



516 8<sup>TH</sup> Avenue West  
PO Box 1209  
Palmetto, Florida 34221  
Phone (941)723-4570  
Fax (941) 723-4576  
Web: [www.palmettofl.org](http://www.palmettofl.org)

**MLK PARK RESTROOM BUILDING  
PROJECT #20-787 EVALUATION COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES  
JUNE 3, 2021 2:30AM**

**1. Introduction & Overview: Nixa Haisley, Purchasing Agent**

Ms. Haisley called the meeting to order at 2:32 pm

a. Committee Members

Moe Rayan, Director of Public Works, David Washington, CRA Board and Cheryl Miller, Finance Director.

b. No Conflict of Interest

Each committee member certified that they had no ethical conflict that would prevent them from evaluating any proposal solely on its merits and in accordance with the Request for Proposal's evaluation criteria. As a member, they have a professional interest that the results of the committee can be supported and defended. All committee members agreed and submitted the signed form.

c. Committee Objective

Ms. Haisley explained the evaluation process to the members. After having conducted their own individual evaluation of each proposal, the goal was to discuss the individual evaluations, in line with the RFP requirements. Committee would be asked to certify initial scoring, as you see fit, or change it based on today's discussion. Once the scoring is complete, Ms. Haisley will tally the numbers, based on the percentages as outline in the RFP, which will automatically rank the proposals.

Committee was informed that Kickler Group did not submit a Bid Bond or a responsive proposal and was therefore disqualified. Four remaining vendor bonds were confirmed as acceptable for evaluation.

DeLesline Construction

D.L. Porter

Stellar Development

Tampa Contracting Services

d. Assignment of Committee Chair

Cheryl Miller volunteered to be the chairperson for the committee.

## 2. Proposal Evaluations:

Committee Discussion of the proposals started with DeLesline Construction. Mo stated that all the proposals complied with all paperwork, licenses, bid bond, project schedule and experience in building construction. DeLesline has performed local work in recent years. Their proposal noted concern of delivery of raw materials for the project. Cheryl noted that DeLesline's bid form was not signed and their opening letter stated minority vendors, although none listed. Nixa stated that the signature was waived as a minor irregularity on the bid form with supporting bond. David Washington said that DeLesline was second highest bidder. They did similar projects at State College of Florida, five years apart with escalating pricing; confirmation that construction cost are increasing. Expressed that they, and others contractors were qualified to do the project.

Discussion of D.L. Porter Constructors began with Mo's comments stating their confirmation of licensing and bonding. Noted their experience in restroom projects. Again, concern stated about raw materials and how this will affect the industry pricing which is showing increases of up to 50%. Noted minority participation as part of the proposal. Cheryl expressed that she was impressed with the thoroughness of D.L. Porter's proposal. Noted that they did include an MBE firm and that they had completed several bathroom projects and included a timeline with their submittal.

Mo confirmed compliance of the Stellar Development proposal requirements and acknowledged their previous and current work experience similar projects for the City of Palmetto. Noted their construction schedule and project approach process, but again concern of lead-time on raw materials. Cheryl stated that Stellar made a good effort to reach out to MBE contractors. They are currently working on a COP project and could save lead-time by ordering some of the materials for both projects at the same time; however, although very qualified, they are the highest bidder and noted concern. Stellar also recognized the security issues at that park. Mr. Washington echoed Cheryl's comments on Stellar and also noted they are conscious of using minority firms.

Mo stated compliance of city requirements with Tampa Contracting Services proposal. Noted experienced team members; recent project include pool, park and stream dredging projects along with experience in building construction. Again, concern for delivery of raw materials. This vendor did not identify MBE or WBE minority firms and are the second lowest bidder. Cheryl stated that Tampa Contracting Services had no recent bathroom project; appeared to be mostly land work. Their proposal was lacking some detail as it related to experience. An effort to get minority firms would have been appreciated. Mr. Washington had no comment on Tampa Contracting Services.

Ms. Haisley reviewed scoring process; again stated that during discussion scoring can change at member's discretion, based on everything that was reviewed and discussed. After no further comments, members were asked to complete and submit their scoring sheets. Moe and David asked for clarification on the scoring

Nixa stated scoring should be numbered 0 thru 5 based on the chart at the bottom. The spreadsheet will calculate based on the percentage formulas. Mr. Washington misunderstood the scoring system, used percentages, was asked to change to the numbers based on the chart. Meeting was recessed to allow everyone to complete their scoring.

Ms. Haisley reconvened meeting at 3:11 pm and began putting in final scores. Ms. Haisley noted, after seeing scoring for cost, an apparent discrepancy and asked member to explain their scoring methodology. Each member explained their approach and, despite being different, should have the same results; this was confirmed.

After no further discussion the following numbers were read:

DeLesline Construction	2.25	D.L. Porter Constructors	2.5	Kickler	– zero
Stellar Development	3.0	Tampa Contracting	3.55		

Tampa Contracting Services ranking highest, number one, based on the scoring

All in agreement? – Yes Any further discussion? No

Cheryl opened the floor to discuss what type of motion to make for Tampa Contracting; move forward with negotiations or delay project due to costs and bid spread and letter from bid bond company to go before commission.

Mo recommended negotiation along with a request for letter from bonding company acknowledging the bid spread. Ms. Haisley will make contact with contractor for letter before recommendation.

Cheryl read final motion MLK Park Restroom Project #20-787 to proceed with recommendation to recommend price negotiations with Tampa Contracting, after receipt of surety letter. Mo made the motion; Mr. Washington seconded.

Mo asked if commission approval was needed to begin negotiations with contractor. Ms. Haisley confirmed yes must wait for their approval of the recommendation. Commission may opt to put project on hold altogether. The committee has evaluated and made their recommendation; project goes to commission for approval.

**a. Summary: Nixa Haisley, Purchasing Agent**

Recommendation of negotiations and letter from bonding company for Tampa Contracting Services to City Commission slated for June 21, 2021.

**Adjourn**