Instructions for Construction Bid Evaluations Effective January 1, 2015

1. Read and become knowledgeable of the requirements of Columbus City Code section 329 as it pertains to construction advertising, evaluation, and contracting.

Here is a link to City Code

As of 1/23/15, Municode is not up to date with the new code language for Section 329.

Referer to the attachment in Ord. 2612-2014 until Municode is updated

- 2. Enter information into the cells that are blank and grey. Do not enter info to cells that are blank and white as there may be a formula in that cell.
- 3. If you have questions about using the spreadsheet, contact Suzanna Gussler or Alex Cofield.
- 4. If you print the workbook in its entirety from the print screen as opposed to printing each worksheet separately ("active sheets"), you will print this page and the evaluation will begin on page 2 and go through page 13. If you print each workbook separately, the page numbering is different.

version: February 27, 2015

| PROJECT: | 2015 General Co | nstruction Contract | Bid Date: | May 6 |
|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------|-------|
| Department/Division: | Public Utilities | Initial Apparer | George J. Ig | |
| Section: | Sewerage & Drainage | Initial Appare | \$ | |

| | Bids from Appare | nt lowest to highest: | Apparent Low | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th |
|----------------------|------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| CIP No. | 650745-100007 | | COMPANY NAME | COMPANY NAME | COMPANY NAME | COMPANY NAME | COMPANY NAME |
| | | | | | | | Complete |
| | | | | | | | General |
| | | | George J. Igel & | Conie | John Eramo & | The Righter Co., | Construction |
| Project Manager: | Mark Timbrook | | Co., Inc | Construction Co. | Sons, Inc. | Inc. | Compamy |
| Engineer's Estimate: | \$ | 2,330,500.00 | Initial Bid Amount | Initial Bid Amount | Initial Bid Amount | Initial Bid Amount | Initial Bid Amount |
| | | | \$ 2,193,215.00 | \$ 2,519,200.00 | \$ 2,578,625.00 | \$ 2,778,450.00 | \$ 2,854,675.00 |
| | | 14.86% | 2.36% | 7.75% | 2.74% | -100.00% | |

| PART IA: Responsiveness Criteria, General Provisions (329.20) | | INPUT "YES" F | OR POSITIVE RESPONS | E OR "NO" FOR NEGAT | IVE RESPONSE (all "yes | " answers needed for r |
|---|--|---------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| а | The bidder is pre-qualified responsible or prequalified provisionally responsible at time of bid due date. (329.20)(c) | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| b | The bid contains the full name of every person or company interested in the same and such other relevant information as the city agency deems appropriate. (329.20)(g) FORM B1 | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| С | The bidder submitted , with bid, an affidavit stating: (1) That as of the date of bid submission, there have been no changes in the information disclosed in its application for responsibility prequalification; or (2) That changes in the information disclosed in the bidder's application for responsibility prequalification have been reported to director of finance and management or designee and that the bidder is still prequalified responsible or provisionally responsible. (329.20)(d) FORM B10 | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| d | There is no evidence of collusion among the bidders. (329.20)(e) | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| | BID IS: | RESPONSIVE | RESPONSIVE | RESPONSIVE | RESPONSIVE | RESPONSIVE |

| | ROJECT: | 2015 General Co | nstruction Contra | ct | Bid l | Date: | May 6 |
|------------------|--|--|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | |
| Departm | ent/Division: | Public Utilities | | | nt Low Bidder: | | George J. Ig |
| Section: | | Sewerage & Drainage | | Initial Appare | ent Low Bid : | | \$ |
| | | Bids from Apparent lowest to highest: | Apparent Low | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th |
| CIP No. | | 650745-100007 | COMPANY NAME | COMPANY NAME | COMPANY NAME | COMPANY NAME | COMPANY NAME |
| O II 1101 | | | | | | | Complete |
| | | | | | | | General |
| | | | George J. Igel & | Conie | John Eramo & | The Righter Co., | Construction |
| Project N | Manager: | Mark Timbrook | Co., Inc | Construction Co. | Sons, Inc. | Inc. | Compamy |
| | r's Estimate: | \$ 2,330,500.00 | Initial Bid Amount | Initial Bid Amount | Initial Bid Amount | Initial Bid Amount | Initial Bid Amount |
| g | <u> </u> | + <u>=</u> jecejeceice | \$ 2,193,215.00 | \$ 2,519,200.00 | \$ 2,578,625.00 | \$ 2,778,450.00 | \$ 2,854,675.00 |
| PART IR: | Responsiveness C | riteria, Subcontractors (329.20) | INPLIT "YFS" F | OR POSITIVE RESPONS | F OR "NO" FOR NEGAT | IVE RESPONSE (all "yes | " answers needed for r |
| | | ed a list of subcontractors with bid or indicated | 0. 120 | | | | |
| а | there were not any | subcontracting opportunities. (329.20)(h)(1) FORM | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| b | subcontractors are | ubcontractors are listed, Bidder indicated which elicensed construction trade subcontractors. RM B6 (If no licensed trade subcontractors are | NA | NA | YES | NA | NA |
| С | qualified responsib | ubcontractors are listed, the bidder proposed pre- ple or provisionally responsible licensed trade 29.20)(h) (If no licensed trade subcontractors are | NA | NA | YES | NA | NA |
| d | work to be subcon | more than one subcontractor for each portion of tracted. (329.20)(h)(5) FORM B6 | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| e | trade subcontractor responsible. (329. | affidavit, that its proposed licensed construction or are pre-qualified responsible or provisionally 20)(h)(3) Form B10 (If no licensed trade re listed, enter "NA") | NA | NA | YES | NA | NA |
| f | Bidder did not bid | subcontractors who were currently suspended or ty. (329.20)(h)(4) (see links on Tab 5) | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| | | BID IS: | RESPONSIVE | RESPONSIVE | RESPONSIVE | RESPONSIVE | RESPONSIVE |
| DART IC: | Resnonsiveness C | riteria, Bid Specific (329.23) | INDUT "VES" E | OR POSITIVE PESDONS | F OR "NO" FOR NEGAT | IVE RESPONSE (all "yes | " answers needed for |
| a | Bidder did not sub | omit more than one bid for same work. (See ection for full text.) (329.23)(f)(1)(a) | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |

TAB I: Assessing Responsiveness

respond to the bid documents. (329.23)(f)(1)(j)

| ., | , toocooming it | | | | | | |
|-------------|---|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------|
| version: Fe | bruary 27, 2015 | | | | | | |
| PR | OJECT: | 2015 General Co | nstruction Contra | ct | Bid I | Date: | May 6 |
| Departme | ent/Division: | Public Utilities | | Initial Apparei | nt Low Bidder: | | George J. Ig |
| Section: | | Sewerage & Drainage | | Initial Appar | ent Low Bid : | | \$ |
| | | Bids from Apparent lowest to highest: | Apparent Low | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | Sth |
| CIP No. | | 650745-100007 | COMPANY NAME |
| | | | George J. Igel & | Conie | John Eramo & | The Righter Co., | Complete General Construction |
| Project N | | Mark Timbrook | Co., Inc | Construction Co. | Sons, Inc. | Inc. | Compamy |
| Engineer | 's Estimate: | \$ 2,330,500.00 | Initial Bid Amount |
| | Didden colonovdo | dred added a (200 22)/D(A)/a) DID CIONATUDE | \$ 2,193,215.00 | \$ 2,519,200.00 | \$ 2,578,625.00 | \$ 2,778,450.00 | \$ 2,854,675.00 |
| b | PAGE, page 2 | dged addenda. (329.23)(f)(1)(e) BID SIGNATURE | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| С | Bidder complied | with technical pre-qualification cification requirements where applicable. | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| d | The bid contains invitation for bid. (| no conditions or qualifications not provided in the 329.23)(f)(1)(d) | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| е | Bidder added no (329.23)(f)(1)(f) | provisions reserving right to accept or reject award. | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| f | Bidder submitted B3 | a bid guarantee. (329.23)(f)(1)(i) FORM B2, FORM | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| g | Bidder did not su FORM B2, FORM | bmit an irregular bid guarantee. (329.23)(f)(1)(i) | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| h | Bid prices are mai | terially balanced. (329.23)(f)(1)(b) FORM B4 | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| i | | regularities or deviations from the bid that affect bid (f)(1)(j) and (329.23)(f)(1)(e) | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| j | (329.23)(f)(1)(g) I "NA") | a unit price for each contract item listed, if required. FORM B4 (If a unit price is not an option, enter | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| k | | a lump sum price if required. (329.23)(f)(1)(h) p sum is not an option, enter "NA") | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| I | Bidder has comp (329.23)(f)(1)(k) F | lied with section 329.20(h) regarding subcontractors. FORM B6 | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| m | | tain alterations, ommissions, errors, such that it does | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |

YES

YES

YES

YES

YES

version: February 27, 2015

| version: February 27, 2015 | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|---------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| PROJECT: | 2015 General Co | nstruction Contra | ct | Bid I | Date: | May 6 | |
| Department/Division: | Public Utilities | | Initial Apparent Low Bidder: | | | | |
| Section: | Sewerage & Drainage | | Initial Appar | ent Low Bid : | | \$ | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Bids from Apparent lowest to highest: | Apparent Low | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | |
| CIP No. | 650745-100007 | COMPANY NAME | COMPANY NAME | COMPANY NAME | COMPANY NAME | COMPANY NAME | |
| | | | | | | Complete | |
| | | | | | | General | |
| | | George J. Igel & | Conie | John Eramo & | The Righter Co., | Construction | |
| Project Manager: | Mark Timbrook | Co., Inc | Construction Co. | Sons, Inc. | Inc. | Compamy | |
| Engineer's Estimate: | \$ 2,330,500.00 | Initial Bid Amount | Initial Bid Amount | Initial Bid Amount | Initial Bid Amount | Initial Bid Amount | |
| | | \$ 2,193,215.00 | \$ 2,519,200.00 | \$ 2,578,625.00 | \$ 2,778,450.00 | \$ 2,854,675.00 | |
| n Bid responds to (329.23)(f)(1)(e) | bid documents in all material respects. | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | |
| o Bid is complete. (| 329.23)(f)(1)(e) | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | |
| | BID IS: | RESPONSIVE | RESPONSIVE | RESPONSIVE | RESPONSIVE | RESPONSIVE | |
| | | | | | | | |
| PART ID: Responsiveness C | | INPUT "YES | " FOR POSITIVE RESPO | NSE OR "NO" FOR NEG | ATIVE RESPONSE (all " | yesses" needed for res | |
| | ctor is not currently debarred from doing business are or more fo the following: the city, state, or federal selinks on Tab 5) | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | |
| | BID IS: | RESPONSIVE | RESPONSIVE | RESPONSIVE | RESPONSIVE | RESPONSIVE | |
| | | | | | | | |
| PART IE: Responsiveness C | riteria, Contract Compliance | A "no" answer in Pa | rt IE will not necessarily | | oonsive. Bidder must h | ave a valid contract co | |
| The "Evaluated L | ow Bidder" has an active contract compliance | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | |
| number at the tim | e of bid. | 120 | 120 | 120 | 120 | 120 | |
| | | Bid Responsive, | Bid Responsive, | Bid Responsive, | Bid Responsive, | Bid Responsive, | |
| Bid Re | sponsivness, Waiver Considerations: | Continue to Part II | Continue to Part II | Continue to Part II | Continue to Part II | Continue to Part II | |
| | Proceed to Part II? | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | |
| | | | 1 | | | | |
| L | OWEST RESPONSIVE BID, TAB I | \$ 2,193,215.00 | \$ | Manually Enter Amou | nt | | |
| | | , , , , , , , , , , , , , | | | | | |

version: February 27, 2015

| PROJE | ECT: | 2015 General Co | Bid l | May 6 | | | | |
|-----------------|---------|--|--------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--|
| Department/Div | vision: | Public Utilities | | Initial Apparer | nt Low Bidder: | | George J. Ig | |
| Section: | | Sewerage & Drainage | | Initial Appare | ent Low Bid : | | \$ | |
| | | Bids from Apparent lowest to highest: | Apparent Low | Apparent Low 2nd 3rd 4th | | | | |
| CIP No. | | 650745-100007 | COMPANY NAME | COMPANY NAME | COMPANY NAME | COMPANY NAME | COMPANY NAME | |
| | | | | | | | Complete | |
| | | | | | | | General | |
| | | | George J. Igel & | Conie | John Eramo & | The Righter Co., | Construction | |
| Project Manage | er: | Mark Timbrook | Co., Inc | Construction Co. | Sons, Inc. | Inc. | Compamy | |
| Engineer's Esti | imate: | \$ 2,330,500.00 | Initial Bid Amount | Initial Bid Amount | Initial Bid Amount | Initial Bid Amount | Initial Bid Amount | |
| | | | \$ 2,193,215.00 | \$ 2,519,200.00 | \$ 2,578,625.00 | \$ 2,778,450.00 | \$ 2,854,675.00 | |
| - | LOW | LOWEST RESPONSIVE BIDDER, TAB I George J. Igel | | | Manually Enter Inform | nation | | |

| 004= | | |
|--------|--|--|
| . 2015 | | |
| , ZUIS | | |
| , | | |

el & Co., Inc 2,193,215.00

6th

COMPANY NAME

Initial Bid Amount

esponsive bid)

| - | | |
|---|--|--|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

el & Co., Inc 2,193,215.00

| 6th | |
|---------|------|
| COMPANY | NAME |

Initial Bid Amount

esponsive bid)

esponsive bid)

, 2015

el & Co., Inc 2,193,215.00

6th **COMPANY NAME Initial Bid Amount**

el & Co., Inc 2,193,215.00

6th

COMPANY NAME

Initial Bid Amount

onsive bid)

npliance no. prior to

Waiver Legislation Required to Contract; Contact Fiscal Office , 2015

el & Co., Inc 2,193,215.00

6th

COMPANY NAME

Initial Bid Amount

TAB II: Assessing Responsibility

| PR | OJECT: | 2015 General Construction Contract Bid Date: | | | | Date: | May 6 | , 2015 | | |
|------------|--|--|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|--|--|
| Departme | ent/Division: | Public Utilities | Responsive Low Bidder (from Tab I): | | | | | J. Igel | | |
| Section: | | Sewerage & Drainage | | Responsive Low | | \$ | 2,193,215.00 | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| CIP No. | | 650745-100007 | COMPANY NAME | COMPANY NAME | COMPANY NAME | COMPANY NAME | COMPANY NAME | COMPANY NAME | | |
| | | | | | | | General | | | |
| Duois at M | lawawaw. | Mark Timbrook | George J. Igel & | Conie Construction Co. | John Eramo & | The Righter Co., Inc. | Construction | NA | | |
| Project M | 's Estimate: | \$ 2,330,500.00 | Co., Inc | Initial Bid Amount | Sons, Inc. Initial Bid Amount | Initial Bid Amount | Compamy Initial Bid Amount | Initial Bid Amount | | |
| Liigiiieei | 3 L3tilliate. | 2,330,300.00 | \$ 2,193,215.00 | \$ 2,519,200.00 | \$ 2,578,625.00 | \$ 2,778,450.00 | \$ 2,854,675.00 | 0 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| DADT IIA | 200 02 (0) D | Lille. Oderal. | INIDALE III | VECT FOR POSITIVE PER | DONICE OR UNIOU FOR N | CATIVE DECRONGE (4 | : | | | |
| PARTIIA: 3 | 329.23 (2) Responsi | nonstrated to the city's satisfaction an adequate and | INPUT | YES" FOR POSITIVE RES | PONSE OR "NO" FOR N | EGATIVE RESPONSE (1) | point for each "yes", 0 f | or "no") | | |
| а | | NG CAPACITY for the project. FORM B2, FORM | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | | | |
| b | | ant (as compared to other bids) no further sided (i.e., bid statistically comparable to others). | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | | | |
| С | | nonstrated to the city's satisfaction adequate and ALIZED EQUIPMENT for the project. FORM B7, | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | | | |
| d | | nonstrated to the city's satisfaction adequate and N RESOURCES for the project. FORM B7, | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | | | |
| е | The bidder has acti | ively engaged in the construction industry. FORM | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | | | |
| f | | perience in the area of construction service for which ubmitted. FORM B8 | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | | | |
| g | The bidder has a si completion deadling | uccessful record of complying with and meeting es. FORM B8 | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | | | |
| h | The bidder has a si construction project | uccessful record of controlling costs on similar ts. FORM B8 | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | | | |
| i | The bidder has no success of the proj | (substantial) uncompleted work that would hinder the ect. FORM B9 | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | | | |
| | | Responsibility Score: | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 0 | | |
| DART IIP: | Pagnangihility Crit | eria - Serious, Willful OSHA Violations | INDUT " | VES" FOR BOSITIVE BES | DONSE OR "NO" FOR N | EGATIVE RESPONSE /1 | point for each "yes", 0 f | or "no") | | |
| a a | The bidder has no | serious or willful OSHA violations. (See link in Tab | YES | YES YES | YES | YES | NO | oi 110) | | |
| _ | 5) | Responsibility Score: | 1 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 0 | 0 | | |
| | | Total Responsibility Score: | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 0 | | |

Manually Enter Information

Continue to TAB 3?

TAB III. Assessing Local Bidder

| PROJECT: 2015 General Co | | | onstruction Contract | | | | Bid I | Date: | May 6, 2015 | | |
|---|--|--|-------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|-------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|--|
| TROOLOT. | | 2015 General Co | act Biu bate. | | | | IVIAY 0, 2015 | | | | |
| Department/Division: Public Utilities | | | | | | | er (from Tabs I and II): | | George J. Igel | | |
| Section: Sewerage & Drainage | | | | Evaluated Low Bid (f | | | (from Tabs I and II) : | | \$ | 2,193,215.00 | |
| 012.11 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CIP No. 650745-100007 | | | COM | PANY NAME | COMPANY NA | ME | COMPANY NAME | COMPANY NAME | COMPANY NAME | COMPANY NAME | |
| | | | 6 | 0 | Camia | | Jahn France O | The Diebter Co | Complete | | |
| Project Manager: Mark Timbrook | | | | ge J. Igel & | Conie Construction Co. | | John Eramo & Sons, Inc. | The Righter Co., Inc. | General Construction | NA | |
| _ | anager: s Estimate: | Mark Timbrook \$ 2,330,500.00 | Co., Inc | | | | Bid Amount | Bid Amount | Bid Amount | Bid Amount | |
| Engineer | s Estimate: | \$ 2,330,300.00 | Bid Amount \$ 2,193,215.00 | | Bid Amount \$ 2,519,200.00 | | \$ 2,578,625.00 | \$ 2,778,450.00 | \$ 2,854,675.00 | NA | |
| PART III: 32 | 29.(01)(u) and 329.2 | 12 Local Bidder | , | 2,133,213.00 | ÿ 2,313,20 | 0.00 | 3 2,378,023.00 | 3 2,778,430.00 | 3 2,854,075.00 | IVA | |
| | . ,, , | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | IS BID LOCAL? | | YES | YES | | YES | YES | YES | | |
| To look up i | To look up if a bidder is local, use the Office of Construction Prequalification's list located at | | | | | regua | <u>lification</u> | | | | |
| PART IIIA: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | IF APPARENT | LOW BID IN PART II IS LOCAL STOP. The | ere are n | o additional | | | | | | | |
| | steps on PART III. Continue to TAB IV. | | | | | | | | | | |
| step 1 | IF APPARENT I | LOW BID IN PART II IS NOT LOCAL, CONTINI | | STEP 2 (see | | | | | | | |
| | | above for apparent low bid and bidder information | ation) | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Part IIIB: | 1 | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| step 2 | Percentage differen | Percentage difference of bid from apparent NON-LOCAL, LOW BID. | | 0.000% | 14.863% | | 17.573% | 26.684% | 30.159% | NA | |
| step 3 | Is amount in prior st | Is amount in prior step WITHIN ONE PERCENT (1%) OF THE LOW BID? | | | NO | | NO | NO | NO | NA | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| step 4 | | SEE PROCEDURES ON SHAREPOINT SITE. LOW PROCEDURES FOR BIDDER RELATING TO | | | | | | | | | |
| 5.0p + | | ONS 329.212 (INDICATE IF NA)? | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| step 5 | | MOUNT FOR BIDDER, IF APPLICABLE, OR ZERO | | | | | | | | | |
| | (\$0) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Part IIIC: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| raitino. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| step 6 | REVISED LOW | BID, TAB IIIB: | \$ | 2,193,215.00 | • | | Manually Enter Amoun | t | | | |
| Commod to the | | | | | | | | | | | |
| step 7 REVISED LOW BIDDER, TAB IIIB: George J. Igel, Co., Inc. | | | | | • |) | Manually Enter Inform | ation | | | |
| | | | | IIIC. | | | | | | | |

TAB IV. Calculating Environmental Preference

Manually Enter Amount

| PROJECT: 2015 General Const | | | ruction Contract | | | Bid Date: | | | May 6, 2015 | | , 2015 | |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------|---------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------|------------------------------------|--------------|
| Department/Division: Public Utilities | | | Evaluated Low Bidder (from Tabs I, II and III): | | | | : | | George J. Igel, Co., Inc | | el, Co., Inc. | |
| Section: Sewerage & Drainage | | Evaluated Low Bid (fr | | | from Tabs I, II and III) : | | | \$ | | 2,193,215 | | |
| CIP No. | | 650745-100007 | 1 | COMPANY NAME | COMPANY NAME | С | OMPANY NAME | С | COMPANY NAME | C | OMPANY NAME | COMPANY NAME |
| Project M | lanager: | Mark Timbrook | (| George J. Igel & Co., Inc | Conie Construction Co. | J | ohn Eramo & Sons, Inc. | TI | he Righter Co., Inc. | C | General Construction Compamy | NA |
| Engineer' | 's Estimate: | \$ | 2,330,500.00 | Bid Amount | Bid Amount \$ 2,519,200.00 | \$ | Bid Amount | Ĺ | Bid Amount | Ś | Bid Amount | Bid Amount |
| PART IV: 3 | 329.(17) Environmenta | I Preference | | \$ 2,193,215.00 | \$ 2,519,200.00 | Þ | 2,578,625.00 | \$ | 2,778,450.00 | ş | 2,854,675.00 | NA |
| Арр | arent Low Bid: | \$ | 2,193,215.00 | Apparent Low Bidder: | George J. Iç | gel, C | Co., Inc. | | | | | |
| DADT IV. 2 | 329.(17) Environmenta | I Proforence | | | | | | _ | | _ | | |
| step 1 | Did apparent/evaluate | ed low bidder submit "envi | ronmentally preferable" bid? Answer other bidder's, input "NA" | YES | YES | | YES | | YES | | YES | |
| step 2 | Excluding apparent bid? | low bidder, did bidder s | ubmit "environmentally preferable" | | YES | | YES | | YES | | YES | |
| step 3 | bid, then the apparent in Steps 4-6, complete | Vevaluated low bidder is le e Step 7, and proceed to 7 ted low bidder did not sub | ted an environmentally preferable ead bidder for Tab 4. Ignore the data Fab 5. mit an environmentally preferable | | | | | | | | | |
| step 4 | Calculate environmen | | d. It is up to five percent (5%) of the 20,000 per bid. | 0.000% | 14.863% | | 17.573% | | 26.684% | | 30.159% | NA |
| step 5 | Preference amount fo applied). | r each eligible bid (if 0, the | en no environmental preference was | \$ - | \$ 20,000.00 | \$ | 20,000.00 | \$ | 20,000.00 | \$ | 20,000.00 | NA |
| step 6 | | onmental preference, exc se, both claiming EP cand | ept if both claim enviornmental els it for both | \$ 2,193,215.00 | \$ 2,499,200.00 | \$ | 2,558,625.00 | \$ | 2,758,450.00 | \$ | 2,834,675.00 | NA |
| step 7 | Low Bid Amount: | \$ 2,193,215.00 | Low Bidder: | George J. Igel | | | | | | | | |

Manually Enter Information

TAB V. Miscellaneous

| Apparent Low Bidder/Bid: | George J. Igel | \$ 2,193,215.00 |
|--------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Project: | 2015 General Construction Contract | |

Other "responsible" requirements 329.23(f)(2)(e)

With respect to a bidder whose bid is determined to be 10% or more below that of the next lowest bidder, [do they have] supplemental details regarding the bid and/or historical information regarding performance and costs on similar contracts to demonstrate the bidder's ability to complete the contract at the price specified.

| Bidders | George J. Igel & Co., Inc | Conie Construction Co. | John Eramo & Sons, Inc. | The Righter Co., Inc. | Complete General Construction Compamy | 0 |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|--|------|
| Bid | \$ 2,193,215.00 | \$ 2,519,200.00 | \$ 2,578,625.00 | \$ 2,778,450.00 | \$ 2,854,675.00 | \$ - |
| Percent Difference btwn Bid and Next | | | | | | |
| Highest Bid | 14.86% | 2.36% | 7.75% | 2.74% | -100.00% | |

Is any bidder 10% or more below the next bidder?

If yes, does the lower bidder's TAB 2 evaluation have 'yes' answers for questions c, d, g, and h?

If yes, low bidder is "responsible" under this provision.

YES YES

State of Ohio - Ohio Auditor

This is the link to the State of Ohio Auditor's web site to check for "findings for recovery" against a prime/sub contractor.

Are there any findings against the prime contractor or any of the subs?

If yes, the bid shall be deemed non-responsive. Inform the Office of Prequalification for further instruction.

Cross Referenced in Tab 1, Part ID

https://ohioauditor.gov/findings.html

Pre-Qualification Office email:

prequalification@columbus.gov

Pre-Qualification Office phone no: 645-0359

Federal - System for Award Management

This is the link to the Federal System for Awards Management site to check for "findings for recovery" against a prime/sub contractor.

Letter of Credit

LOC on City's LOC form

Are there any findings against the prime contractor or any of the subs?

If yes, the bid shall be deemed non-responsive. Inform the Office of Prequalification for further instruction.

Cross Referenced in Tab 1. Part ID

https://www.sam.gov/portal/SAM/#1

Pre-Qualification Office email:

prequalification@columbus.gov

Pre-Qualification Office phone no: 645-0359

City of Columbus

Contact the Purchasing Office if you have a question about the City's list of debarred vendors.

OSHA Violations

Go to the US Department of Labor's web site to see if there are any serious or willful violations by the prime contractor

Cross Referenced in Tab 2. Part IIB

https://www.osha.gov

Bid Gurantee Requirements

Below are the required documents for each bid guarantee type allowed.

Is the guarantee greater than or equal to 10% of the bid?

Did the bidder submit all of the required documents based upon the guarentee submitted?

YES YES

Bid Bond

Bond on City's bond form

Surety power of attorney

Most recent surety financial statement

Current Ohio Dept. of Insurance Certificate of Compliance

Certified/Cashier's Check Drawn on a solvant bank

| Apparent Low Bidder/Bid: | George J. Igel | \$ 2,193,215.00 |
|--------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Project: | 2015 General Construction Contract | |

Award recommendation: After evaluation of the bids, I recommend the following contractor be awarded the contract for:

Project Name: 2015 General Construction Contract

Recommended Bidder: George J. Igel Co., Inc.

Contract Amount: \$ 2,193,215.00

Evaluator's Name:

Evaluation Completion Date:

Mike Pettiford

5/12/2015

TAB VII: Notes

On this page, include any notes or clarification from phone calls made. Be sure to include the company you called, who you spoke with, date, time, question asked, outcome of call, and name of person who made the call.

Include any notes or clarifications from research done.

OSHA Search Results

- 1.) George J. Igel Co., Inc.:No Willful or Serious Incidents Reported
- 2.) Conie Construction: No Willful or Serious Incidents Reported
- 3.) John Eramo & Sons: No Willful or Serious Incidents Reported
- 4.) Righter Company: No Willful or Serious Incidents Reported
- 5.) Complete General Construction: 3 Serious violations

TAB VI: DEPARTMENT SPECIFIC CRITERIA

Instructions:

If you have additional questions/documents that you require with your bids that are department specific, please create your own evaluation worksheet here.

Please follow the format of the previous tabs. If you need assistance, please contact Suzanna Gussler or Alex Cofield.

Tab 6: 18 of 18