



The LaBiche  
ARCHITECTURAL GROUP, INC.

Dohn H. LaBiche, FAIA  
Principal

Greg Wall, AIA  
Principal

7999 Gladys Avenue,  
Suite 101  
Beaumont, Texas 77706  
(409) 860-0197  
Fax: (409) 860-0198  
www.labiche.com

December 9, 2019

Tyler County Commissioners Court  
Judge Jacques L. Blanchette  
100 W. Bluff, RM #102  
Woodville, TX 75979

Re: **Re-roofing Tyler County Courthouse**

Dear Judge Blanchette:

ARCHITECTURE

PROJECT  
CONSULTING

PLANNING

INTERIOR  
DESIGN

Upon examination of the bids received on December 9, 2019, for the above referenced project, we have determined Marsh Waterproofing Inc. of Vidor, Texas to be the low bidder for your project. We have examined their qualifications and Bid documents. It is our suggestion that the contract be awarded to Marsh Waterproofing Inc. in the amount of One Hundred Sixty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents and (\$160,000.00). We have past experience in working with this company and have experienced successful working relationships in the past.

Upon your approval we will begin to gather the required documents: Payment & Performance Bonds, Schedule of Values, Insurance, work schedule, etc. Upon receiving these documents from the Contractor, we will issue a Notice to Proceed. We look forward to beginning this project and working with you and the Tyler County Courthouse Staff. If there are any questions or you need further information please notify my office.

Sincerely,

Dohn H. LaBiche, FAIA  
DHL/bo



**APPROVAL**

Name (print): \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

RE-ROOFING OF  
TYLER COUNTY COURTHOUSE

**SECTION 000499 – CONTRACTOR EVALUATION**

Contractor: Marsh Waterproofing

Date: 12.09.19

Conditions of Evaluation:

Based on the information provided by the Proposer in the Bid and the General Contractor Qualification Statement, and interviews with referenced clients and architects, the Owner shall use the following criteria to evaluate the proposals submitted. The proposal with the highest numerical score shall be selected. 100 Points is the maximum score.

- a. The amount of the Contract Sum. 25  
**25 points for the low bid;**  
**20 points for the second lowest bid;**  
**15 points for the third lowest bid;**  
**10 points for the fourth lowest bid.**
  
- b. The experience of the Proposer in providing roofing services in similar projects. 10  
**10 points maximum, weighted.**
  
- c. Experience in providing general roofing services for restoration, preservation, and adaptive use projects over the past ten (10) years 10  
**10 points maximum, weighted.**
  
- d. The experience of the Proposer's project team on similar projects. 10
  1. Qualifications of the proposed project manager.
  2. Qualifications of the proposed project superintendent.**10 points maximum, weighted.**
  
- e. The experience and reputation of proposed prime subcontractors on similar projects. 10
  1. Prime subcontractors and suppliers for this project:  
**10 points maximum, weighted.**
  
- f. The reputation of the Proposer and of the Proposer's services, based on interviews with past clients and architects. 10
  1. Is the Proposer considered a "team player" or was the relationship "adversarial?"
  2. Will past clients and architects work with Proposer again on future projects?
  3. Does Proposer maintain project schedule and complete the project on time?
  4. Does the Proposer pay subcontractors and suppliers on time?
  5. Is the Proposer fair to the client in pricing change proposals?
  6. Does the Proposer maintain good records during construction?**10 points maximum, weighted.**
  
- g. The Proposer's performance during the final completion and closeout phase of the work. 10
  1. Punch lists completed on schedule?
  2. Quality of punch list work equal to original work?
  3. Closeout documents provided as specified?
  4. Satisfactory cleaning, equipment startup, Owner personnel training?
  5. Accurate record documents provided as specified and on time?**10 points maximum, weighted.**

RE-ROOFING OF  
TYLER COUNTY COURTHOUSE

- h. The Proposer's performance on warranty requests.

  - 1. Responsiveness to warranty requests.
  - 2. Quality of warranty work equal to original work; done by same subcontractors?
  - 3. End-of-warranty inspections completed and done in a satisfactory manner?

**5 points maximum, weighted.** 5
  
- i. Attendance to the Pre-Bid Conference

**5 points** 5
  
- j. The Proposer's time for completion of the project.

  - 5 points for the least amount of days.** 5
  - 4 points for the second least amount of days.**
  - 3 points for the third least amount of days.**
  - 2 points for the fourth least amount of days.**
  - 1 point for the fifth least amount of days.**

Total available points = 100

Total points awarded: 100

END OF SECTION 000499