

**BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA  
FINAL CONSULTANT EVALUATION  
OF PRIME VENDOR - SALTZ MICHELSON ARCHITECTS INC**

<b>FIXED CONTRACT - CONSULTANT</b>			
Project Nbr / Contract Nbr / Title <b>CMD-5217-2008-00 / 5217CONS / EXPANSION OF EXISTING HEALTH DEPARTMENT NO. PARKING LOT</b>			Commission District(s) <b>9</b>
Award Amount <b>\$45,336.88</b>	Change Amount <b>(\$2,009.19)</b>	Total Cost <b>\$43,327.69</b>	
Substantial Completion Date <b>9/25/2009</b>	Final Completion Date <b>10/25/2009</b>		
Goal Type <b>NONE</b>	County Established <b>0.00</b>	Vendor Committed <b>0.00</b>	Attained <b>0.00</b>
<b>EVALUATION SUMMARY</b>			
<b>SALTZ MICHELSON ARCHITECTS INC Is RECOMMENDED For Future Contracts Remarks:</b> <b>This difficult project was completed to the satisfaction of the Health Department in a professional manner and with minimum disturbance to the operations of the Health Department.</b>			Numerical Score <b>4.21</b>
Overall Rating	<b>GOOD</b>		Weighted Score
Unsatisfactory (1.0 - 1.8)   Poor (1.81 - 2.59)   Fair (2.60 - 3.19)   Good (3.20 - 4.49)   Excellent (4.50 - 5.00)			<b>4.22</b>
<b>COUNTY CONTACT INFORMATION</b>			
Overseeing Division <b>CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT DIVISION</b>			
Contract Administrator <b>Steve Hammond</b>		Email: shammond@broward.org	
Project Manager <b>Norman Brown</b>		Email: nbrown@broward.org	
<b>APPROVED EVALUATION</b>			
Rated By <b>Norman Brown</b> Date: 9/22/2011		Reviewed By <b>Norman Brown</b> Date: 9/22/2011	

**BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA**  
**FINAL CONSULTANT EVALUATION**  
**OF PRIME VENDOR - SALTZ MICHELSON ARCHITECTS INC**

<b>A) Preliminary Design/Engineering Services</b>		<b>Section Score: 4.18</b>
<b>Evaluation Question</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
1. How effective were the vendor's meeting with County to clarify and define the County's requirements for the project?	4 - Good	
2. How knowledgeable was the vendor regarding the jurisdiction of various government authorities involved in the approval process?	5 - Excellent	
3. How realistic was the schedule and budget for the project as presented by the design team?	4 - Good	
4. How suitable were the design results to the site?	5 - Excellent	
5. How well did the design meet user objectives and specific program requirements?	4 - Good	
6. How well did the design meet cost limitations?	4 - Good	
7. How clear and detailed were the plans?	4 - Good	
8. How accurate were the plans?	4 - Good	
9. How timely were the submittals of the plans?	4 - Good	
10. How well did the vendor anticipate and address potential construction conflicts with underground/overhead utilities?	4 - Good	
11. How appropriate was the level of completion of the specifications submitted with each design phase?	4 - Good	
Comments: The Consultant provided the necessary paperwork and documentation required for all jurisdictional approvals to proceed with this project. The site was very small and complicated by adjacent properties which required zoning changes in order to proceed with the project. The resulting parking lot met the needs of the stake holders and County.		
<b>B) Cost Control</b>		<b>Section Score: 4.50</b>
<b>Evaluation Question</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
1. How helpful was the project duration and the necessary justification which was provided by the vendor in allowing the County to evaluate for concurrence?	4 - Good	
2. 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?	N/A	
3. How effective was the vendor at finding ways to reduce one-time construction costs, long term maintenance, or staffing requirements by specifying alternative materials or designs?	N/A	
4. How actively did the vendor participate in overcoming problems with other vendors, building officials, and/or regulatory agencies?	5 - Excellent	
5. How valid were the claims for extra costs?	N/A	
Comments: The Consultant was very pro-active in addressing jurisdictional concerns.		

**BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA**  
**FINAL CONSULTANT EVALUATION**  
**OF PRIME VENDOR - SALTZ MICHELSON ARCHITECTS INC**

<b>C) Timeliness</b>		<b>Section Score: 4.00</b>
<b>Evaluation Question</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
1. How well did the vendor meet the schedule of deliverables established at the beginning of the project?	4 - Good	
2. How well did the vendor conform with schedule of work in progress in order to meet the planned completion dates for Phase Completion?	4 - Good	
3. How well did the vendor conform with schedule of work in progress in order to meet the planned completion dates for Substantial Completion?	4 - Good	
4. How well did the vendor conform with schedule of work in progress in order to meet the planned completion dates for Final Completion?	4 - Good	
Comments:		
<b>D) Permitting</b>		<b>Section Score: 4.20</b>
<b>Evaluation Question</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
1. How involved was the vendor in the effort to get permits from appropriate jurisdictions?	N/A	
2. How complete were the plans submitted for permitting?	4 - Good	
3. How complete was the initial design which was submitted to the regulatory agencies as reflected by the comments received from the regulatory agencies?	4 - Good	
4. How effectively did the vendor communicate with the County regarding issues that were being resolved by regulatory agencies?	5 - Excellent	
5. How effectively did the vendor communicate and provide the required notices to the County regarding the status of the permits?	4 - Good	
6. How timely were permit applications submitted so as not to delay the project?	4 - Good	
Comments: The Consultant was always here with us in resolving issues as they came to light.		
<b>E) Bid Documents</b>		<b>Section Score: 4.17</b>
<b>Evaluation Question</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
1. How carefully did the consultant review all bidding documents for conflicts or inconsistencies between documents prepared by the County and those prepared by the design team?	4 - Good	
2. How supportive was the consultant at the pre-bid meeting?	5 - Excellent	
3. How accurate and timely was the vendor's input to addenda in response to marketplace inquiries?	4 - Good	
4. How complete and clear were the specifications which were distributed to the marketplace as reflected by the number of addenda needed to rectify specification issues or the extension of the bid open date?	4 - Good	
5. How actively did the vendor contribute to the evaluation of selected vendors' responsibility in the areas of research, reference, credit, equipment availability and staff expertise?	4 - Good	
6. How actively did the vendor contribute to the evaluation of contractor bids for realistic price and time, fairness and reasonableness?	4 - Good	
Comments: The Consultant had to respond to questions from bidders and did so effectively requiring very little assistance from the County representatives.		

**BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA**  
**FINAL CONSULTANT EVALUATION**  
**OF PRIME VENDOR - SALTZ MICHELSON ARCHITECTS INC**

<b>F) Construction Administration</b>		<b>Section Score: 4.40</b>
<b>Evaluation Question</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
1. How timely were sealed shop drawings provided to the County?	4 - Good	
2. How frequently did the vendor make site visits to observe the project's construction?	5 - Excellent	
3. How proactive was the vendor to intervene as necessary if issues were observed during site visits?	5 - Excellent	
4. How clear and concise were the instructions provided by the vendor to the contractor and how well did they facilitate a professional relationship?	4 - Good	
5. How timely were construction issues related to the vendor's scope of responsibility resolved?	4 - Good	
Comments: Bi-weekly visits were required for construction meetings and other visits when requested by the contractor to observe or make recommendations depending on site conditions. The consultant visited the site on several occasions to observe the progress of construction and indicated in writing to the contractor issues that were evident..		
<b>G) Contract Change Management (Amendments)</b>		<b>Section Score: 4.00</b>
<b>Evaluation Question</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
1. Did the vendor provide independent estimates of the value of changes?	No	
2. How accurate and timely were the preliminary estimates of the value of change orders/amendments provided by the vendor?	4 - Good	
3. How accurate and timely were change orders/amendments processed with the proper documentation?	N/A	
4. How fair and timely did the vendor prepare, negotiate and make recommendations to the County regarding change orders/amendments?	4 - Good	
5. How appropriate were the vendor's recommendations for time extensions based on the actual circumstances and reviewed against the contract requirements?	N/A	
6. How well did the vendor follow Broward County procedure in reporting changes of sub vendors?	N/A	
Comments:		
<b>H) Project Closeout</b>		<b>Section Score: 4.33</b>
<b>Evaluation Question</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
1. How well did the project meet specified standards when inspected?	4 - Good	
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 the appropriate jurisdiction?	4 - Good	
3. How accurate and timely were the vendor's final project accounting documents sent to Broward County?	5 - Excellent	
Comments: They documents were timely but could not be paid because of a pending lawsuit.		