FAYETTE County
Create Your Story!

Purchasing Department
140 Stonewall Avenue West, Ste 204
Fayetteville, GA 30214
Phone: 770-305-5420
www.fayettecountyga.gov

To: Steve Rapson

Through: Ted L. Burgess

From: Sherry White

Date: April 7, 2021

Subject: Invitation to Bid #1943-B: Spring Resurfacing

The Purchasing Department issued Invitation to Bid #1943-B: Spring Resurfacing to secure a contractor to resurface, patch and crack seal various roads in Fayette County. The project includes fourteen (14) roads / 10.4 miles of road to receive the above mentioned service.

Road Name	Length (Miles)	Scope of Work
1. Carriage Drive	0.3	Milling, Patching and 9.5mm Overlay
2. Gaelic Way	0.7	Milling, Patching and 9.5mm Overlay
3. Galway Bend	0.4	Milling, Patching and 9.5mm Overlay
4. Glen Beigh Run	0.1	Milling, Patching and 9.5mm Overlay
5. Healey Pass	0.2	Milling, Patching and 9.5mm Overlay
6. Inman Road	3.0	Crack Sealing & Mill Patching
7. Lee's Lake Road	2.6	Crack Sealing
8. Lucy Place	0.3	Crack Sealing, Mill Patching and 9.5mm Overlay
9. Old Farm Road	1.0	Crack Sealing, Mill Patching and 9.5mm Overlay
10. Roscommon Court	0.2	Milling, Patching and 9.5mm Overlay
11. Shelbourne Run	0.1	Milling, Patching and 9.5mm Overlay
12. Veterans Parkway	0.5	Milling, OGI and 12.5mm Overlay
13. Weldon Road	0.9	Crack Sealing
14. Westmeath Path	0.1	Milling, Patching and 9.5mm Overlay

Notice of the opportunity was emailed to twenty-two (22) companies. Another 454 were contacted through the web-based Georgia Procurement Registry, who were registered under commodity codes #91371 (Maintenance and Repair, Highway and Roads, Including Removal of Asphalt, Concrete, Bitumens, etc.), #91384 (Maintenance and Repair, Streets, Major and Residential), #91395 (Paving and Resurfacing, Highway and Road) and #91396 (Paving and Resurfacing, Streets, Major and Residential). The offer was also advertised through Fayette News, Georgia Local Government Access Marketplace, the county website, and Channel 23.

Three (3) companies submitted bids (Attachment 1).

The Road Department recommends awarding the lowest responsive bidder Piedmont Paving, Inc. The County has not contracted with Piedmont Paving, Inc. for resurfacing work, but a Contractor Performance Evaluation for culvert replacement is attached. (Attachment 2). Three (3) references

were requested for prior work history, and the two (2) responses received were favorable. (Attachment 3)

Specifics of the proposed contract are as follows:

Contract Name 1943-B: Spring Resurfacing
Vendor Piedmont Paving, Inc.
Not-to-Exceed Amount $1,072,928.45
Budget:

Road Dept	**Technical Services**	**Project**	**Contract Amount**	**Budget***
10040220	521316	M&O	$ 158,969.80	$462,744.60
10040220	521316	LMIG1	$ 848,272.15	$956,159.74
10040220	521316	LMIG0	$ 65,686.50	$ 77,707.26
Totals			$1,072,928.45	$1,496,611.60

*Available Budget as of 4/2/2021

ITB #1943-B SPRING RESURFACING

March 31, 2021 3:00pm
Tally Sheet

				Piedmont Paving, Inc		Blount Construcion		CW Matthews	
ITEM #	DESCRIPTION	UNIT	EST QTY	UNIT PRICE	TOTAL	UNIT PRICE	TOTAL	UNIT PRICE	TOTAL
150-1000	Traffic Control	LS	1		$45,000.00		$75,381.12		$137,297.66
402-3101	9.5mm Type 2	TN	4,286.70	$87.00	$372,942.90	$89.09	$381,902.10	$85.79	$367,755.99
402-3130	12.5mm	TN	792	$85.00	$67,320.00	$91.08	$72,135.36	$85.33	$67,581.36
415-5000	9.5mm OGI Leveling	TN	528	$94.00	$49,632.00	$112.51	$59,405.28	$84.92	$44,837.76
402-3190	19mm	TN	2,833.60	$121.00	$342,865.60	$125.41	$355,361.78	$118.75	$336,490.00
407-0010	Asphalt-Rubber Joint and Crack Seal	LM	8.69	$6,700.00	$58,223.00	$5,389.00	$46,830.41	$6,092.00	$52,939.48
413-0750	Bitum Tack Coat	GAL	7,935.40	$4.90	$38,883.46	$2.60	$20,632.04	$1.99	$15,791.45
432-5010	Mill Asph Conc Pvmt, Varible Depth	SY	29,760.86	$2.78	$82,735.19	$2.87	$85,413.67	$2.70	$80,354.32
653-1704	Themo Solid Traf Stripe 24", White	LF	39.6	$8.25	$326.70	$6.00	$237.60	$5.00	$198.00
653-1501	Themo Solid Traf Stripe 5", White	LF	4,730.00	$0.72	$3,405.60	$0.66	$3,121.80	$0.55	$2,601.50
653-1502	Themo Solid Traf Stripe 5", Yellow	LF	4,730.00	$0.72	$3,405.60	$0.66	$3,121.80	$0.55	$2,601.50
653-6004	Thermo White Hatching	SY	848.1	$5.50	$4,664.55	$5.70	$4,834.17	$4.75	$4,028.48
653-6006	Thermo Yellow Hatching	SY	348.7	$5.50	$1,917.85	$5.70	$1,987.59	$4.75	$1,656.33
653-0110	Thermo Traffic Arrows TP1	EA	2	$165.00	$330.00	$114.00	$228.00	$95.00	$190.00
653-0120	Thermo Traffic Arrows TP2	EA	2	$165.00	$330.00	$114.00	$228.00	$95.00	$190.00
653-0210	Thermo Word ONLY	EA	1	$550.00	$550.00	$270.00	$270.00	$225.00	$225.00
654-1001	Raised Pvmt Markers, Tp 1	EA	60	$6.60	$396.00	$6.00	$360.00	$5.00	$300.00
			TOTAL BID PRICE:		$1,072,928.45		$1,111,450.72		$1,115,038.82

FAYETTE COUNTY, GEORGIA
CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

1. Use this form to record contractor performance for any contract of $50,000 or above.
2. The person who serves as project manager or account manager is the designated party to complete the evaluation.
3. This form is to be completed and forwarded to the Purchasing Department not later than 30 days after completion or expiration of a contract. Past performance is considered on future contracts.

VENDOR INFORMATION		COMPLETE ALL APPLICABLE INFORMATION	
Company Name:	Piedmont Paving, Inc.	Contract Number:	Contract #1639-B
Mailing Address:	1226 Highway 16 E	Contract Description or Title:	Rising Star Road Culvert Replacement
City, St, Zip Code:	Newnan, GA 30263	Contract Term (Dates) From: 2/13/2018	To: 9/5/2018
Phone Number:	678-423-0586	Task Order Number:	N/A
Cell Number:	N/A	Other Reference:	
E-Mail Address:	N/A		

DEFINITIONS

OUTSTANDING – Vendor considerably exceeded minimum contractual requirements or performance expectations of the products/services; The vendor demonstrated the highest level of quality workmanship/professionalism in execution of contract.

EXCELLENT (Exc) - Vendor exceeded minimum contractual requirements or performance expectations of the products/services.

SATISFACTORY (Sat) - Vendor met minimum contractual requirements or performance expectations of the products/services.

UNSATISFACTORY (UnSat) - Vendor did not meet the minimum contractual requirements or performance expectations of the products and/or services; Performed below minimum requirements

EVALUATIONS (Place "X" in appropriate box for each criterion.)

Criteria (includes change orders / amendments)	Out-standing	Exc	Sat	Un-Sat	Not Apply
1. Work or other deliverables performed on schedule			X		
2. Condition of delivered products			X		
3. Quality of work			X		
4. Adherence to specifications or scope of work			X		
5. Timely, appropriate, & satisfactory problem or complaint resolution			X		
6. Timeliness and accuracy of invoicing			X		
7. Working relationship / interfacing with county staff and citizens			X		
8. Service Call (On-Call) response time			X		
9. Adherence to contract budget and schedule			X		
10. Other (specify):					X
11. Overall evaluation of contractor performance			X		

EVALUATED BY

Signature: Courtney Hassenzahl	Date of Evaluation: 3/21/2019
Print Name: Courtney Hassenzahl	Department/Division: Environmental Management
Title: Project Manager	Telephone No: 770-305-5229

Form Updated 11/16/2016

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION
Explanation of Outstanding or Unsatisfactory Ratings

Company Name:	Contract Number:

EXPLANATIONS / COMMENTS

1. Do not submit page 2 without page 1.
2. Use this page to explain evaluations of *Outstanding* or *Unsatisfactory*.
3. Be specific (include paragraph and page numbers referenced in the applicable contract, etc.). Continue on separate sheet if needed (show company name and contract number or other reference)

The contractor received a mark of unsatisfactory for the timeliness of invoice submittals on this project. The first two invoices had to be requested from the contractor, invoices toward the end of the project were received in a more timely manner.

The contractor received a mark of unsatisfactory for scheduling. This was mainly due to unexpected contractor staff and organizational changes during the project. These changes should not effect upcoming projects.

Overall, the contractor delivered a quality project and the County would expect the same in all of future work.

Purchasing Department Comments (e.g. did the vendor honor all offers; submit insurance, bonds & other documents in a timely manner; and provide additional information as requested?):

Harold Simmons
Senoia
#1943-B

REFERENCE REQUEST

The Fayette County Purchasing Department is currently reviewing our Invitation to Bid #1943-B Fayette County Spring Resurfacing Project – FY 2021. You have been listed as a reference for Piedmont Paving Inc.

If you would, please answer the following questions as they pertain to the firm listed above:

1. **Brief Project Description:**

   Intersection Improvements SR 16 @ Pylant St. / Bridge –Culvert Replacement

2. Was the Firm *Prime* ___X___ or *Sub* _____ on the above project?

Please rate the following questions 1 - 5 (5 being the best) as it pertains to the firm listed above:

- Quality of work ___5___
- Adherence to specifications or scope of work ___5___
- Problem solving ___5___
- Working relationship ___5___
- Service call response time ___5___
- Deliverables performed on schedule ___5___
- Completed work within the specified budget ___5___

Other comments: They were easy to work with and return calls immediately when called upon.

Thank you in advance for providing a reference for this vendor. Please return your reference by **April 6, 2021 end of day** via email to PurchasingGroup@fayettecountyga.gov.

Thank you for your time and cooperation in this matter. Should you have any questions, please contact me at (770) 305-5314.

Michael Klahr
City of Newnan
#1943-B

REFERENCE REQUEST

The Fayette County Purchasing Department is currently reviewing our Invitation to Bid #1943-B Fayette County Spring Resurfacing Project – FY 2021. You have been listed as a reference for Piedmont Paving Inc.

If you would, please answer the following questions as they pertain to the firm listed above:

1. **Brief Project Description:**
   LMIG 2018 variable depth milling, deep patching, and resurfacing of approximately 3.09 centerline miles on 19 streets, and the application of thermoplastic pavement markings
   LMIG 2019 variable depth milling, deep patching, and resurfacing of approximately 3.00 centerline miles on 11 streets, and the application of thermoplastic pavement markings
   LMIG 2021 variable depth milling, deep patching, and resurfacing of approximately 2.19 centerline miles on 14 streets, and the application of thermoplastic pavement markings

2. Was the Firm *Prime* Yes or *Sub* _____ on the above project?

Please rate the following questions 1 - 5 (5 being the best) as it pertains to the firm listed above:

- Quality of work 5
- Adherence to specifications or scope of work 5
- Problem solving 5
- Working relationship 5
- Service call response time 5
- Deliverables performed on schedule 5
- Completed work within the specified budget 5

Other comments: The City of Newnan does not have a preferred or prequalified list of contractors for paving and street maintenance, however, Piedmont Paving has always provided us with quality work and delivery.

Thank you in advance for providing a reference for this vendor. Please return your reference by **April 6, 2021 end of day** via email to PurchasingGroup@fayettecountyga.gov.

Thank you for your time and cooperation in this matter. Should you have any questions, please contact me at (770) 305-5314.