General Contractors (GC):
7. Lead Foreman Experience
HB Construction & Bradbury Stamm completed Section 7 regarding Lead Foreman Experience. Jaynes Corporation, Flintco LLC, Gerald Martin, & White Sands all left this section intentionally blank.

Architect Comments:
The requirement for Lead Foreman Qualifications was obviously unclear as issued in Addendum #2. Submittal of the Lead Foreman qualification requirements will be necessary as part of the project startup process. Recommend waiving the requirement as non-essential for qualification.

Similar Project Experience
All GCs submitted experience relating to Detention Centers with the exception of White Sands Construction. White Sands Construction did list a few law enforcement buildings but none of which are similar to a Detention Center project.

Architect Comments:
Project experience submitted was not commensurate with the requirements of the qualification questionnaire. The submitted projects did not reflect experience with at least three Detention Facilities within the last ten years. Recommend disqualification as this is a key qualification criterion.

Security Electronics (SE):
7.a Experience Modification Rate (EMR)
Engineered Control Systems, Sierra Detention Systems, CML RW, & Secure Control Systems all had an EMR over 1.0 for each of the past five years. The only company in compliance with this criterion is Metroplex Control Systems.

Architect Comments:
Although an EMR of less than 1.0 would be considered as a favorable rating in the eyes of the Owner, it is not critical to the performance under this contract. Recommend that this requirement be waived as non-essential.
7.c.2 Safety Experience
Sierra Detention center is the only SE subcontractor that answered no to section 7.c.1, saying they did not have a lead safety program manager on one or more projects valued at least $5,000,000 each.

**Architect Comments:**
The response by Sierra Detention was incorrectly noted due to their misunderstanding of the Project Value. The intent was a Total Project Value of $5,000,000, rather than a sub-contract value of $5,000,000. Sierra’s response to question 7.C.2 should have, therefore, been “yes”.

10. Quality Assurance
Engineered Control Systems (ECS) is the only SE subcontractor that answered no to section 10, saying that they do not have a written quality assurance program.

**Architect Comments:**
ECS should have responded positively to this item. They are a subsidiary of Norment who did indicate having a Quality Assurance Plan in their submission as a Detention Equipment Contractor. Recommend waiving this response.

**Detention Equipment (DE):**

2. Department of Labor Registration
Sweeper Metal Fabricators is the only DE Subcontractor that was not registered with the NM Department of Labor as required pursuant to 13-4-13.1.

**Architect Comments:**
Registration with the NM Department of Labor is not required to be current if the entity is not currently paying wages in New Mexico. Sweeper Metal Fabricators will be required to register with the NM Department of Labor prior to execution of any contracts for work in the state of New Mexico.

7.a Experience Modification Rate (EMR)
Norment Security Group, Sweeper Metal Fabricators, ISI Detention Contracting, Sierra Detention Systems, CML RW Security, & Secure Control Systems all had an EMR over 1.0 for each of the past five years. The only company in compliance with this criterion is CCC Group.

**Architect Comments:**
Although an EMR of less than 1.0 would be considered as a favorable rating in the eyes of the owner, it is not critical to the performance under this contract. Recommend waiving this requirement as non-essential.
7.c.2 Safety Experience
Sierra Detention center is the only DE subcontractor that answered no to section 7.c.1, saying they did not have a lead safety program manager on one or more projects valued at least $5,000,000 each.

Architect Comments:
The response by Sierra Detention was incorrectly noted due to their misunderstanding of the Project Value. The intent was a Total Project Value of $5,000,000, rather than a sub-contract value of $5,000,000. Sierra’s response to question 7.C.2 should have therefore been “yes”.

*This summary is to address criteria that were not met by bidders. All criteria/bidders not listed have been met/are in compliance.*