GARLAND

TEXAS MADE HERE

CITY OF GARLAND - NOTICE TO BIDDERS DOCUMENT

Sanders, Cassandra
CITY OF GARLAND | 200 N. FIFTH ST., GARLAND, TX 75040

GARLAND
PROCUREMENT

NOTICE TO BIDDERS

Bid #REQ00003486
Competitive Sealed Proposal (CSP)
Construction Services for Water Utility Garage

Solicitation:
The City of Garland is soliciting proposals for the Construction Services for Water Utility Garage.

- The City's estimated construction budget is approximately **$280,000.00**. This includes an Owner-Controlled Contingency of **$5,000.00.**
- The construction Notice to Proceed (NTP) is anticipated to be issued on or about **December 30, 2026.**
- The estimated construction duration is **90 calendar days**.
- Use Projectmates project management software and maintain a current license at the General Contractor's expense.

Submission:
A **Competitive Sealed Proposal (CSP)** must be submitted electronically through IonWave using the following link Garland IonWave. Acknowledgment to the City of Garland's standard terms and conditions and completion of related forms, including, but not limited to the Bidder's Qualification, References and Conflict of Interest (CIQ) will be done electronically via IonWave at Garland IonWave.

FACSIMILE OR EMAIL PROPOSALS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED

Closing Date: 11/19/2026
Closing Time: 3:00 p.m. Local Time

Mailing/Delivering Proposals:
Proposals must be submitted electronically through Garland IonWave. A Proposer may additionally submit a hard copy; however, a hard copy does not replace the required electronic submission.

Mailing Address	Physical Address
City of Garland Purchasing	City of Garland Purchasing
PO Box 469002	200 North Fifth Street, Second Floor

Garland, TX 75046-9002	Garland, TX 75046

Mark Outside of Envelope:
CSP REQ00003486 Construction Services for Water Utility Garage

Late Responses:
Responses must be received by the due date and time established in this solicitation. Responses received after the published closing date and time will be considered late and rejected. Late responses will not be opened and the Proposer will be notified that the response was rejected because it was not timely received. The City will either return the unopened response to the Proposer at the Proposer's expense or dispose of the response.

Withdrawal of Response:
A Proposer may withdraw its response at any time prior to the closing date and time for the solicitation. The Proposer's request to withdraw its response must be made in writing on company letterhead.

Question-and-Answer Period:
Any questions pertaining to this request must be submitted through Garland IonWave no later than **November 12, 2026 at 12 p.m. Local Time.** The City is not obligated to and may at its own discretion choose not to accept or answer questions received after that date.

Pre-Bid Site Visit:
Prospective Proposers or a designated representative may attend the Pre-Bid Site Visit on **November 4, 2026 at 2:30 p.m. Local Time**. Attendance at the Site Visit is highly recommended but not mandatory and is not part of the evaluation.

Location: City of Garland Water Utilities
2343 Forest Lane
Garland, TX 75042

The Site Visit provides an equitable opportunity for all prospective Proposers to:

- Become familiar with the project site and existing conditions.
- Observe site access, constraints, and other conditions that may affect the Work.
- Meet City staff.
- Ask general project-related questions.

Proposers are responsible for becoming familiar with all existing conditions that may affect the cost or performance of the Work. The City will not consider claims for additional compensation or time based solely on conditions that could reasonably have been observed during the Site Visit or otherwise determined through a reasonable site investigation.

Questions requiring an official interpretation of the solicitation must be submitted through IonWave in accordance with the Questions and Answers section. Verbal statements made during the Site Visit are informational only and are not binding unless issued by written addendum.

Bid Award and Evaluation:
The City has established the award basis for this solicitation as the vendor providing the best value to the City following the requirements of a one-step selection process under Texas Government Code § 2269, Subchapter D, that evaluates both qualifications and proposed costs. By submitting this proposal, Proposer acknowledges that the evaluation process contains both quantitative and qualitative (subjective) criteria, and that the selection of the highest-ranked Proposer will be based on the evaluation criteria below.

Final Proposal Price:
In accordance with Texas Government Code Chapter 2269, the price submitted with the Competitive Sealed Proposal shall constitute the Proposer's final proposed price for purposes of initial evaluation and ranking. Proposers should therefore submit their most competitive pricing, as proposals will be evaluated based on the price submitted at the time of proposal opening. Following selection of the highest-ranked Proposer, the City may negotiate modifications to the scope, time, and associated price to the extent permitted by Texas Government Code Chapter 2269.

Evaluation Criteria:

1. **Price – 50 points**
   The responsible Proposer submitting the lowest response total will receive the maximum number of points for this category. All other responsible Proposers will receive a proportionate percentage of the total points based on their response total relative to the lowest response total. The Response Total is automatically tabulated using the following calculation:
   Price Score = (Lowest Evaluated Response Total ÷ Proposer's Evaluated Response Total) × 50
   Scores will be rounded to two decimal places.

2. **Budget Alignment – 10 points**

- The City has established an Evaluation Budget of $280,000 for purposes of evaluating proposed cost. Budget Alignment will be objectively calculated based on the Proposer's Response Total relative to the City's Established Evaluation Budget.
- A Response Total at or below the Established Evaluation Budget will receive the maximum 10 points for Budget Alignment.
- For a Response Total exceeding the Established Evaluation Budget, the Budget Alignment Score will be reduced by 0.5 point for each one percent (1.0%) by which the Response Total exceeds the Established Evaluation Budget, calculated proportionately based on the actual percentage above budget. The minimum Budget Alignment Score shall be zero (0).
- Percentage Above Budget = ((Response Total − $280,000) ÷ $280,000) × 100
- Budget Alignment Score = MAX (0,10 − (Percentage Above Budget × 0.50))
- Proposals exceeding the Established Evaluation Budget by 20% or more will receive zero points for Budget Alignment.
- Scores will be rounded to two decimal places.
- Exceeding the Established Evaluation Budget will not, by itself, render a proposal non-responsive or exclude the proposal from evaluation and ranking.

3. **General Contractor Information – 5 points (1-page maximum)**
   Provide a cover sheet including the following information:
- Name and address of firm.
- Name, address, email address, and phone number of the individual(s) authorized to make representations on behalf of the firm.
- Length of time the firm has been in business.

4. **General Contractor Experience – 15 points (5-page maximum)**
   Provide three (3) projects similar in size and scope to this project. Proposers demonstrating the most relevant project experience will receive the maximum allowable points.

   Include the following information for each project:
- Project name
- Project owner (entity, contact name, title, email address and phone number)
- Project address
- Description of project size and scope
- Project start date
- Project completion date
- Original contract/bid amount
- Actual completed cost
- Photos

   Note: please do not provide more projects than requested.

5. **Project Approach – 15 points (5-page maximum)**
   Provide a description of the firm's proposed approach to completing this project, including:
- A Critical Path Method (CPM) schedule identifying key milestones, including project phases, approvals, and material procurements.
- A detailed schedule outlining the anticipated day-to-day construction activities.

6. **Proposed Personnel – 5 points (no page limit)**

- Provide an organizational chart identifying all proposed project team members, including the percentage of time each individual will dedicate to this project, and a description of their roles and responsibilities.
- Provide resumes of key personnel assigned to this project.

Evaluation Scoring Rubric:

Category	Score Range	Rating	Description
General Contractor Information	5	Exceptional	Complete, clear, all information provided.
	4	Above Average	Minor omissions
	3	Acceptable	Some lack of clarity
	2	Below Average	Incomplete
	1	Poor	Missing info
	0	No Responsive Information	The Proposer fails to address the criterion or provides no responsive information upon which points can be awarded.
General Contractor Experience	13-15	Exceptional	Extensive, highly relevant experience with comparable municipal construction projects and demonstrated successful performance. All information provided.
	10-12	Above Average	Strong relevant experience with only minor gaps in project comparability or demonstrated performance.
	7-9	Acceptable	Adequate experience with generally comparable projects; some limitations in relevance or depth.
	4-6	Below Average	Limited comparable experience or notable weaknesses in demonstrated performance.
	1-3	Poor	Minimal relevant experience or insufficient evidence of successful comparable performance.
	0	No Responsive Information	The Proposer fails to address the criterion or provides no responsive information upon which points can be awarded.
Project Approach	13-15	Exceptional	Detailed CPM, sequencing, feasible, all information provided.
	10-12	Above Average	Well developed
	7-9	Acceptable	Basic but lacks detail
	4-6	Below Average	Minimal
	1-3	Poor	Lacks detail
	0	No Responsive Information	The Proposer fails to address the criterion or provides no responsive information upon which points can be awarded.
Proposed Personnel	5	Exceptional	Clear structure, strong qualifications, all information provided.
	4	Above Average	Qualified
	3	Acceptable	Limited clarity
	2	Below Average	Incomplete
	1	Poor	Minimal
	0	No Responsive Information	The Proposer fails to address the criterion or provides no responsive information upon which points can be awarded.

Interviews:
The initial written proposals will be evaluated at a maximum of 100 points. Based on the initial evaluation, the City may shortlist the highest-ranked Proposers for interviews. The number of Proposers selected for interviews, if any, will be determined by the City based on the initial evaluation results. Proposers not selected for interviews will receive no further consideration. The shortlisted Proposers will be evaluated at a maximum of 25 additional interview points. The initial evaluation score and interview score will be combined to establish the final ranking.

The purpose of the interview is to evaluate and clarify the shortlisted Proposer's qualifications, project approach, proposed personnel, understanding of the Work, ability to perform the Work, and other matters included within the evaluation criteria identified in this solicitation.

If interviews are conducted, all shortlisted Proposers will be provided substantially with the same instructions, allotted substantially the same amount of presentation and interview time, and evaluated using the same interview criteria and scoring methodology.

The City may ask follow-up questions reasonably necessary to clarify a Proposer's response. Proposers shall not use the interview to materially modify their proposal, substitute proposed personnel, revise their proposal price, or otherwise alter their proposal except when specifically requested or permitted by the City in accordance with applicable law and the solicitation.

If interviews are conducted, shortlisted Proposers will be evaluated as follows:

Interview Criteria:

1. Understanding of Project and Key Challenges – 5 points
2. Project Approach, Sequencing, and Execution – 7 points
3. Key Personnel / Team Demonstrated Knowledge – 5 points
4. Schedule, Risk Management, and Problem Solving – 5 points
5. Clarity, Responsiveness, and Substantive Knowledge of the Proposed Team – 3 points

Maximum Allowable Submission Evaluation Points = 100
Maximum Allowable Interview Points = 25
Total Maximum Allowable Points = 125

The remainder of this page was intentionally left blank.

Interview Scoring Rubric:

Category	Score Range	Rating	Description
Understanding of Project and Key Challenges	5	Exceptional	Demonstrates exceptional understanding of the project, its objectives, constraints, and key challenges; identifies project-specific issues and provides well-supported insights.
	4	Above Average	Demonstrates strong understanding of the project and key challenges with only minor gaps or unanswered concerns.
	3	Acceptable	Demonstrates adequate understanding of the project and primary challenges, but provides limited detail or project-specific insight.
	2	Below Average	Demonstrates partial understanding; overlooks or inadequately addresses material project challenges.
	1	Poor	Demonstrates limited understanding of the project and key challenges, creating significant concerns.
	0	No Responsive Information	Fails to demonstrate an understanding of the project or does not address the criterion.
Project Approach, Sequencing, and Execution	6-7	Exceptional	Presents a detailed, project-specific, feasible approach with logical sequencing and a clear execution strategy that materially supports successful delivery.
	5	Above Average	Presents a strong, credible approach and sequencing plan with only minor weaknesses or unanswered concerns.
	4	Acceptable	Presents an adequate approach and sequencing plan demonstrating ability to execute the work, but with limited detail or differentiation.
	2-3	Below Average	Approach or sequencing partially addresses project needs but contains material weaknesses, gaps, or feasibility concerns.
	1	Poor	Presents an inadequate or unsupported approach with limited evidence of effective sequencing or execution planning.
	0	No Responsive Information	Fails to provide a responsive project approach, sequencing, or execution strategy.
Key Personnel / Team Demonstrated Knowledge	5	Exceptional	Key personnel demonstrate exceptional project-relevant knowledge, clearly defined roles, strong qualifications, and command of the proposed work.
	4	Above Average	Team demonstrates strong relevant knowledge and qualifications with only minor gaps in role clarity or depth.
	3	Acceptable	Team demonstrates adequate knowledge and qualifications, but responses provide limited depth, relevance, or role clarity.
	2	Below Average	Team demonstrates inconsistent or limited knowledge, with notable gaps in qualifications, roles, or project understanding.
	1	Poor	Team demonstrates minimal relevant knowledge or insufficient command of the proposed work.
	0	No Responsive Information	Key personnel do not demonstrate responsive knowledge or the criterion is not addressed.
Schedule, Risk Management, and Problem Solving	5	Exceptional	Demonstrates a realistic schedule strategy, proactively identifies project-specific risks, provides effective mitigation measures, and offers strong problem-solving methods.
	4	Above Average	Demonstrates a strong schedule and risk-management approach with credible problem-solving strategies and only minor weaknesses.
	3	Acceptable	Adequately addresses schedule, risks, and problem solving but provides limited detail, specificity, or proactive mitigation.
	2	Below Average	Partially addresses schedule or risk management; mitigation and problem-solving strategies contain material weaknesses or gaps.
	1	Poor	Demonstrates limited schedule awareness, risk planning, or problem-solving capability, creating significant concerns.
	0	No Responsive Information	Fails to address schedule, risk management, or problem solving in a responsive manner.
Clarity, Responsiveness, and Substantive Knowledge of the Proposed Team	3	Exceptional	Responses are exceptionally clear, direct, and substantive; proposed team members demonstrate strong command of their roles, the project, and the information presented.
	2	Above Average	Responses are clear and substantive and demonstrate strong team knowledge, with only minor gaps or lack of precision.
	1	Acceptable	Responses are generally responsive and demonstrate adequate team knowledge, but lack depth, clarity, or specificity.
	0.5	Below Average	Responses are only partially responsive or clear and reveal notable gaps in the proposed team's substantive knowledge.
	0.1-0.4	Poor	Responses are unclear, minimally responsive, or demonstrate insufficient substantive knowledge by the proposed team.
	0	No Responsive Information	Fails to respond substantively to the criterion or provides no meaningful evidence of team knowledge.

Surety Bonding Requirements:

- **Bid (or Proposal) Bond**
  Each proposer shall submit a Bid Bond in an amount not less than five percent (5%) of the total bid amount, payable to the City of Garland, issued by a reliable surety company authorized to do business in the State of Texas.

  The Bid Bond shall serve as a guarantee that the proposer will enter into a contract and execute the required Performance Bond, Payment Bond, and Maintenance Bond within ten (10) days after receipt of the Notice of Award.

- **Payment & Performance Bond Requirements**
  Payment and Performance Bonds are required for this project.

  Pursuant to Texas Government Code §2253.021 (1) and (2):
  - Public works contracts in excess of $50,000 require a Payment Bond
  - Public works contracts in excess of $100,000 require a Performance Bond

  Both the Payment Bond and Performance Bond shall be issued for 100% of the total awarded contract amount.

- **Maintenance Bond**
  A Maintenance Bond will also be required. The Maintenance Bond ensures that the Contractor will maintain and repair all work performed under the Contract for a period of two (2) years from the date of final acceptance of the Work.

  The Maintenance Bond shall be in the amount of ten percent (10%) of the total awarded contract amount.

Terms and Conditions:
The following terms and conditions are hereby incorporated by reference as if attached hereunto:

City of Garland Terms & Conditions

The remainder of this page was intentionally left blank.