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: April 8, 2025

TO: Cathy Teftt, Procurement Manager

FROM: Brad Smith

SUBJECT: Recommendation for Award Bid No25-CG00981/CT

Project Name: The Hut Pumping Station Upgrade and Force Main Project

The attached bid received from <u>Deeb Construction & Development Co.</u> 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: | \$3,031 | ,988.04 |
|----|-------|----------|-----|-------|-----|---------|---------|
|----|-------|----------|-----|-------|-----|---------|---------|

| 2. | Reference checks are satisfactory: | ⊠ YES □ NO |
|----|---|---|
| | If no, provide an explanation using the space pro | vided 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.

HCUD and Coastal have determined that the bid pricing information provided by Deeb Construction & Development CO is consistent with current market pricing considering current market volume and contract requirements imposed by Hernando County. Both HCUD and Coastal recommends Deeb Construction & Development CO be selected as the lowest, responsive, responsible bidder for the project.

6. Provide the funding information: Fund <u>4144 Dept 33507</u> Account <u>5626323</u> and Fund <u>4144 Dept 07244</u> Account <u>5626323</u>

Brad Smith Digitally signed by Brad Smith Date: 2025.04.08

Recommendation Approved By: _________ Date: ______

Department Director/Manager

Enclosure: Three reference checks

Technical Evaluation for bid

TECHNICAL EVALUATION FOR BID AWARD

ITB# 25-CG00981/CT

The Hut Pumping Station Upgrade and Force Main Project

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

If the bid is considered reasonable/realistic, provide justification for your conclusion. The bid from DEEB is the lowest of the 6 bidders. The bid was over the Engineers estimate, when you remove the contingency, however a bid analysis was conducted by the EOR. Due to the volatility in the utilities industry, supply and demand pricing is higher. The bids also show the increase with the top 3 bidders.

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

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. The estimate included all aspects needed to complete the project. It was used to see how near the vendor's bid was related to the estimated total cost of the project.

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**.

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?

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. Yes. Three references provided feedback on the contractor indicating that the company performed quality work and that they were satisfied with the results. DEEB received high ratings on all five of the criteria from each reference. In addition, the three references stated that they would contract with DEEB again, which implies that the company does satisfactory work and maintains a good relationship during the job.

E. Provide your overall recommendation on the Recommendation for Award Form. I would recommend DEEB as the contractor based on the positive reviews, their experience rehabilitating pump stations, and their bidding price for the project. DEEB has been contracted numerous times with HCUD as well so there is a great work history.

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-CG00981/CT | BID TITLE: The Hut Pumping Station Upgrade a | and Force Main Project |
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------|
| RESPONDENT: Deeb Construction | <u>on</u> | |
| REFERENCE (Company or Perso | n): Big Bend Water Authority | |
| PHONE #: 352 498 357 | PERSON YOU SPOKE TO: | Mark Reblin |
| 1. Describe the work contract | red by your firm/company. | |
| Septic to sewer conversion | | |
| 2. Was the work completed or | n time? | |
| Yes | | |
| 3. Were you satisfied with the | e final results? | |
| yes | | |
| 4. Did you implement their re | ecommendations? | |
| yes | | |
| 5. Did you encounter any pro | blems? | |
| none | | |
| 6. How would you rate the co | ompany on a scale of 1 to 5 (low to high) on the | following: |
| Professionalism | 4 | |
| Qualifications | 4 | |
| Final Product | 4 | |
| Cooperation | 4 | |
| Reliability | 4 | |
| 7. Would you contract with the | nis company again? | |
| Yes x | No Maybe | _ |
| Reference checked by: | Hunter Newton | Date: 4/8/25 |

REFERENCE CHECK

| BID #: 25-CG00981/CT | BID TITLE: The Hut Pumping Station Upg | grade and Force Main Project |
|--|---|------------------------------|
| RESPONDENT: Deeb Constru | action | |
| REFERENCE (Company or Person) | : Brad Smith HCUD | |
| PHONE #: 352-754-4858 | _PERSON YOU SPOKE TO: Brad Sm | ith |
| 1. Describe the work contracted Contractor installed approx. 38 thousand | l by your firm/company. sand LF of 16" PVC via open cut and di | rectional drill. |
| 2. Was the work completed on t | time? Yes | |
| 3. Were you satisfied with the f | inal results? Yes | |
| 4. Did you implement their reco | ommendations? When they were used as | a cost effective measure |
| 5. Did you encounter any proble | ems? Nothing out of the norm for thus ty | ype of work |
| 6. How would you rate the com | pany on a scale of 1 to 5 (low to high) o | n the following: |
| Professionalism | 5 | |
| Qualifications | 5 | |
| Final Product | 5 | |
| Cooperation | 5 | |
| Reliability | 4 | |
| 7. Would you contract with this | company again? | |
| Yes X | No Maybe _ | |
| Reference checked by: | Hunter Newton | Date: 4/8/25 |

REFERENCE CHECK

| BID #: 25-CG00981/CT | BID TITLE: The Hut Pumping Station Upgrade and Fo | orce Main Project |
|--|---|-------------------|
| RESPONDENT: Deeb | Construction | |
| REFERENCE (Company or Person |): RIPA & Associates | |
| PHONE #: 813-623-677 | 7 PERSON YOU SPOKE TO: | Lori Katzman |
| 1. Describe the work contracte | d by your firm/company. | |
| Deeb is installing offsite utilities. | | |
| 2. Was the work completed on | time? | |
| Work is ongoing and being complet | ted ahead of schedule | |
| 3. Were you satisfied with the | final results? | |
| Work is ongoing and scheduled to b | pe completed in December 2025 | |
| 4. Did you implement their rec Yes | commendations? | |
| 5. Did you encounter any prob Not to date | lems? | |
| 6. How would you rate the con | npany on a scale of 1 to 5 (low to high) on the follo | owing: |
| Professionalism | 5 | |
| Qualifications | 5 | |
| Final Product | Not complete | |
| Cooperation | 5 | |
| Reliability | 5 | |
| 7. Would you contract with thi | s company again? | |
| Yes X | No Maybe | |
| Reference checked by: Hunte | er Newton | Date: 4/4/25 |