

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

To: Birch Ohlinger, Engineering
CC: Sue Snider, Purchasing
From: Cheri Smith, City Clerk
Date: January 17, 2013
Subject: **COST PROPOSAL – PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION FACILITY; RFP #001-13**

The following Cost Proposals were opened Thursday, January 17, 2013 at 2:00 p.m. in response to the above referenced project. The Technical Score Sheet is attached.

- | | | | |
|----|--|--------|-----------------|
| 1. | ABC Construction, Inc.
7215 N.W. 7 th Street
Miami, FL 33128 | Total: | \$ 9,445,000.00 |
| 2. | DN Higgins in association with CDM Smith
1213 Glynn Archer Drive
Suite 281
Key West, FL 33040 | Total: | \$ 8,421,420.00 |
| 3. | Recreational Design & Construction, Inc.
3990 North Powerline Road
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33309 | Total: | \$11,395,918.00 |



Bogdan Vitas
City Manager
City of Key West

THE CITY OF KEY WEST

P.O. BOX 1409
KEY WEST, FL 33041-1409

3132 Flagler Avenue
(305) 809-3888
FAX 809-3886
bvitas@keywestcity.com

30 November 2013

From: Bob Vitas
City Manager

Subject: Evaluation Board for the award of RFP-001-13: Public Transportation Facility

The following persons are assigned the Evaluation Board for the award of the Public Transportation Facility Project.

1. Technical Evaluation Board (TEB):
 - a. Birchard Ohlinger
 - b. Jay Gewin
 - c. Myra Wittenberg
 - d. Don Craig
2. Financial And Surety Advisor: Roger McVeigh
3. Reference Verifier and Contact Person: Elizabeth Ignaffo
4. Cost Proposal Evaluator: Terrence Justice
5. Legal Consul: Larry Erskine

In addition, I am appointing Birchard Ohlinger as the interim head of the TEB board until their first meeting in which the board head is selected.

All members are asked to stand on this board and to be responsive to its needs. Your work and behavior shall be in accordance with our City Ordinances and applicable Florida Statues.

Your help in this matter is appreciated and I look forward to a successful award of this project.


Bob Vitas

Key to the Caribbean - Average yearly temperature 77° F.

		RDC	Higgins/CDM Smith	ABC Construction
Demolition				
	Permits/ Fees (other than what is covered Under the City of Key West Allowance)	\$0	\$1,500	\$0
	Mobilization	\$24,572	\$75,000	\$50,000
	General Conditions	\$139,932	\$120,000	\$140,000
	Bonds and Insurance	\$22,900	\$11,000	\$50,000
	Clearing and Grubbing	\$45,660	\$2,500	\$60,000
	Demolition of Structures	\$613,500	\$387,000	\$400,000
	Salvage Value of Equipment and Materials	-\$12,000	-\$90,000	\$0
	Grading and Capping of site	\$1,037,135	\$879,600	\$1,300,000
	Sodding of areas outside of new construction project limits	\$11,500	\$4,500	\$40,000
	Subtotal	\$1,883,199	\$1,391,100	\$2,040,000
Design				
	0% to 60% Design Documents	\$422,000	\$381,910	\$250,000
	60% to 90% Design Documents	\$211,020	\$171,560	\$120,000
	90% to 100% Design Documents	\$70,200	\$64,250	\$50,000
	Subtotal	\$703,220	\$617,720	\$420,000
Construction				
	Permits and fess (other than those covered under the City of Key West Allowance)	\$0	\$18,900	\$0
	Mobilization	\$18,350	\$50,000	\$50,000
	General Conditions	\$575,900	\$685,000	\$250,000
	Bond and Insurance	\$126,700	\$64,000	\$90,000
	Bus Wash Station	\$653,175	\$374,200	\$600,000
	Fuel Station	\$330,255	\$217,500	\$250,000
	Administrative Structure	\$4,410,814	\$2,058,000	\$2,100,000
	Maintenance Structure	\$423,500	\$1,309,600	\$1,200,000
	Underground Utilities	\$470,950	\$339,000	\$800,000
	Site work	\$941,155	\$651,600	\$850,000
	Lighting	\$320,000	\$203,800	\$220,000
	Securing Fencing	\$105,000	\$73,500	\$110,000
	Landscaping	\$268,700	\$202,500	\$300,000
	Subtotal	\$8,644,499	\$6,247,600	\$6,820,000
	Permit Allowance (CKW Building Department)	\$165,000	\$165,000	\$165,000
	Total Base Bid	\$11,395,918	\$8,421,420	\$9,445,000
	TEB Board Points (Cost Propsoal)	190	400	295
	TEB Board Points (Technical Prosposal)	497.25	508.75	382.00
	Total	687.25	908.75	677.00
	Technical Evaluation Board Final Ranking	2	1	3
Alternate Bid Items				
	Alt A: LEED Certification Silver	\$290,280	\$18,800	\$45,000
	Alt B: LEED Certification Gold	\$299,400	\$209,000	\$90,000
	Alt C: Second 8,000 Gal Bio Diesel Tank	\$48,300	\$79,000	\$15,000
	Alt D: Vehicle Lifts	\$282,241	\$270,000	\$300,000
	Alt E: Feed Water Tank	Additive \$4,400	Additive \$9,000	Additive \$20,000

Cost Proposal Points**RFP 001-13**

	CDM Smith	Recreational Design	ABC Construction
Total Base Bid (US\$)	\$ 8,421,420.00	\$ 11,395,918.00	\$ 9,445,000.00
Low Bid Points = 400	400	0	0
Non-low Bid Points	0	190	295

Lowest of Three

\$ 8,421,420.00 Lowest (baseline) Cost Proposal

Technical Proposal Points

From Summary Sheets	508.75	497.25	382.00
---------------------	--------	--------	--------

Points Grand Total and Basis of Award

Technical + Cost = Total	908.8	687.3	677.0
--------------------------	-------	-------	-------

CDM Smith

Recreational Design

ABC Construction

Technical Proposal Points

Qualifications/Experience (maximum 200 points)
Subtotal

Project Approach (maximum 200 points)
Subtotal

Financial Stability (maximum 100 points)
Subtotal

Past Performance (reference Verifications) (maximum 100 points)
Subtotal

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL GRAND TOTAL

Contractor

CDM Smith Higgins

Points

Score

Jay

Birch

Don

Mira

165

190

162

163

170

161

160

146

169

159

100

100

88

76

91

98

99

75

83

88.75

524

549

471

491

508.75 Technical Proposal
 508.75 Total Score

Public Transit Facility RFP:001-13

Technical Proposal Points

Qualifications/Experience (maximum 200 points)
Subtotal

Project Approach (maximum 200 points)
Subtotal

Financial Stability (maximum 100 points)
Subtotal

Past Performance (reference Verifications) (maximum 100 points)
Subtotal

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL GRAND TOTAL

Contractor

Recreational Design & Construction

Points

Score

Jay

159

Birch

160

Don

183

Mira

185

171.75

154

140

169

187

162.5

70

70

85

81

76.5

86

84

95

81

86.5

469

454

532

534

497.25 Technical Proposal
497.25 Total Score

Technical Proposal Points

Qualifications/Experience (maximum 200 points)
Subtotal

Project Approach (maximum 200 points)
Subtotal

Financial Stability (maximum 100 points)
Subtotal

Past Performance (reference Verifications) (maximum 100 points)
Subtotal

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL GRAND TOTAL

Contractor

ABC Construction

Points

Score

Jay

Birch

Don

Mira

140

79

119

145

120.75

143

80

110

141

118.5

77

75

77

77

76.5

73

75

50

67

66.25

433

309

356

430

382 Technical Proposal
 382 Total Score

RecreationAC
Design & Const.
Inc.

Technical Proposal Points

Points

Score

Qualifications/Experience (maximum 200 points)

Proposers Experience in providing proposed services, including demonstrating relevant design/build and LEED Experience

0-40

35

Qualifications and experience of Project Manager

0-30

27

Qualifications and experience of Key Personnel assigned to the Project

0-30

28

Qualifications, experience and past performance of Proposer

0-20

18

Qualifications and past performance of subcontractors

0-20

19

Number of other project that all of some of the proposed team and subcontractors have worked together on

0-20

19

Familiarity with local conditions

0-20

20

Descriptions of past (with in the last 5 years) and ongoing litigations involving proposer and subcontractors

0-20

19

185

Project Approach (maximum 200 points)

Documentation of understanding of scope of work and requirements

0-40

35

Proposer's approach to designing and permitting the Project

0-25

24

Proposer's approach to constructing the project

0-25

24

Proposer's approach to LEED Certification process

0-10

9

Management structures for proposer and subcontractors

0-20

19

Proposer's resources, capacity to perform and mobilization plan

0-20

19

Quality and sufficiency of staffing plan and organizational structure

0-20

19

Project schedule and proposed milestones

0-20

19

Proposed quality assurance/quality control program

0-20

19

Financial Stability (maximum 100 points)

Years Proposer's company has been in business

0-25

21

Proposer's net worth and working capital

0-25

20

Size of Projects successfully completed in the past 5 years

0-25

21

Strength of latest financial statement

0-25

19

81

Past Performance (reference Verifications) (maximum 100 points)

Responsiveness to problems

0-25

21

Projects completed on time and within budget

0-25

21

Quality of project

0-25

18

Overall satisfaction of Owner

0-25

21

81

Thoughts and Comments:

RD&C appears to have far more experience in construction & team work w/regard to D&B projects. They also had most complete proposal submitted - a full package & thorough presentation.

Megan W.
001-17-13

5240

CDM Smith &
DN Higgins

Technical Proposal Points

Points

Score

Qualifications/Experience (maximum 200 points)

Proposers Experience in providing proposed services, including demonstrating relevant design/build and LEED Experience

0-40

28

Qualifications and experience of Project Manager

0-30

25

Qualifications and experience of Key Personnel assigned to the Project

0-30

27

Qualifications, experience and past performance of Proposer

0-20

17

Qualifications and past performance of subcontractors

0-20

17

Number of other project that all of some of the proposed team and subcontractors have worked together on

0-20

18

Familiarity with local conditions

0-20

18

Descriptions of past (with in the last 5 years) and ongoing litigations involving proposer and subcontractors

0-20

13 / 163

Project Approach (maximum 200 points)

Documentation of understanding of scope of work and requirements

0-40

26

Proposer's approach to designing and permitting the Project

0-25

22

Proposer's approach to constructing the project

0-25

22

Proposer's approach to LEED Certification process

0-10

9

Management structures for proposer and subcontractors

0-20

18

Proposer's resources, capacity to perform and mobilization plan

0-20

18

Quality and sufficiency of staffing plan and organizational structure

0-20

18

Project schedule and proposed milestones

0-20

18

Proposed quality assurance/quality control program

0-20

18 / 169

Financial Stability (maximum 100 points)

Years Proposer's company has been in business

0-25

20

Proposer's net worth and working capital

0-25

20

Size of Projects successfully completed in the past 5 years

0-25

18

Strength of latest financial statement

0-25

18 / 76

Past Performance (reference Verifications) (maximum 100 points)

Responsiveness to problems

0-25

23

Projects completed on time and within budget

0-25

22

Quality of project

0-25

19

Overall satisfaction of Owner

0-25

19 / 83

Thoughts and Comments:

CDM Smith / DN Higgins is well qualified in construction work but most experience is in utilities and not D&B projects. No financials included, errors in doc's & possible pending litigation

508.25

ABC
Construction

Technical Proposal Points

Points

Score

Qualifications/Experience (maximum 200 points)

Proposer's Experience in providing proposed services, including demonstrating relevant design/build and LEED Experience

0-40

28

Qualifications and experience of Project Manager

0-30

22

Qualifications and experience of Key Personnel assigned to the Project

0-30

25

Qualifications, experience and past performance of Proposer

0-20

15

Qualifications and past performance of subcontractors

0-20

15

Number of other project that all of some of the proposed team and subcontractors have worked together on

0-20

17

Familiarity with local conditions

0-20

13

Descriptions of past (with in the last 5 years) and ongoing litigations involving proposer and subcontractors

0-20

10

/145

Project Approach (maximum 200 points)

Documentation of understanding of scope of work and requirements

0-40

20

Proposer's approach to designing and permitting the Project

0-25

18

Proposer's approach to constructing the project

0-25

18

Proposer's approach to LEED Certification process

0-10

8

Management structures for proposer and subcontractors

0-20

14

Proposer's resources, capacity to perform and mobilization plan

0-20

14

Quality and sufficiency of staffing plan and organizational structure

0-20

16

Project schedule and proposed milestones

0-20

17

Proposed quality assurance/quality control program

0-20

16

/41

Financial Stability (maximum 100 points)

Years Proposer's company has been in business

0-25

19

Proposer's net worth and working capital

0-25

19

Size of Projects successfully completed in the past 5 years

0-25

20

Strength of latest financial statement

0-25

19

/77

Past Performance (reference Verifications) (maximum 100 points)

Responsiveness to problems

0-25

19

Projects completed on time and within budget

0-25

22

Quality of project

0-25

18

Overall satisfaction of Owner

0-25

8

/67

Thoughts and Comments:

ABC appears well qualified and cohesive as to past D&B experience w/ current team. The info package submitted was not well organized; leaving certain items to question. No financials provided.

Myra W
01/17-13

Technical Proposal Points

Points Score

BTD

Qualifications/Experience (maximum 200 points)

Proposer's Experience in providing proposed services, including demonstrating relevant design/build and LEED Experience	0-40	<u>25</u>
Qualifications and experience of Project Manager	0-30	<u>30</u>
Qualifications and experience of Key Personnel assigned to the Project	0-30	<u>30</u>
Qualifications, experience and past performance of Proposer	0-20	<u>20</u>
Qualifications and past performance of subcontractors	0-20	<u>15</u>
Number of other project that all of some of the proposed team and subcontractors have worked together on	0-20	<u>20</u>
Familiarity with local conditions	0-20	<u>10</u>
Descriptions of past (with in the last 5 years) and ongoing litigations involving proposer and subcontractors	0-20	<u>10</u>
Subtotal		160

Project Approach (maximum 200 points)

Documentation of understanding of scope of work and requirements	0-40	<u>25</u>
Proposer's approach to designing and permitting the Project	0-25	<u>15</u>
Proposer's approach to constructing the project	0-25	<u>20</u>
Proposer's approach to LEED Certification process	0-10	<u>10</u>
Management structures for proposer and subcontractors	0-20	<u>20</u>
Proposer's resources, capacity to perform and mobilization plan	0-20	<u>10</u>
Quality and sufficiency of staffing plan and organizational structure	0-20	<u>20</u>
Project schedule and proposed milestones	0-20	<u>10</u>
Proposed quality assurance/quality control program	0-20	<u>10</u>
Subtotal		140

Financial Stability (maximum 100 points)

Years Proposer's company has been in business	0-25	<u>0</u>
Proposer's net worth and working capital	0-25	<u>0</u>
Size of Projects successfully completed in the past 5 years	0-25	<u>0</u>
Strength of latest financial statement	0-25	<u>0</u>
Subtotal		70

Past Performance (reference Verifications) (maximum 100 points)

Responsiveness to problems	0-25	<u>0</u>
Projects completed on time and within budget	0-25	<u>0</u>
Quality of project	0-25	<u>0</u>
Overall satisfaction of Owner	0-25	<u>0</u>
Subtotal		84

GRAND TOTAL

454

Thoughts and Comments: Firm teamed with a very strong A/E. Strong design program...construction experience with this type of project was less. Points for having an LEED sub-contractor on board. Very strong A/E program, weaker Construction program

Lead Designer is Corzo Sastella Carballo Thompon Salman

RDC David Gomez: Project Manager
 CT3 Eddie Lamas/Jeffrey Crews

It appears that RDC is the lead but CT3 has more experience
 Re-inforced Masonry Construction
 Who is RDC: D/B Managers???

469 454 522 553
~~532~~ 55
 469 454 532 524 = 494

Technical Proposal Points

Points Score

Bib

Qualifications/Experience (maximum 200 points)

Proposer's Experience in providing proposed services, including demonstrating relevant design/build and LEED Experience

0-40 10

Qualifications and experience of Project Manager

0-30 20

Qualifications and experience of Key Personnel assigned to the Project

0-30 20

Qualifications, experience and past performance of Proposer

0-20 4

Qualifications and past performance of subcontractors

0-20 10

Number of other project that all of some of the proposed team and subcontractors have worked together on

0-20 10

Familiarity with local conditions

0-20 5

Descriptions of past (with in the last 5 years) and ongoing litigations involving proposer and subcontractors

0-20 0

Subtotal

79

Project Approach (maximum 200 points)

Documentation of understanding of scope of work and requirements

0-40 15

Proposer's approach to designing and permitting the Project

0-25 10

Proposer's approach to constructing the project

0-25 10

Proposer's approach to LEED Certification process

0-10 5

Management structures for proposer and subcontractors

0-20 10

Proposer's resources, capacity to perform and mobilization plan

0-20 10

Quality and sufficiency of staffing plan and organizational structure

0-20 10

Project schedule and proposed milestones

0-20 5

Proposed quality assurance/quality control program

0-20 5

Subtotal

80

Financial Stability (maximum 100 points)

Years Proposer's company has been in business

0-25 0

Proposer's net worth and working capital

0-25 0

Size of Projects successfully completed in the past 5 years

0-25 0

Strength of latest financial statement

0-25 0

Subtotal

75

Past Performance (reference Verifications) (maximum 100 points)

Responsiveness to problems

0-25 0

Projects completed on time and within budget

0-25 0

Quality of project

0-25 0

Overall satisfaction of Owner

0-25 0

Subtotal

75

GRAND TOTAL

309

Thoughts and Comments: Team has a great deal of willingness...but appears that the scope of work was not clearly understood...Past experience not as strong as other candidates..

Maria Mendoza Architect
 Kwn Groce Water/wastewater and drainage
 Denis Solano Solver Structural Partnership Structural Engineer
 Marcos Misrahi Mechanical Engineer
 Ken Gardner ??? Land Architect
 Santiago Domingues ???

Stru Miami International Bu

Jorge Gonzalez Home Inspector, General Contractors License, Plumbing Contractors License

Small Business

Tell us how you are going to build this project
 Who is the lead on the project?

433 309 356 430 = 382

Technical Proposal Points

Points

Score

Qualifications/Experience (maximum 200 points)

Proposer's Experience in providing proposed services, including demonstrating relevant design/build and LEED Experience

0-40

35

Qualifications and experience of Project Manager

0-30

30

Qualifications and experience of Key Personnel assigned to the Project

0-30

30

Qualifications, experience and past performance of Proposer

0-20

20

Qualifications and past performance of subcontractors

0-20

15

Number of other project that all of some of the proposed team and subcontractors have worked together on

0-20

20

Familiarity with local conditions

0-20

20

Descriptions of past (with in the last 5 years) and ongoing litigations involving proposer and subcontractors

0-20

0

Subtotal

190

Project Approach (maximum 200 points)

Documentation of understanding of scope of work and requirements

0-40

35

Proposer's approach to designing and permitting the Project

0-25

20

Proposer's approach to constructing the project

0-25

20

Proposer's approach to LEED Certification process

0-10

10

Management structures for proposer and subcontractors

0-20

20

Proposer's resources, capacity to perform and mobilization plan

0-20

20

Quality and sufficiency of staffing plan and organizational structure

0-20

15

Project schedule and proposed milestones

0-20

10

Proposed quality assurance/quality control program

0-20

10

Subtotal

160

Financial Stability (maximum 100 points)

Years Proposer's company has been in business

0-25

0

Proposer's net worth and working capital

0-25

0

Size of Projects successfully completed in the past 5 years

0-25

0

Strength of latest financial statement

0-25

0

Subtotal

100

Past Performance (reference Verifications) (maximum 100 points)

Responsiveness to problems

0-25

0

Projects completed on time and within budget

0-25

0

Quality of project

0-25

0

Overall satisfaction of Owner

0-25

0

Subtotal

99

GRAND TOTAL

549

Thoughts and Comments: Liked the past experience in the area. Proven design build results at the solid waste transfer station

161 190 162 163

524 549 471 491 = 508.75

Technical Proposal Points

Points

Score

Qualifications/Experience (maximum 200 points)

Proposers Experience in providing proposed services, including demonstrating relevant design/build and LEED Experience	0-40	<u>28</u>
Qualifications and experience of Project Manager	0-30	<u>20</u>
Qualifications and experience of Key Personnel assigned to the Project	0-30	<u>21</u>
Qualifications, experience and past performance of Proposer	0-20	<u>13</u>
Qualifications and past performance of subcontractors	0-20	<u>13</u>
Number of other project that all of some of the proposed team and subcontractors have worked together on	0-20	<u>12</u>
Familiarity with local conditions	0-20	<u>13</u>
Descriptions of past (with in the last 5 years) and ongoing litigations involving proposer and subcontractors	0-20	<u>20</u>
<i>Subtotal</i>		<u>140</u>

Project Approach (maximum 200 points)

Documentation of understanding of scope of work and requirements	0-40	<u>30</u>
Propoer's approach to designing and permitting the Project	0-25	<u>17</u>
Proposer's approach to constructing the project	0-25	<u>17</u>
Proposer's approach to LEED Certification process	0-10	<u>6</u>
Management structures for proposer and subcontractors	0-20	<u>15</u>
Proposer's resources, capacity to perform and mobilization plan	0-20	<u>14</u>
Quality and sufficiency of staffing plan and organizational structure	0-20	<u>14</u>
Project schedule and proposed milestones	0-20	<u>15</u>
Proposed quality assurance/quality control program	0-20	<u>15</u>
<i>Subtotal</i>		<u>143</u>

p15

Financial Stability (maximum 100 points)

Years Proposer's company has been in business	0-25	<u>20</u>
Proposer's net worth and working capital	0-25	<u>20</u>
Size of Projects successfully completed in the past 5 years	0-25	<u>17</u>
Strength of latest financial statement	0-25	<u>20</u>
<i>Subtotal</i>		<u>77</u>

Past Performance (reference Verifications) (maximum 100 points)

Responsiveness to problems	0-25	<u>19</u>
Projects completed on time and within budget	0-25	<u>18</u>
Quality of project	0-25	<u>18</u>
Overall satisfaction of Owner	0-25	<u>18</u>
<i>Subtotal</i>		<u>73</u>

GRAND TOTAL

433

Thoughts and Comments:

JAY GEWIN

Technical Proposal Points

Points

Score

Qualifications/Experience (maximum 200 points)

Proposers Experience in providing proposed services, including demonstrating relevant design/build and LEED Experience

0-40

32

Qualifications and experience of Project Manager

0-30

23

Qualifications and experience of Key Personnel assigned to the Project

0-30

22

Qualifications, experience and past performance of Proposer

0-20

16

Qualifications and past performance of subcontractors

0-20

16

Number of other project that all of some of the proposed team and subcontractors have worked together on

0-20

15

Familiarity with local conditions

0-20

16

Descriptions of past (with in the last 5 years) and ongoing litigations involving proposer and subcontractors

0-20

19*Subtotal*159

Project Approach (maximum 200 points)

Documentation of understanding of scope of work and requirements

0-40

31

Proposer's approach to designing and permitting the Project

0-25

19

Proposer's approach to constructing the project

0-25

20

Proposer's approach to LEED Certification process

0-10

8

Management structures for proposer and subcontractors

0-20

15

Proposer's resources, capacity to perform and mobilization plan

0-20

15

Quality and sufficiency of staffing plan and organizational structure

0-20

15

Project schedule and proposed milestones

0-20

16

Proposed quality assurance/quality control program

0-20

15*Subtotal*154

Financial Stability (maximum 100 points)

Years Proposer's company has been in business

0-25

20

Proposer's net worth and working capital

0-25

15

Size of Projects successfully completed in the past 5 years

0-25

20

Strength of latest financial statement

0-25

15*Subtotal*70

Past Performance (reference Verifications) (maximum 100 points)

Responsiveness to problems

0-25

22

Projects completed on time and within budget

0-25

22

Quality of project

0-25

21

Overall satisfaction of Owner

0-25

21*Subtotal*86**GRAND TOTAL****469**

Thoughts and Comments:

JAY GEWIN

Technical Proposal Points

Points Score

Qualifications/Experience (maximum 200 points)

Proposers Experience in providing proposed services, including demonstrating relevant design/build and LEED Experience	0-40	<u>34</u>
Qualifications and experience of Project Manager	0-30	<u>23</u>
Qualifications and experience of Key Personnel assigned to the Project	0-30	<u>25</u>
Qualifications, experience and past performance of Proposer	0-20	<u>16</u>
Qualifications and past performance of subcontractors	0-20	<u>15</u>
Number of other project that all of some of the proposed team and subcontractors have worked together on	0-20	<u>13</u>
Familiarity with local conditions	0-20	<u>19</u>
Descriptions of past (with in the last 5 years) and ongoing litigations involving proposer and subcontractors	0-20	<u>20</u>
<i>Subtotal</i>		<u>165</u>

Project Approach (maximum 200 points)

Documentation of understanding of scope of work and requirements	0-40	<u>34</u>
Proposers approach to designing and permitting the Project	0-25	<u>20</u>
Proposers approach to constructing the project	0-25	<u>20</u>
Proposers approach to LEED Certification process	0-10	<u>7</u>
Management structures for proposer and subcontractors	0-20	<u>16</u>
Proposers resources, capacity to perform and mobilization plan	0-20	<u>16</u>
Quality and sufficiency of staffing plan and organizational structure	0-20	<u>17</u>
Project schedule and proposed milestones	0-20	<u>16</u>
Proposed quality assurance/quality control program	0-20	<u>15</u>
<i>Subtotal</i>		<u>161</u>

Financial Stability (maximum 100 points)

Years Proposer's company has been in business	0-25	<u>25</u>
Proposer's net worth and working capital	0-25	<u>25</u>
Size of Projects successfully completed in the past 5 years	0-25	<u>25</u>
Strength of latest financial statement	0-25	<u>25</u>
<i>Subtotal</i>		<u>100</u>

Past Performance (reference Verifications) (maximum 100 points)

Responsiveness to problems	0-25	<u>25</u>
Projects completed on time and within budget	0-25	<u>25</u>
Quality of project	0-25	<u>24</u>
Overall satisfaction of Owner	0-25	<u>24</u>
<i>Subtotal</i>		<u>98</u>

GRAND TOTAL**524**

Thoughts and Comments:

JAY GEWIN

Technical Proposal Points

Points Score

Qualifications/Experience (maximum 200 points)

Proposers Experience in providing proposed services, including demonstrating relevant design/build and LEED Experience	0-40	<u>30</u>	0
Qualifications and experience of Project Manager	0-30	<u>25</u>	0
Qualifications and experience of Key Personnel assigned to the Project	0-30	<u>25</u>	0
Qualifications, experience and past performance of Proposer	0-20	<u>15</u>	0
Qualifications and past performance of subcontractors	0-20	<u>20</u>	0
Number of other project that all of some of the proposed team and subcontractors have worked together on	0-20	<u>12</u>	0
Familiarity with local conditions	0-20	<u>20</u>	0
Descriptions of past (with in the last 5 years) and ongoing litigations involving proposer and subcontractors	0-20	<u>15</u>	0
<i>Subtotal</i>		<u>162</u>	0

Project Approach (maximum 200 points)

Documentation of understanding of scope of work and requirements	0-40	<u>35</u>	0
Proposers approach to designing and permitting the Project	0-25	<u>20</u>	0
Proposer's approach to constructing the project	0-25	<u>20</u>	0
Proposer's approach to LEED Certification process	0-10	<u>5</u>	0
Management structures for proposer and subcontractors	0-20	<u>10</u>	0
Proposer's resources, capacity to perform and mobilization plan	0-20	<u>12</u>	0
Quality and sufficiency of staffing plan and organizational structure	0-20	<u>15</u>	0
Project schedule and proposed milestones	0-20	<u>14</u>	0
Proposed quality assurance/quality control program	0-20	<u>15</u>	0
<i>Subtotal</i>		<u>146</u>	0

Financial Stability (maximum 100 points)

Years Proposer's company has been in business	0-25	<u>22</u>	0
Proposer's net worth and working capital	0-25	<u>23</u>	0
Size of Projects successfully completed in the past 5 years	0-25	<u>20</u>	0
Strength of latest financial statement	0-25	<u>22</u>	0
<i>Subtotal</i>		<u>88</u>	0

Past Performance (reference Verifications) (maximum 100 points)

Responsiveness to problems	0-25	<u>20</u>	0
Projects completed on time and within budget	0-25	<u>20</u>	0
Quality of project	0-25	<u>15</u>	0
Overall satisfaction of Owner	0-25	<u>20</u>	0
<i>Subtotal</i>		<u>75</u>	0

GRAND TOTAL

421 0

Thoughts and Comments:

OC. 1-17-13

Technical Proposal Points

Points Score

Qualifications/Experience (maximum 200 points)

Proposers Experience in providing proposed services, including demonstrating relevant design/build and LEED Experience	0-40	35	0
Qualifications and experience of Project Manager	0-30	28	0
Qualifications and experience of Key Personnel assigned to the Project	0-30	28	0
Qualifications, experience and past performance of Proposer	0-20	17	0
Qualifications and past performance of subcontractors	0-20	20	0
Number of other project that all of some of the proposed team and subcontractors have worked together on	0-20	20	0
Familiarity with local conditions	0-20	15	0
Descriptions of past (with in the last 5 years) and ongoing litigations involving proposer and subcontractors	0-20	20	0
<i>Subtotal</i>		183	0

Project Approach (maximum 200 points)

Documentation of understanding of scope of work and requirements	0-40	37	0
Proposer's approach to designing and permitting the Project	0-25	22	0
Proposer's approach to constructing the project	0-25	22	0
Proposer's approach to LEED Certification process	0-10	8	0
Management structures for proposer and subcontractors	0-20	15	0
Proposer's resources, capacity to perform and mobilization plan	0-20	12	0
Quality and sufficiency of staffing plan and organizational structure	0-20	17	0
Project schedule and proposed milestones	0-20	16	0
Proposed quality assurance/quality control program	0-20	20	0
<i>Subtotal</i>		169	0

Financial Stability (maximum 100 points)

Years Proposer's company has been in business	0-25	20	0
Proposer's net worth and working capital	0-25	20	0
Size of Projects successfully completed in the past 5 years	0-25	25	0
Strength of latest financial statement	0-25	20	0
<i>Subtotal</i>		85	0

Past Performance (reference Verifications) (maximum 100 points)

Responsiveness to problems	0-25	25	0
Projects completed on time and within budget	0-25	25	0
Quality of project	0-25	25	0
Overall satisfaction of Owner	0-25	20	0
<i>Subtotal</i>		95	0

GRAND TOTAL

532 0

Thoughts and Comments:

OCy 1.17.0

Technical Proposal Points

Points

Score

Qualifications/Experience (maximum 200 points)

Proposers Experience in providing proposed services, including demonstrating relevant design/build and LEED Experience

0-40

20 0

Qualifications and experience of Project Manager

0-30

20 0

Qualifications and experience of Key Personnel assigned to the Project

0-30

20 0

Qualifications, experience and past performance of Proposer

0-20

10 0

Qualifications and past performance of subcontractors

0-20

10 0

Number of other project that all of some of the proposed team and subcontractors have worked together on

0-20

12 0

Familiarity with local conditions

0-20

12 0

Descriptions of past (with in the last 5 years) and ongoing litigations involving proposer and subcontractors

0-20

15 0*Subtotal*119 0

Project Approach (maximum 200 points)

Documentation of understanding of scope of work and requirements

0-40

20 0

Proposer's approach to designing and permitting the Project

0-25

15 0

Proposer's approach to constructing the project

0-25

15 0

Proposer's approach to LEED Certification process

0-10

4 0

Management structures for proposer and subcontractors

0-20

10 0

Proposer's resources, capacity to perform and mobilization plan

0-20

10 0

Quality and sufficiency of staffing plan and organizational structure

0-20

14 0

Project schedule and proposed milestones

0-20

12 0

Proposed quality assurance/quality control program

0-20

10 0*Subtotal*110 0

Financial Stability (maximum 100 points)

Years Proposer's company has been in business

0-25

22 0

Proposer's net worth and working capital

0-25

22 0

Size of Projects successfully completed in the past 5 years

0-25

15 0

Strength of latest financial statement

0-25

18 0*Subtotal*77 0

Past Performance (reference Verifications) (maximum 100 points)

Responsiveness to problems

0-25

15 0

Projects completed on time and within budget

0-25

15 0

Quality of project

0-25

10 0

Overall satisfaction of Owner

0-25

10 0*Subtotal*50 0

GRAND TOTAL

356 0

Thoughts and Comments:

OS 1-17-13

Past Performance (Reference Verification): Max. 100 Points

Design-Build Team

	ABC Construction	DN Higgins CDM Smith			Recreational Design Construction C3TS		
	ABC Construction	DN Higgins	DN Higgins CDM	CDM Smith	RDC	C3TS	RDC
COMPANY REFERENCE FOR: Design Build Project? Y/N	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES
Responsiveness to Problems: 0 - 25 points	20	25	25	10	23	8	23
Project Completion On-time/Within Budget: 0 - 25 points	25	23	24	0	23	0	23
Quality of Project: 0 - 25 points	15	20	20	0	17	0	19
Overall Satisfaction of Owner: 0 - 25 points	5	5	20	20	19	11	19
Percentage of Total Scored Points	100	97	99	100	91	76	93
Reference for Design / Construction / both	Build	Build	Design Bid Build	Design	Design Build	Design	Design Build

DESIGN-BUILD TEAM: ABC Construction, Inc.
TEAM COMPANY: ABC Construction, Inc.

Overall Rating	Total Pts Available
65	65

REFERENCE: Miami-Dade General Services Administration
PROJECT: Prototype Branch Library @ International Mall
VALUE: \$3.108M
NAME: Alicia Arguelles, Collections; 786-263-6406

2008

100%

COMMUNICATION

RATING

Extent to which the designated contact person responded to questions, addressed problems, described options, and communicated solutions to all team members.

5

Ability of designated contact person to direct design objectives and produce complete construction documents, accounting for plan revisions due to unknown conditions.

NA

DESIGN

Completeness of Design Documents, with regard to change order frequency.

NA

Level of LEED Certification attained by cooperative team approach to project design.

NA

Ability to incorporate goals & objectives into Design Plans, allowing for review & comment on design progress plans, facilitate communications, reply to inquiries.

NA

Satisfaction regarding completeness of design tasks, permitting, and communication with team members and regulatory agencies, during design & construction phases.

NA

Assess the level at which technical submittals and observation of construction practices were reviewed, for conformance with Design Documents.

NA

CONSTRUCTION

Completeness of construction and delivery of the project, in respect with conformance with the Design Documents and quality of workmanship and materials installation.

5

With regard to on-time delivery & within budget criteria, rate the level of project completion and/or site demolition.

5

Extent to which Contractor performed work & operated equipment safely, kept site clean, provided safety equipment to work force, prevented accidents and reduced injuries.

5

Assess Contractors quality assurance program, ability to direct work crews to complete tasks, prevent mistakes, measure and demonstrate accuracy of construction.

5

Capacity with which Contractor followed the project timeline, met milestone event dates, ordered and received equipment, materials, and efficiently managed the work force.

5

Degree to which Contractor coordinated construction activities to facilitate site work and build-out, directing the workforce and protecting materials.

5

DESIGN-BUILD TEAM: DN Higgins
TEAM COMPANY: DN Higgins

Overall Total Pts
Rating Available
73 75

REFERENCE: City of Key West
PROJECT: Solid Waste Transfer Station 2008-2009
VALUE: \$7.94M
NAME: R.B. Havens; 797-5235; Red Ball, 809-3752

97%

RATING

COMMUNICATION

Extent to which the designated contact person responded to questions, addressed problems, described options, and communicated solutions to all team members. 5

Ability of designated contact person to direct design objectives and produce complete construction documents, accounting for plan revisions due to unknown conditions. 5

DESIGN

Completeness of Design Documents, with regard to change order frequency. NA

Level of LEED Certification attained by cooperative team approach to project design. NA

Ability to incorporate goals & objectives into Design Plans, allowing for review & comment on design progress plans, facilitate communications, reply to inquiries. NA

Satisfaction regarding completeness of design tasks, permitting, and communication with team members and regulatory agencies, during design & construction phases. NA

Assess the level at which technical submittals and observation of construction practices were reviewed, for conformance with Design Documents. NA

CONSTRUCTION

Completeness of construction and delivery of the project, in respect with conformance with the Design Documents and quality of workmanship and materials installation. 5

With regard to on-time delivery & within budget criteria, rate the level of project completion and/or site demolition. 5

Extent to which Contractor performed work & operated equipment safely, kept site clean, provided safety equipment to work force, prevented accidents and reduced injuries. 4

Assess Contractors quality assurance program, ability to direct work crews to complete tasks, prevent mistakes, measure and demonstrate accuracy of construction. 5

Capacity with which Contractor followed the project timeline, met milestone event dates, ordered and received equipment, materials, and efficiently managed the work force. 4

Degree to which Contractor coordinated construction activities to facilitate site work and build-out, directing the workforce and protecting materials. 5

DESIGN-BUILD TEAM: DN Higgins CDM Smith
TEAM COMPANY: DN Higgins CDM Smith

Overall Rating	Total Pts Available
89	90

REFERENCE: South FL Water Mangement District
PROJECT: S-650 Lakeside Ranch Pump Station
VALUE: \$6.98M

2010-2012

99%

NAME: John Creswell, P.E., Section Leader
Engineering Construction Bureau; 561-686-8800 x2550

RATING

COMMUNICATION

Extent to which the designated contact person responded to questions, addressed problems, described options, and communicated solutions to all team members.

5

Ability of designated contact person to direct design objectives and produce complete construction documents, accounting for plan revisions due to unknown conditions.

5

DESIGN

Completeness of Design Documents, with regard to change order frequency.

5

Level of LEED Certification attained by cooperative team approach to project design.

NA

Ability to incorporate goals & objectives into Design Plans, allowing for review & comment on design progress plans, facilitate communications, reply to inquiries.

5

Satisfaction regarding completeness of design tasks, permitting, and communication with team members and regulatory agencies, during design & construction phases.

5

Assess the level at which technical submittals and observation of construction practices were reviewed, for conformance with Design Documents.

5

CONSTRUCTION

Completeness of construction and delivery of the project, in respect with conformance with the Design Documents and quality of workmanship and materials installation.

5 +

With regard to on-time delivery & within budget criteria, rate the level of project completion and/or site demolition.

5

Extent to which Contractor performed work & operated equipment safely, kept site clean, provided safety equipment to work force, prevented accidents and reduced injuries.

4

Assess Contractors quality assurance program, ability to direct work crews to complete tasks, prevent mistakes, measure and demonstrate accuracy of construction.

5

Capacity with which Contractor followed the project timeline, met milestone event dates, ordered and received equipment, materials, and efficiently managed the work force.

5

Degree to which Contractor coordinated construction activities to facilitate site work and build-out, directing the workforce and protecting materials.

5

DESIGN-BUILD TEAM: DN Higgins
TEAM COMPANY: CDM Smith

Overall Rating	Total Pts Available
30	30

REFERENCE: Palm Beach County Solid Waste Authority
PROJECT: Solid Waste Authority Operations & Maintenance Building
VALUE: \$2,000,000
NAME: Jack Mesjedec, P.E., BCEE Asst. Director, 561-640-4000

2007-2010

100%

RATING

COMMUNICATION

Extent to which the designated contact person responded to questions, addressed problems, described options, and communicated solutions to all team members.

5

Ability of designated contact person to direct design objectives and produce complete construction documents, accounting for plan revisions due to unknown conditions.

5

DESIGN

Completeness of Design Documents, with regard to change order frequency.

5

Level of LEED Certification attained by cooperative team approach to project design.

5

Ability to incorporate goals & objectives into Design Plans, allowing for review & comment on design progress plans, facilitate communications, reply to inquiries.

5

Satisfaction regarding completeness of design tasks, permitting, and communication with team members and regulatory agencies, during design & construction phases.

5

Assess the level at which technical submittals and observation of construction practices were reviewed, for conformance with Design Documents.

NA

CONSTRUCTION

Completeness of construction and delivery of the project, in respect with conformance with the Design Documents and quality of workmanship and materials installation.

With regard to on-time delivery & within budget criteria, rate the level of project completion and/or site demolition.

Extent to which Contractor performed work & operated equipment safely, kept site clean, provided safety equipment to work force, prevented accidents and reduced injuries.

Assess Contractors quality assurance program, ability to direct work crews to complete tasks, prevent mistakes, measure and demonstrate accuracy of construction.

Capacity with which Contractor followed the project timeline, met milestone event dates, ordered and received equipment, materials, and efficiently managed the work force.

Degree to which Contractor coordinated construction activities to facilitate site work and build-out, directing the workforce and protecting materials.

DESIGN-BUILD TEAM: Recreational Design & Construction, Inc.
TEAM COMPANY: Recreational Design & Construction, Inc.

Overall Rating 82 Total Pts Available 90

REFERENCE: City of Miami

PROJECT: Grapeland Heights Park Complex & Community Center 2005

VALUE: \$32 M

NAME: Robert Fenton, Sr. Project Manager; 305-416-1002

91%

RATING

COMMUNICATION

Extent to which the designated contact person responded to questions, addressed problems, described options, and communicated solutions to all team members.

5

Ability of designated contact person to direct design objectives and produce complete construction documents, accounting for plan revisions due to unknown conditions.

5

DESIGN

Completeness of Design Documents, with regard to change order frequency.

5

Level of LEED Certification attained by cooperative team approach to project design.

NA

Ability to incorporate goals & objectives into Design Plans, allowing for review & comment on design progress plans, facilitate communications, reply to inquiries.

5

Satisfaction regarding completeness of design tasks, permitting, and communication with team members and regulatory agencies, during design & construction phases.

5

Assess the level at which technical submittals and observation of construction practices were reviewed, for conformance with Design Documents.

5

CONSTRUCTION

Completeness of construction and delivery of the project, in respect with conformance with the Design Documents and quality of workmanship and materials installation.

4

With regard to on-time delivery & within budget criteria, rate the level of project completion and/or site demolition.

4

Extent to which Contractor performed work & operated equipment safely, kept site clean, provided safety equipment to work force, prevented accidents and reduced injuries.

5

Assess Contractors quality assurance program, ability to direct work crews to complete tasks, prevent mistakes, measure and demonstrate accuracy of construction.

5

Capacity with which Contractor followed the project timeline, met milestone event dates, ordered and received equipment, materials, and efficiently managed the work force.

5

Degree to which Contractor coordinated construction activities to facilitate site work and build-out, directing the workforce and protecting materials.

4

DESIGN-BUILD TEAM: Recreational Design & Construction, Inc.
TEAM COMPANY: C3TS

Overall Total Pts
Rating Available
19 25

REFERENCE: Broward County Construction Mgt. Division
PROJECT: Broward County Mass Transit Support Facility 2005
VALUE: \$4,316,721
NAME: Jamil Jaloull, Project Manager; 954-357-5641

76%

COMMUNICATION

RATING

Extent to which the designated contact person responded to questions, addressed problems, described options, and communicated solutions to all team members.

4

Ability of designated contact person to direct design objectives and produce complete construction documents, accounting for plan revisions due to unknown conditions.

4

DESIGN

Completeness of Design Documents, with regard to change order frequency.

4

Level of LEED Certification attained by cooperative team approach to project design.

NA

Ability to incorporate goals & objectives into Design Plans, allowing for review & comment on design progress plans, facilitate communications, reply to inquiries.

4

Satisfaction regarding completeness of design tasks, permitting, and communication with team members and regulatory agencies, during design & construction phases.

3

Assess the level at which technical submittals and observation of construction practices were reviewed, for conformance with Design Documents.

NA

CONSTRUCTION

Completeness of construction and delivery of the project, in respect with conformance with the Design Documents and quality of workmanship and materials installation.

With regard to on-time delivery & within budget criteria, rate the level of project completion and/or site demolition.

Extent to which Contractor performed work & operated equipment safely, kept site clean, provided safety equipment to work force, prevented accidents and reduced injuries.

Assess Contractors quality assurance program, ability to direct work crews to complete tasks, prevent mistakes, measure and demonstrate accuracy of construction.

Capacity with which Contractor followed the project timeline, met milestone event dates, ordered and received equipment, materials, and efficiently managed the work force.

Degree to which Contractor coordinated construction activities to facilitate site work and build-out, directing the workforce and protecting materials.

DESIGN-BUILD TEAM: Recreational Design & Construction, Inc.
TEAM COMPANY: Recreational Design & Construction, Inc.

Overall Total Pts
Rating Available
84 90

REFERENCE: Miami-Dade County

PROJECT: Westwind Lakes Park Environmental Remediation 2008

VALUE: \$2.29M

NAME: Guillermo Pena, Project Manager; 305-755-7914

93%

RATING

COMMUNICATION

Extent to which the designated contact person responded to questions, addressed problems, described options, and communicated solutions to all team members. 5

Ability of designated contact person to direct design objectives and produce complete construction documents, accounting for plan revisions due to unknown conditions. 5

DESIGN

Completeness of Design Documents, with regard to change order frequency. 5

Level of LEED Certification attained by cooperative team approach to project design. NA

Ability to incorporate goals & objectives into Design Plans, allowing for review & comment on design progress plans, facilitate communications, reply to inquiries. 4

Satisfaction regarding completeness of design tasks, permitting, and communication with team members and regulatory agencies, during design & construction phases. 5

Assess the level at which technical submittals and observation of construction practices were reviewed, for conformance with Design Documents. 4

CONSTRUCTION

Completeness of construction and delivery of the project, in respect with conformance with the Design Documents and quality of workmanship and materials installation. 5

With regard to on-time delivery & within budget criteria, rate the level of project completion and/or site demolition. 5

Extent to which Contractor performed work & operated equipment safely, kept site clean, provided safety equipment to work force, prevented accidents and reduced injuries. 5

Assess Contractors quality assurance program, ability to direct work crews to complete tasks, prevent mistakes, measure and demonstrate accuracy of construction. 5

Capacity with which Contractor followed the project timeline, met milestone event dates, ordered and received equipment, materials, and efficiently managed the work force. 4

Degree to which Contractor coordinated construction activities to facilitate site work and build-out, directing the workforce and protecting materials. 4

City of Key West RFP No. 001-13

Design/Build Proposal for Public Transportation Facility

August 2012

Report Dated January 17, 2013

Bid Documents with addendums prepared by City staff with assistance from Chen-Moore and CH2MHill

Roger McVeigh, appointed as Financial and Security Advisor

Role defined in RFP Section 1.6 "Evaluation Criteria, 2. Financial and Security Advisor – reports to the Evaluation Panel on the sufficiency and quality of financial information and creditworthiness, as well as bonding and insurance documentation submitted with a Technical Proposal or Cost Proposal

Amended by Addendum 8: "The Financial/Surety Advisor and the Reference Verifier will perform their duties and submit a recommended score and narrative to the TEB Board Members. The TEB Board Members will each individually assign the score for Financial Stability and Past Performance and may or may not follow the advisor recommendation."

Abbreviations:

RDC = Recreational Design and Construction

DNH = DN Higgins/CDM Smith

ABC = ABC Construction Inc.

My recommended Financial Stability Scoring is as follows:	RDC	DNH	ABC
Year's Proposer's Company has been in business	20	25	20
Proposer's net worth and working capital	15	25	20
Size of projects successfully completed	20	25	15
<u>Strength of latest financial statement</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>20</u>
<u>Total Recommended Points for Financial Stability</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>75</u>

Discussion of Scoring Decisions:

DNH appears to have a slightly longer track record of experience and years in business as demonstrated by the number of years in business and the breadth of their experience and past projects, followed by a shorter tenure and less experience by RDC and ABC, respectively. As a result I have awarded DNH the maximum number of points possible and RDC and ABC approximately 80% of total points reflecting ample history and experience, but less than DNH.

I have ranked the financial strength and credibility by looking to the proposer's financial stability in the level of working capital and net worth and the quality of their financial information as measured by the level of third party assurance provided on the proposer's financial statements. Based upon this, the financial strength of DNH is well above that of RDC and ABC. Furthermore, DNH's financial statements were audited by an independent accounting firm whereas ABC's financial statements were reviewed by an independent accounting firm with full footnote disclosures while RDC's financial statements included only a compilation by an accounting firm with limited disclosures.

I have awarded points for size of projects successfully completed by the relative revenues of each entity included in the latest financial information provided which is obviously limited to recent experience covering only a twelve month period. I would suggest that a TEB member may want to give greater weight to scoring in the Qualifications/Experience section.

Although the financial strength of the latest financial statements of RDC and ABC are comparable, I have scored ABC and RDC at 80% and 60% of available points based upon the level of assurance and quality of financial information provided.

It is important to note that I have not made any conclusions that any or all of the firms are financially strong enough to perform the size of the project that the City of Key West is requesting. The rating points system designed above serves a useful purpose in comparing the financial stability of each of the firms proposing to do the work. It is also important to evaluate whether the firms have or will meet the bonding, surety, and insurance requirements included in the Bid Documents, thereby giving the City of Key West additional assurance that the selected entity will be able to financially meet its obligations under the Bid. It was not possible for me to complete this assessment because of information not available (included in the cost proposal and unopened to this point). I would strongly suggest that the TEB establish as a condition of any recommendation that City Staff confirm that the selected proposer meets all of the Bid requirements with respect to bonding, insurance, and surety.

Respectfully submitted,



1/17/2013

Roger H McVeigh