MANATEE COUNTY GOVERNMENT SOURCE SELECTION

		OLLLO I IOIY	
SUBJECT	Construction Services for Manatee County Historical Courthouse Façade Renovation/ Roof and Window Replacement (RFP#10- 3284BG)	DATE POSTED	December 20, 2010
PURCHASING REPRESENTATIVE	Blair C. Getz, (941)749-3053	DATE CONTRACT SHALL BE AWARDED	TO be determined after Negotiations
DEPARTMENT	Financial Management, Purchasing Division	CONSEQUENCES IF DEFERRED	Delay in acceleration of project
SOURCE RECOMMENDATION	Request for Proposals #10-3284BG	AUTHORIZED BY DATE	R.C. Cuthbert, CPM, CPPO December 20, 2000

ACTION DESIRED

Authorization to enter into negotiations with the top ranked firm, Zirkelbach Construction Inc., Palmetto, FL, to provide Construction Services for Manatee County Historical Courthouse Façade Renovation/ Roof and Window Replacement .

ENABLING/REGULATING AUTHORITY

Federal/State law(s), administrative ruling(s), Manatee County Comp Plan/Land Development Code, ordinances, resolutions, policy.)

Manatee County Purchase Code Section 2-26-45, Contracts and Administration.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

- The Manatee County Historic Courthouse is an existing 4 story building clad in masonry and constructed with concrete, originally built
 in 1913. The building has had 2 major additions with the last addition occurring in 1965. The building's existing masonry exterior facade
 consists of face brick and a decorative projecting terracotta and concrete cornice, topped with a masonry parapet, which is also capped
 with concrete sections. Construction Services for Manatee County Historical Courthouse Façade Renovation/ Roof and Window
 Replacement.
- Funding Source: Building Capital Projects
- Continued on page 2

SUMMARY

RESULTS

Authorization to enter into negotiations with the top ranked firm to provide Construction Services for Manatee

County Historical Courthouse Façade Renovation/ Roof and Window Replacement.

ATTACHMENTS: (List in order as attached) NONE		INSTRUCTIONS TO BOARD RECORDS: N/A	
COMMENTS	N/A	AMT./FREQ. OF RECURRING COSTS (ATTACH FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT)	N/A

Due to improper wall detailing, poor grouting details, improper anchorage materials and lack of proper maintenance, the
exterior facade has been infiltrated with water intrusion, causing deterioration of the facade. The existing parapet will need to
be removed in order to remove the cornice and correct the water intrusion. New light weight fiber glass cornice units will be
fabricated to replicate the original profiles and color, while reducing the overall weight on the structure, while the parapets
rebuilt with thru-wall flashings. The exterior face brick will be tuck-pointed where it is determined necessary to further reduce
water intrusion. New wall flashings will be used at window heads to redirect the water to the exterior so that further water
intrusion is eliminated.

The existing roof was designed with a typical built-up tar and gravel roof system. Over the years, roof leaks occurred which prompted the addition of extra layers of built-up tar and gravel layers, in an attempt to stop the water intrusion. Currently, there are approximately 3 to 5 layers of tar and gravel roof layers in some areas which are now holding water and adding unwanted weight to the structure. The remedy is to remove all the layers of the existing roofing and replace the original system with a new membrane roof system which is intended to also have energy savings.

The original double hung windows were replaced with new single pane aluminum awning windows throughout the entire structure during the 1965 building addition. The existing aluminum windows are now leaking and the existing glazing has deteriorated causing the glass to slip down in the frames. New double hung aluminum window units have been designed to replicate the original 1913 exterior appearance and shall contain low E reflective impact glass to both reduce heat infiltration, while satisfying County wide compliance with building hardening requirements.

Twelve (12) local firms that were directly contacted and made aware of this Request for Proposal are:

Halfacre Construction - Sarasota Harbor Key Development - Bradenton Howell Construction - Sarasota

Core Construction – Sarasota

Jon Swift – Sarasota

Tom Wessel Construction - Sarasota

Zirkelbach Construction, Inc. – Palmetto Mike Carter Construction – Bradenton

R.A. Connelly - Bradenton DeLesline Construction – Palmetto

NDC Construction - Bradenton

Dooley/Mack Constructors, Inc. - Sarasota

- Although notified, nine (9) of these local firms chose not to respond.
- The proposal package was submitted, reviewed and approved by Property Management.

The subject Request For Proposal #10-3284BG was advertised September 27, 2010 Notice of its availability was made via Manatee County Website, DemandStar Bid Notification Delivery System and Manatee County Chamber of Commerce, eleven hundred and fifty two (1152) firms were notified. Eighty (80) firms downloaded the Request For Proposal; eleven (11) responses were received November 15, 2010, the opening was conducted at 1:00P.M. Proposals were received from the following listed firms:

D. L. Porter Constructors, Inc.
Structural Preservation Systems, LLC
Zirkelbach Construction, Inc.
Eveland Brothers, Inc.
J. Kokolakis Contracting, Inc.
Holland Construction Corporation
Contracting Specialists, Inc.
Kraft Construction Company, Inc.
The Lathan Company, Inc.
DeLesline Construction, Inc.
DooleyMack Constructors, LLC

Sarasota
Bradenton
Palmetto
Clearwater
Tarpon Springs
Sarasota
Pompano Beach
Sarasota
Mobile, Alabama
Palmetto

Sarasota

• 11/30/2010 a Selection Committee Meeting was held to review and short list firms from the eleven (11) proposals received. The members of the Selection Committee are Tom Yarger, Property Management Department, Frank Monhart, Property Management, Construction Services Project Manager and Blair Getz Contracts Negotiator, Purchasing Division. The firms short listed to provide oral presentations are listed below in the order determined by Lottery that was held in the Property Management Department on November 30, 2010 @ 9:50A.M.:

DeLesline Construction, Inc.

Zirkelbach Construction, Inc.

Holland Construction, Corp.

Kraft Construction Company, Inc.

Palmetto
Palmetto
Sarasota
Sarasota

• The four (4) proposers that were perceived to have the highest potential direct economic benefit to Manatee County, the best technical and operational capabilities, plus the most experience with similar projects and methods of construction as detailed in the selection criteria were chosen for interviews.

During the term of this engagement the employment, subcontracting, and support services contracting as economic stimulus directly benefiting Manatee County that may be generated were specifically identified as criteria for evaluation of the offers.

The firms not selected may have strengths in some of the Request for Proposal criteria; however, as stated in the solicitation document, all of the criteria specified in the Request for Proposals were utilized in making the selection determination.

- December 10, 2010 oral presentations took place from the selected firms.
- December13, 2010 the Selection Committee held a meeting to select the firm that would bring the most value and
 expertise to the project. The Selection Committee concluded that it is in the best interest of the County to enter into
 negotiations with the top ranked firm Zirkelbach Construction, Inc. of, Palmetto FL.
- Zirkelbach Construction, Inc., the top ranked firm demonstrated exceptional qualifications and an excellent understanding of the phasing that is required to deliver the project successfully and in a time frame acceptable to the County. The team assembled by this firm was in attendance at the Oral Presentation. The subcontractors presented by Zirkelbach are all local well known firms with excellent reputations, plus the proposed on site, hands on training for students of Manatee Technical Institute presented to the Committee were extremely well received. The construction team was very responsive to the questions ask of them during their presentation. The construction schedule proposed was approx. 204 calendar days with an estimated cost of \$1,934,981.00
- Kraft Construction Company, Inc., the second ranked firm although highly competent and extremely qualified to deliver a successful project, fell short of the County expectations in two critical areas: one being that the project managers and the estimating support that make up their proposed management team is based in Naples FL. The second, the project phasing proposed by Kraft was not as expected by the County's management team and was not well received. The subcontractors presented are all from the local area with the exception of the lightning protection firm from Naples FL. The construction schedule proposed was approx.190 calendar days with an estimated cost of \$2,792,773.00
- Holland Construction, Corp., the third ranked firm presented to the Committee several historical renovation/restoration projects, although impressive, were not within the State of Florida and the Selection Committee felt that we would not be afforded the expertise of the Maryland and Pennsylvania management teams that produced this experience, Holland Construction has offices in Maryland and headquartered in Pennsylvania. The subcontractors presented were all local with the exception of the masonry subcontractor from Charlotte County. The construction schedule proposed was approx.179 calendar days with an estimated cost of \$2,527,386.00.

- **DeLesline Construction, Inc.** the fourth ranked firm has far less historical restoration/renovation experience than the top three ranked firms. A major concern of the Selection Committee is the length of construction time proposed by this firm to complete the project, this concern is manifested due to the security issues that are present at all times in and around the Courthouse. The construction schedule proposed was approx. 329 calendar days with an estimated cost of \$2,007,699.00
- It was revealed that a local Sarasota manufacturer, Fibrocon Precast Inc. (cornice replacement material) had inadvertently or
 otherwise represented that its' product was approved by the County for this project. In fact it had not been submitted for preapproval to the County's Architectural firm Jerry Zoller. Three of the four firms short listed for oral presentations utilized this
 product in their estimate based on the statement made to them by Fibrocon Precast Inc. The value of the non approved
 materials allegedly represents approximately 3% lower cost to the overall project.
- The Fibrocon Product is now being evaluated by our Designer Jerry Zoller. This review and contract negotiations will determine the project cost.
- This project will be managed by the Property Management Department.