

**NOTE: The Chief Procurement Officer will be prepared to respond to this e-mail at the City Commission Meeting, should you have any questions.**

Pounds, Michael

From: Ivan Ramos [iramos@serecacorp.com]

Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2009 8:22 PM

To: Gomez, Margie; Pounds, Michael; Contracts; City Clerk

Cc: 'Carlos Rivero, Jr.'

Subject: SERECA's position regarding the Evaluation Meeting (07-20-09) and Intent to Award RFP No. 2005.05.29 (Parking Cahier Services) to Standard Parking, Inc.

**CITY OF CORAL GABLES CONTRACT GROUP**

(Mr. Michael Pounds; Ms. Margie Gomez; Mr. Danny Bedit; Mr. Joe V. Rodriguez)

Procurement Division

City of Coral Gables

c.c. Mr. Walter Foeman, Coral Gables City Clerk (We would appreciate if this information is properly informed to City of Coral Gables Commissioners)

Dear Ms. Gomez, Mr. Pounds, Mr. Bedit and Mr. Rodriguez:

On behalf of JMG Insystems, Inc., DBA Sereca Corp., we want to let you know that we **totally disagree** with the results and the way the Purchasing Division handled the Evaluation Meeting of RFP No. 2005.05.29 (Parking Cashier Services).

In first place, we were **astonished** when, at the beginning of said meeting, in spite of the fact that we had previously **formally requested it**, as you can see in the email below, Mr. Michael Pounds announced, according to us without proper reasoning, that they **would not disqualify** the bid proposers that had included the "billing rates" in the text of their proposals, instead of in **SEALED ENVELOPES, as the RFP expressly requires**: (a) "...Proposal Pricing Schedule submitted in a **separate sealed envelope** will not be open ..." (RFP No. 2009.05.29, Public Notice, Proposal Page 3 of 28); b) "...Proposal Pricing Schedule shall be submitted in a **separate sealed envelope**..." (RFP No. 2009.05.29, Section 1, Introduction to Request for Proposal, Submission of Responses, Subsection 1.3, Proposal Page 7 of 28) and c) "...Failure to submit this form in a **separate sealed envelope** may deem your Proposal non-responsive..." (RFP No. 2009.05.29, Section 7, Proposal Pricing Schedule, Proposal Page 28 of 28).

In second place, we were also **astonished** when we noticed that Mr. Michael Pounds did not make any reference, nor inform any of the three (3) members of the Evaluation Committee, of the **very important comments and observations about several issues and mistakes committed by five (5) proposers (DOUBLE PARKING, FIVE STAR PARKING, CENTRAL PARKING SYSTEM, STANDARD PARKING and LAZ PARKING)** in their RFP submissions, which we gathered during a review that we conducted of all RFP proposals on July 16, 2009. For the record, we suggest to read the complete email (below) which includes the entire text of the comments and observations that, on July 16, 2009, we submitted to City of Coral Gables Procurement Division regarding said RFP, and in which we formally and expressly requested that said five (5) proposers be disqualified (**NON RESPONSIVE**).

As can be seen in the email below, there were **four (4) proposers (DOUBLE PARKING, CENTRAL PARKING SYSTEM, STANDARD PARKING and LAZ PARKING)** that did not submit their "billing rates" in **sealed envelopes** and, therefore, **should have been properly disqualified and considered NON RESPONSIVE**.

Also, as already mentioned, there were several other important "**mistakes**" and "**omissions**" committed by **five (5) proposers** that, **according to us**, were apparently **OVERLOOKED** by the Purchasing Division, considering that although Ms. Margie Gomez acknowledged and thanked us for our "comments", never answered or let us know if they verified our findings, comments and observations, nor did she (Purchasing Division) give us the **reasons** why they overlooked these mistakes and omissions. According to us, there were sufficient grounds to disqualify and consider **NON RESPONSIVE** all of these already mentioned **five (5) proposers**.

Specifically focusing the analysis on Standard Parking, Inc., which we received formal notice today that the City Of Coral Gables Purchasing Division considers the **MOST RESPONSIVE AND RESPONSIBLE** proposer and, as such, has issued the **intent to award** them the contract, we reiterate the following comments and observations (**mistakes and omissions**) committed in their RFP submission:

Standard Parking, Inc., included in its proposal the **BILLING RATES** for Parking Cashiers/Attendants (**\$ 13.44/Hour**) and Supervisors (**\$ 14.58/Hour**), when the RFP document **specifically requests** that: a) "...Proposal Pricing Schedule submitted in a separate sealed envelope will not be open..." (RFP No. 2009.05.29, Public Notice, Proposal Page 3 of 28); b) "Proposal Pricing Schedule shall be submitted in a separate sealed envelope" (RFP No. 2009.05.29, Section 1, Introduction to Request for Proposal, Submission of Responses, Subsection 1.3, Proposal Page 7 of 28) and c) "Failure to submit this form in a **separate sealed envelope** may deem your Proposal non-responsive" (RFP No. 2009.05.29, Section 7, Proposal Pricing Schedule, Proposal Page 28 of 28). In addition,

7/23/2009

separate sealed envelope may deem your Proposal non-responsive" (RFP No. 2009.05.29, Section 7, Proposal Pricing Schedule, Proposal Page 28 of 28). In addition, **Standard Parking: i) did not indicate the type of organization (Corporation) in Page 35 of their proposal; ii) did not include the initial in the acknowledgement of the Addenda, Page 36 of their proposal and iii) did not sign -- nor included specific required notarization of -- several important Forms Pages included in their submission, namely, among others, Pages 42, 44, 46, 48, 50, 52, 54, 56 and 57 of their proposal.** Therefore, based on all of the above facts, which the Purchasing Division staff can easily verify, we hereby formally request that **Standard Parking** be considered **NON-RESPONSIVE**.

On the other hand, regarding the specific **process of the evaluation meeting** of RFP No. 2005.05.29, **which we were able to observe on July 20, 2009**, we found it to be **very subjective and biased**, considering the **final evaluation results** that were handed to us at the end of the evaluation meeting. In fact, according to us, what they actually mentioned and commented in their appraisal did not coincide with the evaluation results. We feel that **we were not fairly evaluated** by all three (3) members of the evaluating committee and that they **favorred and were more inclined** towards giving higher evaluation to other proposers. The **subjective** evaluation placed us tied on **FIFTH** place. There were evaluators that placed us **LAST** on all of the evaluation criteria. **We do not agree with their appraisal.** Although we cannot question the reasoning behind their evaluation criteria, we must let you know that we feel we were **mistreated**.

Finally, in spite of all of the above, **we feel that we do not have sufficient grounds to initiate a PROTEST PROCEDURE**, considering that even if we are able to convince, protest and obtain that the already mentioned five (5) proposers be declared NON RESPONSIVE, for which we feel we definitely have sufficient grounds, **SERCA HAS NO SUFFICIENT GROUNDS to REVERSE the "subjective evaluation"** conducted by the three (3) members of the evaluation committee. Therefore, even if the five (5) proposers are disqualified, there are two (2) other proposers (**IMPARK and AMPCO PARKING**) that, **in that order**, based on our own analysis of the results of the overall evaluation, would become the **FIRST AND SECOND** place of the RFP, respectively, and we (SERCA) would end up in **THIRD PLACE**.

We hereby let you know that we would be more than willing to analyze and discuss the content of this email, at your earliest convenience.

Best regards,

Ivan R. Ramos  
Branch Manager  
JMG Insystems, Inc. DBA Sereca Corp.  
2628 NW 97 Avenue, Miami, Fl. 33172  
Office Phone: (305) 573-7322  
24/7 Cellular Phone: (786) 663-2380  
Fax: (305) 597-1544  
Email: [iramos@serecacorp.com](mailto:iramos@serecacorp.com)  
WEB PAGE: [www.serecacorp.com](http://www.serecacorp.com)

---

**From:** Ivan Ramos [mailto:[iramos@serecacorp.com](mailto:iramos@serecacorp.com)]  
**Sent:** Friday, July 17, 2009 9:11 AM  
**To:** 'Gomez, Margie'; 'Carlos Rivero, Jr.'  
**Cc:** 'Contracts'; 'mpounds@coralgables.com'  
**Subject:** RE: REVIEW of Proposals made for RFP No. 2005.05.29 (Parking Cahier Services for City of Coral Gables)

Ms. Margie Gomez  
Procurement  
City of Coral Gables

Dear Ms. Gomez:

Thank you for acknowledging receipt of our email (below).

As requested, we expect that the information we provided will be informed to the members of the EVALUATION COMMITTEE.

Finally, we confirm that Mr. Carlos Rivero, and the undersigned, will attend the "evaluation meeting" to be held on July 20, at 2.00 PM., at which time we will be glad to answer any questions and clarify any subject that the evaluation committee requires.

Best regards,

Ivan R. Ramos  
Branch Manager  
JMG Insystems, Inc. DBA Sereca Corp.  
2628 NW 97 Avenue, Miami, Fl. 33172  
Office Phone: (305) 573-7322  
24/7 Cellular Phone: (786) 663-2380  
Fax: (305) 597-1544  
Email: [iramos@serecacorp.com](mailto:iramos@serecacorp.com)  
WEB PAGE: [www.serecacorp.com](http://www.serecacorp.com)

7/23/2009

**From:** Gomez, Margie [mailto:mgomez@coralgables.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, July 17, 2009 8:46 AM  
**To:** Ivan Ramos; Carlos Rivero, Jr.  
**Cc:** Contracts  
**Subject:** RE: REVIEW of Proposals made for RFP No. 2005.05.29 (Parking Cahier Services for City of Coral Gables)

Good Morning Mr. Ramos and Mr. Rivero:

Thank you for your comments; Addendum No. 4 issued yesterday is the evaluation meeting notice. It is a public meeting therefore, you are welcome to attend. However, prospective bidders are not allowed to question the committee. On the other hand, the committee may question vendors for clarification purposes only.

Regards,

Margie Gomez  
 City of Coral Gables  
 Procurement

**From:** Ivan Ramos [mailto:iramos@serecacorp.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 16, 2009 9:02 PM  
**To:** Pounds, Michael; Gomez, Margie; Contracts  
**Cc:** 'Carlos Rivero, Jr.'  
**Subject:** REVIEW of Proposals made for RFP No. 2005.05.29 (Parking Cahier Services for City of Coral Gables)

Mr. Michael Pounds and Ms. Margie Gomez  
 Purchasing Division  
 City of Coral Gables

Dear Ms. Gomez and Mr. Pounds:

In first place, on behalf of JMG Insystems, Inc., DBA Sereca Corp., we want to thank you for the hospitality of the Purchasing Division Staff this morning, when Mr. Carlos Rivero (Operations Manager) and the undersigned (Branch Manager) visited your office to review the proposals submitted on June 17<sup>th</sup> for RFP No. 2005.05.29.

For your information, in the review conducted this morning by Mr. Rivero and the undersigned, we found several very important issues that, **FOR THE RECORD AND IN ORDER TO AVOID AN UNNECESSARY PROTEST PROCEDURE THAT WE WOULD BE FORCED TO FILE**, we hereby bring up to City of Coral Gables' Purchasing Division attention the following facts, namely:

1. **DOUBLE PARKING, LLC.**

This "proposer", as far as we know, included in the proposal the BILLING RATES for Parking Cashiers/Attendants (\$ 12.95/Hour) and Supervisors (\$ 15.95/Hour), when the RFP document specifically requests that: a) "Proposal Pricing Schedule submitted in a separate sealed envelope will not be open..." (RFP No. 2009.05.29, Public Notice, Proposal Page 3 of 28); b) "Proposal Pricing Schedule shall be submitted in a separate sealed envelope" (RFP No. 2009.05.29, Section 1, Introduction to Request for Proposal, Submission of Responses, Subsection 1.3, Proposal Page 7 of 28) and c) "Failure to submit this form in a separate sealed envelope may deem your Proposal non-responsive" (RFP No. 2009.05.29, Section 7, Proposal Pricing Schedule, Proposal Page 28 of 28). In addition, this proposer (Double Parking, LLC): i) did not complete the Bond Section included in Proposal Page 2 of 28 of the RFP; ii) answered "NO" to question No. 10 of Forms Page No. 4 of 29, RFP No. 2009.05.29, thus admitting that they did not have the complete documents and addenda; and finally, iii) did not fully complete and sign Forms Page 7 of 29, RFP No. 2009.05.29. Therefore, based on all of the above facts, which the Purchasing Division staff can easily verify, we hereby formally request that this proposer (Double Parking, LLC) be considered **NON-RESPONSIVE**.

2. **FIVE STAR PARKING**

This "proposer", in its submission, as far as we know, did not notarize Forms Page 7 and 20 of 29, RFP No. 2009.05.29. Therefore, based on the above fact, which the Purchasing Division staff can easily verify, we hereby formally request that this proposer (Five Star Parking) be considered **NON-RESPONSIVE**.

3. **CENTRAL PARKING SYSTEM**

This "proposer, as far as we know, included in the proposal the BILLING RATES for Parking Cashiers/Attendants (\$ 14.13/Hour) and Supervisors (\$17.43/Hour), when the RFP document specifically requests that: a) "Proposal Pricing Schedule submitted in a separate sealed envelope will not be open..." (RFP No. 2009.05.29, Public Notice, Proposal Page 3 of 28); b) "Proposal Pricing Schedule shall be submitted in a separate sealed envelope" (RFP No. 2009.05.29, Section 1, Introduction to Request for Proposal, Submission of Responses, Subsection 1.3, Proposal Page 7 of 28) and c) "Failure to submit this form in a separate sealed envelope may deem your Proposal non-responsive" (RFP No. 2009.05.29, Section 7, Proposal Pricing Schedule, Proposal Page 28 of 28). In addition, this proposer (Central Parking System), did not include the names and signatures of the required two (2) witness, thus not fully completing Forms Page 18 of 29, RFP 2009.05.29. Therefore, based on all of the above facts, which the Purchasing Division staff can easily verify, we hereby formally request that this proposer (Central Parking System) be considered **NON-RESPONSIVE**.

4. **STANDARD PARKING**

This "proposer, as far as we know, included in the proposal the BILLING RATES for Parking Cashiers/Attendants (\$ 13.44/Hour) and Supervisors (\$ 14.58/Hour), when the RFP document specifically requests that: a) "Proposal Pricing Schedule submitted in a separate sealed envelope will not be open..." (RFP No. 2009.05.29, Public Notice, Proposal Page 3 of 28); b) "Proposal Pricing Schedule shall be submitted in a separate sealed envelope" (RFP No. 2009.05.29, Section 1, Introduction to Request for Proposal, Submission of Responses, Subsection 1.3, Proposal Page 7 of 28) and c) "Failure to submit this form in a separate sealed envelope may deem your Proposal non-responsive" (RFP No. 2009.05.29, Section 7, Proposal Pricing Schedule, Proposal Page 28 of 28). In addition, this proposer (Standard Parking): i) did not indicate the type of organization (Corporation) in Page 35 of their proposal; ii) did not include the initial in the acknowledgement of the Addenda, Page 36 of their proposal and iii) did not sign -- nor included specific required notarization of -- several important Forms Pages included in the submission, namely, among others, Pages 42, 44, 46, 48, 50, 52, 54, 56 and 57 of their proposal. Therefore, based on all of the above facts, which the Purchasing Division staff can easily verify, we hereby formally request that this proposer (Standard Parking) be considered **NON-RESPONSIVE**.

5. **LAZ PARKING**

This "proposer, as far as we know, included in the proposal the BILLING RATES for Parking Cashiers/Attendants (\$ 14.17/Hour) and Supervisors (\$ 17.15/Hour), when the RFP document specifically requests that: a) "...Proposal Pricing Schedule submitted in a separate sealed envelope will not be open..." (RFP No. 2009.05.29, Public Notice, Proposal Page 3 of 28); b) "Proposal Pricing Schedule shall be submitted in a separate sealed envelope" (RFP No. 2009.05.29, Section 1, Introduction to Request for Proposal, Submission of Responses, Subsection 1.3, Proposal Page 7 of 28) and c) "Failure to submit this form in a separate sealed envelope may deem your Proposal non-responsive" (RFP No. 2009.05.29, Section 7, Proposal Pricing Schedule, Proposal Page 28 of 28). Therefore, based on all of the above facts, which the Purchasing Division staff can easily verify, we hereby formally request that this proposer (LAZ Parking) be considered NON-RESPONSIVE.

Considering the important information indicated above, we hereby formally request that said information be appropriately distributed and informed to the selected members of the EVALUATION COMMITTEE, prior to their meeting (open to the public) to be held on July 20, 2009, at 2.00 PM.

Finally, assuming and taking for granted that the above mentioned five (5) proposers (DOUBLE PARKING LLC, FIVE STAR PARKING, CENTRAL PARKING SYSTEM, STANDARD PARKING and LAZ PARKING) will be considered NON-RESPONSIVE, we are almost sure that our firm, JMG Insystems, Inc., DBA Sereca Corp. is the actual LOWEST BIDDER among the remaining three (3) other RESPONSIVE AND RESPONSIBLE PROPOSERS OF RFP No. 2009.05.29 (AMPCO SYSTEM PARKING, IMPARK and JMG Insystems, Inc., DBA Sereca Corp.). Therefore, we are hoping and look forward to be selected for contract award by the EVALUATION COMMITTEE.

Please feel free to Contact Mr. Carlos Rivero ([crivero@serecacorp.com](mailto:crivero@serecacorp.com), 786-2736136) or the undersigned at your earliest convenience.

Best regards,

Ivan R. Ramos  
Branch Manager  
JMG Insystems, Inc. DBA Sereca Corp.  
2628 NW 97 Avenue, Miami, FL 33172  
Office Phone: (305) 573-7322  
24/7 Cellular Phone: (786) 663-2380  
Fax: (305) 597-1544  
Email: [iramos@serecacorp.com](mailto:iramos@serecacorp.com)  
WEB PAGE: [www.serecacorp.com](http://www.serecacorp.com)

Under Florida Law, e-mail addresses are public records. If you do not want your e-mail address released in response to a public records request, do not send electronic mail to this entity. Instead, contact this office by phone or in writing.

7/23/2009