



November 21, 2017

Romin Khavari, P.E., CFM  
City of Grand Prairie, Texas  
206 W. Church Street  
P.O. Box 534045  
Grand Prairie, TX 75053

RE: Great Southwest Parkway Improvements – Proposer Reference Feedback Summary  
KHA No. 063851034  
Project No. 616.57

Dear Mr. Khavari:

Below is additional feedback received from references for each of the proposers as well as notes associated with proposal information considered in the calculation of accumulated points.

The following cities provided reference information:

City of Arlington	City of Burleson	City of Colleyville
Town of Flower Mound	City of Fort Worth	City of Frisco
City of Mesquite	City of Richardson	

Reference Feedback provided below in *italics* are direct statements from these entities.

#### **Tiseo Paving Co.**

##### Reference Feedback:

General feedback received for Tiseo Paving Co. was positive. Though not a consensus among references, two occasions were cited where roadway projects were behind schedule:

- *Worked with Tiseo also on several projects. Good Contractor.*
- *Great contractor. Does great work, usually ahead of schedule, and is very responsive. Nothing but good things to say here also.*
- *Good contractors.*
- *Royce is “ace in the hole.” Would work with him anytime. Robert is VP and “likes change orders.”*
- *I had no problem with Robert/Tiseo. I had no interaction with Royce. Projects ran a little long but hit important milestones in the beginning of the project.*
- *We have had issues with them not meeting schedule and paving quality. They are paving sub for Water Dept. and way behind schedule on Old Decatur Road.*
- *They have had turnover in PM’s so that has been a struggle.*
- *One of the best contractors I ever work with. Royce really knows what he’s doing.*
- *I have worked with Tiseo as general contractor on Sanctuary Drive which went well. Tiseo was the paving sub for the Stonebrook Parkway Phase II and they did a good job but did want escalated prices on the pavement due to time they went to work versus the original schedule.*
- *Currently has a major roadway project – project is significantly behind schedule. Several issues where the contractor has not followed the plans or specifications requiring rework or penalty.*

## Proposal Information:

- Did not submit Organizational Chart
- Provided Project Manager and Superintendent names but lacked further information specific to relevant experience
- Relevant Experience did not include specifics such as:
  - Contract Time
  - Actual Completion Time
  - Specific experience in requested categories:
    - Reconstruction, expansion, widening or improvement of existing arterial streets
    - Accelerated schedule
    - Concrete paving
    - Water line (24" or greater)
    - Bridge construction
    - Traffic control
- Provided detailed schedule outlining project methodology, delivery and implementation; however, the following specifics were not included:
  - Critical path plan
  - Demolition
  - Water line and coordination with Franchise Utilities
  - Sanitary sewer and coordination with Franchise Utilities
  - Storm drain and coordination with Franchise Utilities
  - Subgrade preparation/placement
  - Pavement marking and signage
  - Deliveries and haul-offs
  - Resources to reach substantial completion

While some of this information listed above could be inferred from personal experience with the contractor, these items were not specifically included in the proposal submission as requested in the proposal instructions.

## **Jackson Construction Ltd.**

### Reference Feedback:

Limited feedback was received for Jackson Construction Ltd; however, the information provided was positive:

- *Currently working with Jackson Construction in 2 CIP projects, so far it's been a good experience, Philip Pfeffer is also a great project manager.*
- *Never directly dealt with Jackson Construction, but they do good work for the City also. I have nothing but good reviews from peers about Jackson Construction.*
- *Good contractors.*
- *Steve is "a good man." Phillip is best one at Jackson, lucky to have him on the project.*
- *#2 contractor for quality and ability to meet schedule.*

## Proposal Information:

- Did not submit Organizational Chart
- Provided Project Manager and Superintendent names but lacked further information (i.e. experience, project commitment, etc.)
- Relevant Experience did not include specifics such as:
  - Project Contact Name, Phone, Email
  - Contract Time
- Did not provide detailed schedule outlining project methodology, delivery and implementation

While some of this information listed above could be inferred from personal experience with the contractor, these items were not specifically included in the proposal submission as requested in the proposal instructions.

## **Texas Sterling Construction Co.**

## Reference Feedback:

General feedback received for Texas Sterling Construction Co. was positive. It is notable that a majority of the references had not completed work with this company in the recent past and most experience submitted by this contractor was work completed or underway in the Houston, TX area:

- *Have not worked with TSC in several years. Crossed paths with Eric, good guy. Previous experience (TxDOT project) has been positive.*
- *So far they are very good and on schedule.*
- *Texas Sterling did the Stonebrook Parkway Phase I between Legacy and Longhorn Trail which included a bridge over Stewart Creek. I believe the job went satisfactory.*
- *Currently has a major roadway project – good progress and work so far, however, lots of disputes and requests for change orders.*

## Proposal Information:

- Did not submit Organizational Chart
- Provided Project Manager and Superintendent names but lacked further information (i.e. project commitment, etc.)
- Relevant Experience included specific but limited information, information omitted includes:
  - Contract Time
  - Actual Completion Time
  - Specific experience in requested categories:
    - Reconstruction, expansion, widening or improvement of existing arterial streets
    - Accelerated schedule
    - Concrete paving
    - Bridge construction
    - Traffic control

While some of this information listed above could be inferred from personal experience with the contractor, these items were not specifically included in the proposal submission as requested in the proposal instructions.



### **Mario Sinacola & Sons Excavating, Inc.**

#### Reference Feedback:

Feedback received for Mario Sinacola & Sons Excavating, Inc. was consistently positive:

- *#1 contractor for quality and ability to meet to schedule. Best concrete paving quality.*
- *Very experienced contractor.*
- *I worked with Sinacola on Teel but with Emily Clup and Bobby Stevens. I believe Chris Logan may have started out initially to help out Emily. The job done by Sinacola went satisfactory.*
- *The quality of work and speed at which Sinacola does a project depends on who the PM is. Peter Magnanti does a good job, but I think Sinacola is trying to bring in a lot of inexperienced PMs. Most jobs missed completion deadlines. If Sinacola is selected, I would advise doing references on the PM, stating in the contract that the PM can not change during the project, and placing hefty liquidated damages in the contract. Lots of hand holding was necessary for project scheduling and material acquisition. I don't know Chris Logan or Craig Young, but if they are new, they may not be high enough to get the necessary resources from the home office to keep the project going.*

#### Proposal Information:

Mario Sinacola & Sons Excavating, Inc. provided a proposal that included all information requested by the proposal instructions for consideration.

### **RKM Utility Services, Inc.**

#### Reference Feedback:

General feedback for RKM Utility Services, Inc. was mixed to negative:

- *Great Contractor. Does great work, has great solutions to issues that come up in construction, usually ahead of schedule. I have nothing but good things to say about RKM.*
- *RKM has "grown too big too fast" so has had growing pains (tough to keep up at times).*
- *They don't have the resume for this size of job, only have done subdivisions and neighborhood reconstruction*
- *They never did any CIP projects for our City but they did a lot of private development projects. From our inspection department, we really had to watch them very, very close.*
- *They owe the City approximately \$50,000 – they will never be used on another City project.*
- *RKM did a recent 20" transmission water line relocation. While the pipe laying went well, the timing and preparedness of testing of the line and tie-in coordination lacked proper supervision and RKM's means and methods were not well thought out ahead of time.*

*The night time tie-in took three attempts for RKM to show up with the proper materials, lighting, personnel and supervision.*

*They went over their 16 hour window, luckily due to the cool weather that day and lack of water usage, the City services were not affected.*

#### Proposal Information:

- *Did not submit Organizational Chart*
- *Provided Project Manager and Superintendent names but lacked further information (i.e. roles and responsibilities, experience, project commitment, etc.)*



- Relevant Experience did not include specifics such as:
  - Contract Time
  - Actual Completion Time
  - Specific experience in requested categories:
    - Reconstruction, expansion, widening or improvement of existing arterial streets
    - Accelerated schedule
    - Concrete paving
    - Water line (24" or greater)
    - Bridge construction
    - Traffic control
- Did not provide detailed schedule outlining project methodology, delivery and implementation

While some of this information listed above could be inferred from personal experience with the contractor, these items were not specifically included in the proposal submission as requested in the proposal instructions.

Based on the information provided by the proposers, including their references, stated experience and expertise, they each meet the requirements of the City's contract documents. Additionally, they each meet the City's bonding requirements.

However, while each proposer meets the minimum requirements of the contract documents, Tiseo Paving Co. scored highest for best value when considering the City's qualitative evaluation criteria in the contract documents. The lowest priced proposer, RKM Utility Services, Inc., met the minimum requirements of the contract documents but its references from other local agencies suggest they may not be the best value to the City based on the contract documents' qualitative evaluation criteria. As a result, we issued a recommendation to award letter stating such, with the disclaimer that the recommendation for the City to award the construction contract does not relieve any party of their contractual or other responsibilities.

We appreciate the opportunity to continue to serve the City of Grand Prairie. Please let us know if you need any additional information.

Sincerely,

Kimley-Horn & Associates, Inc.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Jacob Reinig".

Jacob Reinig, P.E.

Copy To: George Fanous, P.E., City of Grand Prairie, Senior Civil Engineer  
Maxine Snow, City of Grand Prairie, Administrative Supervisor  
Brad Tribble, P.E., Kimley-Horn & Associates, Inc.