



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: May 5, 2026
TO: Gretchen Bechtel, CPPB, FCCM, Contracting Agent II
FROM: Erik Van de Boogaard
CC: Hernando County Fire Rescue
Carla Rossiter-Smith
SUBJECT: Recommendation for Award Bid No. 26-C01265
Project Name: Construction of Fire Station 15

The bid received from Bandes Construction Company, Inc. for the above referenced project/solicitation is has been reviewed, evaluated, and I recommend award. 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), I have completed items 1 through 6 and am returning this award recommendation form with my technical evaluation attached, with approval of Hernando County Fire Rescue.

- 1. Total Contract Bid Price with acceptance of deductive alternates 5, 6, 7 and 8 is: \$ 6,511,800.00
2. Reference checks are satisfactory: [X] 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 [X] YES [] NO
If no, provide a detailed explanation using the space provided below and/or attached to this form.
4. Request Next Bidder? [] YES [X] 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.

Based on pre bid estimates with 11 bids received, the bid is deemed fair and reasonable for the project. The bidders past project history and references indicate their abilities are adequate to perform these services.

Provide the funding information: B110-140-00000-30-52200-566200-13066
B111-141-00000-30-52600-566200-13066

Recommendation Approved By: Erik van de Boogaard Date: May 14, 2026
Department Director/Manager

Enclosure

TECHNICAL EVALUATION FOR BID AWARD

ITB# 26-T01265

ITB Name Construction of Fire Station 15

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.

Eleven bids were received. Upon evaluation Bander is the lowest qualified bidder. The bid is within the general pre-bid estimate for cost.

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

N/A

- B. Was an independent County estimate developed prior to soliciting for the procurement?

Yes, attached email summary outlines expected costs and analysis.

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.

Attached email.

- 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. N/A

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

Review of past performance and types of completed work have provided a reasonable level of comfort in their abilities.

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.

Based on the evaluation of the bidder, award is recommended in the amount of \$6,511,800.00 derived as follows:

Base bid \$6,369,500.00 which includes a \$250,000.00 owner contingency, less deductive alternated 5 thru 8 in the amount of \$107,700.00 for a contract total of ^,511,800.00

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.

BID TABULATION FOR DEDUCTIVES PRICING - 26-C01265 - Construction of Fire Station 15

| Pricing Proposal | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|----------|-----------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Line Item | Description | Quantity | Unit of Measure | Mainstay Construction Services LLC | blackwater construction services | Rycon Construction, Inc. | Bandes Construction Company, Inc | Nabholz Construction Corporation | MVH Construction LLC | Ulloa Management Group, LLC | Wehr Constructors | D.E. Scorpio Corporation | Dinkins Construction LLC | All Phase General Contractors, Inc. | |
| | Base Bid for the Construction of Fire Station #15 as specified. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Owner Contingency - \$250,000 - Requires Owner approval for use. | 1 | LS | \$5,549,923.00 | \$5,744,150.00 | \$6,125,445.00 | \$6,369,500.00 | \$6,362,669.00 | \$6,738,558.63 | \$6,826,000.00 | \$6,965,777.00 | \$7,479,007.00 | \$7,700,000.00 | \$7,862,800.00 | |
| 2 | | 1 | LS | \$250,000.00 | \$250,000.00 | \$250,000.00 | \$250,000.00 | \$250,000.00 | \$250,000.00 | \$250,000.00 | \$250,000.00 | \$250,000.00 | \$250,000.00 | \$250,000.00 | |
| | Total | | | \$5,799,923.00 | \$5,994,150.00 | \$6,375,445.00 | \$6,619,500.00 | \$6,612,669.00 | \$6,988,558.63 | \$7,076,000.00 | \$7,215,777.00 | \$7,729,007.00 | \$7,950,000.00 | \$8,112,800.00 | |
| Alternates Pricing | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Deductive Alternates | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Alternate #5 - Deduct for Exterior Canopy. Includes gutter and downspouts. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 | LS | (\$46,950.00) | (\$23,500.00) | (\$28,882.00) | (\$45,000.00) | (\$24,600.00) | (\$18,446.00) | (\$25,000.00) | (\$73,632.00) | (\$46,950.00) | (\$46,950.00) | (\$23,475.00) | |
| | Alternate #6 - Deduct for plastic laminate casework in lieu of Plyboo in the kitchen. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 | LS | (\$5,500.00) | (\$28,000.00) | (\$5,000.00) | (\$26,000.00) | (\$5,145.00) | (\$26,356.25) | (\$8,000.00) | (\$5,505.00) | (\$38,058.00) | (\$38,058.00) | (\$5,600.00) | |
| | Alternate #7 - Deduct to remove casework in dorms. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 | LS | (\$50,000.00) | (\$44,700.00) | (\$44,000.00) | (\$31,000.00) | (\$55,112.00) | (\$66,325.00) | (\$12,000.00) | (\$51,688.00) | (\$80,471.00) | (\$80,471.00) | (\$16,000.00) | |
| | Alternate #8 - Deduct to remove all panic hardware. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 | LS | No Bid | (\$14,000.00) | (\$150.00) | (\$5,700.00) | (\$5,200.00) | (\$.01) | (\$5,000.00) | \$0.00 | No Bid | (\$.01) | (\$10,000.00) | |
| | Total | | | (\$102,450.00) | (\$110,200.00) | (\$78,032.00) | (\$107,700.00) | (\$90,057.00) | (\$111,127.26) | (\$50,000.00) | (\$130,825.00) | (\$165,479.00) | (\$165,479.01) | (\$55,075.00) | |
| Grand Total (Pricing Proposal Less Deductive Alternatives) | | | | \$5,697,473.00 | \$5,883,950.00 | \$6,297,413.00 | \$6,511,800.00 | \$6,522,612.00 | \$6,877,431.37 | \$7,026,000.00 | \$7,084,952.00 | \$7,563,528.00 | \$7,784,520.99 | \$8,057,725.00 | |

From: [Erik van De Boogaard](#)
To: [Gretchen Bechtel](#)
Subject: FW: New Question Submitted: 26-C01265/GB: Construction of Fire Station 15
Date: Tuesday, February 10, 2026 10:40:00 **AM**

This is a tough one to answer.

Prior to the re-design of this prototype we were at roughly 8.6 million for a same sized facility on Spring Lake Hwy. Several site related items caused this number that are not at US19 and Atlanta, However, the US 19 and Atlanta site have different circumstances.

We took the three bay option and re-designed certain elements to reduce costs and provide it on the US19 and Atlanta site where we originally had a 4 bay option in place that was roughly 11.5 million.

We have not run any new cost estimates in an effort to not spend more money than we already have to this point on these fire stations.

If I take the sq. ft. of the building and apply a \$700 a sq. ft. cost, which I believe is low, and add an emergency traffic signal to the tune of 300K, it puts the project at 5.2 million.

This is a number that I don't think is realistic and more of a hope than anything.

I would be happy if we were able to see bids around 6.3 million, but fully expect to see numbers over 7 mil.

If I take the CPI inflation calculator from the last three bay design we built I come up with 6.7 mil. Add the emergency signal and we can call it 7 mil.

Can we give a range or best to just state 6.5 mil. as a hope that our re-design has effectively lowered costs? Or are we best by stating 7mil.?

Sincerely,
Erik

From: OpenGov Procurement Notifications <procurement-notifications@opengov.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 10, 2026 10:17 AM
To: Erik Van De Boogaard <EVanDeBoogaard@co.hernando.fl.us>
Subject: New Question Submitted: 26-C01265/GB: Construction of Fire Station 15

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

REFERENCE

Reference For (Firm/Company): Bandes Construction Company, Inc.

Company & Person Completing Reference: (Company & First and Last Name of Person Completing this Form):

Company Name: Pinellas County Economic Development

First Name, Last Name: Cynthia Johnson PHONE _____

#: 727-4647445; Email: cyjohnson@pinellas.gov _____

1. Describe the work contracted to firm/company .Pinellas County government contracted with Bandes to construct a 45,000 square foot purposed built incubator/accelerator in St.Petersburg Florida. The public facility intent is to provid, business incubator services to create successful entrepreneurs, foster creation of hightech jobs, and develop new source of technology and manufacturing capabilities by nurturing early stage ventures as they grow and launch their products into the marketplace. This innovate project had a unique design structure and require construction percision and expertise. All of which Bandes exceeded expectations..

2. Was the work completed on time? There were some project delays due to supply chain disruption and County transitions - none of which were predicated on Bandes' performance. In fact, they were accommodating and understanding as we readjusted to the funder's (Federal Govt) timeline and adjustments.

3. Were you satisfied with the final results? Yes, the building is at the epicenter of our Innovation District and serves as a beacon of innovation for other developments.

4. Did you implement their recommendations? Yes. Bandes has gone the extra mile to assist our operator with some recommendations to improve the customer experience and leverage the space at the facility.

5. Did you encounter any problems?None of significance.

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

Professionalism 5 _____

Qualifications 5 _____

Final Product 5 _____

Cooperation 5 _____

Reliability 5 _____

7. Would you contract with this company again?

Ye _____ No _____ Maybe _____

Hernando County Use Only
Reference checked by: _____

Erik van de Zwaard

Date: 5.5.2026

REFERENCE

Reference For (Firm/Company): Bandes Construction Company, Inc.

Company & Person Completing Reference: (Company & First and Last Name of Person Completing this Form):

Company Name: Pasco County Facilities C&R **Brittany Russell** Digitally signed by
Brittany Russell
Date: 2026.04.16
08:11:02 -04'00'

First Name, Last Name: Brittany Russel, MBA, PMP, Sr. Project Manager

PHONE #: (727) 247-8443 Email: brussell@pascocountyfl.net

1. Describe the work contracted to firm/company.
Construction services for the new 12,000-sq-ft. Wesley Chapel Library. Construction includes an outdoor gathering area, makerspace, reading nooks, and a unique children's reading room.
2. Was the work completed on time?
Yes, the work was completed on time.
3. Were you satisfied with the final results?
Yes, we were satisfied with the final result of the building.
4. Did you implement their recommendations?
Yes, we implemented their recommendations.
5. Did you encounter any problems?
The problems that were encountered were design issues that Bandes was able to identify and provide feasible solutions to correct.
6. How would you rate the company on a scale of 1 to 5 (low to high) on the following:

| | |
|-----------------|----------|
| Professionalism | <u>5</u> |
| Qualifications | <u>5</u> |
| Final Product | <u>5</u> |
| Cooperation | <u>5</u> |
| Reliability | <u>5</u> |

7. Would you contract with this company again?

Yes X No _____ Maybe _____

Hernando County Use Only Erk van de Bogaard Date: 5.5.2026
Reference checked by: _____

