Town of Tiverton Office of the Town Administrator

9-I (1,2,3)

Date:

January 6, 2022

To:

Landfill Closure File

CC:

Jown 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	3,50 5, 690	12,317,500	27.6	4

LANDFILL CLOSURE RECOMMENDATION - TOWN COUNCIL 1/10/22 MEETING AGENDA ITEM 9/I

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.



BIDS RECEIVED AND OPENED OCTOBER 28, 2021 BID EVALUATION

SCORING SUMMARY

DECEMBER 14, 2021

		······································			QUALIFI	CATIONS SCORE	***************************************				
			40 POINT	<u>\$</u>	***************************************	<u>20 PC</u>	DINTS	10 POINTS	70 POINTS		
BIDDER	RESUME SCORE	FINANCIAL STABILITY SCORE	PROJECT REFERENCES SCORE	SCHEDULE SCORE	AVAILABILITY SCORE	SUBCONTRACTOR REFERENCE SCORE	SUBCONTRACTOR RESUME SCORE	BID PACKAGE QUALITY SCORE	TOTAL OUALIFICATIONS	30 POINTS COST SCORE	100 POINTS TOTAL SCORE
Maximum Score	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	5.2	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/01	#DIV/0!
ETL Corp	8.6	0.0	18.3	1.0	2.8	10.0	6.8	2.0	49.5	#DIV/01	#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/01	#DIV/0!
Manafort Brothers	5.8	2.0	16.1 -	1.6	4.0	10.0	6.8	7.0	53.3	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!



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
							RESU	ME SCORE	<u>12,0</u>	6,2	
								.,,,			
b. Financial stability of the firm.								Score	Weight	Wt. Score	
Bonding Capacity								5.0	2,0	2.0	\$150/\$250
					FIN	ANCIAL	STABIL	ITY SCORE	2.0	2.0	
	***************************************									<u> </u>	
c. Project references for similar and recent projects	Polrier	Carter	Petit	AcKenn	Magglar	Convers	haskeli	Avg Score	Weight	Wt. Score	
Questionnaire			<u> </u>		1			<u> </u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
1. Competence of Project Manager	+										
A Post pour Control Control Control		Г	T	1	T		1			F	
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	┪ ¯	-] ~	1 .	-		1				
	1	ĺ	[1	Ī	1			[i
with manpower, materials and/or equipment.			L	ــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ	-			<u> </u>	L	I	
2. Competence of SuperIntendent	+	 	т—		├ ──	├──	T				
Bear understanding of the project constraints fragged to		1			1	1	1				l
Poor understanding of the project requirements, frequent shortages	5 5	5	5	2	5	s	5	4.6	1.75	1.60	ĺ
or delays with manpower, materials and/or equipment.	- 3	,	ا ا	1 4	3	"	3	4.6	1,/3	1,00	,
Excellent understanding of the project regularments, no problems		1		1	Į	1					1
with manpower, materials and/or equipment.		 	L	<u></u>	 		L	<u> </u>	L	L.,	
3. Quality of Work	+	 		 -	 	——	т	1		T	
Poor workmanship, disregard for drawings and specifications,	1		1		1		1				
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.			L	<u></u>	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	l		L	
4. Quality of Site Control					↓						
Poor management of dust, erosion controls, noise and traffic	Ī		1				1				
and/or frequent complaints.	5	5	5	3	5	5	5	4,7	1,00	0.94	
	1 -	~	ľ	"	-	-		"			,
Excellent management of dust, erosion controls, noise and traffic.		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	L			<u> </u>				
5. Overall Owner/Engineer/Public Interaction					Ι	<u></u>					
Poor communication skills, frequent misunderstanding or					T	l -	1				
confrontation, difficulty scheduling meetings.	5	5	5	2	5	5	5	4.5	1,00	0.91	
Excellent communication skills, highly organized.	1	l			1	l '					
6, Schedule Expectations	\top										
Very unrealistic schedule or did not provide schedule despite Owner	r		I				T	ļ			
request.	5	5	5	3	5	5	5	4.7	1.00	0.94	
Very realistic schedule, provided in a timely manner.	1 '				į	'					
7. Delivery of the Project on Time	1				t						
777417477 414174744717171	1				†						
Frequently missed milestones, project was significantly delayed due	.]							1 1			
to factors completely within the Contractor's control.	1	ĺ			[[_ !	ĺ .	[[
Milestones were consistently met, project was completed on	- 5	5	5	2	5	5	5	4.6	1.00	0,91	
schedule or was completed within a time frame considering factors											
•				1			ļ				
outside of the Contractor's control. 8, How Legitimate were the Change Order Requests?	+				-	├──		1			
One or more of the change orders were baseless.	+				 	 -	1	 			
One or more of the change orders were passiess. All of the change order(s) were justified or requested by the Owner	5	S	4	4	5	ı .	5	4.6	1,25	1.14	
	1		, "	1 -	"			***	A16.d		
(or no change orders requested).	1	<u> </u>				⊢–				<u> </u>	
9. How Reasonable were the Cost of the Change Orders?				ı	 	 -	ı	т т			
The value of the change order(s) were excessive; difficult	1			1	1	1 1	i				
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				l i	1 1		l	1 1			
respectful (or no change orders were requested),	1	L	<u> </u>			ļl	I	L1			
10, Management of Sub-Contractors,	 	Ļ,			↓	 	г				
Poor quality of work by sub-contractors, frequent scheduling] 1			1	1		I				
problems,	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	4.9	0.75	0.73	
Excellent quality of work by sub-contractors, worked seamlessly					[, I			1		
with Contractor.			<u> </u>		igsquare			<u> </u>			
11. Project Organization	$\perp \perp \rfloor$				╙						
Poor organization skills, performed work without approved				1 1						ŀ	
submittals, submittal process cumbersome.	5	s	4	2	5	5	s	4.4	0.75	0.66	
Excellent organization skills, ensured submittals were organized and	1 -	_	•	_	-	-	-	""			
	1 1				:			1		- 1	
timely.					ļb						
timely.	5	5	5	3	5	5	5	4.7	1.75	1.65	



Pare Evaluation				
Company has performed recent, relevant projects (0-5)	5.	0 2.	2.	7 relevant projects, no closure turf
Number of References that responded (0 for none, 5 for 5 or more)	5.	0 4.	4.	Contacted 9 of 9 references provided
	PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS	005 30	0 19	0
	PROJECT REFERENCES SC	ORE 20	<u>ŭ 13</u>	
d. Schedule	Sco			cote
Is the schedule reasonable (0-5)	5.			I all tacke/clin tacke lister
is it complete, easy to read and understand (0-5)	5.	0 1.) 1,)
	SCHEDULE SC	ORE <u>2.</u>	2	<u>0</u>
E. Availability of equipment and personnel.	Sco	re Wel	ht Wt. S	core
Do they have the equipment needed to perform this project (0-5)	5.			D Equipment provided
Do they have the manpower to perform this project (0-5)	5.	C 2,) 2.	Manpower provided
	AVAILABILITY SO	ORE <u>4.</u>	1 4.	<u> </u>
			0 00	
TOTAL PRIME CONTRACTO	OR QUALIFICATIONS SC	DRE <u>40</u>	0 33	.4
20 points – Major Subcontractors and Material Suppliers' Experience and Qualifications (all subcontractors and Diect cost)	d vendors responsible for great	er than 10%	of the overa	
7*** <u> </u>				
				•
Project references for similar and recent projects (subcontractors and material suppliers).	Sco			
subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5)	5.	0 5.	5.	NE Liner - 7 closure turf projects
subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5) material supplier's experience on similar projects (0-5)	5. S.	0 5. 0 5.	5. 5.	NE Liner - 7 closure turf projects
subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5) material supplier's experience on similar projects (0-5)	5.	0 5. 0 5.	5. 5.	NE Liner - 7 closure turf projects
subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5) material supplier's experience on similar projects (0-5) SUBCO	5. DNTRACTOR REFERENCE SO	0 5. 0 5. ORE 10	5. 5. 0 10	O NE Liner - 7 closure turf projects O O
subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5) material supplier's experience on similar projects (0-5) SUBCO b. Resumes for project managers and key personnel (subcontractors).	5. S.	0 5, 0 5, ORE <u>10</u>	5. 5. 0 10	O NE Liner - 7 closure turf projects O Core
subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5) material supplier's experience on similar projects (0-5) SUBCO b. Resumes for project managers and key personnel (subcontractors). Provided requested resumes (0-5)	5. S. ONTRACTOR REFERENCE SC	0 5. 0 5. ORE 10 re Wel	5. 5. 0 10 ht Wt. S	O NE Liner - 7 closure turf projects O Core
subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5) material supplier's experience on similar projects (0-5) SUBCO b. Resumes for project managers and key personnel (subcontractors). Provided requested resumes (0-5) PM/Super resumes - 10+ years experience landfills (0-5)	5. 5. 5. CONTRACTOR REFERENCE SCI	0 5. 0 5. ORE 10 re Wel 0 2. 0 2.	5. 0 5. 0 10 ht Wt. S 2.	O NE Liner - 7 closure turf projects O COPE COPE S Super 15 years, PM 30
subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5) material supplier's experience on similar projects (0-5) SUBCO b. Resumes for project managers and key personnel (subcontractors). Provided requested resumes (0-5) PM/Super resumes - 1.0+ years experience landfills (0-5) Closure Turf experience (0-5)	5. S. DINTRACTOR REFERENCE SC Scc 5. 5.	0 5.0 0 5.0 ORE 10 rre Well 0 2.0 0 4.0	5. 0 10 ht Wt. S 2. 2. 0 0.	D NE Liner - 7 closure turf projects D COPE STORY STOR
subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5) material supplier's experience on similar projects (0-5) SUBCO b. Resumes for project managers and key personnel (subcontractors). Provided requested resumes (0-5) PM/Super resumes - 10+ years experience landfills (0-5) Closure Turf experience (0-5) Local experience (RI/NE) of PM/SuperIntendent (0-5)	5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 6. 6. 7. 7. 8. 8. 8. 9. 9. 9. 9. 9. 9. 9. 9. 9. 9. 9. 9. 9.	0 5,0 0 5,1 ORE 10 tre Well 0 2,0 0 4,0 0 1,1	5. 5. 0 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	O NE Liner - 7 closure turf projects O COPE COPE SO Super 15 years, PM 30 Super has 1 closure turf, PM unknown O Super and PM 3 Ri projects
subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5) material supplier's experience on similar projects (0-5) SUBCO b. Resumes for project managers and key personnel (subcontractors). Provided requested resumes (0-5) PM/Super resumes0+ years experience landfills (0-5) Closure Turf experience (0-5) Local experience (RI/NE) of PM/SuperIntendent (0-5) SUE	Scoontractor reference scoontractor reference scoontractor resume	0 5,0 0 5,0 ORE 10 ORE 2.0 0 2.0 0 4.0 0 1.0 ORE 10	5. 0 5. 0 10 ht Wt. S 2. 2. 0 0. 1 1. 0 6.	O NE Liner - 7 closure turf projects O Core Store Super 15 years, PM 30 Super has 1 closure turf, PM unknown O Super and PM 3 RI projects
subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5) material supplier's experience on similar projects (0-5) SUBCO b. Resumes for project managers and key personnel (subcontractors). Provided requested resumes (0-5) PM/Super resumes - 10+ years experience landfills (0-5) Closure Turf experience (0-5) Local experience (Rf/NE) of PM/SuperIntendent (0-5) SUE TOTAL, SUB-CONTRACTO	Scoontractor reference scoontractor reference scoontractor resume	0 5,0 0 5,0 ORE 10 ORE 2.0 0 2.0 0 4.0 0 1.0 ORE 10	5. 0 5. 0 10 ht Wt. S 2. 2. 0 0. 1 1. 0 6.	O NE Liner - 7 closure turf projects O Core Store Super 15 years, PM 30 Super has 1 closure turf, PM unknown O Super and PM 3 RI projects
subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5) material supplier's experience on similar projects (0-5) Bubbot Bubbot	Scoontractor reference scoontractor reference scoontractor resume	0 5,0 0 5,0 ORE 10 ORE 2.0 0 2.0 0 4.0 0 1.0 ORE 10	5. 0 5. 0 10 ht Wt. S 2. 2. 0 0. 1 1. 0 6.	O NE Liner - 7 closure turf projects O Core Store Super 15 years, PM 30 Super has 1 closure turf, PM unknown O Super and PM 3 RI projects
subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5) material supplier's experience on similar projects (0-5) SUBCO b. Resumes for project managers and key personnel (subcontractors). Provided requested resumes (0-5) PM/Super resumes - 1.0+ years experience landfills (0-5) Closure Turf experience (0-5) Local experience (RI/NE) of PM/SuperIntendent (0-5) SUBCO TOTAL SUB-CONTRACTO 1.0 points - Overall Quality of the Bid Package a. Completeness and organization.	Scoontractor reference scoontractor reference scoontractor resume	0 5.0 0 5.0 ORE 10 ore Wel 0 2.0 0 2.0 0 4.0 0 1.1 ORE 10 ORE 20	5.5 5.0 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 1	Description of the content of the co
subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5) material supplier's experience on similar projects (0-5) SUBCO b. Resumes for project managers and key personnel (subcontractors). Provided requested resumes (0-5) PM/Super resumes - 1.0+ years experience landfills (0-5) Closure Turf experience (0-5) Local experience (RI/NE) of PM/Superintendent (0-5) SUE TOTAL SUB-CONTRACTO	Scoontractor reference scoon s	0 5.0 0 5.0 ORE 10 tre Well 0 2.0 0 4.0 0 1.0 ORE 10 ORE 20 ORE 5.0	5.0 5.0 5.0 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 1	O NE Liner - 7 closure turf projects O COTE STATE OF THE PROJECTS O Super 15 years, PM 30 Super has 1 closure turf, PM unknown O Super and PM 3 Ri projects B STATE OF THE PROJECTS O Very organized, complete, followed RF
subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5) material supplier's experience on similar projects (0-5) SUBCO b. Resumes for project managers and key personnel (subcontractors). Provided requested resumes (0-5) PM/Super resumes - 1.0+ years experience landfills (0-5) Closure Turf experience (0-5) Local experience (RI/NE) of PM/SuperIntendent (0-5) SUBCO TOTAL SUB-CONTRACTO O points - Overall Quality of the Bid Package a. Completeness and organization.	Scoontractor reference scoontractor reference scoontractor resume	0 5.0 0 5.0 ORE 10 te Well 0 2.0 0 4.0 0 1.0 DRE 10 DRE 20 Tre Well 0 5.4	5.0 5.0 5.0 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 1	O NE Liner - 7 closure turf projects O COTE STATE OF THE PROJECTS O Super 15 years, PM 30 Super has 1 closure turf, PM unknown O Super and PM 3 Ri projects B STATE OF THE PROJECTS O Very organized, complete, followed RF
subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5) material supplier's experience on similar projects (0-5) SUBCO b. Resumes for project managers and key personnel (subcontractors). Provided requested resumes (0-5) PM/Super resumes - 1.0+ years experience landfills (0-5) Closure Turf experience (0-5) Local experience (RI/NE) of PM/Superintendent (0-5) SUBCO TOTAL SUB-CONTRACTO Displace - Overall Quality of the Bid Package a. Completeness and organization. Completeness (0-a lot missing, 5-a everything requested was provided)	Scoontractor reference scoon s	0 5.0 0 5.0 ORE 10 tre Well 0 2.0 0 4.0 0 1.0 ORE 10 TRE 20 TRE 20 TRE 30 TR	5.5 5.6 5.6 5.6 5.6 5.6 5.6 5.6 5.6 5.6	D NE Liner - 7 closure turf projects D O COTE STORY SUPER 15 years, PM 30 Super has 1 closure turf, PM unknown Super and PM 3 Ri projects B COTE O Very organized, complete, followed RF numbering
subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5) material supplier's experience on similar projects (0-5) SUBCO b. Resumes for project managers and key personnel (subcontractors). Provided requested resumes (0-5) PM/Super resumes - 1.0+ years experience landfills (0-5) Closure Turf experience (0-5) Local experience (RI/NE) of PM/Superintendent (0-5) SUBCO TOTAL SUB-CONTRACTO (0 points - Overall Quality of the Bid Package a. Completeness and organization. Completeness (0-a lot missing, 5-a everything requested was provided) Organization (0-highly disorganized, 5-a highly organized)	SCONTRACTOR REFERENCE SCOOL S	0 5.0 0 5.0 0 5.0 0 5.0 0 6 2.0 0 2.0 0 2.0 0 1.0 0 1.0 0 5.4 0 5.7 0 5.7 0 5.7 0 5.7 0 5.7 0 5.7 0 5.7 0 5.7 0 5.7 0 5.7 0 5.7 0 5.7	5. 5. 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	O NE Liner - 7 closure turf projects O Core Super 15 years, PM 30 Super has 1 closure turf, PM unknown O Super and PM 3 Ri projects O Super and PM 3 Ri projects O core O very organized, complete, followed RF unmbering O
subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5) material supplier's experience on similar projects (0-5) SUBCO b. Resumes for project managers and key personnel (subcontractors). Provided requested resumes (0-5) PM/Super resumes - 1.0+ years experience landfills (0-5) Closure Turf experience (0-5) Local experience (RI/NE) of PM/Superintendent (0-5) SUBCO TOTAL SUB-CONTRACTO (0 points - Overall Quality of the Bid Package a. Completeness and organization. Completeness (0-a lot missing, 5-a everything requested was provided) Organization (0-highly disorganized, 5-a highly organized)	Scoontractor reference scoon s	0 5.0 0 5.0 0 5.0 0 5.0 0 6 2.0 0 2.0 0 2.0 0 1.0 0 1.0 0 5.4 0 5.7 0 5.7 0 5.7 0 5.7 0 5.7 0 5.7 0 5.7 0 5.7 0 5.7 0 5.7 0 5.7 0 5.7	5. 5. 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	O NE Liner - 7 closure turf projects O Core Super 15 years, PM 30 Super has 1 closure turf, PM unknown O Super and PM 3 Ri projects O Super and PM 3 Ri projects O core O very organized, complete, followed RF unmbering O





BIDS RECEIVED AND OPENED OCTOBER 28, 2021
BID EVALUATION

QUALIFICATIONS SCORING

JH Lynch and Sons

. 40 points – Prime Contractor Experience and Qualifications				_		-			T302 -	
a. Resumes for project managers and key personnel.							5core	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	J-,,,,
Super resume - 20+ years experience and 10 years landfill exp (0-5)						j	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	
						RESUM	<u>ME SCORE</u>	12.0	9.0	
,										
b. Financial stability of the firm.							Score	Weight	Wt. Score	
Bonding Capacity							5.0	2.0	2.0	\$225/\$500
				FINA	NCIALS	STABILE	TY SCORE	2,0	<u>2.0</u>	
c. Project references for similar and recent projects	A. Corvi	Inga					Avg Score	Weight	Wt. Score	
Questionnaire										
1. Competence of Project Manager										
	1	<u> </u>		T						
Poor understanding of the project requirements, frequent shortages	1	l	1 1		1	į		İ	1 !	
or delays with manpower, materials and/or equipment.	4	5	1			į	4.5	1.25	1.13	
Excellent understanding of the project requirements, no problems	1		1 1			1			∤ !	
with manpower, materials and/or equipment.		1	1 1					I		
	 	1	<u> </u>							
2. Competence of SuperIntendent		Γ	3			1	Т			
Poor understanding of the project regulrements, frequent shortages			1 1			ļ			[
	4	5	1 1				4.5	1,75	1,58	
or delays with manpower, materials and/or equipment.	} "	, ,]]			l	7.5	2,73	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	
Excellent understanding of the project requirements, no problems	1		1 1		l	1	[
with manpower, materials and/or equipment.	ļ									
3, Quality of Work						-				
Poor workmanship, disregard for drawings and specifications,		•			i		- 1	, !	'	
needed constant oversight.	4	5		1 1	ı		4,5	1.25	1,13	
Excellent workmanship, understood what was required, worked				1						
well without oversight.			<u></u>			1			L	
4. Quailty of Site Control										
Poor management of dust, erosion controls, noise and traffic			}			1			1 /	
and/or frequent complaints.	4	5				- 1	4.5	1,00	0.90	
	1 "	-				Ì	4,.,	1,00	0.50	
Excellent management of dust, erosion controls, noise and traffic.					- 1				1 !	
5, Overall Owner/Engineer/Public Interaction										
Poor communication skills, frequent misunderstanding or							T T			
confrontation, difficulty scheduling meetings.	4	5				1	4.5	1.00	0.90	
Excellent communication skills, highly organized,	1					1	1		1	
6. Schedule Expectations	 		L							
Very unrealistic schedule or did not provide schedule despite Owner						T				
· ,	4	5 .	1 [1		1	4.5	1,00	0.90	
request.	' '	-				1	71.0	1,00	0.50	
Very-realistic schedule, provided in a timely manner.					L	1	l			
7. Delivery of the Project on Time				7 7						
many to the first time of the state of the s						i				
Frequently missed milestones, project was significantly delayed due						i			ı	
to factors completely within the Contractor's control.	4	5			1		4.5	1,00	0.90	
Milestones were consistently met, project was completed on			1 1	1 1	- F	ļ		ŀ	. 1	
schedule or was completed within a time frame considering factors			1 1		- }	1	l	-	, [
outside of the Contractor's control,							<u> </u>			
8, How Legitimate were the Change Order Requests?	ļ									
One or more of the change orders were baseless.]		- 1	- 1			المرا	
All of the change order(s) were justified or requested by the Owner	4	5	1		- 1	İ	4.5	1.25	1,13	
(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						Ţ			, 7	
negotiation process.	4	5	1 1		1	į	4.5	1.25	1.13	
The value of the change orders was very fair; negotiation was	7		! !		j		7.3	1,23	4.43	
respectful (or no change orders were requested).			1 1		- 1		_			
10, Management of Sub-Contractors.										
Poor quality of work by sub-contractors, frequent scheduling			I I							
problems.	ايا	_	1 1							•
Excellent quality of work by sub-contractors, worked seamlessly	3	5			1		4.0	0.75	0.60	
with Contractor.				į	ŀ				- 1	
With Contractor. 11. Project Organization						1				
Poor organization Poor organization skills, performed work without approved							·			
	1				- 1	1	`			
submittals, submittal process cumbersome.	5	5	. 1		- 1	-	5.0	0,75	0.75	
Excellent organization skills, ensured submittals were organized and			, 1		- 1	1	J	J		
	ſ	ĺ					[
timely.		******								
12. Overall Experience with the Contractor										
	. 4	s					4.5	1.75	1.58	



	.,	-			
Page Evaluation					
Company has performed recent, relevant projects (0-5)		5.0	2,0	2.0	S 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
PRC	OJECT REFERENCES	SCORE	20.0	16.2	
	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,				
d, Schedule		Score	Weight	Wt. Scare	
is the schedule reasonable (0-5)		5.0	1,0	1.0	very detalled
Is it complete, easy to read and understand (0-5)		5,0	1,0	1.0	very detailed
	SCHEDULE	SCORE	2.0	2.0	
e. Availability of equipment and personnel.		Score	Weight	Wt, Score	
e. Availsounty or equipment and personnel. Do they have the equipment needed to perform this project (6-5)		5.0	2.0	2.0	Egulpment provided
Do they have the manpower to perform this project (0-5)	—————— —	5,0	2.0	2.0	Manpower provided
po disk trake the marchawar to heriorid rais broker (0-0)	AVAILABILITY		4.0	4.0	(Vietipowe) provided
TOTAL PRIME CONTRACTOR Q	UALIFICATIONS S	SCORE	40.0	33.2	
2. 20 points – Major Subcontractors and Material Suppliers' Experience and Qualifications (all subcontractors and vendo project cost)	iors responsible for gr	reater than	10% of the	overali	
		Score	Welght	Wt. Score	
Project references for similar and recent projects (subcontractors and material suppliers).		Score 5,0	Welght 5,0	Wt. Score	NE Uner - 7 closure turf projects
Project references for similar and recent projects (subcontractors and material suppliers). subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5)					NE Uner - 7 closure turf projects
Project references for similar and recent projects (subcontractors and material suppliers). subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5) material supplier's experience on similar projects (0-5)	ACTOR REFERENCE	5,0 5.0	5.0	5,0	NE Liner - 7 closure turf projects
Project references for similar and recent projects (subcontractors and material suppliers). subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5) material supplier's experience on similar projects (0-5) SUBCONTRA	ACTOR REFERENCE	5,0 5.0 SCORE	5.0 5.0 <u>10.0</u>	5,0 5,0 10.0	NE Liner - 7 closure turf projects
a. Project references for similar and recent projects (subcontractors and material suppliers). subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5) material supplier's experience on similar projects (0-5) SUBCONTRA b. Resumes for project managers and key personnel (subcontractors).	ACTOR REFERENCE	5,0 5.0 SCORE	5.0 5.0 <u>10.0</u> Welght	5,0 5.0 10.0 Wt. Score	NE Liner - 7 closure turf projects
a. Project references for similar and recent projects (subcontractors and material suppliers). subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5) material supplier's experience on similar projects (0-5) SUBCONTR/ b. Resumes for project managers and key personnel (subcontractors). Provided requested resumes (0-5)	ACTOR REFERENCE	5.0 5.0 SCORE Score 5.0	5.0 5.0 10.0 Welgfit 2.5	5,0 5.0 10.0 Wt. Score 2.5	
a. Project references for similar and recent projects (subcontractors and material suppliers). subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5) material supplier's experience on similar projects (0-5) SUBCONTR/ b. Resumes for project managers and key personnel (subcontractors). Provided requested resumes (0-5) PM/Super resumes - 10+ years experience landfills (0-5)	ACTOR REFERENCE	5,0 5.0 SCORE Score 5,0 5,0	5.0 5.0 10.0 Welght 2.5 2.5	5,0 5.0 10.0 Wt. Score 2.5 2.5	Super 15 years, PM 30
a. Project references for similar and recent projects (subcontractors and material suppliers). subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5) material supplier's experience on similar projects (0-5) SUBCONTRA b. Resumes for project managers and key personnel (subcontractors). Provided requested resumes (0-5) PM/Super resumes - 10+ years experience landfills (0-5) Closure Turf experience (0-5)	ACTOR REFERENCE	5,0 5,0 SCORE Score 5,0 5,0 1,0	5.0 5.0 10.0 Weight 2.5 2.5 4.0	5,0 5.0 10.0 Wt. Score 2.5 2.5 0.8	Super 15 years, PM 30 Super has 1 closure turf, PM unknown
a. Project references for similar and recent projects (subcontractors and material suppliers). subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5) material supplier's experience on similar projects (0-5) SUBCONTR/ b. Resumes for project managers and key personnel (subcontractors). Provided requested resumes (0-5) PM/Super resumes - 10+ years experience landfills (0-5) Closure Turf experience (0-5) Local experience (8I/NE) of PM/SuperIntendent (0-5)	ACTOR REFERENCE	5.0 5.0 SCORE 5.0 5.0 1.0 5.0	5.0 5.0 10.0 Weight 2.5 2.5 4.0	5,0 5.0 10.0 Wt. Score 2.5 2.5 0.8 1.0	Super 15 years, PM 30
a. Project references for similar and recent projects (subcontractors and material suppliers). subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5) material supplier's experience on similar projects (0-5) SUBCONTR/ b. Resumes for project managers and key personnel (subcontractors). Provided requested resumes (0-5) PM/Super resumes - 10+ years experience landfills (0-5) Closure Turf experience (0-5) Local experience (RI/NE) of PM/SuperIntendent (0-5)	ACTOR REFERENCE	5.0 5.0 SCORE 5.0 5.0 1.0 5.0	5.0 5.0 10.0 Weight 2.5 2.5 4.0	5,0 5.0 10.0 Wt. Score 2.5 2.5 0.8	Super 15 years, PM 30 Super has 1 closure turf, PM unknown
a. Project references for similar and recent projects (subcontractors and material suppliers). subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5) material supplier's experience on similar projects (0-5) SUBCONTR/ b. Resumes for project managers and key personnel (subcontractors). Provided requested resumes (0-5) PM/Super resumes - 10+ years experience landfills (0-5) Closure Turf experience (0-5) Local experience (RI/NE) of PM/SuperIntendent (0-5)	ACTOR REFERENCE	5.0 5.0 5.0 SCORE 5.0 5.0 1.0 5.0 SCORE	5.0 5.0 10.0 Weight 2.5 2.5 4.0	5,0 5.0 10.0 Wt. Score 2.5 2.5 0.8 1.0	Super 15 years, PM 30 Super has 1 closure turf, PM unknown
a. Project references for similar and recent projects (subcontractors and material suppliers). subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5) material supplier's experience on similar projects (0-5) SUBCONTR/ b. Resumes for project managers and key personnel (subcontractors). Provided requested resumes (0-5) PM/Super resumes - 10+ years experience landfills (0-5) Closure Turf experience (0-5) Local experience (RI/NE) of PM/SuperIntendent (0-5) SUBCONT	ACTOR REFERENCE	5.0 5.0 5.0 SCORE 5.0 5.0 1.0 5.0 SCORE	5.0 5.0 10.0 Weight 2.5 2.5 4.0 1.0	5,0 5.0 10.0 Wt. Score 2.5 2.5 0.8 1.0 6.8	Super 15 years, PM 30 Super has 1 closure turf, PM unknown
a. Project references for similar and recent projects (subcontractors and material suppliers). subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5) material supplier's experience on similar projects (0-5) b. Resumes for project managers and key personnel (subcontractors). Provided requested resumes (0-5) PM/Super resumes - 10+ years experience landfills (0-5) Closure Turf experience (0-5) Local experience (RI/NE) of PM/SuperIntendent (0-5) SUBCONT	ACTOR REFERENCE	5.0 5.0 5.0 SCORE 5.0 5.0 1.0 5.0 SCORE	5.0 5.0 10.0 Weight 2.5 2.5 4.0 1.0	5,0 5.0 10.0 Wt. Score 2.5 2.5 0.8 1.0 6.8	Super 15 years, PM 30 Super has 1 closure turf, PM unknown
a. Project references for similar and recent projects (subcontractors and material suppliers). subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5) material supplier's experience on similar projects (0-5) b. Resumes for project managers and key personnel (subcontractors). Provided requested resumes (0-5) PM/Super resumes - 10+ years experience landfills (0-5) Closure Turf experience (0-5) Local experience (RI/NE) of PM/SuperIntendent (0-5) SUBCONT	ACTOR REFERENCE TRACTOR RESUME	5.0 5.0 5.0 SCORE 5.0 5.0 1.0 5.0 SCORE	5.0 5.0 10.0 Weight 2.5 2.5 4.0 1.0	5.0 5.0 10.0 Wt. Score 2.5 2.5 0.8 1.0 6.8	Super 15 years, PM 30 Super has 1 closure turf, PM unknown Super and PM 3 RI projects
a. Project references for similar and recent projects (subcontractors and material suppliers). subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5) material supplier's experience on similar projects (0-5) SUBCONTR/ b. Resumes for project managers and key personnel (subcontractors). Provided requested resumes (0-5) PM/Super resumes - 10+ years experience landfills (0-5) Closure Turf experience (0-5) Local experience (RI/NE) of PM/Superintendent (0-5) SUBCONT TOTAL SUB-CONTRACTOR QI	ACTOR REFERENCE TRACTOR RESUME	5.0 5.0 SCORE 5.0 5.0 1.0 5.0 SCORE	5.0 5.0 10.0 Welght 2.5 2.5 4.0 1.0 20.0	5.0 5.0 10.0 Wt. Score 2.5 2.5 0.8 1.0 6.8	Super 15 years, PM 30 Super has 1 closure turf, PM unknown
a. Project references for similar and recent projects (subcontractors and material suppliers). subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5) material supplier's experience on similar projects (0-5) SUBCONTRA b. Resumes for project managers and key personnel (subcontractors). Provided requested resumes (0-5) PM/Super resumes - 10+ years experience landfills (0-5) Closura Turf experience (0-5) Local experience (RI/NE) of PM/SuperIntendent (0-5) SUBCONT TOTAL SUB-CONTRACTOR QI - 10 points Overall Quality of the Bid Package a. Completeness and organization.	ACTOR REFERENCE TRACTOR RESUME	S.O S.O	5.0 5.0 10.0 Welght 2.5 2.5 4.0 1.0 10.0	5.0 5.0 10.0 Wt. Score 2.5 2.5 0.8 1.0 6.8	Super 15 years, PM 30 Super has 1 closure turf, PM unknown Super and PM 3 RI projects
a. Project references for similar and recent projects (subcontractors and material suppliers). subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5) material supplier's experience on similar projects (0-5) SUBCONTR/ b. Resumes for project managers and key personnel (subcontractors). Provided requested resumes (0-5) PM/Super resumes - 10+ years experience landfills (0-5) Closure Turf experience (0-5) Local experience (RI/NE) of PM/Superintendent (0-5) SUBCONT TOTAL SUB-CONTRACTOR QI 1. 10 points Overall Quality of the Bid Package a. Completeness and organization. Completeness (0-a lot missing, 5= everything requested was provided) Organization (0-highly disorganized, 5= highly organized)	ACTOR REFERENCE TRACTOR RESUME	S.O	5.0 5.0 10.0 Welght 2.5 2.5 4.0 1.0.0 20.0	5.0 5.0 10.0 Wt. Score 2.5 2.5 0.8 1.0 6.8 Wt. Score 5.0	Super 15 years, PM 30 Super has 1 closure turf, PM unknown Super and PM 3 RI projects complete, but not highly organized, did no
a. Project references for similar and recent projects (subcontractors and material suppliers). subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5) material supplier's experience on similar projects (0-5) SUBCONTR/ b. Resumes for project managers and key personnel (subcontractors). Provided requested resumes (0-5) PM/Super resumes - 10+ years experience landfills (0-5) Closure Turf experience (0-5) Local experience (RI/NE) of PM/Superintendent (0-5) SUBCONT TOTAL SUB-CONTRACTOR QI 3. 10 points Overall Quality of the Bid Package a. Completeness and organization. Completeness (0-a lot missing, 5= everything requested was provided) Organization (0-highly disorganized, 5= highly organized) BID F	ACTOR REFERENCE TRACTOR RESUME UALIFICATIONS S	S.O S.O	5.0 5.0 10.0 Welght 2.5 2.5 4.0 10.0 20.0 Welght 3.0 5.0	5.0 5.0 10.0 Wt. Store 2.5 2.5 0.8 1.0 6.8 16.8	Super 15 years, PM 30 Super has 1 closure turf, PM unknown Super and PM 3 Rl projects complete, but not highly organized, did no
a. Project references for similar and recent projects (subcontractors and material suppliers). subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5) material supplier's experience on similar projects (0-5) SUBCONTR/ b. Resumes for project managers and key personnel (subcontractors). Provided requested resumes (0-5) PM/Super resumes - 10+ years experience landfills (0-5) Closure Turf experience (0-5) Local experience (RI/NE) of PM/Superintendent (0-5) SUBCONT TOTAL SUB-CONTRACTOR QI 5. 10 points Overall Quality of the Bid Package a. Completeness and organization. Completeness (0-a lot missing, 5= everything requested was provided) Organization (0-highly disorganized, 5= highly organized) BID F	ACTOR REFERENCE TRACTOR RESUME UALIFICATIONS S PACKAGE QUALITY	S.O S.O	5.0 5.0 10.0 Welght 2.5 2.5 4.0 10.0 20.0 Welght 3.0 5.0	5.0 5.0 10.0 Wt. Store 2.5 2.5 0.8 1.0 6.8 16.8 Wt. Score 5.0 4.0	Super 15 years, PM 30 Super has 1 closure turf, PM unknown Super and PM 3 Rl projects complete, but not highly organized, did no





BIDS RECEIVED AND OPENED OCTOBER 28, 2021 BID EVALUATION

QUALIFICATIONS SCORING

Manafort Brothers

DECEMBER 8, 2021

AO adult. Balant Contractor Consulation and Constituent											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)								0,6	3.0	1.8	only 1 landfill project
Super resume - 20+ years experience and 10 years landfill exp (0-5)								1,0	4.0	8.0	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	X sipper con broke
total axperience (m/ner) or envy-openmenteent (0-2)							RESUN	AE SCORE	12,0	<u>5.8</u>	
										T::2 -	
b. Financial stability of the firm.								Score	Welght	Wt. Score	avaided for statements handles 150/25
Bonding Capacity					EIM.	MCIAL	CTABILI	5,0 TY SCORE	2.0	2.0	provided fin. statements, bonding 150/35
					1114	MOME	21711111	11 3CONE	<u>E-10</u>	L	
c. Project references for similar and recent projects	Learned	Jnga						Avg Score	Welght	Wt. Score	
Questionnaire											
1. Competence of Project Manager		_	T	1 1						I	
Poor understanding of the project requirements, frequent shortages											
or delays with manpower, materials and/or equipment.	5	5		1			ļ l	5,0	1.25	1,25	
Excellent understanding of the project requirements, no problems	1]							
with manpower, materials and/or equipment.											
2. Competence of Superintendent											
•]]							
Poor understanding of the project requirements, frequent shortages			i	1 1		ł			4 77#	4.55	
or delays with manpower, materials and/or equipment.	5	5		1 1				5.0	1,75	1.75	
Excellent understanding of the project regulrements, no problems		1									
with manpower, materials and/or equipment.			<u> </u>	<u> </u>					·	L	
3, Quality of Work	<u> </u>	ı		т т					-		
Poor workmanship, disregard for drawings and specifications,											
needed constant oversight.	- 5	5		1 1				5.0	1.25	1.25	
Excellent workmanship, understood what was required, worked				1							
weil without oversight.			ł								
4. Quality of Site Control Poor management of dust, erosion controls, noise and traffic		_	· · · · · ·	T T				1			
•											
and/or frequent complaints.	4	5	l					4.5	1,00	0,90	
Excellent management of dust, erosion controls, noise and traffic.											
5, Overall Owner/Engineer/Public Interaction		I	'								
Poor communication skills, frequent misunderstanding or		· · · · · ·	T	Г						i T	
confrontation, difficulty scheduling meetings.	4	5	l	l I				4.5	1,00	0.90	
Excellent communication skills, highly organized.	1		ŀ]							
6, Schedule Expectations											
Very unrealistic schedule or did not provide schedule despite Owner			Γ								4
request.	5	5						5.0	1.00	1.00	
Very realistic schedule, provided in a timely manner.	1										
7. Delivery of the Project on Time							•				
	ĺ										
frequently missed milestones, project was significantly delayed due			ļ		١.,		j				
to factors completely within the Contractor's control.	5	5						5.0	1.00	1.00	
Milestones were consistently met, project was completed on	,								2.00	1.00	
schedule or was completed within a time frame considering factors						l	l				
outside of the Contractor's control.			L	<u> </u>							
8. How Legitimate were the Change Order Requests?											
One or more of the change orders were baseless.							1	ا ہے	435	1 445	
All of the change order(s) were justified or requested by the Owner	S	5					- 1	5.0	1.25	1.25	
(or no change orders requested).			L								
9. How Reasonable were the Cost of the Change Orders?											
The value of the change order(s) were excessive; difficult							Ì	1			•
negotiation process.	5	5						5,0	1.25	1.25	
The value of the change orders was very fair; negotiation was				!				į			•
respectful (or no change orders were requested).						I		i			
10. Management of Sub-Contractors. Poor quality of work by sub-contractors, frequent scheduling				Ţ T				1			
problems.]			1				
problems. Excellent quality of work by sub-contractors, worked seamlessly	4	S		1 1		1	- 1	4.5	0,75	0,68	
with Contractor.							- 1	ĺ		ļ	
11. Project Organization				·			l.				
Poor organization skills, performed work without approved				T T		$\neg \neg$					
submittals, submittal process cumbersome.	,	ا ہ				-		۱ ۸٫۰		ا م	
Excellent organization skills, ensured submittals were organized and	4	5		[- 1	4.5	0.75	0.68	
timely.								J	}		
12. Overall Experience with the Contractor				ъ		<u>.</u>		s.			
								- 1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-	
If given the choice, would not work with again.	5	5		I		1	I.	5.0	1.75	1.75	



				<u> </u>
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	<u>20.0</u>	<u>16.1</u>	
d Schodulo	Score	Weight	Wt. Score	
d. Schedule Is the schedule reasonable (0-5)	4.0	1.0	0.8	
is the schedule reasonable (u-s) Is it complete, easy to read and understand (0-5)	4,0	1.0	0.8	basic, but complete
is it complete, easy to read and understand (0-5)	SCHEDULE SCORE	2.0	1.6	
A A A Maria A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A	3CHEDOLE SCORE		4.0	
e. Availability of equipment and personnel.	Score	Weight	Wt. Score	
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 QUAL	FICATIONS SCORE	40.0	<u>29.5</u>	
20 points – Major Subcontractors and Material Suppliers' Experience and Qualifications (all subcontractors and vandors re- oject cost)	sponsible for greater tha	n 10% of the	overall	
oject (ost)				
	Score	Weight	Wt. Score	
a. Project references for similar and recent projects (subcontractors and material suppliers).	5.0	5.0	5,0	NE Liner - 7 closure turf projects
subcontractor's experience on similar projects (0-5) material supplier's experience on similar projects (0-5)	5.0	5.0	5.0	Ne Litter - 7 closore cutt projects
	R REFERENCE SCORE	10.0	10.0	
SOBCONTRACTO	W WELLWEITER SCONE	20.0		
b. Resumes for project managers and key personnel (subcontractors).	Score	Weight	Wt. Score	
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	
Closure Turf experience (0-5)			2.5	Super 15 years, PM 30
	1.0	4.0	0.8	Super 15 years, PM 30 Super has 1 closure turf, PM unknown
Local experience (RI/NE) of PM/Superintendent (0-5)	1.0 5.0		8.0	
Local experience (RI/NE) of PM/Superintendent (0-5) SUBCONTRAC		4.0	8.0	Super has 1 closure turf, PM unknown
	5.0	4.0 1.0	0.8 1.0	Super has 1 closure turf, PM unknown
	5.0 TOR RESUME SCORE	4.0 1.0	0.8 1.0	Super has 1 closure turf, PM unknown
SUBCONTRAC TOTAL SUB-CONTRACTOR QUALI	5.0 TOR RESUME SCORE	4,0 1,0 10,0	0.8 1.0 6.8	Super has 1 closure turf, PM unknown
SUBCONTRAC TOTAL SUB-CONTRACTOR QUALI	5.0 TOR RESUME SCORE	4,0 1,0 10,0	0.8 1.0 6.8	Super has 1 closure turf, PM unknown
SUBCONTRACT TOTAL SUB-CONTRACTOR QUALI 10 points Overall Quality of the Bid Package	5.0 TOR RESUME SCORE	4,0 1,0 10,0 20,0	0.8 1.0 6.8 16.8	Super has 1 closure turf, PM unknown
SUBCONTRACT TOTAL SUB-CONTRACTOR QUALI 10 points Overall Quality of the Bid Package a. Completeness and organization.	5.0 TOR RESUME SCORE FICATIONS SCORE	4,0 1,0 10,0 20.0	0.8 1.0 6.8 16.8	Super has 1 closure turf, PM unknown Super and PM 3 RI projects
SUBCONTRACT TOTAL SUB-CONTRACTOR QUALI 10 points Overall Quality of the Bid Package a. Completeness and organization. Completeness (G=a lot missing, 5= everything requested was provided)	5.0 TOR RESUME SCORE FICATIONS SCORE , Score 5.0	4,0 1,0 10,0 20,0 Weight 5,0	0.8 1.0 6.8 16.8 Wt. Score 5.0	Super has 1 closure turf, PM unknown Super and PM 3 RI projects organ, has media away sind, but of dispersion was selected to be selected to
SUBCONTRAC TOTAL SUB-CONTRACTOR QUALI 10 points Overall Quality of the Bid Package a. Completeness and organization. Completeness (0=a lot missing, 5= everything requested was provided) Organization (0=highly disorganized, 5= highly organized)	5.0 TOR RESUME SCORE IFICATIONS SCORE , Score , 5.0 2.0	4,0 1,6 10,0 20,0 Weight 5,0 5,0	0.8 1.0 6.8 16.8 Wt. Score 5.0 2.0	Super has 1 closure turf, PM unknown Super and PM 3 RI projects
SUBCONTRAC TOTAL SUB-CONTRACTOR QUALI 10 points Overall Quality of the Bid Package a. Completeness and organization. Completeness (0=a lot missing, 5= everything requested was provided) Organization (0=highly disorganized, 5= highly organized)	5.0 TOR RESUME SCORE FICATIONS SCORE , Score 5.0	4,0 1,0 10,0 20,0 Weight 5,0	0.8 1.0 6.8 16.8 Wt. Score 5.0	Super has 1 closure turf, PM unknown Super and PM 3 RI projects organ, has needed additional translational superior and the
SUBCONTRACT TOTAL SUB-CONTRACTOR QUALI 10 points Overall Quality of the Bid Package a. Completeness and organization. Completeness (9-a lot missing, 5- everything requested was provided) Organization (0-highly disorganized, 5- highly organized) BID PACK	, Score 5.0 Score 5.0 2.0 CAGE QUALITY SCORE	4,0 1.0 10.0 20.0 Weight 5,0 5,0	0.8 1.0 6.8 16.8 Wt. Score 5.0 2.0 7.0	Super has 1 closure turf, PM unknown Super and PM 3 RI projects organ, has media dauguring helder tiped any consequences with a selection or project by the selection of the se
SUBCONTRAC TOTAL SUB-CONTRACTOR QUALI 10 points Overall Quality of the Bid Package a. Completeness and organization. Completeness (0=a lot missing, 5= everything requested was provided) Organization (0=highly disorganized, 5= highly organized)	, Score 5.0 Score 5.0 2.0 CAGE QUALITY SCORE	4,0 1,6 10,0 20,0 Weight 5,0 5,0	0.8 1.0 6.8 16.8 Wt. Score 5.0 2.0	Super has 1 closure turf, PM unknown Super and PM 3 RI projects organ, has media accurated, held displays managed in the MARIE delivered accurate to the MARI
SUBCONTRACT TOTAL SUB-CONTRACTOR QUALI 10 points Overall Quality of the Bid Package a. Completeness and organization. Completeness (0=a lot missing, 5= everything requested was provided) Organization (0-highly disorganized, 5= highly organized) BID PACK	, Score 5.0 Score 5.0 2.0 CAGE QUALITY SCORE	4,0 1.0 10.0 20.0 Weight 5,0 5,0	0.8 1.0 6.8 16.8 Wt. Score 5.0 2.0 7.0	Super has 1 closure turf, PM unknown Super and PM 3 RI projects organ, has media away sind, but of dispersion was selected to be selected to





TIVERTON LANDFILL CLOSURE BIDS RECEIVED AND OPENED OCTOBER 28, 2021 BID EVALUATION

QUALIFICATIONS SCORING

DIGregorio Corporation DECEMBER 8, 2021

. 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
Closure Torf 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	
						R	SUME SCORE	12.0	<u>6,6</u>	
					1	,				
b. Financial stability of the firm.							Score	Weight	Wt. Score	
Bonding Capacity							5.0	2.0	2.0	\$70/\$125
					FINA	NCIAL STA	ABILITY SCORE	2.0	2.0	and the state of t
		· · · · · ·						1	T.11.	
c. Project references for similar and recent projects	DiPrete	Runtol	Bernie	Owen	<u> </u>	l	Avg Score	Weight	Wt. Score	
Questionnaire										
1. Competence of Project Manager	-	1		1	т т	$\overline{}$	<u> </u>	1	1	
Poor understanding of the project requirements, frequent shortages	l :		1	1	li			1	l	
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		1 -	1	1						
with manpower, materials and/or equipment.	l :		1					1		
2. Competence of Superintendent			<u> </u>	<u> </u>	,I,		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<u></u>		
a compense of copermentations			$\overline{}$	1				1	1	
Poor understanding of the project requirements, frequent shortages			l	i	!!					
or delays with manpower, materials and/or equipment.	5	5	4	5		1	4.8	1,75	1.66	
Excellent understanding of the project requirements, no problems	1	l				•			[
with manpower, materials and/or equipment.		l	i					ŀ		
3. Quality of Work										
Poor workmanship, disregard for drawings and specifications,		l								
needed constant oversight.	5	5	5	5		- 1	5.0	1,25	1.25	
Excellent workmanship, understood what was required, worked]		"	1 "		1	1 2.0		-,	
well without oversight.		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>				<u></u>		
4. Quality of Site Control	<u> </u>		,	·	·				r	
Poor management of dust, erosion controls, noise and traffic										
and/or frequent complaints.	4	5	4	5			4.5	1.00	0.90	
						ŀ		1		•
Excellent management of dust, erosion controls, noise and traffic.		L	L	L					l	
5. Overall Owner/Engineer/Public Interaction			T	T	1 1			1	1	
Poor communication skills, frequent misunderstanding or	4	5	5	5			4.8	1.00	0.95	
confrontation, difficulty scheduling meetings. Excellent communication skills, highly organized.	7	້	-] _			1 110			
6. Schedule Expectations		l	I	1				J.		***************************************
Very unrealistic schedule or did not provide schedule despite Owner			T	1		-		T T		
request.	5	5	4	5		1	4.8	1.00	0.95	
Very realistic schedule, provided in a timely manner.	1		1			1		1		
7. Delivery of the Project on Time				•						
		I]	ĭ		Ĭ				
Frequently missed milestones, project was significantly delayed due				ļ			ı		! i	
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]	,	7	~			7.0	1.00	0.55	
schedule or was completed within a time frame considering factors			1	l		- 1	1	ł		
outside of the Contractor's control.			<u> </u>	<u> </u>				<u> </u>	İ	
8. How LegitImate were the Change Order Requests?		,	1				-	T	r	
One or more of the change orders were baseless.		_	-	,			,,	1 25	1,19	
All of the change order(s) were justifled or requested by the Owner	5	5	5	4			4.8	1,25	1,12	
(or no change orders requested).		L	L	L	<u> </u>			<u> </u>		
9. How Reasonable were the Cost of the Change Orders?				T	1				f -	
The value of the change order(s) were excessive; difficult			1	1	[l	1			
negotiation process.	5	5	5	4	Ì		4.8	1,25	1.19	
The value of the change orders was very fair; negotiation was			1		I	- 1	l			•
respectful (or no change orders were requested).	\vdash	ļ	<u>!</u>					J	-	
Management of Sub-Contractors. Poor quality of work by sub-contractors, frequent scheduling			T					1		
problems.	ایا		١.	l		ŀ				
Excellent quality of work by sub-contractors, worked seamlessly	5	5	4	5	l i		4.8	0.75	0.71	
with Contractor,			l				1	ļ		
11. Project Organization				*		-				
Poor organization skills, performed work without approved								,		
submittals, submittal process cumbersome.	4	S	4	5	I	ļ	4.5	8.75	0.68	
Excellent organization skills, ensured submittals were organized and	4	۵	*	١ ،			4,3	0.75	0.05	
timely.			<u></u>	L_						
12. Overall Experience with the Contractor										
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	



Pare Evaluation			1	
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 (O for none, 5 for S or more)	4.0	4.G	3.2	Contacted 8 of 8 references provided with contact info.
PROJECT REFEREN	CES SCORE	<u>20,0</u>	17.3	
d. Schedule	Score	Weight	Wt. Score	
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	Polite Rehalinacentaries
	ULE SCORE	2.0	1.4	
e. Availability of equipment and personnel.	Score	Weight	Wt. Score	/···
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		Manpower provided
	LITY SCORE	4.0	2.8	
TOTAL PRIME CONTRACTOR QUALIFICATIO	NS SCORE	40.0	30.1	•
20 points - Major Subcontractors and Material Suppliers' Experience and Qualifications (all subcontractors and vendors responsible fo oject cost)	or Breater ina	IN TOW OF THE	2 Over 811	
a. Project references for similar and recent projects (subcontractors and material suppliers).	Score	Weight	Wt. Score	
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 REFERE		10.0	8.0	
b. Resumes for project managers and key personnel (subcontractors).	Score	Weight	Wt. Score	
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		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 RESU	ME SCORE	10,0	4.8	
TOTAL SUB-CONTRACTOR QUALIFICATIO	NS SCORE	20.0	12,8	
10 points – Overall Quality of the Bid Package				
TA Braiss - Oxel an Abanti An are pin LarveRe				P
a. Completeness and organization.	Score	. Weight	Wt. Score	
Completeness (0=a lot missing, 5= everything requested was provided)	4,0	5.0	4.0	organized, included project approach but
Organization (0=highly disorganized, 5= highly organized)	4.0	5,0	4.0	missing equip; some most projects are of
BID PACKAGE QUA	LITY SCORE	10.0	8.0	
. TOTAL BID PACKAGE QUALI	TY SCORE	10.0	8,0	
TOTAL QUALIFICATIONS SCORE		70.0	50.9	





BIDS RECEIVED AND OPENED OCTOBER 28, 2021 **BID EVALUATION**

QUALIFICATIONS SCORING

ETL Corp DECEMBER 8, 2021

				.,,,.						-	
1, 40 points Prime Contractor Experience and Qualifications								Score	Weight	Wt. Score	Comments
a, Resumes for project managers and key personnel. Provided requested resumes (0-5)								5.0	1.0	1,0	Confinents
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 Turi experience (0-5)								0.0	3.0	0.0	no closure turi experience
Local experience (RI/NE) of PM/Superintendent (0-5)					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			3.0	1.0		NE but no RI
							RESU	ME SCORE	12.0	8.6	
		-									
b. Financial stability of the firm.								Score	Weight	Wt. Score	
Bonding Capacity								0.0	2.0	0.0	Called ref. 3 times, left 2 VMs
					FIN	ANCIAL	STABI1	ITY SCORE	2.0	0.0	
c. Project references for similar and recent projects	McGow.	Musla	l Donelso	n		L	<u> </u>	Avg Score	Weight	Wt, Score	-
Questionnaire											
1. Competence of Project Manager		,							···		
			i			ł					
Poor understanding of the project requirements, frequent shortages	5	5	s		1			5.0	1.25	1.25	
or delays with manpower, materials and/or equipment.	1 3	"	'		1		1	3.0	1.23	1,23	
Excellent understanding of the project requirements, no problems		l	ĺ	1	1		l				
with manpower, materials and/or equipment. 2. Competence of Superintendent	 	L	1		J	l		<u> </u>			
2. colliberate of adjetititelide in	<u> </u>		T	ī	1			1			
Poor understanding of the project regulrements, frequent shortages			1		1						
or delays with manpower, materials and/or equipment.	5	5	5	Į.	1			5.0	1.75	1,75	
Excellent understanding of the project regulrements, no problems	1		1	[i						
with manpower, materials and/or equipment,	i			1							
3. Quality of Work											
Poor workmanship, disregard for drawings and specifications,		Ĭ									
needed constant oversight.	5	5	5	1	1			5.0	1.25	1.25	
Excellent workmanship, understood what was required, worked] ~	-	1 ~		1	1				2124	
well without oversight.	ļ		<u> </u>	<u>i </u>		<u></u> _	L				
4. Quality of Site Control	ļ <u> </u>				т	——		T	-		
Poor management of dust, erosion controls, noise and traffic					j			<u> </u>			
and/or frequent complaints.	5	4	5			ĺ		4.7	1,00	0,93	
	ł		1	1	1	ł					
Excellent management of dust, erosion controls, noise and traffic.	-	l		<u> </u>	1	L	l	l			
Overall Owner/Engineer/Public Interaction Poor communication skills, frequent misunderstanding or	 	1	T	Т	7			1			
confrontation, difficulty scheduling meetings.	5	5	5	l	ĺ			5,0	1.00	1.00	
Excellent communication skills, highly organized.	1		"				1	-,-			
6, Schedule Expectations	 				•		l				
Very unrealistic schedule or did not provide schedule despite Owner			T	1	1						
request	5	5	5	1	ļ			5.0	1.00	1.00	•
Very realistic schedule, provided in a timely manner.			i i	İ							
7. Delivery of the Project on Time											
					T						
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	ļ		1								
outside of the Contractor's control.	ļ		Ь.	<u></u>	نـــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ			i1			
8. How Legitimate were the Change Order Requests?		·····	т		1						
One or more of the change orders were baseless,	5	5	5	1 .				5.0	1.25	1.25	
All of the change order(s) were justified or requested by the Owner	,	"	-					5.0	1.2.5	4,2,3	
(or no change orders requested). 9. How Reasonable were the Cost of the Change Orders?	-			<u> </u>	1			LI			
The value of the change order(s) were excessive; difficult			T	1	1						
negotiation process.	l .	_	l _							4.00	
The value of the change orders was very fair; negotiation was	5	5	5	1	1	:		5.0	1,25	1.25	
respectful (or no change orders were requested).			1]						
10. Management of Sub-Contractors,				-,							
Poor quality of work by sub-contractors, frequent scheduling			1	T							
problems.	5	5	5					5.0	0.75	0.75	
Excellent quality of work by sub-contractors, worked seamlessly		_									
with Contractor.			<u> </u>		<u> </u>			i			
11. Project Organization	ļ			,							
Poor organization skills, performed work without approved				l							
submittals, submittal process cumbersome.	5	5	5	1			*	5.0	0.75	0.75	,
Excellent organization skills, ensured submittals were organized and					1 1						,
timely.	\vdash		<u></u>	J		i		1	1		
12. Overall Experience with the Contractor if given the choice, would not work with again.			Τ	Γ							
if given the choice, would not work with again. Would highly recommend.	5	5	5		1			5.0	1.75	1,75	
would likelik teropilitedio.			1	J		1			1		



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 (O for none, 5 for 5 or more)	3,0	4.0	2,4	Contacted 4 of 4 references on recent
			<u> </u>	landfill projects
	ROJECT REFERENCES SCOR	20.0	18,3	
	MARCI REFERENCES SCON	: <u>20.0</u>	2012	
d. Schedule	Score	Weight	Wt. Score	~~
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	very dasic, (to priases
SCHEDULE SCOR		2.0	<u>1.0</u>	
		,		
e. Availability of equipment and personnel.	Score	Weight	Wt. Score	
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 SCOR	4.0	2,8	
Marie meter solital arch	ALIAL IPLOATIONS COOR	100	20.7	
TOTAL PRIME CONTRACTOR QUALIFICATIONS SCORE 40.0 30.7				
		4444 (1)	. 11	
20 points – Major Subcontractors and Material Suppliers' Experience and Qualifications (all subcontractors and venoject cost)	none Lezbourinis tot Breatet ri	ISD TOWN OF CITE	S Over all	
	,			
a. Project references for similar and recent projects (subcontractors and material suppliers).	Score	Weight	Wt. Score	
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	
	RACTOR REFERENCE SCOR	10.0	10.0	
			····	
b, Resumes for project managers and key personnel (subcontractors).	Score	Welght	Wt. Score	
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
SUBCO	NTRACTOR RESUME SCORE	10.0	<u>6.8</u>	<u> </u>
		1 200	46.6	1
TOTAL SUB-CONTRACTOR (QUALIFICATIONS SCOR	20.0	<u>16.8</u>	<u> </u>
AA I I A HI III AN AN AN AN AN AN AN AN AN AN AN AN AN	<u> </u>			I
10 points - Overall Quality of the Bid Package				<u> </u>
a. Completeness and organization.	Score	Weight	Wt. Score	
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 financial
Organization (0=highly disorganized, 5= highly organized)	1.0	5.0	1.0	personnel, sub listed limit, included irrelevant projects, no con- letter
	PACKAGE QUALITY SCOR		2.0	
TOTAL BID PACKAGE QUALITY SCORE 10.0 2.0			2.0	
CONMET		<u> </u>	1	
TOTAL OLIMITICATIONS COOPE		70.0	40 E	
TOTAL QUALIFICATIONS SCORE		70.0	<u>49.5</u>	

