

TO:	Jeannette Ferrell, Purchasing Agent				
FROM:	Purchasing Division Jonathan K. Allen, Division Director				
I IXOINI.					
SUBJECT:	Water and Wastewater Business Operations Division Solicitation No.: BLD2115552B1				
OUDULUI.		(Croupe 2.9 NAMS Groupe 6.91)			
	Grounds Maintenance Services	(Groups 3-0 [vvvva Groups 0-0])			
	ed Vendor: Weed-a-Way, Inc. (Prir	nary)			
	ed Group(s)/Line Item(s): Group 6 Amount: \$219,844,57	Potential Total Amount: \$659,533.71			
	et Term: One Year	Contract Term, including Renewals: Three Years			
CONCURRE		Contract Form, moraling Contract. Timee Tears			
The agenc	y has reviewed Vendor's response	e(s) for specification compliance and Vendor responsibility. I endor Questionnaire and after careful evaluation, I concur with			
☐ I am satisfi	BACKGROUND/D & B REPORT: ied with the Vendor's financial bac able Not required for this Requisition.	kground and/or rating and payment performance.			
LITIGATION	HISTORY: (check one)				
	ewed the Litigation History Form a dditional information from the Offic	nd there is no issue of concern. e of the County Attorney to address an issue/concern.			
	ORMANCE: (check all that apply ed the Vendor's past Performance) Evaluations in Contracts Central and:			
	ceived an overall rating ≥ 2.59 on a				
		entained any items rated a score of 2 or less.			
		ition(s). Refer to additional information. ual item(s). Refer to additional information.			
	ations are not relevant to the scop				
☐ No past Pe	erformance Evaluations exist in Co				
⊠ Boforoneo	Varification Forms are attached	AND			
Kelelence	Verification Forms are attached.	OR			
Reference	Verification Forms are not require \$50,000 and the Vendor has a Per	d: Commodity only purchase (less than \$250,000); Service formance Evaluation within the past three years.			
NON-CONCL					
☐ I do not co	ncur. Detailed reason for non-con-	currence is attached.			
TYPED NAM	E OF SIGNER: Nadja Horton	TITLE: Facilities & Grounds Manager			
CICNATURE	. 111. 111	DATE: April 16, 2019			
SIGNATURE		DATE: April 16, 2018			

Page 2 of 2 Concurrence: Grounds Maintenance Services (Groups 3-8 [WWS Groups 6-8])

TYPED NAME OF SIGNER: Jonathan K. Allen	TITLE: Division Director	
SIGNATURE: Januh + ell	DATE: 4/16/18	
TYPED NAME OF SIGNER: Alan W. Garcia, P.E.	TITLE: Agency Director	
(Individual authorized to administer the contract.)		
SIGNATURE:	DATE: 4/16/14	
111111		



WATER AND WASTEWATER SERVICES / Business Operations Division

2555 West Copans Road • Pompano Beach Florida 33069 • PHONE: 954-831-0991

MEMORANDUM

DATE:

April 16, 2018

TO:

Jeannette Ferrell, Purchasing Agent

Purchasing Division

THRU:

Jonathan K. Allen, Director

Water and Wastewater Business Operations Division

FROM:

Nadia Horton, Facilities and Grounds Maintenance Manager

Water and Wastewater Business Operations Division

SUBJECT:

Solicitation No. BLD2115552B1

Grounds Maintenance Services (Groups 3-8 [WWS Groups 6-8])

Facilities and Grounds Maintenance Section of the WWS Business Operations Division concurs with the recommended vendor Weed-a-Way, Inc. based on additional information provided by Vendor during a scheduled site visit on 3/29/18.

During the site visit, the following was noted:

- Weed-a-Way will have to purchase additional equipment and hire additional staff to be able to provide services under this Contract; however, Vendor stated he will do that once award of the Contract is confirmed.
- WWS staff went over aerial views of the locations under this Contract with the Vendor. These aerial views were provided in the solicitation. Vendor confirmed he is aware of the size of the scope of services to be provided.

Weed-a-Way has assured WWS staff that they will have enough equipment and staff to provide the services required under this Contract.

If you have any questions, please contact Nadja Horton at (954) 831-0792.



Vendor Reference Verification Form

Broward County Solicitation No. and Title	e: BLD2115552B	31, Grounds Ma	iintenance Se	ervices (Group 3-8) [wws
(Groups 6-8)]					
Reference for: (Name of Firm) Weed-A-Way, Inc. (Primary - Group 6)					
Organization/Firm Name providing refere	ence: City of Holl	ywood Code E	nforcement		
Contact Name/Title: Xavier Leal / Contract	act Compliance (Coordinator			
Contact E-mail: xleal@hollywoodfl.org					
Contact Phone: 954-967-4526					
Name of Referenced Project:					
Contract No.					
Contract Amount: \$140,000 / Annual					
Date Services Provided: 1/2010 until C	urrent				
(list date rai	nge or date servi	ces began until	"current")		
Vendor's role in Project: ⊠ Prime Ven	ndor 🗌 Sub-c	onsultant/Sub-	contractor		
Would you use this vendor again? ⊠ Ye	s 🗌 No If	No, please spe	cify in Additio	onal Comments (belo	ow).
Description of services provided by V	endor:				
Vendor provides lawn mowing service		n tree trimmin	services.		
			•		
Please rate your experience with the	Needs	Satisfactory	Excellent	Not Applicable	
referenced Vendor:	Improvement	2		• •	
Vendor's Quality of Service					
a. Responsive		\boxtimes			
b. Accuracy		\boxtimes			
c. Deliverables		\boxtimes			
2. Vendor's Organization					
a. Staff expertise		\boxtimes			
b. Professionalism		\boxtimes			
c. Turnover	The state of the s			\boxtimes	
3. Timeliness of:		<u> </u>		¥3	
a. Project		\boxtimes			
b. Deliverables		X			
5. 5 3 N 3 C 5 C 5 C 5 C 5 C 5 C 5 C 5 C 5 C 5 C	Book 3	8C.33	Annual I	feered.	
Additional Comments: (provide on ad	ditional sheet if	needed)			
1. How would you rate their overall pe		•			
2. How well did they do following a sc			neet schedu	ile, but tend fall bel	nind
during the reavy seasonal time (e.g. ra		•		•	
3. Were there issues/concerns with ed		d by the Vend	or? No issu	es.	
4. Were there issues/concerns with th	e number of sta	aff available to	perform the	work? Have conc	erns
of having enough staff to handle the v	vork load during	g the heavy se	asonal time	(e.g. rainy season)	
References Checked By		77.11			
Name: John Wilf				ts Administrator	
Division/Department: WWS / Business C	Operations Division	on Date of \	/erification: I	March 22, 2018	
or Reference Verification Form - Ride					



Vend	or Reference	Verification Fo	rm		
Broward County Solicitation No. and Title: BLD2115552B1, Grounds Maintenance Services (Group 3-8) [WW					٧S
	(Groups 6-8)]				
Reference for: (Name of Firm) Weed-A-\	Reference for: (Name of Firm) Weed-A-Way, Inc. (Primary - Group 6)				
Organization/Firm Name providing refere					
Contact Name/Title: Amber Cox / Admin	istrative Assista	ant			
Contact E-mail: acox@cohb.org					
Contact Phone: 954-457-1390					
Name of Referenced Project: Lot Mainte	nance Service				
Contract No.		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			
Contract Amount: \$20,000 / Annually					
Date Services Provided: 10/2016 Until O	Current	<u> </u>	THE STATE OF THE S		
(list date ran	ge or date serv	ices began unti	("current")		
Vendor's role in Project: ☐ Prime Vendor	dor 🗆 Sub-	consultant/Sub-	contractor		
Would you use this vendor again? ☑ Yes				onal Comments (below).	
Description of services provided by Ve					
Vendor provides lawn mowing service		mavalldienaea	Leonuico		
vendor provides lawn mowing service	and debnis rei	muvanuispusa	i Seivice.		
				WHETPHATEIN WALLES AND A STATE OF THE STATE]
Please rate your experience with the	Needs	Satisfactory	Excellent	Not Applicable	
referenced Vendor:	Improvement	Catisiactory	EACHOII.	Not Applicante	
Vendor's Quality of Service					
a. Responsive			\boxtimes		
b. Accuracy		П	\boxtimes	П	
c. Deliverables		F	X	H	
2. Vendor's Organization	لسا	<u> </u>	K.M	Januara d	
a. Staff expertise	П	П	\boxtimes	П	
b. Professionalism			\boxtimes	님	
c. Turnover		님			
3. Timeliness of:				M	
		- manage	K-71		
a. Project	니	닐	×	Ц	
b. Deliverables			\boxtimes		
Additional Commentar (provide on add	litional about i	f naadad\			
Additional Comments: (provide on add					
1. How would you rate their overall per	Tormance / E	xcellent			
2. How well did they do following a sci					
3. Were there issues/concerns with eq					
4. Were there issues/concerns with the number of available staff to perform the		an avallable to	perionii ine	e work? No issues with	Ω
Engineer of available staff to heliotili to	e WUIN.				
References Checked By					
Name: John Wilf		Title: Co	ntracts/Gran	ts Administrator	
Division/Department: WWS / Business O	perations Divisi	on Date of \	/erification: N	March 21, 2018	



Vendor Reference Verification Form Broward County Solicitation No. and Title: BLD2115552B1, Grounds Maintenance Services (Group 3-8) [WWS (Groups 6-8)]						
Reference for: (Name of Firm) Weed-A	-Way, Inc. (Prima	ary - Group 6)				
Organization/Firm Name providing refer	ence: City of Hol	lywood		A3000-101		
Contact Name/Title: Clay Milan / Comr		ent Manager				
Contact E-mail: cmilan@hollywoodfl.org)					
Contact Phone: 954-921-3271						
Name of Referenced Project:		200				
Contract No.						
Contract Amount: \$16,000 / Annually						
Date Services Provided: 1/2013 until 0	Current					
(list date ra	inge or date serv	ices began unti	"current")			
Vendor's role in Project: ⊠ Prime Ve Would you use this vendor again?⊠ Yo		consultant/Sub- No, please spe		onal Comments (below).		
Description of services provided by Vendor provides lawn mowing servic services.		ral (including ti	res), and tre	e/hedge trimming		
Please rate your experience with the referenced Vendor:	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Excellent	Not Applicable		
Vendor's Quality of Service						
a. Responsive	П	\boxtimes	П			
b. Accuracy		\boxtimes				
c. Deliverables	ဌ	\boxtimes	님	H		
2. Vendor's Organization	i	الاعا		L i		
a. Staff expertise	П	П	\boxtimes			
b. Professionalism	Ä		\boxtimes	Ä		
c. Turnover	Ä	ñ	F	\boxtimes		
3. Timeliness of:		1				
a. Project			\boxtimes			
b. Deliverables			×			
Additional Comments: (provide on ac 1. How would you rate their overall p 2. How well did they do following a so 3. Were there issues/concerns with e 4. Were there issues/concerns with the number of staff.	erformance? Ve chedule? Very quipment utilize	ry Good. prompt, meets ed by the Vend	or? No issu	ies with equipment.		
References Checked By Name: John Wilf Division/Department: WWS / Business	Operations Divis			ts Administrator March 19, 2018		



Vendor Reference Verification Form Broward County Solicitation No. and Title: BLD2115552B1, Grounds Maintenance Services (Group 3-8) [WWS (Groups 6-8)] Reference for: (Name of Firm) Weed-A-Way, Inc. (Primary - Group 6) Organization/Firm Name providing reference: Miami Dade County Parks and Recreations Contact Name/Title: Alfredo Rivero / Landscape Maintenance Inspector 2 Contact E-mail: alfredo.rivero@miamidade.gov Contact Phone: 305-270-1791 Name of Referenced Project: Road Side Lawn Maintenance Contract No. Contract Amount: \$300,000 Date Services Provided: 10/2011 until 9/2015 (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: Provide lawn maintenance along road sides, that included mowing, edging, and trimming. Covered approximately 72 acres. Please rate your experience with the Needs **Excellent Not Applicable** Satisfactory Improvement referenced Vendor: 1. Vendor's Quality of Service a. Responsive \boxtimes b. Accuracy c. Deliverables \boxtimes 2. Vendor's Organization a. Staff expertise b. Professionalism X c. Turnover 3. Timeliness of: a. Project X П b. Deliverables Additional Comments: (provide on additional sheet if needed) 1. How would you rate their overall performance? Satisfactory 2. How well did they do following a schedule? Satisfactory 3. Were there issues/concerns with equipment utilized by the Vendor? No issues with equipment. 4. Were there issues/concerns with the number of staff available to perform the work? No issues with available staff. References Checked By Name: John Wilf Title: Contracts/Grants Administrator

Division/Department: WWS / Business Operations Division

Date of Verification: March 27, 2018



Vendor Reference Verification Form

Broward County Solicitation No. and Title		1, Grounds Ma	intenance Se	ervices (Group 3-8) [V	ws		
(Groups 6-8)] Reference for: (Name of Firm) Weed-A-Way, Inc. (Primary - Group 6)							
Organization/Firm Name providing reference: City of Miami Gardens							
Contact Name/Title: Frank Johnson / Operations Manager - Public Works							
	Contact Name/Title: Frank Johnson / Operations Manager - Public Works Contact E-mail: FJOHNSON@MIAMIGARDENS-FL.GOV						
Contact Phone: 786-279-1266							
Name of Referenced Project: CANAL RI	IGHT-OF-WAYL	ANDSCAPE M	AINTENANO	F			
Contract No.	IOTTI-OT WITE	WOOO, WE W	/ (IV) ETO IVO	lane			
Contract Amount: Information was not a	vailable						
Date Services Provided: 5/2017 until Cu	urrent						
the same and the s	nge or date servi	ces began unti	"current")				
Vendor's role in Project: ⊠ Prime Ven	dor 🖂 Sub-c	onsultant/Sub-	contractor				
Would you use this vendor again?				onal Comments (belov	ω.		
•		10, please spe	City in Addition	mai Comments (belov	v).		
Description of services provided by V					.		
Clearing, mowing, edging, and trimming acres.	ng canal areas v	within the City	of Miami G	ardens. Approximat	ely		
ou acres.							
				de white production was a tracked white production was the public behavior of the behavior or we want to be a			
Please rate your experience with the referenced Vendor:	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Excellent	Not Applicable			
1. Vendor's Quality of Service	•						
a. Responsive	П	\boxtimes	П				
b. Accuracy		\boxtimes	Ħ	ā			
c. Deliverables	Ä	\boxtimes	Ħ	Ä			
2. Vendor's Organization	ina, and	Kendi		terent'			
a. Staff expertise	П	\boxtimes	П				
b. Professionalism	Ä	\boxtimes	Ħ				
c. Turnover	Ħ	Ħ	Ħ	\boxtimes			
3. Timeliness of:	lance-transl		lanand	L			
a. Project	П	\boxtimes	П				
b. Deliverables		\boxtimes					
Additional Comments: (provide on add	ditional sheet if	needed)					
1. How would you rate their overall pe							
2. How well did they do following a scl	rformance? Sat						
	rformance? Sat hedule?Follows	schedule ver					
3. Were there issues/concerns with eq	rformance? Sat hedule?Follows juipment utilized	schedule ver d by the Vend	or? No issue				
 Were there issues/concerns with eq Were there issues/concerns with the 	rformance? Sat hedule?Follows juipment utilized	schedule ver d by the Vend	or? No issue		th		
3. Were there issues/concerns with eq	rformance? Sat hedule?Follows juipment utilized	schedule ver d by the Vend	or? No issue		th		
Were there issues/concerns with eq Were there issues/concerns with the available staff.	rformance? Sat hedule?Follows juipment utilized	schedule ver d by the Vend	or? No issue		th		
 Were there issues/concerns with eq Were there issues/concerns with the 	rformance? Sat hedule?Follows juipment utilized	s schedule ver d by the Vend ff available to	or? No issue perform the		th		

Page 1 of 3

Commodity OE Contract: N1364405Q1 - Bus Shelter Trash and Litter

Removal Services

Prime Vendor: WEED-A-WAY

CA:Tim Garling

Renewal Commodity Evaluation - Status: Approved

Start Dt: 8/31/2015 End Dt: 11/6/2015

Evaluation Score: 4.00

WEED-A-WAY Is RECOMMENDED For Future Contracts Remarks: Good Contractor, Responsive and responsible

Rated By: R. Viola On 11/6/2015 Reviewed By: R. Viola On 11/6/2015

Numerical Score: 4

Quality	Category Average: 4.25
How responsive was the vendor to notification of an unauthorized substitution?	5
How close did the delivered product(s) or software perform to expectations?	4
How accurate and timely were any necessary repairs or reconfigurations?	4
How timely were necessary parts or software made available?	N/A
How appropriate were any vendor recommended repairs or upgrades?	N/A
How efficient and timely were product/software installations and training completed?	N/A
How complete and timely did the vendor submit warranties, manuals, etc.?	N/A
How well did the vendor performance meet agreement expectations?	4
Comments:	

Quantity	Category Average: 4
How well did the amount of product shipped match the amount ordered?	N/A
How fast were partial deliveries or non-deliveries satisfied?	The state of the s
If there were backorders, how accurate where estimates of delivery times?	N/A
How accurate was the weight of the item received as compared to the weight listed on the invoice?	N/A
How accurate was the paperwork in the shipment?	N/A
How accurate were the licensing estimates for the software installation(s)?	N/A
Comments:	

Delivery	Category Average: 4
How timely was the complete order received, based on industry standards?	4
How well was the shipment protected against damage or loss?	N/A
How responsive was the vendor to notice of damaged goods?	N/A
How proactive was the vendor response to replacing damaged goods?	N/A
How cooperative was the vendor in making the delivery at a satisfactory time?	4
How accurate were the prices quoted to the invoiced price?	4
How accurate were the documents provided at closcout, e.g. packing slips, invoices, technical manuals, etc. regarding the correct material codes and pruchase order numbers?	N/A
How accurate was the method of delivery?	N/A
How correct was the delivery location?	4
How visible were the required inspection stamps?	N/A
How well did the vendor manage delivery of the product and/or service?	N/A
How accurately were close-out procedures followed?	NA

Customer Service	Category Average: 3.71
How knowledgeable was the vendor regarding the requested product and/or service?	4
How timely were requests for information, proposals and quotes answered?	3
How prompt were County staff communications returned or responded to?	4
How proactive was the vendor in addressing County staff problems or concerns regarding the product or service?	4
How courteous/professional was the vendor in dealing with the County, Sub-vendors, County Tenants/Customers?	4
How sensitive/responsive was the vendor to working around County operationaal needs?	4
How consistent and clear were the vendor communications with County staff?	3
Comments:	

Support	Category Average: 4.2	
How close was the level of vendor technical expertise to what was needed to support the product or service?	4	
How appropriate was the contact information provided by the vendor for questions?	4	
How well did the vendor respond to additional questions regarding the product or service?	4	
How timely was the vendor response compared to the contract requirements?	5	
How clear was the vendor information regarding the warranty or replacement policy?	N/A	2-11/2
How well did the vendor respond to warranty service requests?	N/A	
How timely were repairs completed?	NA	

Page 3 of 3

How well did the vendor coordinate any sub vendors?	N/A.
How responsive and competent were vendor representatives?	
Comments:) **

Emergency Procurement	Category Average: 4
How responsive was the vendor to providing after hours contact information?	да — ком непольство на начиналисти в се и непольство на польство на польство на непольство непольство на непольство на непольство на непольство на непольст
How clear was the vendor regarding the local warehousing and availability of products in the event of an emergency?	N/A
How proactive was the vendor in providing emergency support for repair or replacement of a failed or unusable commodity?	N/A
How accessible was the vendor before, during and after the emergency?	N/A
How willing was the vendor to provide support services?	4
How cooperative was the vendor in demonstrating extra effort to meet County staff requirements in the emergency?	4
Comments:	



TO:	Jeannette Ferrell, Purchasing Ag	ent			
EDOM.	Purchasing Division	t			
FROM:	Jonathan K. Allen, Division Direc				
and a finance of them that them	Water and Wastewater Business	Operations Division			
SUBJECT: Solicitation No.: BLD2115552B1					
	Grounds Maintenance Services (Groups 3-8 [WWS Groups 6-8])			
Recommende	d Vendor: Superior Landscaping & d Group(s)/Line Item(s): Group 6 Amount: \$302,287.20	Lawn Service (Secondary) Potential Total Amount: \$906,861.60			
Initial Contract	t Term: One Year	Contract Term, including Renewals: Three Years			
have review recommend	y has reviewed Vendor's response wed all documents including the Ve dation for award to the Vendor.	(s) for specification compliance and Vendor responsibility. I endor Questionnaire and after careful evaluation, I concur with			
☐ I am satisfi	BACKGROUND/D & B REPORT: (ed with the Vendor's financial back ble Not required for this Requisition	ground and/or rating and payment performance.			
🛛 I have revie	HISTORY: (check one) wed the Litigation History Form anditional information from the Office	nd there is no issue of concern. s 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 rec ☐ Vendor rec ☐ Past evalua	eived a rating ≤ 2.59 on an evalua	ntained any items rated a score of 2 or less. tion(s). Refer to additional information. al item(s). Refer to additional information. e of this contract.			
Reference	Verification Forms are attached.				
□ Reference less than \$	Verification Forms are not required 50,000 and the Vendor has a Perf	OR d: Commodity only purchase (less than \$250,000); Service ormance Evaluation within the past three years.			
NON-CONCU					
	ncur. Detailed reason for non-cond	urrence is attached.			
TYPED NAME	OF SIGNER: Nadja Horton	TITLE: Facilities & Grounds Manager			
SIGNATURE:	My After	DATE: April 16, 2018			
		Secretary and the secretary an			

Page 2 of 2 Concurrence: Grounds Maintenance Services (Groups 3-8 [W	WS Groups 6	i-8])		
TYPED NAME OF SIGNER: Jonathan K. Allen		TITLE: D	ivision Director	
1 11 1 -00	w.·		er de la	
SIGNATURE: January 1		DATE:	4/16/15	
TYPED NAME OF SIGNER: Alan W. Garcia, P.E. (Individual authorized to administer the contract.)	Wir	TITLE: A	gency Director	4/16/18

DATE:

SIGNATURE:



Vendor Reference Verification Form Broward County Solicitation No. and Title: BLD2115552B1, Grounds Maintenance Services (Group 3-8) [WWS (Groups 6-8)] Reference for: (Name of Firm) Superior Landscaping & Lawn Service, Inc. (Secondary - Group 6) Organization/Firm Name providing reference: City of Hollywood - Code Enforcement Contact Name/Title: Xavier Leal / Contract Compliance Coordinator Contact E-mail: xleal@hollywoodfl.org Contact Phone: 954-967-4526 Name of Referenced Project: Contract No. Contract Amount: \$250,000 / Annual Date Services Provided: 1/2014 until Current (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: Vendor provides lawn mowing services, hedge trimming, edging, weed control and minimum tree trimming. Please rate your experience with the Needs Improvement Satisfactory **Excellent Not Applicable** referenced Vendor: 1. Vendor's Quality of Service a. Responsive \boxtimes b. Accuracy c. Deliverables 2. Vendor's Organization a. Staff expertise b. Professionalism \boxtimes c. Turnover 3. Timeliness of: a. Project X b. Deliverables X Additional Comments: (provide on additional sheet if needed) 1. How would you rate their overall performance? Excellent How well did they do following a schedule? Follow the schedule very well. Very responsive. 3. Were there issues/concerns with equipment utilized by the Vendor? No issue with equipment used. 4. Were there issues/concerns with the number of staff available to perform the work? No issue with number of staff available to perform the work. References Checked By Name: John Wilf Title: Contracts/Grants Administrator Division/Department: WWS / Business Operations Division Date of Verification: March 20, 2018



Vendor Reference Verification Form Broward County Solicitation No. and Title: BLD2115552B1, Grounds Maintenance Services (Group 3-8) [WWS (Groups 6-8)] Reference for: (Name of Firm) Superior Landscaping & Lawn Service, Inc. (Secondary - Group 6) Organization/Firm Name providing reference: City of Bonita Springs Contact Name/Title: Joel Langaney / Project Manager Contact E-mail: joel.langaney@cityofbonitasprings.org Contact Phone: 239-478-4614 Name of Referenced Project: Landscaping and Irrigation with 1 Year Maintenance Contract No. Contract Amount: \$561,000 / Annually Date Services Provided: 1/2011 until Current (list date range or date services began until "current") □ Prime Vendor Vendor's role in Project: ☐ 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: Vendor currently has multiple contracts with the City of Bonita Springs. Services for landscaping and maintenance, fertilizing, tree trimming, and maintenance for Right-of-Way areas. Please rate your experience with the Needs Satisfactory **Excellent Not Applicable** Improvement referenced Vendor: 1. Vendor's Quality of Service a. Responsive b. Accuracy c. Deliverables 2. Vendor's Organization a. Staff expertise b. Professionalism c. Turnover 3. Timeliness of: a. Project X b. Deliverables П Additional Comments: (provide on additional sheet if needed) 1. How would you rate their overall performance? Satisfactory 2. How well did they do following a schedule? Stick to the schedule, weather permitting. 3. Were there issues/concerns with equipment utilized by the Vendor? No equipment issues. 4. Were there issues/concerns with the number of staff available to perform the work? No issues on staff availabile to perform the work. References Checked By Name: John Wilf Title: Contracts/Grants Administrator Division/Department: WWS/Business Operations Division Date of Verification: March 16, 2018



Vendor Reference Verification Form Broward County Solicitation No. and Title: BLD2115552B1, Grounds Maintenance Services (Group 3-8) [WWS (Groups 6-8)] Reference for: (Name of Firm) Superior Landscaping & Lawn Service, Inc. (Secondary - Group 6) Organization/Firm Name providing reference: City of Miami Beach Contact Name/Title: Jose del Risco, Assistant Parks Director Contact E-mail: josedelrisco@miamibeachfl.gov Contact Phone: 305-673-7272 Name of Referenced Project: Grounds Maintenance Services - Parks and Athletic Fields (South Region) Contract No. ITB-2014-195-LR Contract Amount: \$1,375,358 Date Services Provided: 2/2015 until Current (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: Grounds maintenance services for all South Region parks Please rate your experience with the Needs Satisfactory **Excellent Not Applicable** Improvement referenced Vendor: 1. Vendor's Quality of Service a. Responsive \boxtimes b. Accuracy c. Deliverables 2. Vendor's Organization a. Staff expertise b. Professionalism X c. Turnover 3. Timeliness of: a. Project X b. Deliverables X Additional Comments: (provide on additional sheet if needed) 1. How would you rate their overall performance? Excellent 2. How well did they do following a schedule? They do well, very flexible in accommodating last minute request and delivering on projects. 3. Were there issues/concerns with equipment utilized by the Vendor? No issues with equipment used. 4. Were there issues/concerns with the number of staff available to perform the work? No issues with available staff.

References Checked By Name: John Wilf

Division/Department: WWS / Business Operations Division

Title: Contracts/Grants Administrator

Date of Verification: March 20, 2018

	FIXED CONTRACT -	CONSTRUCTION		
Project Nbr / Contract Nbr / Title 3557 / Q307073CAF / Task II Ros Q307073CAF	adways, Landscape and Aes	thetic Improvement Proj	Commission District(s) ect 7	
Award Amount Change Amount Total C			Total Cost	
\$5,571,869.13	(\$377,206.05)	A. C.	\$5,194,663.08	
Substantial Completion Date 12/1/2009	Final Completion Date 12/31/2010	merce annual communication (see the communication of the communication o		
Goal Type	County Established	Vendor Committed	Attained	
СВЕ	30.07	30.07	29.49	
	EVALUATION	SUMMARY		
SUPERIOR LANDSCAPING & LA Contracts Remarks: Superior La time and their work was satisfac	on Numerical Score 3.57 Goal Evaluation Score 3.80			
Overall Rating	GOOD	The second secon	Weighted Score	
Unsatisfactory (1.0 - 1.8) Poor (1.81 - 2.5	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 CONTACT	(INFORMATION		
Overseeing Division				
AVIATION - AIRPORT EXPANSI	ON PROGRAM	Carles and		
Contract Administrator		Email: tmafisher@bro	Email: tmafisher@broward.org	
Trevor Fisher				
Project Manager Email: rlaur			oward.org	
Richard Lauricella	The second secon			
	APPROVED E	/ALUATION		
Rated By		Reviewed By		
Richard Lauricella, Expansion Project Administrator Steven T. Wiesner, Dire		Director, AEP		
Date: 2/17/2011 Date: 2/17/2011				

Evaluation Question	Rating
. How well did the vendor cooperate with the Contract Administrator, other County personnel and the consultant?	3 - Fair
2. How closely did vendor conform with specifications, drawings and other requirements?	3 - Fair
3. How appropriate was the staff assigned to do the work to ensure a quality product on a timely basis?	3 - Fair
4. How actively did the vendor communicate with subvendors and others involved in project?	3 - Fair
5. How adequate and effective was the vendor's coordination and control of subvendors' work and documentation?	3 - Fair
6. How proactively did the vendor participate in the resolution of disputes?	3 - Fair
7. How timely were the notices of inspection requests?	4 - Good
8. 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?	4 - Good
9. How clean did the vendor keep the work site on a continuous basis?	3 - Fair
10. How well did the vendor conform to the permit requirements?	3 - Fair 4 - Good
10. How well did the vendor conform to the permit requirements? Comments: B) Business Practices Sect	4 - Good on Score: 3.50
9. How clean did the vendor keep the work site on a continuous basis? 10. How well did the vendor conform to the permit requirements? Comments: Sect Evaluation Question 1. 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 Occupational Health Section requirements? Consider the vendor's established safety program, compliance with standards, safety practices, accident prevention, etc.	4 - Good
10. How well did the vendor conform to the permit requirements? Comments: Sect Evaluation Question 1. 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 Occupational Health Section requirements? Consider the vendor's established safety program, compliance with	4 - Good on Score: 3.50 Rating
10. How well did the vendor conform to the permit requirements? Comments: Sect Evaluation Question 1. 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 Occupational Health Section requirements? Consider the vendor's established safety program, compliance with standards, safety practices, accident prevention, etc. 2. 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	4 - Good on Score, 3.50 Rating 4 - Good

valuation Question	Rating
. How actively did the vendor pursue/take aggressive action in obtaining documents such as building ermits, Certificate of Occupancy and other required documents on a timely basis?	4 - Good
. How actively did the vendor participate in overcoming problems with other vendors, building fficials, and/or regulatory agencies?	4 - Good
. How valid were the claims for extra costs?	4 - Good
. How well did the vendor comply with the prevailing wage rate policy?	5 - Excellent
. How well did the vendor comply with the County's Living Wage rate policy (if applicable)?	N/A
Comments:	
) Timeliness Secti	on Score: 3.71
valuation Question	Rating
. How well did the vendor manage delivery of necessary equipment and material for the project?	3 - Fair
. How timely and accurate were payment requests when submitted?	3 - Fair
. How well did the vendor meet the schedule of deliverables established at the beginning of the roject?	4 - Good
. How well did the vendor conform with schedule of work in progress in order to meet the planned ompletion dates for Phase Completion?	4 - Good
. How well did the vendor conform with schedule of work in progress in order to meet the planned ompletion dates for Substantial Completion?	4 - Good
. How well did the vendor conform with schedule of work in progress in order to meet the planned ompletion dates for Final Completion?	4 - Good
. How effectively did the vendor communicate with the Contract Administrator and other County ersonnel as well as the consultant?	4 - Good
comments:	
	on Score, 3.25
valuation Question	Rating
. 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 rovided by the vendor?	3 - Fair
. How accurate and timely were change orders/amendments processed with the proper ocumentation?	3 - Fair
. How fair and timely did the vendor prepare, negotiate and make recommendations to the County	3 - Fair
egarding change orders/amendments?	4 - Good

F) Quality Of Work	Section Score: 3:50
Evaluation Question	Rating
How accessible was the work for inspection?	4 - Good
2. How close were the equipment and materials to the specifications?	4 - Good
3. How closely were industry standard construction methods followed?	3 - Fair
4. How responsive and competent were superintendents, supervisors and workers?	3 - Fair
Comments:	
G) Project Clossout	Section Score: 3,75
G) Project Closeout Evaluation Question	Section Score: 3,75 Rating
Evaluation Question	Rating 4 - Good 4 - Good
Evaluation Question 1. How well did the project meet specified standards when inspected? 2. 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	Rating 4 - Good 4 - Good the
Evaluation Question 1. How well did the project meet specified standards when inspected? 2. 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 appropriate jurisdiction?	Rating 4 - Good 4 - Good the



TO:	Jeannette Ferrell, Purchasing Ag	_l ent
FROM:	Purchasing Division	4
1 1101111	Jonathan K. Allen, Division Direct	
SUBJECT:	Water and Wastewater Business Solicitation No.: BLD2115552B1	Operations Division
JUDULUI.	Grounds Maintenance Services	(Groupe 3.9 NAMS Groupe 6.91)
		(Oldups 0-0 [VVVVO Oldups 0-0])
	d Vendor: MCT Service, LLC 17	
	d Group(s)/Line Item(s): Groups 7 Amount: \$277,813,18	-o Potential Total Amount: \$833,439,54
	t Term: One Year	Contract Term, including Renewals: Three Years
CONCURREN		John doc Form, morading Northwale. Timee Fears
The agency ⊠have reviev	y has reviewed Vendor's response ved all documents including the V	e(s) for specification compliance and Vendor responsibility. I endor Questionnaire and after careful evaluation, I concur with
recommend	dation for award to the Vendor.	
	BACKGROUND/D & B REPORT:	•
-3-0-	ed with the Vendor's financial bac ble Not required for this Requisition	kground and/or rating and payment performance. on
LITIGATION I	HISTORY: (check one)	
	ewed the Litigation History Form a	
		e of the County Attorney to address an issue/concern.
	PRMANCE: (check all that apply ed the Vendor's past Performance	l Evaluations in Contracts Central and:
	eived an overall rating ≥ 2.59 on a	
		ntained any items rated a score of 2 or less.
		tion(s). Refer to additional information.
		al item(s). Refer to additional information.
	ations are not relevant to the scoper rformance Evaluations exist in Co	
∑ 140 past 1 c	Hormanice Evaluations exist in Co	AND
⊠ Reference ¹	Verification Forms are attached.	
5.		OR
less than \$	Verification Forms are not require 50,000 and the Vendor has a Peri	d: Commodity only purchase (less than \$250,000); Service formance Evaluation within the past three years.
NON-CONCU		
	ncur. Detailed reason for non-cond	
TYPED NAME	OF SIGNER: Nadja Horton	TITLE: Facilities & Grounds Manager
SIGNATURE:	The Alfa	DATE: April 46, 2049
SIGNATURE.	find the same of t	DATE: April 16, 2018

TYPED NAME OF SIGNER: Jonathan K. Allen	TITLE: Division Director
SIGNATURE: Sault tell	DATE: 4/16/18
TYPED NAME OF SIGNER: Alan W. Garcia, P.E.	TITLE: Agency Director
(Individual authorized to administer the contract.)	Tree. / goney billootor
SIGNATURE:	DATE: 4/1/19

Page 2 of 2 Concurrence: Grounds Maintenance Services (Groups 3-8 [WWS Groups 6-8])



Vendor Reference Verification Form Broward County Solicitation No. and Title: BLD2115552B1, Grounds Maintenance Services (Group 3-8) [WWS

Dioward County Solicitation No. and Thin	(Groups 6-8)]	JI, GIOUITUS IVIZ	initeriance of	ervices (Oroup 5-6) [vvvc
Reference for: (Name of Firm) MCT Ser	vice. LLC	Groups 7	·-8)	NATION OF THE PROPERTY OF THE
Organization/Firm Name providing refere				Miami-Dade RAAM Divisie
Contact Name/Title: Marcos Meza / Offi	ce Manager			
Contact E-mail:				
Contact Phone: 305-607-5364	HALL CONTRACTOR OF THE STREET			Strait Transportation of the Strain S
Name of Referenced Project: Lawn Sen	vices		handan da an	
Contract No.				
Contract Amount: \$521,000 / Annually				
Date Services Provided: 8/2013 until cu	ırren			
	nge or date serv	ices began unti	l "current")	
Vendor's role in Project: ☐ Prime Ven	dar Mauk	consultant/Sub-	aantraatar	
Vendor's role in Project: ☐ Prime Ven Would you use this vendor again? ☐ Ye				onal Comments (below).
Description of services provided by V		rro, process ope		71101 001111111111111111111111111111111
Vendor provides lawn moving service		itae		
Vendor provides lawn moving service	55 101 10 10 11 1	nics.		
Please rate your experience with the referenced Vendor:	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Excellent	Not Applicable
1. Vendor's Quality of Service				
a. Responsive	П	\boxtimes	\Box	
b. Accuracy	$\overline{\Box}$	Ē	\boxtimes	
c. Deliverables	Ħ	Ħ	\boxtimes	П
2. Vendor's Organization		in the second	لاسيكا	bend
a. Staff expertise	П	П	\boxtimes	П
b. Professionalism	H	H	\boxtimes	<u> </u>
c. Turnover	H	吕		X
3. Timeliness of:	LI	السا	لسسا	KA
a. Project	П	·		
b. Deliverables		×	듬	anna d
s. Domoidside	L_J	57	ii	I
Additional Comments: (provide on ad	ditional sheet i	f needed)		
1. How would you rate their overall pe		•		
2. How well did they do following a sc			time.	
3. Were there issues/concerns with ed				es with equipment.
4. Were there issues/concerns with th				
available staff to perform the work.			•	
	TO THE PARTY OF TH			
References Checked By		T.11 ~		An Autorit to Anna
Name: John Wilf	S			ts Administrator
Division/Department: WWS / Business C	perations Divisi	on Date of \	verification: I	March 19, 2018



Vendor Reference Verification Form Broward County Solicitation No. and Title: BLD2115552B1, Grounds Maintenance Services (Group 3-8) [WWS (Groups 6-8)] Reference for: (Name of Firm) MCT Service, LLC Groups 7-8) Organization/Firm Name providing reference: Miami Dade Water & Sewer Department Contact Name/Title: Jose Martin/ Assistant Superintendent Contact E-mail: JMART@miamidade.gov Contact Phone: 786-552-8569/ 786-236-7605 cell Name of Referenced Project: Tree Services & Landscaping Contract No. Bid 1298-1/21 Contract Amount: varied \$4,000.00 to \$60,000.00 Date Services Provided: Yearly services since January 2012 (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: Tree removal services Tree trimming & pruning Brush and land clearing Tree planting and transplanting Please rate your experience with the Improvement Satisfactory Needs **Excellent Not Applicable** referenced Vendor: 1. Vendor's Quality of Service a. Responsive X X b. Accuracy 図 c. Deliverables 2. Vendor's Organization a. Staff expertise X b. Professionalism c. Turnover 3. Timeliness of: a. Project X b. Deliverables Additional Comments: (provide on additional sheet if needed) 1. How would you rate their overall performance? Satisfactory 2. How well did they do following a schedule? Satisfactory 3. Were there issues/concerns with equipment utilized by the Vendor? No issues with equipment used. 4. Were there issues/concerns with the number of staff available to perform the work? No issues with the number of staff available to perform the work. References Checked By Name: John Wilf Title: Contracts/Grants Administrator Division/Department: WWS / Business Operations Division Date of Verification: March 19, 2018



		Verification Fo			
Broward County Solicitation No. and Title			aintenance Se	ervices (Group 3-8) [\	wws
Reference for: (Name of Firm) MCT Ser	(Groups 6-8)]		7.0\		
Organization/Firm Name providing refere		'(Groups 7	-8)		
Contact Name/Title: Paul Bannerman /		an Landscaping			
Contact E-mail: pbannerman53@bellsou Contact Phone: 786-262-7455	itn.net	- C.P.A.VAudit			
Name of Referenced Project:		nananan maranan maranan nyikita dalah iki ilain 1800 ka tan			
Contract No.					
Contract Amount: \$50,000 / Annually Date Services Provided: 1/2009 until Co					
		vices began unti	l "current")		
•		-	-		
Vendor's role in Project: Prime Ven		consultant/Sub-		anal Commanta (hala	
Would you use this vendor again?⊠ Ye		i No, piease spe	cny in Additio	onal Comments (belo	W).
Description of services provided by V			_		
Vendor provides lawn mowing service	e, tree installat	ion, and landsc	aping.		
]
Please rate your experience with the	Needs	6 4 8	pm 63 . 4		
referenced Vendor:	Improvement	Satisfactory	Excellent	Not Applicable	
1. Vendor's Quality of Service	·				
a. Responsive		П	\boxtimes		
b. Accuracy	Ē	Ē	\boxtimes	ī	
c. Deliverables	듬	吕	×		
2. Vendor's Organization	L	اسسا	K_33		
a. Staff expertise	П	П	\boxtimes		
b. Professionalism	吕	日	\boxtimes		
c. Turnover	님	吕		\boxtimes	
3. Timeliness of:	ليسا		اسسا	K	
a. Project			\boxtimes		
b. Deliverables	<u></u>			H	
S. DOMO, abido	Land	L	6		
Additional Comments: (provide on ad	ditional sheet	if needed)			
1. How would you rate their overall pe		•			
2. How well did they do following a sc			chedule.		
3. Were there issues/concerns with ed				es with equipment ເ	ısed.
4. Were there issues/concerns with th					
available staff to perform the work.				Charles in a convenience of a programmy Charles are a real and properly styles which were	
References Checked By					
Name: John Wilf		Title: Co	intracte/Gran	ts Administrator	