



DEPARTMENT OF PURCHASING AND CONTRACTS

15470 FLIGHT PATH DRIVE ♦ BROOKSVILLE, FLORIDA 34604
P 352.754.4020 ♦ F 352.754.4199 ♦ W www.HernandoCounty.us

DATE: 2025-06-27

TO: Joseph Goulart, Contracting Agent II

FROM: Donald Carey, P.E. *dsc*

SUBJECT: Recommendation for Award Bid No. 25-C01032/JG

Project Name: Ayers Road Stormwater Management Facility-4 Repair and Quality Drive
Pond SE Flume Restoration

The attached bid received from Hartman Civil Construction Co., Inc for the above referenced project/solicitation is submitted for your review, evaluation, and award recommendation. In accordance with the Hernando County Ordinance No. 93.16, Section 2-105 (6) and Purchasing and Contracts Department Policies and Procedures Manual, Procedure No. 130F, Paragraph 3. (D), Policy140I, Paragraph 2(H), please complete items 2 through 6 and return this award recommendation form with your technical evaluation attached, approved by your department director/manager.

1. Total Contract Bid Price is: \$237,388.00

2. Reference checks are satisfactory: ☒ YES ☐ NO

If no, provide an explanation using the space provided below and/or attached to this form.

3. Recommend award as responsive and responsible bidder ☒ YES ☐ NO

If no, provide a detailed explanation using the space provided below and/or attached to this form.

4. Request Next Bidder? ☐ YES ☒ NO

5. Provide a statement that addresses the reason(s) for your recommendation or rejection. Include your basis for determining that pricing is fair and reasonable and that the Bidder has the ability and resources to perform in accordance with the bid terms, conditions and scope.

The bid amount approximates and falls short of the internal engineer's opinion of the cost.

Hartman has well-documented experience successfully constructing projects of similar scope, difficulty, and complexity.

6. Provide the funding information: Fund: 7552; Dept: 09552; Account: 5305263; Project: 112205

Recommendation Approved By: *[Signature]*

Department Director/Manager

Date: *6/27/25*

Enclosure

TECHNICAL EVALUATION FOR BID AWARD

ITB# 25-C01032/JG

Ayers Road Stormwater Management Facility-4 Repair and Quality Drive Pond SE Flume Restoration

This document has been developed to facilitate your evaluation. Your evaluation should be limited to the attached. **Purchasing will ensure that all documents required by the solicitation are contained for evaluation.** This documentation will be included with the bid submitted for evaluation. Bids that are determined non-responsive by the Purchasing Division will not be submitted to you for evaluation. Please note that you should focus your attention on the areas contained within this document. Your evaluation will be a major consideration as to the responsiveness and/or responsibility of a bidder.

- A. Is the amount of the bid reasonable and realistic for the services to be performed or the item or equipment to be purchased? Yes. The bid amount approximates and falls short of the EOC the internal cost.

If the bid is considered reasonable/realistic, provide justification for your conclusion.

If you consider the bid to be unreasonable and/or unrealistic, please explain in detail.

- B. Was an independent County estimate developed prior to soliciting for the procurement? Yes. The County's internal cost estimate was given significant weight in evaluating this bid.

If affirmative, submit this estimate with your evaluation in the same format as the bid schedule and describe the extent the estimate was used in the analysis of the bid.

- C. Do the resources (manpower, equipment, supplies, etc.) proposed by the bidder meet the minimum requirements, if any, established by the solicitation? Yes.

If minimums were not identified in the solicitation, you may request information on proposed resources from the bidder **through Purchasing.**

TECHNICAL EVALUATION FOR BID AWARD

Page 2

When specific types and quantities of equipment are required to meet minimum standards, the bidder may address this requirement by providing purchasing with a pro-forma invoice with confirmation from a bank or lending institution to the effect that they are prepared to finance the lease or purchase of equipment necessary to perform the services if the bidder is awarded the contract.

D. Does the bidder have a satisfactory record of performance? **Yes.**

At a minimum, the bidder's record on previous county contracts must be considered and an attempt must be made to contact all references. The reference form attached is to be used for your documentation of your reference check. If references cannot be contacted, the Department shall contact Purchasing for additional references. Purchasing shall request from the bidder in writing of this fact and inform that the reference must contact the project person within two business days or it will negatively impact the evaluation the bid.

E. Provide your overall recommendation on the Recommendation for Award Form.

Note: At no time will the user/project person/bid evaluator discuss responsiveness, responsibility or withdrawal from the bidding process with any bidder. Moreover, it is strictly prohibited for any County representative involved in the bidding process to attempt to negotiate bids, influence or otherwise impact the business decisions of a bidder.

REFERENCE CHECK

BID #:25-C01032/JG **BID TITLE:** Ayers Road Stormwater Management Facility-4 Repair and Quality Drive Pond SE Flume Restoration

RESPONDENT: Hartman Civil Construction Co, Inc

REFERENCE (Company or Person): FDOT; Frank Kelch

PHONE #: (352) 459-2049 (KM) PERSON YOU SPOKE TO: Karen Madrid

1. Describe the work contracted by your firm/company.

Pond retrofit

2. Was the work completed on time?

Yes

3. Were you satisfied with the final results?

Yes

4. Did you implement their recommendations?

yes

5. Did you encounter any problems?

There was only one: slow paper work

6. How would you rate the company on a scale of 1 to 5 (low to high) on the following:

Professionalism 4.5

Qualifications n/a

Final Product 4.5

Cooperation 4

Reliability 4

7. Would you contract with this company again?

Yes ☒ No ☐ Maybe ☐

Reference checked by: Donald Carer Date: 2025-06-20

Please Print and Sign

Company Name and Title if not completed by Hernando County Personnel

REFERENCE CHECK

BID #:25-C01032/JG **BID TITLE:** Ayers Road Stormwater Management Facility-4 Repair and Quality Drive Pond SE Flume Restoration

RESPONDENT: Hartman Civil Construction Co, Inc

REFERENCE (Company or Person): Burrell Engineering

PHONE #: (352) 489-4144 PERSON YOU SPOKE TO: Tray Burrell

1. Describe the work contracted by your firm/company.

water line company ibcs
road/site work on 2 subdivisions in Citrus County

2. Was the work completed on time?

Yes

3. Were you satisfied with the final results?

Yes

4. Did you implement their recommendations?

probably

5. Did you encounter any problems?

no

6. How would you rate the company on a scale of 1 to 5 (low to high) on the following:

Professionalism	<u>4</u>
Qualifications	<u>5</u>
Final Product	<u>5</u>
Cooperation	<u>5</u>
Reliability	<u>4</u>

7. Would you contract with this company again?

Yes ☒

No ☐

Maybe ☐

Reference checked by: Donald S. Carey Date: 2025-06-24

Please Print and Sign

Company Name and Title if not completed by Hernando County Personnel

Marion County Board of County Commissioners
Marion County, Florida
Performance Evaluation Form
Final Construction Evaluations

OCT 24 '15 4:12:25

CONTACT INFORMATION

Bid/RFP/RFQ Number	Title	Evaluation Period	
18B-058	Rainbow Springs 5th Replat Stormwater Retrofit DRA 2216	From	To
		Feb 12, 2018	Jun 15, 2019
Vendor Name		Contract Period	
Hartman Civil Construction Co. Inc.		From	To
		Feb 12, 2018	Aug 15, 2018
Service Description			
Retrofit construction of DRA 2216 with Bold & gold.			
Award Amount	Change Orders & Amendments	No. of	Revised Contract Amount
\$154,381.00	5		\$173,208.11

RECOMMENDED FOR FUTURE USE

Recommended for Future Contracts:	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes
	<input type="radio"/> No
State Condition Recommendation:	<input type="radio"/> Conditional
Overall Rating:	<input type="radio"/> 5-Excellent (4.50 - 5.00) <input type="radio"/> 4-Good (3.20 - 4.49) <input checked="" type="radio"/> 3-Fair (2.60 - 3.19) 3.0 <input type="radio"/> 2-Poor (1.81 - 2.59) <input type="radio"/> 1-Unsatisfactory (1.0 - 1.8)
This project ran past substantial and final completion dates. There were heavy rains experienced throughout the project, DRA sat multiple lengthy times with water in bottom, contract had dewatering item.	

COUNTY CONTACT INFORMATION

Project Manager:	Using Director/Supervisor:	Procurement Representative:
Gail Mowry, PE/J.R. Gorentz	Tracy Straub, PE, County Engineer	Sue Moreland

EVALUATION CRITERIA

This evaluation provides an indication of the vendor's ability to implement a practical, accurate, complete and cost conscious project. For each item, please provide a numerical score from 1 to 5, in accordance to the performance rating scale. Select N/A if the criteria does not apply to this evaluation. Reviewer comments must be entered for a rating of 1, 2 or 5. Minimum passing score is 2.60. The following scale is used to rank the level of contributions made by the vendor to the project.

5 - Excellent Performance: Project had no time or cost impacts related to vendor's performance;

4 - Good Performance: Project had some minor issues which the vendor aggressively pursued to resolve and there were minor time or cost impacts related to the contractor's performance;

3 - Fair Performance: Project had some issues which the vendor pursued to resolve and that resulted in acceptable time and/or cost impacts;

2 - Poor Performance: Project had several issues which the vendor provided limited assistance to resolve and that resulted in significant time and cost impacts;

1 - Unsatisfactory Performance: Project had multiple, significant issues which the vendor provided no assistance to resolve and that resulted in substantial time and cost impacts.

A) Project Management	Section Score:
Evaluation Questions	Unsatisfactory Excellent
1. How well did the vendor cooperate with the Contract Administrator, other County personnel and the consultant?	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5 <input type="radio"/> NA

2. How closely did vendor conform with specifications, drawings and other requirement?	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	<input type="radio"/> NA
3. How appropriate was the staff assigned to do the work to ensure a quality product on a timely basis?	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	<input type="radio"/> NA
4. How actively did the vendor communicate with sub-vendors and others involved in project?	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	<input type="radio"/> NA
5. How adequate and effective was the vendor's coordination and control of sub-vendors' work and documentation?	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	<input type="radio"/> NA
6. How pro-actively did the vendor participate in the resolution of disputes?	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	<input type="radio"/> NA
7. How timely were the notices of inspection requests?	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	<input type="radio"/> NA
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?	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	<input type="radio"/> NA
9. How clean did the vendor keep the work site on a continuous basis?	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	<input type="radio"/> NA

B) Business Practices	Section Score:
------------------------------	-----------------------

Evaluation Questions	Unsatisfactory	Excellent
1. How was the vendor's compliance with the United States Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and Marion 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.	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	<input type="radio"/> NA
2. How well did the vendor manage business relationships with sub-vendors by ensuring that sub-vendors were fully paid for work that had been completed to specifications? (This information can be verified through sub-vendor complaints or liens for non-payment)	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	<input type="radio"/> NA
3. How well did the vendor manage business relationships with sub-vendors by ensuring that sub-vendors were promptly paid?	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	<input type="radio"/> NA
4. How well did the vendor follow Marion County procedure in reporting changes of sub vendors?	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	<input type="radio"/> NA
Comments:		
Vendor worked safe and all release of liens were submitted prior to final payment.		

C) Cost Control	Section Score:
------------------------	-----------------------

Evaluation Questions	Unsatisfactory	Excellent
1. 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 time basis?	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	<input checked="" type="radio"/> NA
2. How actively did the vendor participate in overcoming problems with other vendors, building officials and/or regulatory agencies?	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	<input checked="" type="radio"/> NA
Comments:		

D) Timeliness	Section Score:
----------------------	-----------------------

Evaluation Questions	Unsatisfactory	Excellent
1. How well did the vendor manage delivery of necessary equipment and material for the project?	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	<input type="radio"/> NA
2. How timely and accurate were payment requests when submitted?	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	<input type="radio"/> NA
3. How well did the vendor meet the schedule of deliverable's established at the beginning of the project?	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	<input type="radio"/> NA
4. How well did the vendor conform to schedule of work progress in order to meet the planned completion dates for Phase Completion?	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	<input checked="" type="radio"/> NA

5. How well did the vendor conform to schedule of work progress in order to meet the planned completion dates for Substantial Completion? ☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ NA
6. How well did the vendor conform to schedule of work progress in order to meet planned completion dates for Final Completion? ☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ NA
7. How effectively did the vendor communicate with the Contract Administrator and other County personnel as well as the consultant? ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☒ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ NA

Comments:

Project had frequent rain delays, contractor did not dewater until this item was renegotiated which took the project past substantial completion and final project completion dates. This was a grant project.

E) Change Order Management

Section Score:

Evaluation Questions

Unsatisfactory

Excellent

1. Did the vendor provide independent estimates of the value of changes? ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☒ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ NA
2. How accurate and timely were the preliminary estimates of the value of change orders/amendments provided by the vendor? ☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ NA
3. How accurate and timely were change orders/amendments processed with proper documentation? ☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ NA
4. How fair and timely did the vendor prepare, negotiate and make recommendations to the County regarding change orders/amendments? ☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ NA
5. How appropriate were the vendor's recommendations for time extensions based on the actual circumstances and reviewed against the contract requirements? ☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ NA

Comments:

Contractor requested additional time added to the contract, rain days were added but additional days beyond that were not granted. Project stalled while pond had sitting water rather than being dewatered.

F) Quality of Work

Section Score:

Evaluation Questions

Unsatisfactory

Excellent

1. How accessible was the work for inspection? ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☒ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ NA
2. How close were the equipment and materials to the specifications? ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☒ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ NA
3. How responsive and competent were superintendents, supervisors and workers? ☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ NA

Comments:

Project ran over, cooperation improved at the end to finish the project.

G) Project Closeout

Section Score:

Evaluation Questions

Unsatisfactory

Excellent

1. How well did the project meet specified standards when inspected? ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☒ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ NA
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? ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ NA
3. How clean did the vendor leave the work-site by completely disposing of debris in a legal manner? ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☒ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ NA
4. How accurate and timely were the vendor's final project accounting documents sent to Marion County Board of County Commissioners? ☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ NA

Comments:

Reminded repeatedly to submit final and retainage invoices.