


9-I
(1, 2, 3)

Town of Tiverton
Office of the Town Administrator

Date: January 6, 2022
 To: Landfill Closure File
 CC: Town Members, Town Clerk, Town Solicitor
 From:  Town Administrator, Chris Cotta

Selection process and overall recommendations:

As described in a 12/20/21 email to all above, on 10/28/21 the Town received the bid packages from the following vendors:

	Technical Score	Cost Score	Total	Rank
Manafort Brothers Inc.	53.3	27.2	80.5	3
E.T. & L. Corp	49.5	28.1	77.6	5
J.H. Lynch & Sons Inc.	59.0	30.0	89.0	1
DiGregorio, Inc.	50.9	28.8	79.7	4
Charter Contracting Company, LLC	60.0	27.6	87.6	2

The bid packages were segregated into two components, a technical proposal worth up to 70 points and a cost proposal worth up to 30 points. Between 10/28/21 and 12/20/21 the technical proposals were reviewed by Pare Engineering to ensure conformity to the required bid specification. After their review, they met with Director Rogers and myself to explain the ranking system designed to evaluate each technical proposal in a fair and equitable manner. This evaluation was required as part of the procurement process we laid out in the bid documents. Attached are the evaluations of the technical review and the summary sheet scores of how they ended up. Both Director Rogers and I agreed completely with the evaluations as we had read the technical submissions separately from Pare Engineering.

The Costs component was broken into two parts, fixed base bid costs and an alternate bid item costs. Pare Engineering will describe the rationale for both components. At the end of the project both components are required to be completed to satisfy RIDEM closure requirements.

The following represents the costs proposals submitted:

	Base Bid	Alternate bid	Total Costs	Score	Rank
Manafort Brothers Inc.	8,455,964	4,010,004	12,465,968	27.2	5
E.T. & L. Corp	8,365,640	3,747,785	12,113,424	28.1	3
J.H. Lynch & Sons Inc.	7,776,500	3,626,250	11,402,750	30.0	1
DiGregorio Inc.	8,287,275	3,582,605	11,869,880	28.8	2
Charter Contracting Co, LLC	8,811,810	3,505,690	12,317,500	27.6	4

Pare Engineering staff, Director Rogers and myself interviewed the top two firms construction managers, superintendents, job estimators, owners and their largest subcontractor used for this project to ascertain the validity of the bid submission and to ensure the staff they represented would be assigned to the actual job would be the ones actually performing if awarded the contract. Additionally we validated the equipment needed to execute the job specification requirements were assets available for this job. We discussed issues involving change order processing, the town's expectation with regard to change orders and we discussed communication and safety concerns regarding this job.

We all agreed the lowest bidder can and should be awarded this contract. The second ranked firm has done more landfills in the Northeast but the cost differential was able to be justified through our deliberations.

In addition to recommending that J.H. Lynch and Sons be awarded the landfill closure contract, the Town Council will need to consider two additional financial components to this project as they are not imbedded in the bid award for this contract. The Town will need to engage a firm to oversee as the clerk of the works this project. I would like the Town Council to consider asking Pare Engineering to submit a contract addendum to the existing professional services contract they maintain today to oversee this project. They are intimately familiar with all the RIDEM requirements for this closure project. Additionally, there needs to be some funding allocated as a contingency for this project. I believe discussions with Pare Engineering, Director Rogers and myself with the Town Council will provide a clear need for and possible amount needed to be set aside for this project.



TIVERTON LANDFILL CLOSURE
BIDS RECEIVED AND OPENED OCTOBER 28, 2021
BID EVALUATION
SCORING SUMMARY
DECEMBER 14, 2021

BIDDER	QUALIFICATIONS SCORE									30 POINTS COST SCORE	100 POINTS TOTAL SCORE
	40 POINTS				20 POINTS		10 POINTS	70 POINTS TOTAL QUALIFICATIONS SCORE			
	RESUME SCORE	FINANCIAL STABILITY SCORE	PROJECT REFERENCES SCORE	SCHEDULE SCORE	AVAILABILITY SCORE	SUBCONTRACTOR REFERENCE SCORE	SUBCONTRACTOR RESUME SCORE	BID PACKAGE QUALITY SCORE			
<i>Maximum Score</i>	12.0	2.0	20.0	2.0	4.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	70.0	30.0	100.0
Charter Contracting Company	6.2	2.0	19.0	2.0	4.0	10.0	6.8	10.0	60.0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
DiGregorio Corporation	6.6	2.0	17.3	1.4	2.8	8.0	4.8	8.0	50.9	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
ETL Corp	8.5	0.0	18.3	1.0	2.8	10.0	6.8	2.0	49.5	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
JH Lynch and Sons	9.0	2.0	16.2	2.0	4.0	10.0	6.8	9.0	59.0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Manafort Brothers	5.8	2.0	15.1	1.6	4.0	10.0	6.8	7.0	53.3	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!



TIVERTON LANDFILL CLOSURE
BIDS RECEIVED AND OPENED OCTOBER 28, 2021
BID EVALUATION
QUALIFICATIONS SCORING
Charter Contracting Company
DECEMBER 8, 2021

1. 40 points - Prime Contractor Experience and Qualifications													
a. Resumes for project managers and key personnel.										Score	Weight	Wt. Score	Comments
Provided requested resumes (0-5)										5.0	1.0	1.0	
PM resume - 20+ years experience and landfill experience (0-5)										5.0	3.0	3.0	
Super resume - 20+ years experience and 10 years landfill exp (0-5)										2.0	4.0	1.6	<20 yrs, only 2 landfills
Closure Turf experience (0-5)										0.0	3.0	0.0	no closure turf experience
Local experience (RI/NE) of PM/Superintendent (0-5)										3.0	1.0	0.6	NE but no RI
RESUME SCORE										12.0		6.2	
b. Financial stability of the firm.										Score	Weight	Wt. Score	
Bonding Capacity										5.0	2.0	2.0	\$150/\$250
FINANCIAL STABILITY SCORE										2.0		2.0	
c. Project references for similar and recent projects													
Questionnaire	Poirier	Carter	Petit	McKenney	Magliaro	Convers	Haskell	Avg Score	Weight	Wt. Score			
1. Competence of Project Manager													
Poor understanding of the project requirements, frequent shortages or delays with manpower, materials and/or equipment.	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	4.9	1.25	1.21			
Excellent understanding of the project requirements, no problems with manpower, materials and/or equipment.													
2. Competence of Superintendent													
Poor understanding of the project requirements, frequent shortages or delays with manpower, materials and/or equipment.	5	5	5	2	5	5	5	4.6	1.75	1.60			
Excellent understanding of the project requirements, no problems with manpower, materials and/or equipment.													
3. Quality of Work													
Poor workmanship, disregard for drawings and specifications, needed constant oversight.	5	5	5	3	5	5	5	4.7	1.25	1.18			
Excellent workmanship, understood what was required, worked well without oversight.													
4. Quality of Site Control													
Poor management of dust, erosion controls, noise and traffic and/or frequent complaints.	5	5	5	3	5	5	5	4.7	1.00	0.94			
Excellent management of dust, erosion controls, noise and traffic.													
5. Overall Owner/Engineer/Public Interaction													
Poor communication skills, frequent misunderstanding or confrontation, difficulty scheduling meetings.	5	5	5	2	5	5	5	4.6	1.00	0.91			
Excellent communication skills, highly organized.													
6. Schedule Expectations													
Very unrealistic schedule or did not provide schedule despite Owner request.	5	5	5	3	5	5	5	4.7	1.00	0.94			
Very realistic schedule, provided in a timely manner.													
7. Delivery of the Project on Time													
Frequently missed milestones, project was significantly delayed due to factors completely within the Contractor's control.	5	5	5	2	5	5	5	4.6	1.00	0.91			
Milestones were consistently met, project was completed on schedule or was completed within a time frame considering factors outside of the Contractor's control.													
8. How Legitimate were the Change Order Requests?													
One or more of the change orders were baseless.	5	5	4	4	5	4	5	4.6	1.25	1.14			
All of the change order(s) were justified or requested by the Owner (or no change orders requested).													
9. How Reasonable were the Cost of the Change Orders?													
The value of the change order(s) were excessive; difficult negotiation process.	5	5	5	4	4	4	5	4.6	1.25	1.14			
The value of the change orders was very fair; negotiation was respectful (or no change orders were requested).													
10. Management of Sub-Contractors.													
Poor quality of work by sub-contractors, frequent scheduling problems.	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	4.9	0.75	0.73			
Excellent quality of work by sub-contractors, worked seamlessly with Contractor.													
11. Project Organization													
Poor organization skills, performed work without approved submittals, submittal process cumbersome.	5	5	4	2	5	5	5	4.4	0.75	0.66			
Excellent organization skills, ensured submittals were organized and timely.													
12. Overall Experience with the Contractor													
If given the choice, would not work with again.	5	5	5	3	5	5	5	4.7	1.75	1.65			
Would highly recommend.													

DRAFT

Pare Evaluation				
Company has performed recent, relevant projects (0-5)	5.0	2.0	2.0	7 relevant projects, no closure turf
Number of References that responded (0 for none, 5 for 5 or more)	5.0	4.0	4.0	Contacted 9 of 9 references provided
PROJECT REFERENCES SCORE			20.0	19.0
d. Schedule				
Is the schedule reasonable (0-5)	5.0	1.0	1.0	all tasks/sub tasks listed
Is it complete, easy to read and understand (0-5)	5.0	1.0	1.0	
SCHEDULE SCORE			2.0	2.0
e. Availability of equipment and personnel.				
Do they have the equipment needed to perform this project (0-5)	5.0	2.0	2.0	Equipment provided
Do they have the manpower to perform this project (0-5)	5.0	2.0	2.0	Manpower provided
AVAILABILITY SCORE			4.0	4.0
TOTAL PRIME CONTRACTOR QUALIFICATIONS SCORE			40.0	33.2
2. 20 points -- Major Subcontractors and Material Suppliers' Experience and Qualifications (all subcontractors and vendors responsible for greater than 10% of the overall project cost)				
a. Project references for similar and recent projects (subcontractors and material suppliers).				
subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5)	5.0	5.0	5.0	NE Liner - 7 closure turf projects
material supplier's experience on similar projects (0-5)	5.0	5.0	5.0	
SUBCONTRACTOR REFERENCE SCORE			10.0	10.0
b. Resumes for project managers and key personnel (subcontractors).				
Provided requested resumes (0-5)	5.0	2.5	2.5	
PM/Super resumes - 10+ years experience landfills (0-5)	5.0	2.5	2.5	Super 15 years, PM 30
Closure Turf experience (0-5)	1.0	4.0	0.8	Super has 1 closure turf, PM unknown
Local experience (RI/NE) of PM/Superintendent (0-5)	5.0	1.0	1.0	Super and PM 3 RI projects
SUBCONTRACTOR RESUME SCORE			10.0	6.8
TOTAL SUB-CONTRACTOR QUALIFICATIONS SCORE			20.0	16.8
3. 10 points -- Overall Quality of the Bid Package				
a. Completeness and organization.				
Completeness (0=a lot missing, 5= everything requested was provided)	5.0	5.0	5.0	very organized, complete, followed RFP numbering
Organization (0=highly disorganized, 5= highly organized)	5.0	5.0	5.0	
BID PACKAGE QUALITY SCORE			10.0	10.0
TOTAL BID PACKAGE QUALITY SCORE			10.0	10.0
TOTAL QUALIFICATIONS SCORE			70.0	60.0

DRAFT



TIVERTON LANDFILL CLOSURE
BJDS RECEIVED AND OPENED OCTOBER 28, 2021
BID EVALUATION
QUALIFICATIONS SCORING
JH Lynch and Sons
DECEMBER 8, 2021

1. 40 points -- Prime Contractor Experience and Qualifications										
a. Resumes for project managers and key personnel.										
	Score	Weight	Wt. Score	Comments						
Provided requested resumes (0-5)	5.0	1.0	1.0							
PM resume - 20+ years experience and landfill experience (0-5)	5.0	3.0	3.0							
Super resume - 20+ years experience and 10 years landfill exp (0-5)	5.0	4.0	4.0							
Closure Turf experience (0-5)	0.0	3.0	0.0	no closure turf experience						
Local experience (RI/NE) of PM/Superintendent (0-5)	5.0	1.0	1.0							
RESUME SCORE			12.0	9.0						
b. Financial stability of the firm.										
	Score	Weight	Wt. Score	Comments						
Bonding Capacity	5.0	2.0	2.0	\$225/\$500						
FINANCIAL STABILITY SCORE			2.0	2.0						
c. Project references for similar and recent projects										
Questionnaire	A. Corv.	Inga						Avg Score	Weight	Wt. Score
1. Competence of Project Manager										
Poor understanding of the project requirements, frequent shortages or delays with manpower, materials and/or equipment.	4	5						4.5	1.25	1.13
Excellent understanding of the project requirements, no problems with manpower, materials and/or equipment.										
2. Competence of Superintendent										
Poor understanding of the project requirements, frequent shortages or delays with manpower, materials and/or equipment.	4	5						4.5	1.75	1.58
Excellent understanding of the project requirements, no problems with manpower, materials and/or equipment.										
3. Quality of Work										
Poor workmanship, disregard for drawings and specifications, needed constant oversight.	4	5						4.5	1.25	1.13
Excellent workmanship, understood what was required, worked well without oversight.										
4. Quality of Site Control										
Poor management of dust, erosion controls, noise and traffic and/or frequent complaints.	4	5						4.5	1.00	0.90
Excellent management of dust, erosion controls, noise and traffic.										
5. Overall Owner/Engineer/Public Interaction										
Poor communication skills, frequent misunderstanding or confrontation, difficulty scheduling meetings.	4	5						4.5	1.00	0.90
Excellent communication skills, highly organized.										
6. Schedule Expectations										
Very unrealistic schedule or did not provide schedule despite Owner request.	4	5						4.5	1.00	0.90
Very realistic schedule, provided in a timely manner.										
7. Delivery of the Project on Time										
Frequently missed milestones, project was significantly delayed due to factors completely within the Contractor's control.	4	5						4.5	1.00	0.90
Milestones were consistently met, project was completed on schedule or was completed within a time frame considering factors outside of the Contractor's control.										
8. How Legitimate were the Change Order Requests?										
One or more of the change orders were baseless.	4	5						4.5	1.25	1.13
All of the change order(s) were justified or requested by the Owner (or no change orders requested).										
9. How Reasonable were the Cost of the Change Orders?										
The value of the change order(s) were excessive; difficult negotiation process.	4	5						4.5	1.25	1.13
The value of the change orders was very fair; negotiation was respectful (or no change orders were requested).										
10. Management of Sub-Contractors.										
Poor quality of work by sub-contractors, frequent scheduling problems.	3	5						4.0	0.75	0.60
Excellent quality of work by sub-contractors, worked seamlessly with Contractor.										
11. Project Organization										
Poor organization skills, performed work without approved submittals, submittal process cumbersome.	5	5						5.0	0.75	0.75
Excellent organization skills, ensured submittals were organized and timely.										
12. Overall Experience with the Contractor										
If given the choice, would not work with again.	4	5						4.5	1.75	1.58
Would highly recommend.										

DRAFT

Pare Evaluation				
Company has performed recent, relevant projects (0-5)	5.0	2.0	2.0	5 recent, no closure turf
Number of References that responded (0 for none, 5 for 5 or more)	2.0	4.0	1.6	Contacted 2 of 2 references provided
PROJECT REFERENCES SCORE			20.0	16.2
d. Schedule				
Is the schedule reasonable (0-5)	5.0	1.0	1.0	very detailed
Is it complete, easy to read and understand (0-5)	5.0	1.0	1.0	
SCHEDULE SCORE			2.0	2.0
e. Availability of equipment and personnel.				
Do they have the equipment needed to perform this project (0-5)	5.0	2.0	2.0	Equipment provided
Do they have the manpower to perform this project (0-5)	5.0	2.0	2.0	Manpower provided
AVAILABILITY SCORE			4.0	4.0
TOTAL PRIME CONTRACTOR QUALIFICATIONS SCORE			40.0	33.2
2. 20 points -- Major Subcontractors and Material Suppliers' Experience and Qualifications (all subcontractors and vendors responsible for greater than 10% of the overall project cost)				
a. Project references for similar and recent projects (subcontractors and material suppliers).				
subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5)	5.0	5.0	5.0	NE Liner - 7 closure turf projects
material supplier's experience on similar projects (0-5)	5.0	5.0	5.0	
SUBCONTRACTOR REFERENCE SCORE			10.0	10.0
b. Resumes for project managers and key personnel (subcontractors).				
Provided requested resumes (0-5)	5.0	2.5	2.5	
PM/Super resumes - 10+ years experience landfills (0-5)	5.0	2.5	2.5	Super 15 years, PM 30
Closure Turf experience (0-5)	1.0	4.0	0.8	Super has 1 closure turf, PM unknown
Local experience (RI/NE) of PM/Superintendent (0-5)	5.0	1.0	1.0	Super and PM 3 RI projects
SUBCONTRACTOR RESUME SCORE			10.0	6.8
TOTAL SUB-CONTRACTOR QUALIFICATIONS SCORE			20.0	16.8
3. 10 points -- Overall Quality of the Bid Package				
a. Completeness and organization.				
Completeness (0=a lot missing, 5= everything requested was provided)	5.0	5.0	5.0	complete, but not highly organized, did not follow RFP format
Organization (0=highly disorganized, 5= highly organized)	4.0	5.0	4.0	
BID PACKAGE QUALITY SCORE			10.0	9.0
TOTAL BID PACKAGE QUALITY SCORE			10.0	9.0
TOTAL QUALIFICATIONS SCORE			70.0	59.0

DRAFT



TIVERTON LANDFILL CLOSURE
 BIDS RECEIVED AND OPENED OCTOBER 28, 2021
 BID EVALUATION
QUALIFICATIONS SCORING
Manafort Brothers
 DECEMBER 8, 2021

1. 40 points -- Prime Contractor Experience and Qualifications										
a. Resumes for project managers and key personnel.										
	Score	Weight	Wt. Score	Comments						
Provided requested resumes (0-5)	5.0	1.0	1.0							
PM resume - 20+ years experience and landfill experience (0-5)	3.0	3.0	1.8	only 1 landfill project						
Super resume - 20+ years experience and 10 years landfill exp (0-5)	1.0	4.0	0.8	no landfill experience						
Closure Turf experience (0-5)	2.0	3.0	1.2	1 closure turf project						
Local experience (RI/NE) of PM/Superintendent (0-5)	5.0	1.0	1.0							
RESUME SCORE			12.0	5.8						
b. Financial stability of the firm.										
	Score	Weight	Wt. Score	Comments						
Bonding Capacity	5.0	2.0	2.0	provided fin. statements, bonding 150/350						
FINANCIAL STABILITY SCORE			2.0	2.0						
c. Project references for similar and recent projects										
Questionnaire	Learnc	Inga						Avg Score	Weight	Wt. Score
1. Competence of Project Manager										
Poor understanding of the project requirements, frequent shortages or delays with manpower, materials and/or equipment.	5	5						5.0	1.25	1.25
Excellent understanding of the project requirements, no problems with manpower, materials and/or equipment.										
2. Competence of Superintendent										
Poor understanding of the project requirements, frequent shortages or delays with manpower, materials and/or equipment.	5	5						5.0	1.75	1.75
Excellent understanding of the project requirements, no problems with manpower, materials and/or equipment.										
3. Quality of Work										
Poor workmanship, disregard for drawings and specifications, needed constant oversight.	5	5						5.0	1.25	1.25
Excellent workmanship, understood what was required, worked well without oversight.										
4. Quality of Site Control										
Poor management of dust, erosion controls, noise and traffic and/or frequent complaints.	4	5						4.5	1.00	0.90
Excellent management of dust, erosion controls, noise and traffic.										
5. Overall Owner/Engineer/Public Interaction										
Poor communication skills, frequent misunderstanding or confrontation, difficulty scheduling meetings.	4	5						4.5	1.00	0.90
Excellent communication skills, highly organized.										
6. Schedule Expectations										
Very unrealistic schedule or did not provide schedule despite Owner request.	5	5						5.0	1.00	1.00
Very realistic schedule, provided in a timely manner.										
7. Delivery of the Project on Time										
Frequently missed milestones, project was significantly delayed due to factors completely within the Contractor's control.	5	5						5.0	1.00	1.00
Milestones were consistently met, project was completed on schedule or was completed within a time frame considering factors outside of the Contractor's control.										
8. How Legitimate were the Change Order Requests?										
One or more of the change orders were baseless.	5	5						5.0	1.25	1.25
All of the change order(s) were justified or requested by the Owner (or no change orders requested).										
9. How Reasonable were the Cost of the Change Orders?										
The value of the change order(s) were excessive; difficult negotiation process.	5	5						5.0	1.25	1.25
The value of the change orders was very fair; negotiation was respectful (or no change orders were requested).										
10. Management of Sub-Contractors.										
Poor quality of work by sub-contractors, frequent scheduling problems.	4	5						4.5	0.75	0.68
Excellent quality of work by sub-contractors, worked seamlessly with Contractor.										
11. Project Organization										
Poor organization skills, performed work without approved submittals, submittal process cumbersome.	4	5						4.5	0.75	0.68
Excellent organization skills, ensured submittals were organized and timely.										
12. Overall Experience with the Contractor										
If given the choice, would not work with again.	5	5						5.0	1.75	1.75
Would highly recommend.										

DRAFT

Pare Evaluation				
Company has performed recent, relevant projects (0-5)	2.0	2.0	0.8	only 1 recent, but was closure turf
Number of References that responded (0 for none, 5 for 5 or more)	2.0	4.0	1.6	Contacted 6 of 6 landfill references with contact info.
PROJECT REFERENCES SCORE			20.0	16.1
d. Schedule				
Is the schedule reasonable (0-5)	4.0	1.0	0.8	basic, but complete
Is it complete, easy to read and understand (0-5)	4.0	1.0	0.8	
SCHEDULE SCORE			2.0	1.6
e. Availability of equipment and personnel.				
Do they have the equipment needed to perform this project (0-5)	5.0	2.0	2.0	Equipment provided
Do they have the manpower to perform this project (0-5)	5.0	2.0	2.0	Manpower provided
AVAILABILITY SCORE			4.0	4.0
TOTAL PRIME CONTRACTOR QUALIFICATIONS SCORE			40.0	29.5
2. 20 points – Major Subcontractors and Material Suppliers' Experience and Qualifications (all subcontractors and vendors responsible for greater than 10% of the overall project cost)				
a. Project references for similar and recent projects (subcontractors and material suppliers).				
subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5)	5.0	5.0	5.0	NE Liner - 7 closure turf projects
material supplier's experience on similar projects (0-5)	5.0	5.0	5.0	
SUBCONTRACTOR REFERENCE SCORE			10.0	10.0
b. Resumes for project managers and key personnel (subcontractors).				
Provided requested resumes (0-5)	5.0	2.5	2.5	Super 15 years, PM 30 Super has 1 closure turf, PM unknown Super and PM 3 RI projects
PM/Super resumes - 10+ years experience landfills (0-5)	5.0	2.5	2.5	
Closure Turf experience (0-5)	1.0	4.0	0.8	
Local experience (RI/NE) of PM/Superintendent (0-5)	5.0	1.0	1.0	
SUBCONTRACTOR RESUME SCORE			10.0	6.8
TOTAL SUB-CONTRACTOR QUALIFICATIONS SCORE			20.0	16.8
3. 10 points – Overall Quality of the Bid Package				
a. Completeness and organization.				
Completeness (0=a lot missing, 5= everything requested was provided)	5.0	5.0	5.0	complete, but somewhat disorganized, included a lot of extra cost with price and bid deviation letter, included all the relevant projects, no project sheets but a few key bid sheets.
Organization (0=highly disorganized, 5= highly organized)	2.0	5.0	2.0	
BID PACKAGE QUALITY SCORE			10.0	7.0
TOTAL BID PACKAGE QUALITY SCORE			10.0	7.0
TOTAL QUALIFICATIONS SCORE			70.0	53.3

DRAFT



TIVERTON LANDFILL CLOSURE
BIDS RECEIVED AND OPENED OCTOBER 28, 2021
BID EVALUATION
QUALIFICATIONS SCORING
DiGregorio Corporation
DECEMBER 8, 2021

1. 40 points -- Prime Contractor Experience and Qualifications										
a. Resumes for project managers and key personnel.										
	Score	Weight	Wt. Score	Comments						
Provided requested resumes (0-5)	5.0	1.0	1.0							
PM resume - 20+ years experience and landfill experience (0-5)	5.0	3.0	3.0							
Super resume - 20+ years experience and 10 years landfill exp (0-5)	2.0	4.0	1.6	landfills mentioned, but not specific no closure turf experience						
Closure Turf experience (0-5)	0.0	3.0	0.0							
Local experience (RI/NE) of PM/Superintendent (0-5)	5.0	1.0	1.0							
RESUME SCORE			12.0	6.6						
b. Financial stability of the firm.										
	Score	Weight	Wt. Score	Comments						
Bonding Capacity	5.0	2.0	2.0	\$70/\$125						
FINANCIAL STABILITY SCORE			2.0	2.0						
c. Project references for similar and recent projects										
Questionnaire	DIPrete	Ruotolo	Bernier	Owen				Avg Score	Weight	Wt. Score
1. Competence of Project Manager										
Poor understanding of the project requirements, frequent shortages or delays with manpower, materials and/or equipment.	5	5	4	4				4.5	1.25	1.13
Excellent understanding of the project requirements, no problems with manpower, materials and/or equipment.										
2. Competence of Superintendent										
Poor understanding of the project requirements, frequent shortages or delays with manpower, materials and/or equipment.	5	5	4	5				4.8	1.75	1.66
Excellent understanding of the project requirements, no problems with manpower, materials and/or equipment.										
3. Quality of Work										
Poor workmanship, disregard for drawings and specifications, needed constant oversight.	5	5	5	5				5.0	1.25	1.25
Excellent workmanship, understood what was required, worked well without oversight.										
4. Quality of Site Control										
Poor management of dust, erosion controls, noise and traffic and/or frequent complaints.	4	5	4	5				4.5	1.00	0.90
Excellent management of dust, erosion controls, noise and traffic.										
5. Overall Owner/Engineer/Public Interaction										
Poor communication skills, frequent misunderstanding or confrontation, difficulty scheduling meetings.	4	5	5	5				4.8	1.00	0.95
Excellent communication skills, highly organized.										
6. Schedule Expectations										
Very unrealistic schedule or did not provide schedule despite Owner request.	5	5	4	5				4.8	1.00	0.95
Very realistic schedule, provided in a timely manner.										
7. Delivery of the Project on Time										
Frequently missed milestones, project was significantly delayed due to factors completely within the Contractor's control.	5	5	4	5				4.8	1.00	0.95
Milestones were consistently met, project was completed on schedule or was completed within a time frame considering factors outside of the Contractor's control.										
8. How Legitimate were the Change Order Requests?										
One or more of the change orders were baseless.	5	5	5	4				4.8	1.25	1.19
All of the change order(s) were justified or requested by the Owner (or no change orders requested).										
9. How Reasonable were the Cost of the Change Orders?										
The value of the change order(s) were excessive; difficult negotiation process.	5	5	5	4				4.8	1.25	1.19
The value of the change orders was very fair; negotiation was respectful (or no change orders were requested).										
10. Management of Sub-Contractors.										
Poor quality of work by sub-contractors, frequent scheduling problems.	5	5	4	5				4.8	0.75	0.71
Excellent quality of work by sub-contractors, worked seamlessly with Contractor.										
11. Project Organization										
Poor organization skills, performed work without approved submittals, submittal process cumbersome.	4	5	4	5				4.5	0.75	0.68
Excellent organization skills, ensured submittals were organized and timely.										
12. Overall Experience with the Contractor										
If given the choice, would not work with again.	5	5	5	5				5.0	1.75	1.75
Would highly recommend.										

DRAFT

Pare Evaluation				
Company has performed recent, relevant projects (0-5)	2.0	2.0	0.8	5 projects, most old, not all capped
Number of References that responded (0 for none, 5 for 5 or more)	4.0	4.0	3.2	Contacted 8 of 8 references provided with contact info.
PROJECT REFERENCES SCORE			20.0	17.3
d. Schedule				
Is the schedule reasonable (0-5)	4.0	1.0	0.8	some gaps/inaccuracies
Is it complete, easy to read and understand (0-5)	3.0	1.0	0.6	
SCHEDULE SCORE			2.0	1.4
e. Availability of equipment and personnel.				
Do they have the equipment needed to perform this project (0-5)	2.0	2.0	0.8	No equipment provided
Do they have the manpower to perform this project (0-5)	5.0	2.0	2.0	Manpower provided
AVAILABILITY SCORE			4.0	2.8
TOTAL PRIME CONTRACTOR QUALIFICATIONS SCORE			40.0	30.1
2. 20 points – Major Subcontractors and Material Suppliers' Experience and Qualifications (all subcontractors and vendors responsible for greater than 10% of the overall project cost)				
a. Project references for similar and recent projects (subcontractors and material suppliers).				
subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5)	3.0	5.0	3.0	only 2 closure turf projects
material supplier's experience on similar projects (0-5)	5.0	5.0	5.0	
SUBCONTRACTOR REFERENCE SCORE			10.0	8.0
b. Resumes for project managers and key personnel (subcontractors).				
Provided requested resumes (0-5)	5.0	2.5	2.5	
PM/Super resumes - 10+ years experience landfills (0-5)	3.0	2.5	1.5	PM only 2 years exp.
Closure Turf experience (0-5)	1.0	4.0	0.8	only 2 closure turf projects PM/Super
Local experience (RI/NE) of PM/Superintendent (0-5)	0.0	1.0	0.0	no RI or NE experience
SUBCONTRACTOR RESUME SCORE			10.0	4.8
TOTAL SUB-CONTRACTOR QUALIFICATIONS SCORE			20.0	12.8
3. 10 points – Overall Quality of the Bid Package				
a. Completeness and organization.				
Completeness (0=a lot missing, 5= everything requested was provided)	4.0	5.0	4.0	organized, included project approach but missing equip; some most projects are old
Organization (0=highly disorganized, 5= highly organized)	4.0	5.0	4.0	
BID PACKAGE QUALITY SCORE			10.0	8.0
TOTAL BID PACKAGE QUALITY SCORE			10.0	8.0
TOTAL QUALIFICATIONS SCORE			70.0	50.9

DRAFT



TIVERTON LANDFILL CLOSURE
BIDS RECEIVED AND OPENED OCTOBER 20, 2021
BID EVALUATION
QUALIFICATIONS SCORING
ETL Corp
DECEMBER 6, 2021

1. 40 points -- Prime Contractor Experience and Qualifications																						
a. Resumes for project managers and key personnel.																						
	Score	Weight	Wt. Score	Comments																		
Provided requested resumes (0-5)	5.0	1.0	1.0																			
PM resume - 20+ years experience and landfill experience (0-5)	5.0	3.0	3.0																			
Super resume - 20+ years experience and 10 years landfill exp (0-5)	5.0	4.0	4.0																			
Closure Turf experience (0-5)	0.0	3.0	0.0	no closure turf experience																		
Local experience (RI/NE) of PM/Superintendent (0-5)	3.0	1.0	0.6	NE but no RI																		
RESUME SCORE			12.0	8.6																		
b. Financial stability of the firm.																						
	Score	Weight	Wt. Score	Comments																		
Bonding Capacity	0.0	2.0	0.0	Called ref. 3 times, left 2 VMs																		
FINANCIAL STABILITY SCORE			2.0	0.0																		
c. Project references for similar and recent projects																						
McGow	Musla	Donelson							Avg Score	Weight	Wt. Score											
Questionnaire																						
1. Competence of Project Manager																						
Poor understanding of the project requirements, frequent shortages or delays with manpower, materials and/or equipment.											5	5	5						5.0	1.25	1.25	
Excellent understanding of the project requirements, no problems with manpower, materials and/or equipment.																						
2. Competence of Superintendent																						
Poor understanding of the project requirements, frequent shortages or delays with manpower, materials and/or equipment.											5	5	5						5.0	1.75	1.75	
Excellent understanding of the project requirements, no problems with manpower, materials and/or equipment.																						
3. Quality of Work																						
Poor workmanship, disregard for drawings and specifications, needed constant oversight.											5	5	5						5.0	1.25	1.25	
Excellent workmanship, understood what was required, worked well without oversight.																						
4. Quality of Site Control																						
Poor management of dust, erosion controls, noise and traffic and/or frequent complaints.											5	4	5						4.7	1.00	0.93	
Excellent management of dust, erosion controls, noise and traffic.																						
5. Overall Owner/Engineer/Public Interaction																						
Poor communication skills, frequent misunderstanding or confrontation, difficulty scheduling meetings.											5	5	5						5.0	1.00	1.00	
Excellent communication skills, highly organized.																						
6. Schedule Expectations																						
Very unrealistic schedule or did not provide schedule despite Owner request.											5	5	5						5.0	1.00	1.00	
Very realistic schedule, provided in a timely manner.																						
7. Delivery of the Project on Time																						
Frequently missed milestones, project was significantly delayed due to factors completely within the Contractor's control.											5	5	5						5.0	1.00	1.00	
Milestones were consistently met, project was completed on schedule or was completed within a time frame considering factors outside of the Contractor's control.																						
8. How Legitimate were the Change Order Requests?																						
One or more of the change orders were baseless.											5	5	5						5.0	1.25	1.25	
All of the change order(s) were justified or requested by the Owner (or no change orders requested).																						
9. How Reasonable were the Cost of the Change Orders?																						
The value of the change order(s) were excessive; difficult negotiation process.											5	5	5						5.0	1.25	1.25	
The value of the change orders was very fair; negotiation was respectful (or no change orders were requested).																						
10. Management of Sub-Contractors.																						
Poor quality of work by sub-contractors, frequent scheduling problems.											5	5	5						5.0	0.75	0.75	
Excellent quality of work by sub-contractors, worked seamlessly with Contractor.																						
11. Project Organization																						
Poor organization skills, performed work without approved submittals, submittal process cumbersome.											5	5	5						5.0	0.75	0.75	
Excellent organization skills, ensured submittals were organized and timely.																						
12. Overall Experience with the Contractor																						
if given the choice, would not work with again.											5	5	5						5.0	1.75	1.75	
Would highly recommend.																						

DRAFT

Pare Evaluation				
Company has performed recent, relevant projects (0-5)	5.0	2.0	2.0	8 recent landfills, no closure turf
Number of References that responded (0 for none, 5 for 5 or more)	3.0	4.0	2.4	Contacted 4 of 4 references on recent landfill projects
PROJECT REFERENCES SCORE			20.0	18.3
d. Schedule				
Is the schedule reasonable (0-5)	3.0	1.0	0.6	very basic, no phases
Is it complete, easy to read and understand (0-5)	2.0	1.0	0.4	
SCHEDULE SCORE			2.0	1.0
e. Availability of equipment and personnel.				
Do they have the equipment needed to perform this project (0-5)	5.0	2.0	2.0	Equipment provided
Do they have the manpower to perform this project (0-5)	2.0	2.0	0.8	No manpower provided
AVAILABILITY SCORE			4.0	2.8
TOTAL PRIME CONTRACTOR QUALIFICATIONS SCORE			40.0	30.7
2. 20 points – Major Subcontractors and Material Suppliers' Experience and Qualifications (all subcontractors and vendors responsible for greater than 10% of the overall project cost)				
a. Project references for similar and recent projects (subcontractors and material suppliers).				
subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5)	5.0	5.0	5.0	NE LIner - 7 closure turf projects
material supplier's experience on similar projects (0-5)	5.0	5.0	5.0	
SUBCONTRACTOR REFERENCE SCORE			10.0	10.0
b. Resumes for project managers and key personnel (subcontractors).				
Provided requested resumes (0-5)	5.0	2.5	2.5	Super 15 years, PM 30 Super has 1 closure turf, PM unknown Super and PM 3 RI projects
PM/Super resumes - 10+ years experience landfills (0-5)	5.0	2.5	2.5	
Closure Turf experience (0-5)	1.0	4.0	0.8	
Local experience (RI/NE) of PM/Superintendent (0-5)	5.0	1.0	1.0	
SUBCONTRACTOR RESUME SCORE			10.0	6.8
TOTAL SUB-CONTRACTOR QUALIFICATIONS SCORE			20.0	16.8
3. 10 points – Overall Quality of the Bid Package				
a. Completeness and organization.				
Completeness (0=a lot missing, 5= everything requested was provided)	1.0	5.0	1.0	disorganized, missing additional resumes, additional financials, personnel, sub listed firm, included irrelevant projects, no cover letter
Organization (0=highly disorganized, 5= highly organized)	1.0	5.0	1.0	
BID PACKAGE QUALITY SCORE			10.0	2.0
TOTAL BID PACKAGE QUALITY SCORE			10.0	2.0
TOTAL QUALIFICATIONS SCORE			70.0	49.5

DRAFT