

TAB I: Assessing Responsiveness

version: 2/22/2017

PROJECT:	Blueprint Clintonville: Blenheim/Glencoe/Acton	Bid Date:	May 17, 2017
Department/Division:	DPU & DPS	Initial Apparent Low Bidder:	Eramo & Sons
Section:	SSES, Water Distrib.	Initial Apparent Low Bid :	\$ 13,621,530.79

Bids from Apparent lowest to highest:		Apparent Low	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th
CIP No.	650870-1, 690236-0, DPS#:	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME
Project Manager:	Hunter Kelly, Evan DiSanto	Eramo & Sons	Shelly & Sands	Trucco			
Engineer's Estimate:	\$10,846,488.51	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount
		\$ 13,621,530.79	\$15,401,506.94	\$16,845,041.59			
		13.07%	9.37%	-100.00%			

PART IA: Responsiveness Criteria, General Provisions (329.20)		INPUT "YES" FOR POSITIVE RESPONSE OR "NO" FOR NEGATIVE RESPONSE (all "yes" answers needed for responsive bid)					
a	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			
c	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 signing 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

version: 2/22/2017

PROJECT:	Blueprint Clintonville: Blenheim/Glencoe/Acton	Bid Date:	May 17, 2017
Department/Division:	DPU & DPS	Initial Apparent Low Bidder:	Eramo & Sons
Section:	SSES, Water Distrib.	Initial Apparent Low Bid :	\$ 13,621,530.79

Bids from Apparent lowest to highest:		Apparent Low	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th
CIP No.	650870-1, 690236-0, DPS#:	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME
Project Manager:	Hunter Kelly, Evan DiSanto	Eramo & Sons	Shelly & Sands	Trucco			
Engineer's Estimate:	\$10,846,488.51	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount
		\$ 13,621,530.79	\$15,401,506.94	\$16,845,041.59			
PART IB: Responsiveness Criteria, Subcontractors (329.20)		INPUT "YES" FOR POSITIVE RESPONSE OR "NO" FOR NEGATIVE RESPONSE (all "yes" answers needed for responsive bid)					
a	The bidder provided a list of subcontractors with bid or indicated there were not any subcontracting opportunities. (329.20)(h)(1) FORM B5	YES	YES	YES			
b	If subcontractors are listed, Bidder indicated which subcontractors are licensed construction trade subcontractors. (329.20)(h)(2) FORM B5 (If no licensed trade subcontractors are listed, enter "NA")	YES	YES	YES			
c	If licensed trade subcontractors are listed, the bidder proposed pre-qualified responsible or provisionally responsible licensed trade subcontractors. (329.20)(h) (If no licensed trade subcontractors are listed, enter "NA")	YES	YES	YES			
d	If subcontractors are listed, the bidder listed the division/section of work under which the sub is performing. (329.20)(h)(5) (If no subcontractors are listed, enter "NA") FORM B5	YES	YES	YES			
e	If subcontractors are listed and the bidder listed more than one subcontractor per division/section of work, did the bidder explain why more than one sub is listed for the division/section of work? (329.20)(h)(5) (If no licensed trade subcontractors are listed, enter "NA") FORM B5	NA	NA	NA			
f	Bidder stated, via affidavit, that its proposed licensed construction trade subcontractors are pre-qualified responsible or provisionally responsible. (329.20)(h)(3) Form B9 (If no licensed trade subcontractors are listed, enter "NA")	YES	YES	YES			
g	Bidder did not bid subcontractors who were currently suspended or debarred by the city. (329.20)(h)(4) (see links on Tab 5)	YES	YES	YES			
	BID IS:	RESPONSIVE	RESPONSIVE	RESPONSIVE			

TAB I: Assessing Responsiveness

version: 2/22/2017

PROJECT:	Blueprint Clintonville: Blenheim/Glencoe/Acton	Bid Date:	May 17, 2017
Department/Division:	DPU & DPS	Initial Apparent Low Bidder:	Eramo & Sons
Section:	SSES, Water Distrib.	Initial Apparent Low Bid :	\$ 13,621,530.79

Bids from Apparent lowest to highest:		Apparent Low	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th
CIP No.	650870-1, 690236-0, DPS#:	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME
Project Manager:	Hunter Kelly, Evan DiSanto	Eramo & Sons	Shelly & Sands	Trucco			
Engineer's Estimate:	\$10,846,488.51	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount
		\$ 13,621,530.79	\$15,401,506.94	\$16,845,041.59			
PART IC: Responsiveness Criteria, Bid Specific (329.23)		INPUT "YES" FOR POSITIVE RESPONSE OR "NO" FOR NEGATIVE RESPONSE (all "yes" answers needed for responsive bid)					
a	Bidder did not submit more than one bid for same work. (See referenced code section for full text.) (329.23)(f)(1)(a)	YES	YES	YES			
b	Bidder acknowledged addenda. (329.23)(f)(1)(e)	YES	YES	YES			
c	Bidder complied with technical pre-qualification requirements/specification requirements where applicable. (329.23)(f)(1)(c)	YES	YES	YES			
d	The bid contains no conditions or qualifications not provided in the invitation for bid. (329.23)(f)(1)(d)	YES	YES	YES			
e	Bidder added no provisions reserving right to accept or reject award. (329.23)(f)(1)(f)	YES	YES	YES			
f	Bidder submitted a bid guarantee. (329.23)(f)(1)(f) FORM B2	YES	YES	YES			
g	Bidder did not submit an irregular bid guarantee. (329.23)(f)(1)(f) FORM B2	YES	YES	YES			
h	Bid prices are materially balanced. (329.23)(f)(1)(b) FORM B3	YES	YES	YES			
i	Bid contains no irregularities or deviations from the bid that affect bid amount. (329.23)(f)(1)(j) and (329.23)(f)(1)(e)	YES	YES	YES			
j	Bidder submitted a unit price for each contract item listed, if required. (329.23)(f)(1)(g) FORM B3 (If a unit price is not an option, enter "NA")	YES	YES	YES			
k	Bidder submitted a lump sum price if required. (329.23)(f)(1)(h) FORM B3 (If lump sum is not an option, enter "NA")	YES	YES	YES			
l	Bidder has complied with section 329.20(h) regarding subcontractors. (329.23)(f)(1)(k) FORM B5	YES	YES	YES			
m	Bid does not contain alterations, omissions, errors, such that it does respond to the bid documents. (329.23)(f)(1)(j)	YES	YES	YES			
n	Bid responds to bid documents in all material respects. (329.23)(f)(1)(e)	YES	YES	YES			

TAB I: Assessing Responsiveness

version: 2/22/2017

PROJECT:	Blueprint Clintonville: Blenheim/Glencoe/Acton	Bid Date:	May 17, 2017
Department/Division:	DPU & DPS	Initial Apparent Low Bidder:	Eramo & Sons
Section:	SSES, Water Distrib.	Initial Apparent Low Bid :	\$ 13,621,530.79

Bids from Apparent lowest to highest:		Apparent Low	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th
CIP No.	650870-1, 690236-0, DPS#:	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME
Project Manager:	Hunter Kelly, Evan DiSanto	Eramo & Sons	Shelly & Sands	Trucco			
Engineer's Estimate:	\$10,846,488.51	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount
		\$ 13,621,530.79	\$15,401,506.94	\$16,845,041.59			
o	Bid is complete. (329.23)(f)(1)(e)	YES	YES	YES			
BID IS:		RESPONSIVE	RESPONSIVE	RESPONSIVE			

TAB I: Assessing Responsiveness

version: 2/22/2017

PROJECT:	Blueprint Clintonville: Blenheim/Glencoe/Acton	Bid Date:	May 17, 2017
Department/Division:	DPU & DPS	Initial Apparent Low Bidder:	Eramo & Sons
Section:	SSES, Water Distrib.	Initial Apparent Low Bid :	\$ 13,621,530.79

Bids from Apparent lowest to highest:		Apparent Low	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th
CIP No.	650870-1, 690236-0, DPS#:	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME
Project Manager:	Hunter Kelly, Evan DiSanto	Eramo & Sons	Shelly & Sands	Trucco			
Engineer's Estimate:	\$10,846,488.51	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount
		\$ 13,621,530.79	\$15,401,506.94	\$16,845,041.59			

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

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

LOWEST RESPONSIVE BID, TAB I	\$ 13,621,530.79	← Manually Enter Amount
LOWEST RESPONSIVE BIDDER, TAB I	John Eramo & Sons, Inc.	← Manually Enter Information

TAB II: Assessing Responsibility

PROJECT:	Blueprint Clintonville: Blenheim/Glencoe/Acton	Bid Date:	May 17, 2017
----------	--	-----------	--------------

Department/Division:	DPU & DPS	Responsive Low Bidder (from Tab I):	John Eramo & Sons, Inc.
Section:	SSES, Water Distrib.	Responsive Low Bid (from Tab I):	\$ 13,621,530.79

CIP No.	650870-1, 690236-0, DPS#:	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME
Project Manager:	Hunter Kelly, Evan DiSanto	Eramo & Sons	Shelly & Sands	Trucco	NA	NA	NA
Engineer's Estimate:	\$ 10,846,488.51	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount
		\$ 13,621,530.79	\$ 15,401,506.94	\$ 16,845,041.59	0	0	0

PART IIA: 329.23 (2) Responsibility Criteria		INPUT "YES" FOR POSITIVE RESPONSE OR "NO" FOR NEGATIVE RESPONSE (1 point for each "yes", 0 for "no")					
a	Based on bid amount (as compared to other bids) no further documentation needed (i.e., bid statistically comparable to others). FORM B3, SPECIFICATIONS	YES	NA	NA			
b	The bidder has demonstrated to the city's satisfaction adequate and appropriate SPECIALIZED EQUIPMENT for the project. FORM B6, SPECIFICATIONS	YES	YES	YES			
c	The bidder has demonstrated to the city's satisfaction adequate and appropriate HUMAN RESOURCES for the project. FORM B6, SPECIFICATIONS	YES	YES	YES			
d	The bidder has actively engaged in the construction industry. FORM B6	YES	YES	YES			
e	The bidder has experience in the area of construction service for which the bid has been submitted. FORM B6	YES	YES	YES			
f	The bidder has a successful record of complying with and meeting completion deadlines. FORM B7	NA	YES	YES			
g	The bidder has a successful record of controlling costs on similar construction projects. FORM B7	YES	YES	YES			
h	The bidder has no (substantial) uncompleted work that would hinder the success of the project. FORM B8	YES	YES	YES			
j	The bidder has submitted FORM B10- Green Infrastructure Experience that meets the Department's Criteria	YES	YES	YES			
	Responsibility Score:	8	8	8	0	0	0
	Continue to TAB 3?	YES	YES	YES			

↑
Manually Enter Information

TAB III. Assessing Local Bidder

PROJECT:	Blueprint Clintonville: Blenheim/Glencoe/Acton	Bid Date:	May 17, 2017
----------	--	-----------	--------------

Department/Division:	DPU & DPS	Evaluated Low Bidder (from Tabs I and II):	John Eramo & Sons, Inc.
Section:	SSES, Water Distrib.	Evaluated Low Bid (from Tabs I and II) :	\$ 13,621,530.79

CIP No.	650870-1, 690236-0, DPS#:	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME
Project Manager:	Hunter Kelly, Evan DiSanto	Eramo & Sons	Shelly & Sands	Trucco	NA	NA	NA
Engineer's Estimate:	\$ 10,846,488.51	Bid Amount	Bid Amount	Bid Amount	Bid Amount	Bid Amount	Bid Amount
		\$ 13,621,530.79	\$ 15,401,506.94	\$ 16,845,041.59	NA	NA	NA
PART III: 329.(01)(u) and 329.212 Local Bidder							

	IS BID LOCAL?	NO	YES	NO			
--	---------------	----	-----	----	--	--	--

To look up if a bidder is local, use the Office of Construction Prequalification's list located at

[X:\Construction Prequalification](#)

PART IIIA:	
step 1	<p>IF <u>APPARENT LOW BID IN PART II IS LOCAL</u> STOP. Skip steps 2-5 and enter data in Steps 6 & 7 and continue to TAB IV.</p> <p>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)</p>

Part IIIB:							
step 2	Percentage difference of bid from apparent NON-LOCAL, LOW BID.	0.000%	13.067%	23.665%	NA	NA	NA
step 3	Is amount in prior step WITHIN ONE PERCENT (1%) OF THE LOW BID?	YES	NO	NO	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)?						
step 5	INPUT NEW BID AMOUNT FOR BIDDER, IF APPLICABLE, OR ZERO (\$0)						

Part IIIC:		
step 6	REVISED LOW BID AMOUNT, TAB IIIB:	\$ 13,621,530.79
step 7	REVISED LOW BIDDER, TAB IIIB:	Eramo & Sons

Manually Enter Amount

Manually Enter Information

TAB IV. Calculating Environmental Preference

PROJECT:	Blueprint Clintonville: Blenheim/Glencoe/Acton	Bid Date:	May 17, 2017
----------	--	-----------	--------------

Department/Division:	DPU & DPS	Evaluated Low Bidder (from Tabs I, II and III):	Eramo & Sons
Section:	SSES, Water Distrib.	Evaluated Low Bid (from Tabs I, II and III) :	\$ 13,621,531

CIP No.	650870-1, 690236-0, DPS#:	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME
Project Manager:	Hunter Kelly, Evan DiSanto	Eramo & Sons	Shelly & Sands	Trucco	NA	NA	NA
Engineer's Estimate:	\$ 10,846,488.51	Bid Amount	Bid Amount	Bid Amount	Bid Amount	Bid Amount	Bid Amount
		\$ 13,621,530.79	\$ 15,401,506.94	\$ 16,845,041.59	NA	NA	NA
PART IV: 329.(17) Environmental Preference							
Apparent Low Bid:	\$ 13,621,530.79	Apparent Low Bidder:	Eramo & Sons				

PART IV: 329.(17) Environmental Preference							
step 1	Did apparent/evaluated low bidder submit "environmentally preferable" bid? Answer "YES" or "NO" for apparent low bidder. For all other bidder's, input "NA"	YES	NA	NA			
step 2	Excluding apparent low bidder, did bidder submit "environmentally preferable" bid?	NA	YES	NA			
step 3	STOP. If apparent/evaluated low bidder submitted an environmentally preferable bid, then the apparent/evaluated low bidder is lead bidder for Tab 4. Ignore the data in Steps 4-6, complete Step 7, and proceed to Tab 5. If the apparent/evaluated low bidder did not submit an environmentally preferable bid, proceed to Steps 6 and 7.						
step 4	Calculate environmental preference for each bid. It is up to five percent (5%) of the non-environmental low bid, for a maximum of \$20,000 per bid.	0.000%	13.067%	23.665%	NA	NA	NA
step 5	Preference amount for each eligible bid (if 0, then no environmental preference was applied).	\$ -	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000.00	NA	NA	NA
step 6	Bid amount less environmental preference, except if both claim environmental preference; in that case, both claiming EP cancels it for both	\$ 13,621,530.79	\$ 15,381,506.94	\$ 16,825,041.59	NA	NA	NA
step 7	Low Bid Amount: \$ 13,621,530.79	Low Bidder: Eramo & Sons					

Manually Enter Amount

Manually Enter Information

TAB V. Miscellaneous

Apparent Low Bidder/Bid:	Eramo & Sons	\$ 13,621,530.79
Project:	Blueprint Clintonville: Blenheim/Glencoe/Acton	

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	Eramo & Sons	Shelly & Sands	Trucco	0	0	0
Bid	\$ 13,621,530.79	\$ 15,401,506.94	\$ 16,845,041.59	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Percent Difference btwn Bid and Next Highest Bid	13.07%	9.37%	-100.00%			

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

YES

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

YES

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?

YES

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

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

Contract Compliance

Are all subcontractors contract compliant? Required before the contract can be executed.

YES

If there are not any subcontractors, choose N/A.

Foreign/Non-Ohio Corp

Is the corporation foreign or the individual or partnership a non-resident of the State of Ohio?

NO

If yes, business entity shall register with the Ohio Secretary of State's Office for the purpose of accepting service of summons, in any action in law or equity, or both, brought in the State of Ohio.

N/A

This is required before the contract is awarded. "Awarded" means before the Director accepts/approves the bid

<http://www.sos.state.oh.us/>

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

Project Name:	Blueprint Clintonville: Blenheim/Glencoe/Acton
Recommended Bidder:	John Eramo & Sons, Inc.
Contract Amount:	\$ 13,621,530.79

Evaluator's Name: Missy Smith 645-3776

Evaluation Completion Date: 5/22/2017

TAB 6: U.S. and Ohio EPA Requirements

version: April 28, 2015

PROJECT:	Blueprint Clintonville: Blenheim/Glencoe/Acton	Bid Date:	May 17, 2017
----------	--	-----------	--------------

Department/Division:	DPU & DPS	Initial Apparent Low Bidder:	Eramo & Sons
Section:	SSES, Water Distrib.	Initial Apparent Low Bid :	\$ 13,621,530.79

Bids from Apparent lowest to highest:		Apparent Low	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th
CIP No.	650870-1, 690236-0, DPS#:	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME	COMPANY NAME
Project Manager:	Hunter Kelly, Evan DiSanto	Eramo & Sons	Shelly & Sands	Trucco			
Engineer's Estimate:	\$ 10,846,488.51	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount	Initial Bid Amount
		\$ 13,621,530.79	\$ 15,401,506.94	\$ 16,845,041.59			
		13.07%	9.37%	-100.00%			
Responsiveness Criteria, WPCLF/WSRLA Compliance		A "NO" answer will not necessarily render a bid non-responsive. Bidder must have all forms completed and required information submitted prior to contract execution. Delay in providing this information may result in delay of loan award and affect project schedule.					
FORM B11	The "Evaluated Low Bidder" has completed, signed, and returned the Contractor Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Certification Form	Yes	Yes	Yes			
FORM B12	The "Evaluated Low Bidder" has completed, signed, and returned the US EPA Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, and Other Responsibility Matters Form	Yes	Yes	Yes			
FORM B13.2	The "Evaluated Low Bidder" has provided a completed and signed US EPA Form 6100-3 from each proposed subcontractor	Yes	Yes	Yes			
FORM B13.3	The "Evaluated Low Bidder" has completed, signed, and returned US EPA Form 6100-4	Yes	Yes	Yes			
GOOD FAITH EFFORTS	The "Evaluated Low Bidder" has NOT met the EPA Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Utilization Goals of 1.2% MBE and 1.8% WBE, so documentation of Good Faith Efforts to solicit DBE participation has been provided	N/A	N/A	No			
FORM B14	The "Evaluated Low Bidder" has completed, signed, and returned the American Iron and Steel (AIS) Acknowledgement Form	Yes	Yes	Yes			

LOWEST RESPONSIVE BID, TAB I	\$ 13,621,530.79	← Manually Enter Amount
LOWEST RESPONSIVE BIDDER, TAB 6	Eramo & Sons	← Manually Enter Information

Eramo	Shelly & Sands	Trucco	SSES's response:	Water's response:	DPS's response:
Tab 1, Part 1C-c: Technical Prequalifications?					
Please respond in corresponding cell if there were technical specs the bidders had to have in order to bid or be awarded job.			HWK: Yes - they were provided in bid book	EMD: OK on Water's end.	(no comment from DPS)
Tab 2, Part IIA-a: Statistically Comparable to other Bidders?					
	42% > E.E. & 13.07% > Eramo; marked "NA" to continue evaluation.	55.3% > E.E. & 23.66% > Eramo; marked "NA" to continue evaluation.			
Tab 2, Part IIA-e: Experience					
PM's will need to comment regarding their portion of work.			HWK: OK	Missy: ok	(no comment from DPS)
Tab 2, Part IIA-g: Meeting deadlines/costs:					
Project begin / end dates nor costs were not provided; cannot evaluate. PM to comment if ok. Marked "Yes" since PM's were ok.	# of projects meeting costs: 1 out of 3 due to CO's; marked "yes".	# of projects meeting costs: 0 out of 3 due to CO's; marked "yes".	HWK: OK	EMD: This is OK.	(no comment from DPS)
	schedules: 2 out of 3 due to CO's; marked "yes".	schedules: 1 out of 3 due to CO's; marked "yes".			
Tab 2, Part IIA-h: Amount of Current Work:					
Listed 11 current projects w/o dates. PM to comment if ok. Marked "Yes" since PM's were ok.	3 high dollar projects listed but expected to end by 9/1/17; marked "yes".		HWK: OK	EMD: This is OK.	(no comment from DPS)

Eramo	Shelly & Sands	Trucco	SSES's response:	Water's response:	DPS's response:
Tab 2, Part IIA-J: Green Infrastructure?					
PM's to review projects listed...I do not know if these are GI projects or not. Marked "Yes" based on PM's response.			HWK: OK		(no comment from DPS)
Tab 4, Environmentally Preferable Offerer?					
Submitted weak plan. Marked "yes" to continue eval.	Submitted weak plan. Marked "yes" to continue eval.	Did not evalute since 3rd lowest and not within 5% or \$20k of Eramo. Marked "NA".			
Tab 6, Form B13.1 thru 13.3 - MBE/WBE Goals Met:					
Eramo clarified submissions 5/22/17.	Confused about MBE/DBE info. Same amounts listed for MBE/DBE for both Water & Sewer...is it supposed to be separate, or, is info just duplicated on the forms?	FBE vendor did not meet 1.8% goal. 2 DBE vendors do meet MBE goals. Since they are 3rd lowest bidder, I am not asking for GFE statement for FBE part.			
Tab 6, Good Faith Efforts:					
not needed	Would need clarification from Vendor...marked "NA" on Tab 6.	See above; marked "no" on Tab 6.			