicable	
1. Vendor's Quality of Service					
a. Responsive			\boxtimes		
b. Accuracy			\bowtie		
c. Deliverables			\boxtimes		
2. Vendor's Organization		,			
a. Staff expertise			\boxtimes		
b. Professionalism			\boxtimes		
c. Turnover			\boxtimes		
3. Timeliness of:					
a. Project			\boxtimes		
b. Deliverables			\boxtimes		
[A 1.1]					
Additional Comments: (provide on ad					
Contractor provided excellent service	ior a very chai	lenging projec	L.		
References Checked By					
Name: John Morra, P.E.		Title: DA	A LIT		
		Title: PN	4 111		



Vendor Reference Verification Form

Broward County Solicitation No. and Titl	e: PNC2115060	C1 New Booste	r Pumpina Si	tation for District 3A	
Reference for: (Name of Firm) Cardina	al Contractors. In	iC.			
Organization/Firm Name providing reference: Randy Howell					
Contact Name/Title: Inspector					
Contact E-mail: randy.howell@pxd.com					
Contact Phone: 903.312.5562					
Name of Referenced Project: Pioneer M	Mainline Pipeline	007 Pump Stat	ion		
Contract No.					
Contract Amount: \$7.7M					
Date Services Provided: 1/16-9/16	A15 (\$100 C)		,		
(list date ra	nge or date serv	ices began unti	l "current")		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
Vendor's role in Project: ☐ Prime Ver		consultant/Sub-			
Would you use this vendor again?⊠ Ye		No, please spe	city in Additio	onal Comments (below).	
Description of services provided by V					
Cardinal was the GC on my project th					
station with the capacity of moving 22			lay. They su	pplied and managed	
sub contractor and about 50 % of the	materials for th	e job.			
		·			
Please rate your experience with the referenced Vendor:	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Excellent	Not Applicable	
1. Vendor's Quality of Service	•				
a. Responsive		\boxtimes		П	
b. Accuracy	Ē	\boxtimes			
c. Deliverables	H	\boxtimes	H	Ħ	
2. Vendor's Organization					
a. Staff expertise			\boxtimes		
b. Professionalism		H			
c. Turnover	H	H	\boxtimes	H	
3. Timeliness of:		Ш		_	
a. Project			\boxtimes	П	
b. Deliverables	Ä			Ä	
,	land.	LJ	E-3		
Additional Comments: (provide on ad	ditional sheet if	f needed)			
Cardinal finished on time and under b			injuries.		
	_		_		
_					
1/1	MI				
References Checked By	M.W.	T''' 0		Managan O	
Name: Steven J. Doyle, PE.	12/1/1			Manager Supervisor	
Division/Department: WWS/WWED	// //	Date of \	Verification: (J1-U2-2U18	

Project: 9127 - WTP 2A 4-Log Virus Removal

Construction Contract: Y1062102C1 - WTP 2A 4-Log Virus Removal

Prime Vendor: CARDINAL CONTRACTORS INC

PM: John Morra, P.E. CA: Gregory Balicki, P.E.

Final Construction Evaluation - Status: Approved

Final Eval Raw Score: 4.70 Final Goal Raw Score: 5.00 Weighted Score: 4.69

CARDINAL CONTRACTORS INC Is RECOMMENDED For Future Contracts

Remarks: Contractor performed very well on an extremely difficult project. Superintendent Oscar Diaz and his crew did an outstanding job jointing, pressure testing, and placing the new 4 Log process piping system in operation.

Rated By: John Morra, P.E. Eng. of Record On 6/19/2015 Reviewed By: Gregory M. Balicki, P.E. On 8/10/2015

Numerical Score: 4.7

Project Management	Category Average: 4.8
How well did the vendor cooperate with the Contract Administrator, other County personnel and the consultant?	5
How closely did vendor conform with specifications, drawings and other requirements?	5
How appropriate was the staff assigned to do the work to ensure a quality product on a timely basis?	5
How actively did the vendor communicate with subvendors and others involved in project?	5
How adequate and effective was the vendor's coordination and control of subvendors' work and documentation?	4
How proactively did the vendor participate in the resolution of disputes?	5
How timely were the notices of inspection requests?	5
How well did the vendor control the project by providing recommendations, addressing issues, participating in decision making, and working with government officials and the County?	5
How clean did the vendor keep the work site on a continuous basis?	4
How well did the vendor conform to the permit requirements?	5
Comments: Commen	l on an extremely difficult water treatment a remarkable job constructing 60 inch

Business Practices	Category Average: 4.75
How was the vendor's compliance with the United States Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and Broward County's Risk Management Division, Safety and	5

Occupational Health Section requirements? Consider the vendor's established safety program, compliance with standards, safety practices, accident prevention, etc.	
How well did the vendor manage business relationships with subvendors by ensuring that subvendors were fully paid for work that had been completed to specifications? (This information can be verified through subvendor complaints or liens for non-payment)	5
How well did the vendor manage business relationships with subvendors by ensuring that subvendors were promptly paid?	5
How well did the vendor follow Broward County procedure in reporting changes of sub vendors?	4
Contractor followed all safety rules. Vendors and si	ubcontractors responded well to requests

Comments: Contractor followed all safety rules. Vendors and subcontractors responded well to requests for service by the general contractor.

Cost Control	Category Average: 5
How actively did the vendor pursue/take aggressive action in obtaining documents such as building permits, Certificate of Occupancy and other required documents on a timely basis?	5
How actively did the vendor participate in overcoming problems with other vendors, building officials, and/or regulatory agencies?	5
How valid were the claims for extra costs?	5
How well did the vendor comply with the prevailing wage rate policy?	5
How well did the vendor comply with the County's Living Wage rate policy (if applicable)?	5

Comments: Contractor obtained building permits on a timely basis and costs for extra work were fair and they worked with the County to keep costs within the project budget.

Category Average: 4.86
5
4
5
5
5
5
5

exceed the project schedule.

Change Order Management Category Average: 4

Did the vendor provide independent estimates of the value of changes?	Yes	
How accurate and timely were the preliminary estimates of the value of change orders/amendments provided by the vendor?	4	
How accurate and timely were change orders/amendments processed with the proper documentation?	4	
How fair and timely did the vendor prepare, negotiate and make recommendations to the County regarding change orders/amendments?	4	
How appropriate were the vendor's recommendations for time extensions based on the actual circumstances and reviewed against the contract requirements?	N/A	

Comments:

Change Orders were mostly due to requests for project modification by the County and were priced fairly so as not to exceed the project budget. Time for extra work was reasonable.

Quality Of Work	Category Average: 5
How accessible was the work for inspection?	5
How close were the equipment and materials to the specifications?	5
How closely were industry standard construction methods followed?	5
How responsive and competent were superintendents, supervisors and workers?	5

Comments:

Work was always open for inspection. All materials met the contract specifications. The contract superintendent Oscar Dias and pipe crew did an outstanding job laying large 60 inch diameter in very tight conditions at the water treatment plant while keeping it in full operation.

Project Closeout	Category Average: 4	
How well did the project meet specified standards when inspected?	5	
How complete and accurate was the documentation provided at the completion of the project, including punch list, warranties, operation, appropriate manuals and Certificate of Occupancy from the appropriate jurisdiction?	4	
How clean did the vendor leave the worksite by completely disposing of debris in a legal manner?	5	
How accurate and timely were the vendor's final project accounting documents sent to Broward County?	2	

Comments:

Project met all industry standards and punch list items were completed rapidly. Job site was left clean and in order. Final pay application and other paperwork at the end of the project was very slow requiring prodding to close out the project.





Public Works Department • Water and Wastewater Services WATER AND WASTEWATER ENGINEERING DIVISION 2555 West Copans Road • Pompano Beach Florida 33069 PHONE: 954-831-0745 • FAX: 954 831-0798/0925

January 11, 2018

William Pat Mitchell, Construction Project Manager Broward County Water and Wastewater Services 2555 W Copans Road Pompano Beach, FL 33069

RE: VENDOR PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Mr. Mitchell,

I am responding to your inquiry regarding the Performance Evaluation given to Cardinal Contractors Inc. on Capitol Project # 9127/Solicitation #Y1062102C1 WTP 2A 4-Log Virus Inactivation.

This project was an extremely challenging \$2,000,000 project requiring new 48" and 54" 4 Log piping that completely rearranged the finished effluent discharge from the WTP 2A lime softening plant. This new 500' long piping/treatment system with chemical injection points then became a treatment system on the tail end of the existing 30 MGD water treatment plant.

As the Engineer of Record and Construction Project Manager for this project, I can only say that Cardinal Contractors Inc. did an excellent job with the project and assisted the County in putting the system in service. I gave the contractor a nearly perfect weighted average Final Construction Evaluation score of 4.70. Cardinal Contractors staff exceeded my expectations for their experience with heavy construction. Cardinal Contractors retained a subcontractor for survey and for the preparation of as-built drawings. It took quite a while to get the proper documents at the end of the project for which I gave them a Rating of 2 under Item 4 in category G) Project Closeout.

Cardinal Contractors Inc. received an overall Excellent Rating and I would highly recommend them for future work with the County.

Should you have any questions or need additional information please do not hesitate to contact me at impra@broward.org or 954-831-0902.

Regards

John Morra, P.E.

Construction Project Manager

JM/as

C: File: 1.14