TAB I: Assessing Responsiveness

PROJECT:	Argyle Dr. Area Wa	Bid Date:	D	ecember 7, 2016	
Department/Division:	Public Utilities / Water	Initial Apparer	nt Low Bidder:		Elite Excavating
Section:	Distribution	Initial Appare	ent Low Bid :	\$	3,009,598.30

	Bids from Apparent lowest to highest:	Apparent Low	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th
CIP No.	690236-100075	COMPANY NAME					
Project Manager:	Evan DiSanto, P.E.	Elite Excavating	Underground Util.	Kemore (local)			
Engineer's Estimate:	(614) 645-7677	Initial Bid Amount					
		\$ 3,009,598.30	\$3,034,887.66	\$3,038,184.43			
		0.84%	0.11%	-100.00%			

Part IA: F	Responsiveness Criteria, General Provisions (329.20)	INPUT "YES" F	OR POSITIVE RESPONS	E OR "NO" FOR NEGAT	IVE RESPONSE (all "yes	" answers needed for	responsive bid)
а	The bidder is pre-qualified responsible or prequalified provisionally responsible at time of bid due date. (329.20)(c)	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			
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 B9	YES	YES	YES			
d	If applicable, the bidder listed a (sub)contractor(s) with an active water or sewer contractor tappers license (CMS 107.02)	YES	YES	YES			
e	Digital ID on bid is from a person authorized to enter into contract on behalf of the company ("name of person singing contract" on Signature Affidavit must match the name on the Digital ID). Proposal Signature Affidavit	YES	YES	YES			
f	There is no evidence of collusion among the bidders. (329.20)(e)	YES	YES	YES			
	BID IS:	RESPONSIVE	RESPONSIVE	RESPONSIVE			

TAB I: Assessing Responsiveness

PROJECT:	Argyle Dr. Area Water Line Improvements		Bid Date:	D	ecember 7, 2016
Department/Division:	Public Utilities / Water	Initial Appare	nt Low Bidder:		Elite Excavating
Section:	Distribution	Initial Appar	ent Low Bid :	\$	3,009,598.30

		Bids from Apparent lowest to highest:	Apparent Low	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th
CIP No.		690236-100075	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME
Project M	lanager:	Evan DiSanto, P.E.	Elite Excavating	Underground Util.	Kemore (local)			
Engineer'	's Estimate:	(614) 645-7677	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount
			\$ 3,009,598.30	\$3,034,887.66	\$3,038,184.43			
Part IB: F	Responsiveness Cri	teria, Subcontractors (329.20)	INPUT "YES" F	OR POSITIVE RESPONS	E OR "NO" FOR NEGAT	IVE RESPONSE (all "yes	" answers needed for r	esponsive bid)
а		ed a list of subcontractors with bid or indicated subcontracting opportunities. (329.20)(h)(1)	YES	YES	YES			
b	are licensed constru	e listed, Bidder indicated which subcontractors uction trade subcontractors. (329.20)(h)(2) FORM trade subcontractors are listed, enter "NA")	NA	NA	NA			
с	qualified responsibl	bcontractors are listed, the bidder proposed pre- e or provisionally responsible licensed trade 9.20)(h) (If no licensed trade subcontractors are	NA	NA	NA			
d	work under which th	e listed, the bidder listed the division/section of ne sub is performing. (329.20)(h)(5) (If no listed, enter "NA") FORM B5	NA	NA	NA			
e	subcontractor per d more than one sub	e listed and the bidder listed more than one livision/section of work, did the bidder explain why is listed for the division/section of work? o licensed trade subcontractors are listed, enter	NA	NA	NA			
f	trade subcontractor responsible. (329.2	affidavit, that its proposed licensed construction rs are pre-qualified responsible or provisionally 0)(h)(3) Form B9 (If no licensed trade e listed, enter "NA")	NA	NA	NA			
g		subcontractors who were currently suspended or . (329.20)(h)(4) (see links on Tab 5)	YES	YES	YES			
		BID IS:	RESPONSIVE	RESPONSIVE	RESPONSIVE			

TAB I: Assessing Responsiveness

PROJECT:	Argyle Dr. Area Water Line Improvements		Bid Date:		December 7, 2016
Department/Division:	Public Utilities / Water	Initial Appare	nt Low Bidder:	_	Elite Excavating
Section:	Distribution	Initial Appar	ent Low Bid :	\$	3,009,598.30

		Bids from Apparent lowest to highest:	Apparent Low	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th
CIP No.		690236-100075	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME
Project N	Nanager:	Evan DiSanto, P.E.	Elite Excavating	Underground Util.	Kemore (local)			
Engineer	r's Estimate:	(614) 645-7677	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount
			\$ 3,009,598.30	\$ 3,034,887.6 6	\$3,038,184.43			
PART IC:	Responsiveness Cri	teria, Bid Specific (329.23)	INPUT "YES" F	OR POSITIVE RESPONS	E OR "NO" FOR NEGAT	IVE RESPONSE (all "yes	" answers needed for	responsive bid)
а		mit more than one bid for same work. (See section for full text.) (329.23)(f)(1)(a)	YES	YES	YES			
b	Bidder acknowled	ged addenda. (329.23)(f)(1)(e)	YES	YES	YES			
с		ith technical pre-qualification fication requirements where applicable.	YES	YES	YES			
d	The bid contains n invitation for bid. (3	to conditions or qualifications not provided in the 29.23)(f)(1)(d)	YES	YES	YES			
е	Bidder added no pr (329.23)(f)(1)(f)	rovisions reserving right to accept or reject award.	YES	YES	YES			
f	Bidder submitted a	a bid guarantee. (329.23)(f)(1)(i) FORM B2	YES	YES	YES			
g	Bidder did not sub FORM B2	mit an irregular bid guarantee. (329.23)(f)(1)(i)	YES	YES	YES			
h	Bid prices are mate	erially balanced. (329.23)(f)(1)(b) FORM B3	YES	YES	YES			
i		egularities or deviations from the bid that affect bid (1)(j) and (329.23)(f)(1)(e)	YES	YES	YES			
j		a unit price for each contract item listed, if required. ORM B3 (If a unit price is not an option, enter	YES	YES	YES			
k		a lump sum price if required. (329.23)(f)(1)(h) sum is not an option, enter "NA")	NA	NA	NA			
I		ed with section 329.20(h) regarding (9.23)(f)(1)(k) FORM B5	YES	YES	YES			
m		in alterations, omissions, errors, such that it does documents. $(329.23)(f)(1)(j)$	YES	YES	YES			
n	Bid responds to bid (329.23)(f)(1)(e)	d documents in all material respects.	YES	YES	YES			

TAB I: Assessing Responsiveness

PROJECT:	Argyle Dr. Area Wa	ter Line Improvements	Bid Date:	D	ecember 7, 2016
Department/Division:	Public Utilities / Water	Initial Apparer	nt Low Bidder:	6	Elite Excavating
Section:	Distribution	Initial Appare	ent Low Bid :	\$	3,009,598.30

		Bids from Apparent lowest to highest:		Apparent Low	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th
CIP No.		690236-100075	CO	MPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME
Project N	lanager:	Evan DiSanto, P.E.	Eli	ite Excavating	Underground Util.	Kemore (local)			
Engineer	Engineer's Estimate: (614) 645-7677		Initi	al Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount
			\$	3,009,598.30	\$ <mark>3,034,887.6</mark> 6	\$3,038,184.43			
0	Bid is complete. (3	29.23)(f)(1)(e)		YES	YES	YES			
		BID IS:		RESPONSIVE	RESPONSIVE	RESPONSIVE			

TAB I: Assessing Responsiveness

PROJECT:	Argyle Dr. Area Wa	ter Line Improvements	Bid Date:	D	ecember 7, 2016
Department/Division:	Public Utilities / Water	Initial Apparer	nt Low Bidder:		Elite Excavating
Section:	Distribution	Initial Appare	ent Low Bid :	\$	3,009,598.30

	Bids from Apparent lowest to highest:	Apparent Low	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th
CIP No.	690236-100075	COMPANY NAME					
Project Manager:	Evan DiSanto, P.E.	Elite Excavating	Underground Util.	Kemore (local)			
Engineer's Estimate:	(614) 645-7677	Initial Bid Amount					
		\$ 3,009,598.30	\$3,034,887.66	\$3,038,184.43			

		A "no" answer in Part IE will not necessarily render a bid non-responsive. Bidder must have a valid contract compliance no. prior to					mpliance no. prior to
Part ID: R	esponsiveness Criteria, Contract Compliance	contract execution.					
2	The "Evaluated Low Bidder" has an active contract compliance number at the time of bid.						
			-	-	-		-

	Bid Responsive,	Bid Responsive,	Bid Responsive,	Waiver Legislation	Waiver Legislation	Waiver Legislation
Did Deenensivenses Weiver Considerations	Continue to Part II	Continue to Part II	Continue to Part II	Required to Contract;	Required to Contract;	Required to Contract;
Bid Responsiveness, Waiver Considerations:				Contact Fiscal Office	Contact Fiscal Office	Contact Fiscal Office
Proceed to Part II?	YES	YES	YES			

LOWEST RESPONSIVE BID, TAB I	\$ 3,009,598.30		Manually Enter Amount
LOWEST RESPONSIVE BIDDER, TAB I	Elite Excavating Co. of	f Ohio, Inc.	Manually Enter Information

TAB II: Assessing Responsibility

PROJE	CT: Argyle Dr. Area W	ater Line Improven	ients	Bid [Date:	Decembe	er 7, 2016	
Department/Div	vision: Public Utilities / Water		Responsive Low E	lidder (from Tab I):		Elite Excavating Co. of Ohio, Inc.		
Section:	Distribution		Responsive Low	Bid (from Tab I):		\$	3,009,598.30	
CIP No.	690236-100075	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	
Project Manage	er: Evan DiSanto, P.E.	Elite Excavating	Underground Util.	Kemore (local)	NA	NA	NA	
Engineer's Esti		Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	
		\$ 3,009,598.30	\$ 3,034,887.66	\$ 3,038,184.43	0	0	0	
ART IIA: 329.23	(2) Responsibility Criteria	INPUT "	YES" FOR POSITIVE RES	PONSE OR "NO" FOR NI	EGATIVE RESPONSE (1	point for each "yes", 0 f	for "no")	
Based	(2) Responsibility Criteria I on bid amount (as compared to other bids) no further nentation needed (i.e., bid statistically comparable to others).			PONSE OR "NO" FOR NI	EGATIVE RESPONSE (1	point for each "yes", 0 f	for "no")	
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	YES	YES	YES				
FORM	I B3, SPECIFICATIONS	YES	YES	YES				
The b b appro	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	YES	YES	YES				
b The b appro SPEC The b appro	I B3, SPECIFICATIONS idder has demonstrated to the city's satisfaction adequate and priate SPECIALIZED EQUIPMENT for the project. FORM B6,							

	Continue to TAB SF YES YES YES									
	Continue to TAB 3?	YES	YES	YES						
	Responsibility Score:	8	8	8	0	0	0			
h	The bidder has no (substantial) uncompleted work that would hinder the success of the project. FORM B8	YES	YES	YES						
g	The bidder has a successful record of controlling costs on similar construction projects. FORM B7	YES	YES	YES						
f	The bidder has a successful record of complying with and meeting completion deadlines. FORM B7	YES	YES	YES						
е	The bidder has experience in the area of construction service for which the bid has been submitted. FORM B7		YES	YES						
d	e bidder has actively engaged in the construction industry. FORM YES		YES	YES						
	The bidder has demonstrated to the city's satisfaction adequate and appropriate HUMAN RESOURCES for the project. FORM B6, SPECIFICATIONS	YES	YES	YES						

Manually Enter Information

TAB III. Assessing Local Bidder

PF	ROJECT:	Argyle Dr. Area Water Line Improve			eme	nents Bid Date:			December 7, 2016		
Departme	nt/Division:	Public Utilities / Water					w Bidder (from Tabs I and II):			Elite Excavating	Co. of Ohio, Inc.
Section:		Distribution			E	Evaluated Low Bid	(from	Tabs I and II) :		\$	3,009,598.30
CIP No.		690236-100075	(Company Name	C	ompany name	C	ompany name	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME
Project M	anager:	Evan DiSanto, P.E.		Elite Excavating		nderground Util.	-	Kemore (local)	NA	NA	NA
	s Estimate:	(614) 645-7677		Bid Amount	Bid Amount		Bid Amount		Bid Amount	Bid Amount	Bid Amount
			\$	3,009,598.30	\$	3,034,887.66	\$	3,038,184.43	NA	NA	NA
PART III: 32	29.(01)(u) and 329	.212 Local Bidder						<u> </u>			
		IS BID LOCAL?		NO		NO		YES			
To look up i	if a bidder is local	, use the Office of Construction Prequalification	's list loca	ated at	X:\C	onstruction Pregua	ificat	ion			
Part IIIA:											
	IF <u>APPARENT</u>	LOW BID IN PART II IS LOCAL STOP. S data in Steps 6 & 7 and continue t									
step 1	step 1 IF <u>APPARENT LOW BID IN PART II IS NOT LOCAL</u> , CONTINUE TO TO STEP 2 (see above for apparent low bid and bidder information)										
Part IIIB:											

step 2	Percentage difference of bid from apparent NON-LOCAL, LOW BID.	0.000%	0.840%	0.950%	NA	NA	NA
step 3	Is amount in prior step WITHIN ONE PERCENT (1%) OF THE LOW BID?	YES	YES	YES	NA	NA	NA
step 4	If step 3 is "yes", SEE PROCEDURES ON SHAREPOINT SITE. DID AGENCY FOLLOW PROCEDURES FOR BIDDER RELATING TO CITY CODE SECTIONS 329.212 (INDICATE IF NA)?			YES			
step 5	INPUT NEW BID AMOUNT FOR BIDDER, IF APPLICABLE, OR ZERO (\$0)			\$3,009,479.25			

Part IIIC:			
step 6	REVISED LOW BID AMOUNT, TAB IIIB:	\$ 3,009,479.25	Manually Enter Amount
step 7	REVISED LOW BIDDER, TAB IIIB:	Kenmore Construction	Manually Enter Information

TAB IV. Calculating Environmental Preference

	Public Utilities / Water Distribution 690236-100075 Evan DiSanto, P.E. (614) 645-7677 Preference \$		COMPANY NAME Elite Excavating Bid Amount		(from Tabs I, II and III): rom Tabs I, II and III) : COMPANY NAME Kemore (local)	COMPANY NAME	Kenmore C \$ COMPANY NAME	onstruction 3,009,479 COMPANY NAME
jer: timate: 7) Environmental	690236-100075 Evan DiSanto, P.E. (614) 645-7677 Preference		Elite Excavating	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME			
jer: timate: 7) Environmental	Evan DiSanto, P.E. (614) 645-7677 Preference		Elite Excavating				COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME
jer: timate: 7) Environmental	Evan DiSanto, P.E. (614) 645-7677 Preference		Elite Excavating				COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME
timate: 7) Environmental	(614) 645-7677 Preference		0	Underground Util.		NA	NA	NA
7) Environmental	Preference		Dia Amount	Bid Amount	Bid Amount	Bid Amount	Bid Amount	Bid Amount
			\$ 3,009,598.30			NA	NA	NA
Low Bid:	\$							
		3,009,479.25	Apparent Low Bidder:	Kenmore C	onstruction			
7) Environmental	Preference							
apparent/evaluated	d low bidder submit "environmentally prefera		YES	NA	NA			
uding apparent l	ow bidder, did bidder submit "environmen	itally preferable" bid?	NA	NO	YES			
the apparent/eval complete Step 7, a apparent/evaluate	uated low bidder is lead bidder for Tab 4. Ig and proceed to Tab 5. red low bidder did not submit an environmer	gnore the data in Steps						
ulate environmenta	al preference for each bid. It is up to five pe	rcent (5%) of the non-	0.004%	0.844%	0.954%	NA	NA	NA
erence amount for ied).	each eligible bid (if 0, then no environment	al preference was	\$ 119.05	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000.00	NA	NA	NA
		vironmental	\$ 3,009,479.25	\$ 3,014,887.66	\$ 3,018,184.43	NA	NA	NA
w Bid Amount:	\$ 3,009,479.25 Lo	ow Bidder:	Kenmore Construction					
ap S" U P. th C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	ding apparent/evaluate or "NO" for app ding apparent l i If apparent/evaluate pomplete Step 7, apparent/evaluate ed to Steps 6 an late environment nmental low bid, rence amount for d). nount less enviro ence; in that cas	pparent/evaluated low bidder submit "environmentally prefer "or "NO" for apparent low bidder. For all other bidder's, inp ding apparent low bidder, did bidder submit "environmer _ If apparent/evaluated low bidder submitted an environmer he apparent/evaluated low bidder is lead bidder for Tab 4. I pomplete Step 7, and proceed to Tab 5. apparent/evaluated low bidder did not submit an environmer ed to Steps 6 and 7. late environmental preference for each bid. It is up to five pe mmental low bid, for a maximum of \$20,000 per bid. rence amount for each eligible bid (if 0, then no environment d). nount less environmental preference, except if both claim er ence; in that case, both claiming EP cancels it for both	pparent/evaluated low bidder submit "environmentally preferable" bid? Answer " or "NO" for apparent low bidder. For all other bidder's, input "NA" ding apparent low bidder, did bidder submit "environmentally preferable" bid? _ If apparent/evaluated low bidder submitted an environmentally preferable bid, he apparent/evaluated low bidder is lead bidder for Tab 4. Ignore the data in Steps pomplete Step 7, and proceed to Tab 5. apparent/evaluated low bidder did not submit an environmentally preferable bid, ed to Steps 6 and 7. late environmental preference for each bid. It is up to five percent (5%) of the non- mental low bid, for a maximum of \$20,000 per bid. rence amount for each eligible bid (if 0, then no environmental preference was d). nount less environmental preference, except if both claim environmental ence; in that case, both claiming EP cancels it for both	opparent/evaluated low bidder submit "environmentally preferable" bid? Answer YES ding apparent low bidder. For all other bidder's, input "NA" NA ding apparent low bidder, did bidder submit "environmentally preferable" bid? NA	opparent/evaluated low bidder submit "environmentally preferable" bid? Answer YES NA ding apparent low bidder. For all other bidder's, input "NA" NA NO ding apparent low bidder, did bidder submit "environmentally preferable" bid? NA NO	opparent/evaluated low bidder submit "environmentally preferable" bid? Answer YES NA NA ding apparent low bidder. For all other bidder's, input "NA" NA NO YES ding apparent low bidder, did bidder submit "environmentally preferable" bid? NA NO YES	opparent/evaluated low bidder submit "environmentally preferable" bid? Answer YES NA NA ding apparent low bidder. For all other bidder's, input "NA" NA NO YES ding apparent low bidder submit "environmentally preferable" bid? NA NO YES ding apparent/evaluated low bidder submit environmentally preferable bid, to a paparent/evaluated low bidder is lead bidder for Tab 4. Ignore the data in Steps omplete Step 7, and proceed to Tab 5. NA NO YES apparent/evaluated low bidder did not submit an environmentally preferable bid, ed to Steps 6 and 7. 0.004% 0.844% 0.954% NA alte environmental preference for each bid. It is up to five percent (5%) of the non- mental low bid, for a maximum of \$20,000 per bid. \$ 119.05 \$ 20,000.00 \$ 20,000.00 NA ence amount for each eligible bid (if 0, then no environmental preference was d). \$ 3,009,479.25 \$ 3,014,887.66 \$ 3,018,184.43 NA	parent/evaluated low bidder submit "environmentally preferable" bid? Answer or "NO" for apparent low bidder, For all other bidder's, input "NA" ding apparent low bidder, did bidder submit "environmentally preferable" bid? If apparent/evaluated low bidder submit an environmentally preferable bid, he apparent/evaluated low bidder is lead bidder for Tab 4. Ignore the data in Steps omplete Step 7, and proceed to Tab 5. apparent/evaluated low bidder did not submit an environmentally preferable bid, ed to Steps 6 and 7. alte environmental preference for each bid. It is up to five percent (5%) of the non- mmental low bid, for a maximum of \$20,000 per bid. ence amount for each eligible bid (if 0, then no environmental preference was d). nount less environmental preference, except if both claim environmental s 3,009,479.25 \$ 3,014,887.66 \$ 3,018,184.43 NA NA

Manually Enter Amount

Manually Enter Information

TAB 6: U.S. and Ohio EPA Requirements

version: April 28, 2015

PR	PROJECT: Argyle Dr. Area Water L				Bid D	ate:	10/1	2/16
Departme	nt/Division:	Public Utilities / Water						
Section:		Distribution						
		Bids from Apparent lowest to highest:	Apparent Low	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th
CIP No.		690236-100075	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME
Project Mar		Evan DiSanto, P.E.	Elite Excavating	Underground Util.	Kemore (local)			
Engineer's	Estimate:	(614) 645-7677	\$3,009,598.30	\$3,034,887.66	\$3,009,479.25			
			<i>43,003,330.30</i>	ç3,03 4 ,007.00				
Responsive	ness Criteria, WI	PCLF/WSRLA Compliance						
	·	·						
	1							
FORM B10		by Bidder" has completed, signed, and returned the Contractor	yes	yes	yes			
		nt Opportunity (EEO) Certification Form						
FORM B11		by Bidder" has completed, signed, and returned the US EPA rding Debarment, Suspension, and Other Responsibility Matters	yes	NOS	yes			
TORWEIT	Form	raing Deburment, Suspension, and Other Responsibility induces	yes	yes	yes			
	The "Evaluated Lo	ow Bidder" has provided a completed and signed US EPA Form						
FORM B12.2	6100-3 from each	proposed subcontractor.	yes	yes	yes			
	The "Evaluated L	ow Bidder" has completed, signed, and returned US EPA Form						
FORM B12.3	6100-4.		yes	yes	yes			
		ed Business Enterprises (DBE) Utilization Goals of 1.2% MBE and		yes; Rath Builders	yes; Rath Builders &			
)," Good Faith Efforts must be documented - see immediately	yes; Bridges Bros.	Supply	Bridges Bros. Trucking			
	The "Evaluated L	ow Bidder" has NOT met the EPA Disadvantaged Business			3			
GOOD FAITH EFFORTS	Enterprise (DBE)	Utilization Goals of 1.2% MBE and 1.8% WBE, so documentation	N/A; has met goals.	N/A; has met goals.	N/A; has met goals.			
LITORIS	of Good Faith Effo	orts to solicit DBE participation has been provided.						
FORM B13		by Bidder" has completed, signed, and returned the American Iron	yes	yes	yes			
	anu Steel (AIS) A	cknowledgement Form			,			

LOWEST RESPONSIVE BID, TAB I	\$3,009,479.25	Manually Enter Amount
LOWEST RESPONSIVE BIDDER, TAB 6	Kenmore Constr.	Manually Enter Information

TAB V. Miscellaneous

Apparent L	Apparent Low Bidder/Bid:		enmore Construction	on	\$ 3,009,47	9.25			
Pr	oject:	Ar	gyle Dr. Area Wate	er Line Improven	nents				
Other "responsible" requirements 329.23(f)(2)(e)						jarding the bid	and/or hist	orical information	
	Bidders	Elite Excavating	Underground Util.	Kemore (local)	0		0		0
	Bid Percent Difference btwn Bid and <u>Next Highest</u> Bid	\$ 3,009,598.30 0.84%	\$ 3,034,887.66 0.11%	\$ 3,038,184.43	\$	- \$		- \$	-
	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.								
Bid Guarantee 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 guarantee submitted? YES								
	<u>Bid Bond</u> Bond on City's bond form Surety power of attorney Most recent surety financial stateme Current Ohio Dept. of Insurance Cer								
Contract Compliance	Are all subcontractors contract comp If there are not any subcontractors,		the contract can be execu	ted.	YES				
Foreign/Non-Ohio Corp	Is the corporation foreign or the indiv		on-resident of the State of	Ohio?	NO				
	If yes, business entity shall register service of summons, in any action ir	law or equity, or both,	brought in the State of Ohi	0.	N/A				
	This is required before the contract i http://www.sos.state.oh.us/	s awarded. "Awarded"	means before the Director	accepts/approves the bi	id				
Award recommendation: After	revaluation of the bids, I recommend	the following contract	tor be awarded the contr	act for:					
Project Name:	Argyle Dr. Area Water Line Imp	0	_						
Recommended Bidder: Contract Amount:	Kenmore Construction Co., Inc \$ 3,009,479.25	•							
Evaluator's Name: Evaluation Completion Date:	Missy Smith 645-3776 12/13/2016								

TAB VI: DEPARTMENT SPECIFIC CRITERIA

CONTRACTOR EXPERIENCE:

HORIZONTAL DIRECTIONAL DRILLING (HDD) WITH DUCTILE IRON WATER PIPE

Each Bidder must prove to the City that it meets the City's experience requirement in order to be considered for this project. The Bidder shall submit this proof in a notarized statement with the bid package.

Elite Excavating Co. of Ohio, Inc.	Underground Utilities	Kenmore Construction
Provided notarized statement after	Provided notarized statement from Precise	Rec'd notarized statement.
contacting them.	Boring of Ohio.	

TAB VII: Notes

Elite Excavating Co. of Ohio, Inc.	Underground Utilities	Kenmore Construction	PM's comments:
		Excavating & a local company. Awarding to Kenmore since they agreed to meet Elite's bid.	
Tab 1. Dart	1C-c: Technical Prequalifications: Nota	prized statement of HDD experience?	
12/12/16: Rec'd notarized	ic-c. rechnical Prequaincations. Note	12/13/16: Rec'd notarized documentaion	
documentation per Sarah Harrell's ok.	yes; Precise Boring	per Sarah Harrell's ok.	
		-	
	Tab 1, Part IC-g: Bio		
12/12/16: Rec'd surety's fin. stmt. & Cert. of Compliance.	Missing surety's fin. stmt. & Cert. of Compliance.	12/13/16: Rec'd B-2 Bid Bond forms per Sarah Harrell's ok.	
	Tab 2, Part IIA-g: Meeting d	and lines (sorts:	
		eaumes/costs.	
# of projects meeting costs: 1 out of 3. Marked "yes". PM to evaluate.	# of projects meeting costs: 11 pgs. of references; several met costs. Marked "yes".	# of projects meeting costs: 1 out of 3. PM to evaluate.	12/14/16: Evan has no issues with Kenmore's ability to meet schedules or costs.
# of projects meeting schedules: 1 out of 3. Marked "yes". PM to evaluate.	# of projects meeting schedules: no dates submitted; see PM's comment from 690236-100072.	# of projects meeting schedules: 0 out of3. PM to evaluate.	
	Tab 4, Part IV: step 1: Environmenta	· · · ·	
		Submitted fleet policy but no schedule to retrofit/upgrademarked "yes".	
	Tab 6, Form B13.1 thru 13.3 - M	RE/WRE Goals Met:	
	100 0, 10111 013.1 till 13.3 - IM	Rath Builders Supply (EDGE) - 1.8% &	
yes	Rath Builders Supply (EDGE); 3%.	Bridges Bros. Trucking (EDGE) - \$1.3% = total 3.1%	

Fields Excavating	Behele Excavating	Danbert, Inc.	
Bid amount =	Bid amount =	Bid amount =	
\$3,064,658.35	\$3,134,527.56	\$3,234,994.85	
	Not reviewed; top 3 bidders responsive.		Columbus Asphalt
onie Construction	Not reviewed; top 3 bidders responsive. Darby Creek Excavating	Shelly & Sands	Columbus Asphalt Paving
		Shelly & Sands Bid amount =	•