#### Contractor Recommendation – Selective Demolition



## Gonzales County Courthouse Annex Building

April 11, 2025

### I. Project Background

CPM Texas was engaged in late 2024, near the end of the design phase, by Gonzales County for a Renovation project that is focused on updating and enhancing the functionality of the county annex building. This building, which spans 25,000 square feet and is located at 1709 E. Sarah DeWitt Dr., Gonzales, TX 78629, will initially serve as a temporary courthouse during the main courthouse renovation. Once the courthouse renovations are complete, the annex will be repurposed for future county operations.

### II. Contractor Proposal Analysis

A Request for Competitive Sealed Proposals (CSP RFP #2025A-001) was issued and publicly posted on February 19th. The RFP was posted in the Gonzales Inquirer for 2 weeks, starting on February 19th. Pre-Bid site walks were held with interested contractors on March 3<sup>rd</sup> and March 10<sup>th</sup>. Proposals were received on March 26<sup>th</sup> from JR Ramon Demolition, Robles 1, Vesta Commercial and Weaver & Jacobs Constructors.

Following receipt of the proposal submissions, CPM performed an analysis to identify the firm that provides the best value for Gonzales County. This analysis included evaluation of a leveled bid price, contractor experience and qualifications, past performance and references, project approach and schedule, and overall proposal quality (reference attached matrix). Each category of evaluation was weighted per the scoring information included in the RFP.

One item to note is that Weaver & Jacobs Constructors noted that their selective demolition proposal would not be valid without them being awarded the construction services portion of the project.

#### IV. Recommendation

While all bidding firms demonstrated the capability to perform the selective demolition scope of work for this Project, Robles 1 has distinguished itself as the best value for Gonzales County. Their strong qualifications, combined with a highly competitive price, clearly set them apart from the other respondents.

Following a thorough evaluation of all proposals and subsequent discussions with the contractors, CPM recommends awarding the selective demolition scope of work to Robles 1.

We respectfully request confirmation of the County's acceptance of this recommendation. Please refer to the attached supplement for detailed information supporting this recommendation.

Submitted by:
John Duke, Principal
Brian Carpenter, Project Manager
Isaac Dé Leon, Project Manager



# Proposal Analysis – Supplemental Information

Gonzales County Courthouse Annex Request for Proposal #2025A-001 - Selective Demolition Firm Selection Matrix

|   | Criteria  | Weight |
|---|---|--------|
| 1 | Price The total proposed cost for construction (including review of qualifications & assumptions & leveling as necessary)   | 40     |
| 2 | Leveled total cost (Max score of 1 assigned to 40 overall points - scale based on deviation from low bid).  Contractor's Experience & Qualifications  Evaluates the contractor's history with similar projects, years in business, etc. | 20     |
|   | Notes:  |        |
| 3 | Past Performance & References Reviews previous project success, client feedback, and adherence to schedules and budgets.  | 15     |
|   | Previous Project Success  |        |
|   | Project References  |        |
| 4 | Project Approach & Schedule Evaluates the contractor's methodology, timeline, and ability to manage risks.  | 20     |
|   | Notes:  |        |
| 5 | Overall Proposal Quality  Measures the submitted proposal's completeness, clarity, and thoroughness, ensuring responsiveness to the RFP requirements.   | 5      |
|   | Overall assessment  |        |
|   | TOTAL SCORE   |        |
|   | RANK  |        |

| JR Ramon Demolition  |           | Robles 1   |                                       | Vesta Commercial   |                                       | Weaver & Jacobs Constructors<br>(Selective demo not valid without<br>construction services award)   |  |  |
|--|-----------|--|---------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 31.61  |           | 40.00  |                                       | 36.04  |                                       | 36.91   |  |  |
| 0.79   | \$698,027 | 1.00   | \$577,000                             | 0.90   | \$634,091                             | 0.92  | \$621,621  |  |
|  | 20.00     |  | 19.00                                 |  | 18.00                                 |   | 15.00  |  |
| Company specializes in demolition with 80+years in business  |           | Demolition specific contractor with a proven track record and over 16 years in business.   |                                       | Demolition specific contractor with a proven track record. Approaching 10 years in business.   |                                       | Solid experience, but not as a demolition specific contractor.  |  |  |
| 15.00  |           | 15.00  |                                       | 15.00  |                                       | 15.00   |  |  |
| Representative past projects demonstrated success in selective demolition projects.  |           | Representative past projects demonstrated success in selective demolition projects.  |                                       | Representative past projects demonstrated success in selective demolition projects.  |                                       | Representative past projects demonstrated success in selective demolition projects.   |  |  |
| All references provided a positive experience with contractor  |           | All references provided a positive experience with contractor  |                                       | All references provided a positive experience with contractor  |                                       | All references provided a positive experience with contractor   |  |  |
| 15.00  |           | 15.00  |                                       | 15.00  |                                       | 20.00   |  |  |
| Approach to demolition of the project was thoughful and appropriate. Did not provide a detailed CPM schedule and logistics plan. Proposed schedule is approximately 2.5 months |           | Approach to demolition of the project was thoughtful and appropriate. Did not provide a detailed CPM schedule and logistics plan. Proposed schedule is just over two months. |                                       | Approach to demolition of the project was thoughtful and appropriate. Did not provide a detailed CPM schedule and logistics plan. Proposed schedule is ~ 2 months. |                                       | Provided an in-depth CPM schedule and logistics plan, along with narrative approach to tackling project. Proposed schedule is approximately 2.5 months. |  |  |
| 4.00   |           | 4.00   |                                       | 4.00   |                                       | 5.00  |  |  |
| Proposal was thorough and responsive.  |           | Prop   | Proposal was thorough and responsive. |  | Proposal was thorough and responsive. |   | Proposal was thorough and responsive, and distinguished from the others mainly due to a detailed CPM schedule and site logistics plan. |  |
| 86 93  |           | 93   |                                       | 88 92  |                                       |   |  |  |
|  | 4         |  | 1                                     |  | 3                                     |   | 2  |  |

construction services award)